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Problem

Among the wide spectrum of definitions regarding the meaning of leadership there are also themes regarding a critical need for leadership-development, and the belief that leadership can be learned and should be available to all. Therefore, it can be said that higher education has both a responsibility and an opportunity to purposefully develop this a new generation of leaders. This study explored the potential of Andrews University to foster a culture of leadership-development that will transform students who will work in collaborative spheres of influence around the globe.
Methodology

I used an exploratory, mixed-methods design. Data from an electronic survey were gathered from 418 undergraduate students. Thirteen Andrews University administrators, faculty, and staff were interviewed from a purposive sample selection process. Their responses were analyzed, clustered, and presented in 24 themes.

Findings

Students showed a high level of agreement and support that Andrews should offer a variety of leadership-development programs. Students with higher levels of agreement that Andrews should offer leadership-development and believe that leadership-development will help them Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith and Change the World will likely participate in the higher levels of leadership-development programs. The discriminate analysis showed that other demographic variables are not predictors of likely participation. The lack of characteristic predictors may be due to the generally high interest in leadership-development found in every demographic group.

Most interview respondents expressed that leadership-development is a worthwhile and attractive prospect for Andrews University and that students, staff, and central administration will be highly supportive. They also noted that while many faculty are already supportive of leadership-development, that resistance should be expected, especially related to curriculum changes. Concerns regarding the busy lives of students and faculty, lack of collaboration, further proliferation adding to the financial constraints, and too much talk—too little action emerged as challenges.
Recommendations and Conclusions

The data and findings that emerged from this study provided a framework to identify 13 best practices for Andrews University to consider. As a microcosm of the international community, Andrews University has the potential to be a nucleus of learning in fostering a global undergraduate leadership-development culture.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview and Background of Problem

The Need for Leadership

At the dawn of the 21st century in an era of epic change, we are daily confronted with uncertainty and chaos. Peter Vaill (1996) vividly compares our turbulent times to the dangers inherent in navigating permanent white water. "The events of 9/11 and the ongoing war on terrorism in the face of a myriad of global problems have created a new world playing field" (Tichy, 2002, p. 275). In every arena—government, business, education, church, community, and family—we encounter a crisis of leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000, NCLP). Tarnished images of leaders seeking personal advantage, declining civic engagement and heightened individualism, and a dearth of compelling leadership have created a culture of mistrust that showcases this deepening crisis (Astin & Astin, 2000; Boyer, 1987).

On this landscape, some managers feel compelled to choose the allure and demand for short-term profits over the importance of fostering a thriving long-term employment climate (Spivey, 2002). What appear to be efficient and traditional business practices often are shortsighted quick fixes that sometimes are motivated by self-interest (Bennis, 1989, Cohan, 2003; Tichy, 2002). In a democratic nation built on the tenet of the participation of its citizenship, the growing sense of distrust, apathy, and isolation is alarming. Noel Tichy
(2002) warned, “We are traversing terrain that weak or sleazy self-aggrandizers cannot take us across safely. We need smart, gutsy leaders with vision and integrity to get us through the minefields. And unfortunately, these leaders are in woefully short supply” (p. xxii). This looming leadership crisis is due not only to the irresponsibility of current leaders and the competitive market to find leaders, but also to the failure to plan for the succession of retiring leaders (Burns, 1978, p. 2; Caudron, 1999, p. 72).

Although the demand for more leaders exists, the quantity of leaders is of far less concern than is the scarcity of leaders with the qualities necessary to embrace the turmoil of our times, the explosion of information, and globalization (Burns, 1978; Tichy, 2002; Wheatley, 1999, 2005). The approach to leadership that consumed the 20th century was built on an industrial, machine-orientated paradigm that focused on solving problems in a controlled environment (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998; Rost, 1991; Wheatley, 1999, 2005). Margaret Wheatley (2005) stated that “the tension of our times is that we want our organizations to behave as living systems but we only know how to treat them as machines” (p. 33).

The Need for a New Kind of Leadership

In the new quantum world, filled with chaos, a new strategy is imperative (Wheatley, 2005). Ralph Stacey (1992) contended that the trouble with standard maps and traditional navigational principles is that they can be used only to identify routes that others have traveled before: they can make sense only for managing the knowable. Only under familiar conditions can the captain identify the ship’s future destination, and only under such conditions does it make sense for members of the team to follow the leader slavishly. An old map is useless when the terrain is new. Old beliefs cannot help in the task managers face today; managing the unknowable. (p. 4)
Susan Komives, Nance Lucas, and Timothy McMahon (1998) proposed that "to successfully navigate in this world, new maps are needed, maps describing the leadership that is needed in an era of rapid change" (p. 48).

Some authors argue that leadership based on position, authority, and control is ineffective for today's sea of challenges (Allen, Stelzner, & Wielkiewics, 1998; Wheatley, 2005). These challenges include critical, ethical dilemmas which have an impact on local and global systems which in turn demand that leadership be practiced from an ethical and spiritual framework (Allen et al., 1998, p. 3; Gardner, 1990; Greenleaf, 1977). Quite simply, there is a great need for a new generation of leaders (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 1; Tichy, 2002, p. xxii; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000, p. 2). Leadership spheres of influence that range from small family units to giant corporations united in purpose with integrity, respect, collaborative practices, and global competence have a powerful opportunity to change the world (Burns, 1978; Fairholm, 1998, p. xiv).

The Need for Leadership-Development

Kathleen Zimmerman-Oster and John Burkhardt (2000) found that "the leadership potential of students can be intentionally built. This can be both a great source of hope and a source of challenge to higher education and society. Acting on this responsibility should concern everyone who cares about the future" (p. 2). Astin and Astin (2000) admitted that while higher education must assume some of the responsibilities for the poor quality of leadership that currently characterizes much of American society, it also has the potential to produce future generations of transformative leaders who will be able to devise more effective solutions to some of our most pressing social problems. (p. 6)
Preparing graduates to be educated citizens engaged in leadership should be a major goal of American institutions of higher education (Astin & Astin, 2000; Brungardt, Gould, Moore, & Potts, 1997). Boyer (1987) asserted that an effective college education should help students to go beyond their own private interests, learn about the world around them, develop a sense of civic and social responsibility, and discover how they, as individuals, can contribute to the larger society of which they are a part (pp. 66-69). In 1990, John Gardner observed that our educational systems encourage the making of content experts and discourage the making of leaders who know how to use content to make positive change (p. 60).

Although institutions of higher education have been slow to implement a leadership culture, today the demand for positive leadership spans a host of divergent fields beyond the traditional field of business management. There is growing interest in producing graduates from any field of study who are equipped to use their education to change the world. Robert Colvin (2003) explained the situation in this way:

The knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for effective leadership seem closely aligned with the desired learning outcomes of a liberal arts education, regardless of major. Leadership study can be a complementary and integrating discipline in undergraduate liberal arts curricula, empowering graduates to engage others in making a positive difference in their selected fields of endeavor. Leadership study can help empower students to enact their liberal arts education. (p. 33)

Prior to formalized leadership programs in higher education, the student affairs division of a university was often the main provider of leadership training programs through student organizations (Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003, p. 228; Simonds, 1979). Even though these programs had recognized value, they lacked an approach that combined
theory and practice and were not considered leadership-studies programs.

Ronald Riggio, Joanne Ciulla, and Georgia Sorenson (2003) recorded nearly 1,000 recognized leadership-development programs in institutions of higher education in 2003 (p. 223). The general belief has been that in order for leadership studies to become a recognized academic pursuit, some form of academic authorization is necessary. Yet, until recently, few undergraduate leadership-development programs had strong curricular components that offered academic recognition with a leadership major, a leadership minor, or a leadership certificate.

Frank H. T. Rhodes (2001), president emeritus of Cornell University, posited that undergraduate education should provide students with “a sense of direction, with the self-discipline, values, and moral conviction to pursue it” (p. 6). Roya Ayman, Susan Adams, Bruce Fisher, and Erica Hartman (2003) maintained that higher education should play a significant role in developing the future of leadership.

As our universities stretch beyond traditional academic subjects to focus on leadership, personal growth and development, and even values, higher education is positioned to play a more pivotal role in the development of a leadership culture in our society. The evolution and advancement in our leadership-development programs in higher education institutions will contribute toward meeting our society's goals of developing leaders in all walks of life. (p. 220)

An Opportunity for Andrews University

The growing need for graduates to be able to work effectively with diverse groups of people presents Andrews University with a unique opportunity. According to U. S. News and World Report (“What Are National Universities?” 2006), Andrews University is ranked sixth in the nation in the percentage of international students. Andrews has an
opportunity to harness its optimum learning environment as a microcosm of the global community.

Recently, Wheatley (2005) stated, "I believe that the times have led leaders to a spiritual threshold. . . . We must enter the domain of spiritual traditions if we are to succeed as good leaders in these difficult times" (p. 126). The landscape of Andrews University's global community and faith-based approach to whole-person education provides a unique opportunity to intentionally develop a new generation of graduates to match the needs of the 21st century and diminish the existing leadership crisis.

Society's need for leadership-development and the unique and fertile landscape of Andrews University, coupled with my vantage point as a student-affairs' professional with extensive experience in co-curricular leadership-training programs, motivated my interest in developing a more intentional approach to leadership-development. With this combination of challenge and opportunity, I began exploring the idea of a comprehensive undergraduate leadership-development program on the campus of Andrews University.

Need to Understand the Meaning of Leadership

Gilbert Fairholm (1998) declared that "understanding the role and function of leadership is the single most important intellectual task of this generation, and leading is the most needed skill" (p. xiii). In light of the futility of attempting to understand the role of leadership until one understands the meaning of leadership, it is surprising that most studies on leadership neglect to offer a definition. Joseph Rost (1991) analyzed 587 works relating to leadership published between 1900 and 1990 and found that 366 did not supply
a definition of leadership (p. 46). Rost (1991) contended that “the fact that so many authors have written works on a phenomenon that they have not defined is a scandal that should have been exposed prior to 1990” (p. 46).

Although some scholars find little value in debating the definition of leadership, others are comfortable with the ambiguity and may find a single definition confining (Freeman & King, 1992, p. 3; Yukl, 1994, p. 5). Frank Freeman and Sarah King (1992) expressed the need to match definitions to purpose:

There is no single definition of 'leadership' (a holy grail) that we must somehow discover to be successful in the enterprise of leadership education. Rather, each community, institution and organization (indeed, each individual) must define “leadership” in a manner that complements and reinforces its raison d'etre. (p. 3)

Some scholars seem content to wait until leadership simply appears to reach a definition: “To an extent, leadership is like beauty: it's hard to define, but you know it when you see it” (Bennis, 1989, p. 1).

Understanding the definitions and meanings of the terms leader, leadership, and leadership-development and how these terms provide frameworks that influence small groups as well as entire cultures is especially critical for anyone seeking to teach or practice leadership. There is a growing number of scholars who charge that definitions of leadership as “a person with key traits” or a “position of power” have contributed to the fallacy that leadership is the same as management, a position of authority, or merely a set of traits (Burns, 1978; Fairholm, 1998, p. xiv; Jacobs, 1970, p. 339; Rost, 1991, p. 43). Mary Uhl-Bien (2003) stated that most contemporary definitions of leadership include “influence” and “change” as defining elements (p. 133); thus the
absence of influence and change may help us to understand how management differs from leadership.

Some scholars believe that studying phenomena such as management in the name of leadership contributes to the challenge of understanding and teaching leadership (Hoskins & Morley, 1988; Northhouse, 1997; Rost, 1991; Rost & Barker, 2000, p. 6). Abraham Zaleznik (1977) argued that leaders and managers differ in their worldviews and in their conceptions about chaos and order:

Leaders tolerate chaos and lack of structure and are thus prepared to keep answers in suspense, avoiding premature closure on important issues. Managers seek order and control and are almost compulsively addicted to disposing of problems even before they understand their potential significance. (p. 55)

Gardner (1990) described a manager as one who by virtue of a position is expected to organize systems and effectively allocate people and resources. John Kotter (1999) explained that whereas management uses positional power to cope with complexity by bringing order, leadership uses influence to produce change (pp. 52-53). Kotter (1996) also noted that management includes budgeting, organizing, and problem solving to keep systems running smoothly, whereas leadership creates, adapts, and inspires organizations in challenging and changing circumstances (p. 25). According to Gardner (1990) many managers could not “lead a squad of seven-year-olds to the ice-cream counter” (p. 2).

However, Gardner discouraged extreme contrasts, as leaders may “end up looking like a cross between Napoleon and the Pied Piper, and managers like unimaginative clods” (p. 3).

Although Kotter (1999) believed that most organizations are over-managed and under-led he cautioned that over-leading and under-management might be worse (pp. 8).
Henry Mintzberg (2004) agreed and argued that there is too much leadership and not enough management. He urged a return to a management framework that does not depend on charismatic saviors. Brian Bridgeforth (2005) expressed concern regarding a casual approach to understanding the essence of leadership, “leadership is often an illegitimate practice gestated and nurtured of a handicapped base of instruction” (p. 5).

In this study, I view leadership as a complex relational process rather than a formal position. As such the process opens the door of engagement to all members of the organization and informs and drives how one would design a comprehensive leadership-development program. Therefore, the importance of and challenges related to defining leadership and its influence on theory and practice are explored as part of this study. Leadership literature is discussed further in chapter 2.

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the level of interest and the expected challenges reported by Andrews University students, faculty, administration, and staff in implementing a comprehensive undergraduate leadership program. Another aspect of this study considers the potential of a formal undergraduate leadership program to complement the vision and mission of Andrews University. Additionally, the data gathered regarding the common practices of leadership-development programs in higher education may be informative for determining the best framework (a bachelor's degree, a minor, a cluster of leadership courses, a certificate program, a general education requirement, or an experiential learning component) for designing a formal undergraduate
leadership program at Andrews University.

Research Questions

I constructed research questions that were intended to determine the level of interest in developing a formalized undergraduate leadership program at Andrews University. The research questions are as follows:

1. What perspectives and characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University have in relationship to undergraduate leadership-development programs?

2. What characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University interested in participating in leadership-development programs have compared to students less interested in participating in leadership-development programs?

3. How might an undergraduate leadership-development program align with the mission of Andrews University?

4. What level of interest do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University have for an undergraduate leadership-development program?

5. What components do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University report would be needed for implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

6. What obstacles or challenges would exist in implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

Rationale for the Study and Significance of the Study

There is a growing consensus that at some point in any graduate's professional...
career, regardless of program or degree, he or she will be transmitting information, vision, and values and making critical decisions that have an impact others. This consensus reflects a resurgence of the historical purpose of a liberal-arts education that was designed not only to cultivate the mind but also to prepare graduates, engaged in strengthening their local and global communities, for leadership and service (Boyer, 1987; Bunting, 1998; Caruso, 1981; McIntire, 1989). In 2002, the Greater Expectations National Panel challenged liberal-arts education to shape "global thinkers who, enjoying a sophisticated world-view, consciously integrate their studies into the life of the community and the world" (p. 21).

With the rising cost of providing a quality education, university resources and personnel are stretched and limited. Thus, new programs undergo scrutiny and are sometimes treated with suspicion. In addition, just because there are nearly 1,000 undergraduate leadership programs in the country does not mean that one is needed, that one would be welcomed, or that one would flourish on the campus of Andrews University. In order for new programs to be embraced, developed, and implemented, they should reflect the University's mission and portray a compelling vision for strategic-planning initiatives.

In 2000, Andrews University created a mission-based marketing theme: Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, Change the World. The president of Andrews University, Niels-Erik Andreasen (2003), articulated a vision statement, A New Andrews for a New Century, which calls Andrews to embrace its "legacy of leadership" in order to influence the world (see Appendix A).
Increasingly, Adventist church members interact with their communities, leading the church to become ever more engaged in public affairs. This interaction will depend on a new class of church leaders, such as diplomats, lawyers, educators, business leaders, social agents, politicians and community leaders, who are able to serve as bridges between church and society. Andrews must help lead the way through its educational programs and public service. (p. 3)

Andreasen also commented on the rapid growth of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, its remarkable diversity, and the implications for Andrews University:

It is estimated that by the year 2020 the Adventist church family will number approximately 50 million members, and about 44 million of them will have joined the church in the 21st century. This new Adventist world church will continue to grow rapidly; its membership will become younger and more diverse; and it will reach out for education and leadership—the legacy of Andrews. (p. 2)

In conclusion, Andreasen stated that "the challenges facing Andrews University and the world church are enormous. They center around preparing the next generation of leaders, and our response to meeting that challenge must be strong, courageous, and durable" (p. 6).

The general body of liberal-arts educators, as well as some Andrews University educators, may argue that by mastering a rigorous discipline, students are equipped and prepared for leadership. Although it is true that vision statements and models should include inspirational verbiage, a brief review of the curriculum at Andrews University may bring into question the intentionality of Andrews University to develop leaders. Other than a few isolated classes, a General-Education service learning and diversity component, and traditional leadership training for appointed student-leaders, there is no coordinated plan at Andrews University to teach undergraduates how to use their knowledge and influence to work with others to change the world. Others may contend that a formal leadership-studies program is already available at the graduate level in the School of Education at Andrews
University and that a Center for Christian Leadership is currently housed in the Theological Seminary of Andrews University. If, however, Andrews University fails to address how to realize the institutional mission to *Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, Change the World* for the core undergraduate population, it is possible that Andrews University may fail to reach the full potential of Andrews University to build and fulfill our *Legacy of Leadership*.

This study explores the level of interest and potential for translating President Andreasen's vision for a *Legacy of Leadership* into practice at the undergraduate level at Andrews University. This investigation will shed light on the level of the intentionality of Andrews University to prepare students to become competent bridges of influence to strengthen and change their homes, work environments, churches, and communities. The findings in this study may also be used to determine if and what aspects of leadership-development could be used to support, enhance, and further implement the vision, mission, and influence of Andrews University.

Building on the assumption that leadership-study and leadership-practice should be anchored in a strong theoretical framework and a supporting model of leadership-development, this study examines a variety of theories, models, and best practices. In order to combat the rising costs of providing a quality education, Andrews University currently is seeking new marketing niches to attract and retain students. The exploration of the level of interest of current students in leadership-development could shed light on the potential of students to be attracted to the added value of an Andrews University undergraduate leadership-development program.
Theoretical Framework and Assumptions

According to Gay (1981) "an assumption is any important 'fact' presumed to be true but not actually verified" (p. 71). The basic assumptions underlying the purpose of this study are that (a) society needs more good leadership, (b) leadership can be taught, (c) college students are interested in making a positive difference in the world, (d) leadership-development should not be restricted to a few, and (e) a university is an ideal setting in which to develop a leadership culture.

Society Needs More Good Leadership

The enormous complexity of challenges in the 21st-century society call for a new generation of great leadership. According to Burns (1978), "One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership" (p. 10). The need for more leaders prepared to face complexity at all levels of society has never been greater (Brungardt, 1996, p. 91; Tichy, 2002, p. xxii).

Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) noted that "the nation's ability to respond and prosper will depend on the quality of leadership demonstrated at all levels of society" (p.1). Great leadership has the capacity to heal diverse human problems and transform lives and cultures (Astin & Astin, 2000; Burns, 1978; Kotter, 1996; Quigley, 1996).

Leadership Can Be Learned

According to Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner (1995) the belief that leadership cannot be learned "is a far more powerful deterrent to development then is the nature of leadership itself" (p. 16). The belief that leadership can be taught plays a key role in the
historical debate regarding whether leaders are born or bred. In spite of the basic belief that individuals can and do make a difference, as championed in the late 1800s by William James (1897), many scholars have strongly dismissed the assertion that leaders are born. Gardner (1990) argued, "Nonsense! Most of what leaders have that enables them to lead is learned. Leadership is not a mysterious activity" (p. xv). Astin and Astin (2000) insisted that "student leaders are not born. Rather, they are individuals who have associated themselves with other like-minded students and have taken the trouble to acquire the knowledge, skills, tools, and capabilities that are needed to effect change through the group" (p. 23).

Kotter (1996) contended that the most glaring error in the traditional assumptions related to the origins of leadership was in attributing it to a few gifted people: "The older model is oblivious to the power and potential of lifelong learning" (p. 176). Kouzes and Posner (1987) agreed that "every exceptional leader we know is also a learner" (p. 277). Vaill (1998) simply stated that "leadership is mainly learning" (p. 119). According to Tichy (2002), "the essence of leading is not commanding, but teaching. More than knowledge, experience, and a point of view, it is imperative that a leader have a teachable point of view" (Tichy, 2002, p. 75). Ronald Heifetz (1994) insisted that it is dangerous to presume that leaders are born. Born leaders are delusional, irresponsible, feeling no compulsion to grow, "their grandiosity is a set-up for a rude awakening and for blindly doing damage" (p. 20). Additionally, people who do not consider themselves born leaders "escape responsibility for taking action" (Heifetz, 1994, p. 20).

Ironically, Kouzes and Posner (1995) pointed out the lack of similar "born or
raised" questions being raised relative to management (p. 322). Nevertheless, Thomas Cronin (1993) noted that some scholars continue to question whether or not leaders can be made and thus "our institutions of higher learning are bashful about teaching leadership" (p. 8). In spite of these doubts, the plethora of leadership-development programs in higher education and the host of books and publications on the topic of leadership reflect the belief that a vibrant learning environment can foster leadership-development (Bass, 1990; Gardner, 1990; Komives et al., 1998; McGill & Slocum, 1997; Northouse, 1997; Watt, 2003).

College Students Are Interested in Making a Difference

The current generation of students is marked by increased involvement in civic activities and community service, as well as the desire and confidence to achieve. Generational theorists Neil Howe and William Strauss (2003) stressed that marketing higher education to this new group "requires more than just relying on reputation. It requires an explicit appeal to a sense of generational destiny" (p. 69). Leadership-development appeals to students seeking a special destiny. Astin and Astin (2000) reported that two-thirds of today's college students participate in community-service opportunities (p. 21).

Leadership-Development Should Not Be Restricted to a Few

As Gardner (1990) declared,

Great gifts unused, even unsuspected, are hardly a rarity. No doubt there have always been a great many men and women of extraordinary talent who have died...
“with all their music in them.” But it is my belief that with some imagination and social inventiveness we could tap those hidden reserves—not just for government, not just for business, but for all the diverse leadership needs of a dynamic society. (p. 182)

Leadership-development can foster growth and enhance the effectiveness of all individuals. Mark McCaslin (2001) stated that “the promise of leadership is the promise of potential.” Given that a democracy will rise or fall based on the commitment of its citizens, everyone can and ought to share the responsibility of contributing to society. According to Kouzes and Posner (1987), “it is our collective task to liberate the leaders within each and every one of us” (p. 387).

There is a growing consensus that leadership-development should not be restricted to extraordinary individuals or to those in specific positions but should be available to all members of an organization (Day, 2000; Drath, 1998; Harter, 2003; Manz & Sims, 1989; McGill & Slocum, 1997; Northouse, 1997, p. 11; Uhl-Bien, 2003, p. 143).

A University Climate Is Ideal for Fostering Leadership-Development

In light of the purpose and potential of fostering a culture of leadership and learning, it can be argued that a college setting is the best place to learn leadership-development. Not only is a university populated with experts who test and confirm assumptions, but it also holds strong theoretical frameworks related to how people learn and how to design programs with the appropriate pedagogical model. Astin and Astin (2000) maintained that higher education has the potential to produce future generations of transforming leaders who can help find solutions for our most vexing problems (p. 6).
Ayman et al. (2003) contended that "individuals in college are in a learning mode. This state of mind can make them ready and eager to try new things and to think outside of the box" (p. 207). Ayman et al. further suggested that because college students have fewer responsibilities, they have more time and energy to devote to self-development: "Programs that can seize this opportunity and time to help students develop the skills, knowledge, and wisdom required for leadership are invaluable to our society" (Ayman et al., 2003, p. 208). According to Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000), the most important finding of their report was the confirmation that leadership can be developed in college students if an intentional commitment is made to do so (p. 2).

Summary of Assumptions

The intentional design of formal leadership-development programs grows out of the general assumption that an intentional educational process stimulates a culture of life-long learning and out of the belief that students will not automatically learn leadership skills through mastering course content. This is a culture where everyone has something to teach and something to learn. Through testing these assumptions, this study may provide information about the feasibility of recommended parameters for the development of a formal undergraduate leadership-development program, specifically at Andrews University.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, I have defined the terms leader, leadership, leadership training, leadership education, leadership-development, undergraduate
leadership-development program, and leadership culture. The following terms are defined as they are used in this study:

*Leader* is one who influences others to make a positive difference.

*Leadership* is an active relational process influencing a positive change toward a common purpose.

*Leadership training* is the learning process of developing effective leadership relationships to influence positive change related to a current responsibility.

*Leadership education* is the learning process of developing effective leadership relationships to influence positive change in preparation for a future responsibility.

*Leadership-Development* is the continuous, comprehensive learning process of integrating formal learning and informal life experiences in the development of effective leadership competencies in order to influence positive change toward a common purpose.

*Undergraduate leadership-development program* is a comprehensive, undergraduate program in leadership-development that integrates experiential learning and academic recognition toward the granting of a degree, a minor, a certificate, or a developmental transcript confirming the completion of a set of core classes, experiences, or both.

*Leadership culture* is an environment that harnesses resources and designs opportunities to foster and integrate leadership-development into the fabric of a community or organization.
Delimitations

I intentionally limited the sample populations of this study and selected them for the purpose of determining the direct relationship between the findings and Andrews University. In order to focus at a deeper level on the interest in and challenges related to program implementation at Andrews University, this study does not incorporate the level of interest of potential students in leadership-development nor did it study potential employers' interest in hiring Andrews graduates with leadership-development credibility. Both may be topics for future research. In addition, while this study explored challenges related to implementation, it did not examine the processes of program development and approval at Andrews University.

Limitations

Gay (1981) described a limitation as "some aspect of the study that the researcher knows may negatively affect the results or generalizability of the results but over which he or she probably has no control" (p. 72). The recommendations of this study are largely descriptive and are limited to recommendations regarding the development of a leadership program at Andrews University. Although the findings of this study may not generalize to other institutions, they may be of general interest to other institutions in a similar state of program-exploration and program-development. Owing to the interview sample-size and selection-process, this study does not provide generalized findings representing every employee of Andrews University.

Consideration must be given to my bias and my position of employment at Andrews University. I am currently a leading advocate and member of an ad hoc team
exploring the potential for developing a comprehensive undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University. Additionally, I serve as the vice president for student life, and as a result, work in close proximity with students and colleagues at Andrews University. Although the influence of these biases is a limitation, that influence was minimized wherever possible in the methodology of this study.

Summary

A review of the literature surrounding the challenge to define leadership and the history of leadership theory and leadership-development programs appears in chapter 2. The research design and methodology is described in chapter 3. The results of the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study are reported separately. The report of the qualitative phase of the study is provided in chapter 4; the results of the quantitative phase are reported in chapter 5. Chapter 6 presents a holistic discussion of the quantitative and the qualitative findings, a summary of the study, and recommendations. The postscript consists of my final reflections related to this study, and the prospect of creating a culture of leadership-development for Andrews University comprises chapter 7.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In view of the universal call to leadership (Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1990; Wren, 1995) and the purpose of this study—to explore the level of interest in and potential for fostering undergraduate leadership-development at Andrews University—this review covers a wide spectrum in the field of leadership. It first provides collective insights regarding the challenge of understanding the meaning of leadership. Wren (1995) asserted that "because the issues relating to leadership cut across all types of human activity and thought, true understanding of such a complex phenomenon requires a broadly conceived approach" (p. x). Thus, the more that is known and understood about the process of leadership from scholars who study, teach, and practice it, the stronger the foundation for considering the implementation of an undergraduate leadership program at Andrews University. Furthermore, as Richard Barker (1997) asked, "How can we train leaders if we do not know what leadership is?" (p. 343).

With that question in mind, it is surprising to note the number of current leadership-development programs that lack even the acknowledgment of a theoretical foundation (Ayman et al., 2003, p. 218). Additionally, although there have been few studies on effective outcomes of leadership-development programs, there are some
generalizations from the research that may be valuable in building the theoretical foundation and applied strategies for an undergraduate leadership program (Ayman et al., 2003).

Therefore, this review of literature includes an overview of the challenge to define leadership; a historical review of leadership theory; summaries of the history, growth, and published research related to formal leadership-development programs in educational institutions; and, finally, an overview of the variety of models of formal leadership-development programs.

The Challenge to Define Leadership

Attempts to define and understand leadership have been both numerous and nebulous (Gardner, 1990; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Rost, 1991). James MacGregor Burns's (1978) often-quoted expression that “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2) may contribute to a continued lack of diligence in understanding the role of leadership. The lack of agreement on a universal definition of leadership may be related to the wide variety of scholars who have sought to understand it. Bernard Bass (1990) declared that “there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 11).

For much of the 20th century, the meaning and definitions of the words leader and leadership have been assumed, conspicuously ignored, or the subject of vigorous discussion (Burns, 1978; Rost, 1991). Rost (1991) went so far as to declare that the inability of scholars and practitioners to have a common notion of leadership has led to “a
culture of definitional permissiveness and relativity" (p. 6). Additionally, Rost (1991) stated that the mythological significance of the word *leadership* has contributed to the challenge of defining the concept:

Leadership is a word that has come to mean all things to all people. Even worse, leadership has increasingly become a very "hot word" since about 1960, with an ability to produce a passionate reaction that draws people to it through an emotional attraction. Leadership has been "in" for so long, I cannot remember when it was "out." (p. 7)

Some scholars have chosen to define what leadership is not. Gardner (1990) and Kotter (1999) contended that leadership is not mysterious. Kotter further declared that leadership "has nothing to do with having 'charisma' or other exotic personality traits" (p. 51). Neither insisted Komives et al. (1998) is leadership just common sense: "Catherine the Great, John F. Kennedy, Sitting Bull, and Harriet Tubman did not rise to greatness serendipitously. They had a mission or purpose and they all experienced life events that shaped their values and sharpened their skills" (p. 30).

The nomenclature of the word *leadership* has fought what at times appears to be a losing battle, as it struggles to separate itself from the umbilical-cord of *leader* (Block, 1993; Hurst, 1996). Several authors warned against the danger of focusing on the leader. According to Barker (1997), frameworks that center on the leader fuel false hope for salvation and heighten the visibility of a target to blame (p. 4). Others contended that keeping the spotlight on the leader often frees *followers* from individual responsibility and the need to develop their own leadership capabilities (Gemmill & Oakley, 1992, p. 119; Senge, 1995, p. 50). Viki Hurst (1996) claimed that "the word leadership triggers basic background assumptions concerning the need for control, direction, dominance, and
positional or hierarchical power" and may not be appropriate for collaborative pursuits (p. 125). Peter Block (1993) proposed the term stewardship, declaring that leadership "carries the baggage . . . of being inevitably associated with behaviors of control, direction, and knowing what is best for others" (p. 13).

Conversely, James Meindl and Sanford Ehrlich (1987) described their assumptions about the attraction to the aura of word leadership as "the romance associated with leaders and leadership which provided a glimpse of the power and prominence of leadership as a relevant, significant concept for comprehending complex organized systems" (p. 107). They concluded that despite varying views, there was general receptivity to the values and ideology represented in the concept of leadership (Meindle & Ehrlich, 1987, p. 107).

Leader and Leadership Definitions

In researching the origins of the words leader and leadership, Ralph Stogdill (as cited in Bass, 1990) reported that

_The Oxford English Dictionary_ (1933) notes the appearance of the word "leader" in the English language as early as the year 1300. However, the word, "leadership" did not appear until the first half of the nineteenth century in writings about political influence and control of the British Parliament. (p. 11)

Although Rost (1991) concurred with Stogdill's general review of the origins of the word leadership, his compelling belief that definitions frame paradigms and practice led him to deepen his search. According to Rost (1991), the word leader grew from the Middle English root leden, which means "to travel" or "show the way." Additionally, Rost (1991) reported that early dictionaries in 1755 and 1788 defined the verb lead as "to guide, to conduct" and that the 1788 edition defined leader as "one that leads, one who goes first,
the captain or conductor" (pp. 38-40). Rost (1991) noted that Webster's 1828 edition, *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, defined leading as to "influence and to exercise dominion." This edition also contained the first reference to the word leadership which was defined as "the state or condition of a leader." Strangely, Webster's 1915 edition fails to include the word leadership (Rost, 1991, p. 41).

In concluding that the term leadership was not regularly used until the early 1900s, Rost (1991) argued that scholars who "assume [that] the modern concept of leadership has been in use since Greek and Roman antiquity, are in error" (p. 42). Therefore, references to leadership earlier than the 1900s are actually describing only a small aspect of our current understanding of leadership (Rost, 1991). According to T. O. Jacobs (1970), "the research on leadership has shown a continuing tendency for attention to be focused either on the individual in a leadership position, or on the structure of the social group in which the leader finds himself" (p. 4). Although by 1970 Jacobs noted that conflicting frameworks were beginning to seem more compatible, clearly the deliberations to define the essence of leadership continued over the next few decades.

**Control, Position, and Power**

Bass (1990) offered Mumford's early-1900s definition as "the preeminence of one or a few individuals in a group in a process of control" (p. 11). In 1927, Moore (as cited in Rost, 1991) defined leadership as "the ability to impress the will of the leader on those led and [to] induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation" (p. 47).

As early as 1928, Cowley (as cited by Jacobs, 1970) differentiated between the
terms headmen and leaders. Whereas leaders seemed to have plans and objectives, headmen "were simply administrators, with no program and no objectives, marking time while holding office" (Cowley, 1928, as cited in Jacobs, 1970, p. 5). Jacobs (1970) avoided using the word leader to describe the positional head in a formal organization and believed that the word superordinate was more appropriate (p. 289).

In 1928, Schenk (as cited by Rost, 1991) excluded implications of coercion and even included the word management in his definition: "Leadership is the management of men by persuasion and inspiration rather than the direct or implied threat of coercion" (p. 47). Still, Rost (2001) noted traces of the concepts of power and position found in later definitions. Gibb (1954), for example, asserts that "whether we couch our definition in terms of the leader or the leadership act it is, of course, leader behaviors with which psychologists are concerned" (as cited in Rost, 1991, p. 50). And Bennis (1959) defines leadership as "the process by which an agent induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner" (as cited in Rost, 1991, p. 50). Some scholars have altered their original definitions in order to clarify their thoughts. For example, Edwin Locke (1999) defined leadership as "the process of inducing others to pursue a common goal." Later, Locke (2003) explained that a leader not only must hold a position but also must influence through persuasion, not coercion (pp. 29-30).

**Group Process**

Although Smith and Krueger's 1933 (as cited in Jacobs, 1970) view that the effectiveness of leadership was "in proportion to the degree of control which the leader has
over the follower group” (pp. 4-5) still focused on control, simultaneously there existed a growing awareness of the impact of other forces, including the leader’s degree of security and support from other organizational entities. Rost (1991) found that other scholars of the 1930s, such as Borgardus and Schmidt, introduced the concept of leadership as a group phenomenon and as social relationships between a person and a group sharing a common interest (p. 48). The group and influence focus of leadership continued throughout the 1940s and 1950s. For example, in 1942 Copeland (as cited in Rost, 1991) defined leadership as

the art of dealing with human nature. . . . It is the art of influencing a body of people by persuasion or example to follow a line of action. It must never be confused with drivership—to coin a word—which is the art of compelling a body of people by intimidation or force to follow a line of action. (p. 49)

Behavior That Influences

Most 1960s definitions of the 1960s described leadership as a behavior that influences people toward a shared goal. The focus on the leader continues to be foremost in Fiedler's 1967 definition: "the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of group members" (p. 36). In his review, Rost (1991) noted a resurgence of the lack of consensus in leadership definitions offered by scholars of the 1970s, the frequent interchange of the words leader and leadership, and a move toward a management approach (p. 57).

Process of Influence

Exceptions to this trend are the social exchange theories of Jacobs (1970) and
Hollander (1978), which defined leadership as “a process of influence which involves an ongoing transaction between a leader and followers” (as cited in Rost, 1991, p. 61). Jacobs (1970) offered that “while a social exchange approach to understanding of the processes involved in ‘superordinate-ship’ may not be the ultimate solution, it appears to contribute to more ultimate purposes” (p. 382). Katz and Kahn (1978) defined leadership as the “influential increment which goes beyond routine and taps bases of power beyond those that are organizationally decreed” (p. 574). Burns (1978) brought a transformational focus when he stated that leadership occurs “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20).

According to Rost (1991), however, what at first appeared to be an explosion of leadership ideas in the 1980s was, in reality, scholars defining leadership as acting in accordance with a leader’s wishes (p. 73). The military mind-set is vividly portrayed in General Patton’s definition: “Leadership is the thing that wins battles. It probably consists of what you want to do, and then doing it, and getting mad as hell if someone tries to get in your way” (as cited in Rost, 1991, p. 72).

Gardner (1990) defined leadership as “the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (p. 1). Similarly, Rost (1991) contended that “leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 102). Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal (1997) described leadership as “a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought,
feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values of both the leader and the led” (p. 296).

Leadership Can Be Learned

In the 1980s, definitions of leadership began to broaden to describe activity not related to formal leadership positions. Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus (1985) described leadership as “the marshaling of skills possessed by a majority but used by a minority . . . [skills] that can be learned by anyone, taught to everyone” (p. 27). According to Manz and Simms (1989), a leader is “one who can lead others to lead themselves” (p. xvi). Still, even Bennis and Nanus (1985) continued to focus on the leader as the person who was to take charge.

Adaptive Action-Based

Ronald Heifetz (1994) contended that “Tackling tough problems—problems that often require an evolution of values—is the end of leadership; getting that work done is its essence” (p. 26). Thus, leadership is more than influence; it is an “activity to mobilize adaptation” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 27).

Shared Leadership

In the current decade, the spotlight has been more on the engagement and outcomes of followers than on a single-savior leader. Larraine Matusak (1997) defined the leadership process as “initiating and guiding and working with a group to accomplish change” (p. 5). Drath (1998) described leadership as “a distributed process shared by many ordinary people.
instead of the expression of a single extraordinary individual" (p. 404). Russ Moxley (2000) suggested that leadership is "two or more people sharing power and working interdependently toward a shared goal" (p. 182). Nancy Huber (2002) stated that leadership is a "shared responsibility for creating a better world in which to live and work, which manifests [itself] in our passion to engage others in bringing about purposeful change" (p. 26). Colvin (2003) summarized leadership as "the capacity and passion to engage others in making a positive difference in society. In a word, this is leadership" (p. 30). Wilfred Drath and Charles Palus (1994) viewed leadership "as a social meaning-making process that occurs in groups of people who are engaged in some activity together" (p. 1).

Value-Based

Astin and Astin (2000) defined leadership as "a purposive process which is inherently value-based" (p. 8). In the view of Joseph Potts (2001), every aspect of leadership is a form of ethical living. According to Joanne Ciulla (2003), the core issues in ethics—what we should do and what we should be—are also the core issues of leadership (p. xi).

Leadership as a Metaphor

Several authors suggested that a metaphor may be the more appropriate way to describe the complex concept of leadership. Max De Pree compared leadership to a condition of the heart and to a jazz band (De Pree, 1989, p. 148; 1992, pp. 8-9). Vaill (1989) likewise described the leadership process as a performing art. In the traditional approach to leadership, wherein the focus was on finding ways to solve problems, a machine metaphor
seemed appropriate (Rost, 1991; Wheatley, 1999, 2005). Conversely, Kathleen Allen, Stephen Stelzner, and Richard Wielkiewicz (1998) contended that, in a more complex world, a different type of framework is needed. Therefore, they offered this ecological metaphor: "A critical idea in ecology is the notion that there is an interconnection of life forces that cannot be ignored" (p. 5).

Leader-Development and Leadership-Development Definitions

The significance of defining the framework of leader and leadership crystallize when one attempts to determine how to design the practice of training leaders and developing effective leadership. David Day (2000) noted the importance of clarifying the difference between leader-development and leadership-development by stressing the idea that developing the individual will not automatically result in better leadership.

When leadership is approached from the personal, or leader, focus, the assumption is that leadership happens when a leader exercises what is considered leadership behavior toward others. As a result, better leadership occurs when a few selected leaders develop certain knowledge and skills. When leadership is approached as an emerging process of building relationships within the social context of the group, better leadership will arise from the interactions in the quality of relationships among the group members (Day, 2000; Drath, 2001; Northouse, 1997).

Most scholars agree that leader-development focuses on the growth of an individual, whereas leadership-development focuses on the development of leadership capacity within a group or social context (Day, 2000; Day & O'Connor, 2003; Draft, 2001;
Uhl-Bien, 2003; Van Velsor, McCauley, & Moxley, 1998). Although a focus on the
development of the individual leader may not be erroneous, Wilfred Drath (2001)
cautioned that such a focus will be limited in its effectiveness if it is not shared by everyone
(pp. 164-5). According to Day and O'Connor (2003), “an organization's collective mind set
about the construct of leadership may be one of the most important drivers or restrainers to
developing a more complex and systemic approach to thinking about and enacting
leadership” (p. 21). Rost and Barker (2000) insisted that “the industrial view of leadership
is inadequate for educational purpose because it does not address the nature of the complex
social relationships among people . . . nor does it accurately accommodate their purposes,
motives, and intentions” (p. 1).

Leadership Training, Development,
and Education Definitions

In contemplating how leadership is developed, one also must consider the
differences and relationships between the terms training, education, and development.
Leonard Nadler and Zeace Nadler (1989) offered the following definitions: Training occurs
“where the learning is focused on the present job,” education occurs “where the learning is
focus on a future job,” and development occurs where learning is for growth that “does not
relate to a specific present or future job” (pp. 16-17).

Several scholars (Barker, 1997; Harre, Clarke, & DeCarlo, 1985; Rost & Barker,
2000) argued that leadership education of the future better fits the three-tier model of Harre
et al. Although the labels training, development, and education used by Harre et al. (1985)
are similar to those of Nadler and Nadler (1989), they differ in definition, order, and scope.
The first tier of Harre et al.'s (1985) model, \textit{training}, relates to subconscious routines and converts a capability into ability. The second tier, \textit{development}, is the analysis and integration of ideas and values to increase self-efficacy. The third tier, \textit{education}, is the cognitive exploration of social patterns and moral orders that integrates knowledge, insight, and experiences and forms the basis for collective decisions about the future (Rost & Barker, 2000, p. 6). Rost and Barker (2000) contended that \textit{leadership education} is more comprehensive, longer-term, and less goal-orientated than are training and development (p. 6).

Still, there appears to be consensus for the conceptual framework in which \textit{leadership-development} has a more comprehensive, broader role than \textit{leadership education} and \textit{leadership training}, just as education has a more general role than a specific training activity (Ayman et al., 2003, p. 205; Brungardt, 1996; Nadler & Nadler, 1989; Roberts & Ullom, 1989). Ayman et al. (2003) further explained,

When comparing training to education, it could be said that training may be part of an educational curriculum, or it could be free standing. In turn, educational programs seem to also be part of the developmental plan of an individual on a particular path in life. If the goal is development, then the process is an educational curriculum, and training is a more specific component of the educational process. (p. 205)

Curt Brungardt (1996) considered curricular leadership-education programs as forming only a minor subset or component of the more comprehensive field of leadership-development (p. 83). According to Brungardt (1996),

\textit{leadership-development} refers to almost every form of growth or stage of development in the life cycle that promotes, encourages, and assists in one's leadership potential. . . \textit{Leadership education} on the other hand, is usually defined more narrowly. It includes those learning activists and educational environments that are intended to enhance and foster leadership abilities. (p. 83)
From Brungardt's viewpoint, training and education are accomplished in a shorter period of time, whereas development is a longer, comprehensive process that includes the integration of multiple experiences (Avolio, 1999; Ayman et al., 2003; Day, 2000).

**History of Leadership Theory**

The evolution and resulting array of leadership theories has been a "complex and elusive phenomenon" (Komives et al., 1998, p. 34). The impact of leadership and the relationship between leaders and followers cannot be underestimated and can, according to some, be compared to the growth of civilization. Bass (1990) stated that "leadership is one of the world's oldest preoccupations" and further explained that "the study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders as much as it was shaped by them" (p. 3). Other scholars compared the paradigm shift in leadership theory to assumptions related to the atom. At the turn of the 20th century, emerging leadership theory, like the atom, was simple and concrete. Under decades of intense scrutiny, leadership (like the atom) was discovered to be an intricate complexion of social processes (Burns, 1978; Komives et al., 1998; Rost, 1991; Wheatley, 1999, 2005; Yukl, 1994).

Although Yukl (1994) agreed that the theories of leadership are embedded with weaknesses and lack research support, he also contended that the amount of confusion is overstated (p. 268). He noted that "the disparity of approaches, the proliferation of terms, the tendency of researchers to concentrate on a narrow aspect of leadership, and the absence of an integrating conceptual framework have created an exaggerated impression of chaos and contradiction" (Yukl, 1994, pp. 267-268).
Several scholars have offered various organizational systems as means to understanding the history of leadership-development. Martin Chemers (as cited in Wren, 1995) divided the history of leadership theory into three phases: (a) 1910 to WWII, or the *trait period*, (b) WWII to the late 1960s, or the *behavior period*, and (c) 1960 to the present, or the *contingency period* (p. 83). More-contemporary theorists, such as Burns (1978), divided leadership into two categories: *transactional leadership*, which focuses on the goals of the individual leader, and *transformational leadership*, which focuses on the shared goals of leaders and followers (pp. 19-20).

Locke (2003) pointed out another challenge: "Most of the theories developed today are (a) theories of supervision rather than of leadership, (b) theories that are very narrow in their focus, and (c) theories that are so esoteric that one cannot make sense of them" (p. 29). Other scholars agree that the body of leadership literature is illogical, non-linear, and confusing. Although it is true that changing theories may at times seem to unfold in a chronological fashion, it is also evident that metaphoric elements overlap, reappear in various forms, and fail to fall into neat categories or timelines (Hoskins & Morley, 1988, p. 89; Rost, 1991, p. 19; van Maurik, 2001). Furthermore, as John van Maurik (2001) noted, each theory adds an element that perpetuates the ongoing debate (pp. 2-3). Still, many authors, such as Rost (1991), used timelines to offer a historical review of leadership theory.

Contemporary theorists are often deemed as being more enlightened than earlier theorists in their view of leadership as a complex social system. Rost (1991) contended, however, that the *great-man theory* is espoused as strongly in 1990 as it was in 1890 (p. 19).
Early scholars who offered new paradigms were not always recognized by the mainstream. As early as 1957, Phillip Selznick viewed leadership as a culture-building, value-infusing, and mind-changing process (as cited in Fairholm, 1998, p. 87; Rost, 1991, pp. 29-30). In another example, Jacobs (1970) noted that as early as 1960, leading anthropologist Margaret Mead believed that “leadership in the old fashioned and individual sense of the word, that is, personal leadership, may well become obsolete” (p. 18). And Jacobs’s own 1970 view of leadership—as a social exchange theory—differed significantly from the prominent positional authority models at that time (as cited in Rost, 1991, pp. 60-61).

For the purpose of this overview, leadership theories are organized according to the classifications of Komives et al. (1998): (a) great-man approaches, (b) trait approaches, (c) behavior approaches, (d) situational-contingency approaches, (e) influence approaches, (f) reciprocal-leadership approaches, and (g) emerging leadership paradigms (p. 35).

Great-Man Theory

The great-man theory grew out of a Darwinist influence in the 18th century (Komives et al., 1998). Early theorists, influenced by Galton (1869), espoused the widely held belief that for centuries kingdoms were to be ruled by a succession of descendants who were believed to have inherited natural leadership gifts (as cited in Bass, 1990, p. 38; Polleys, 2002, p. 121). According to Jacobs (1970) the essence of the great-man theory was a postulation that “the progress the world has experienced is a product of the individual achievements of great men” (p. 3). The birth of this first approach and its classification, the great-man theory, depicted a glaring shortcoming. If males inherited positive
leadership traits, then females could inherit such traits. However, *great women* such as Catherine the Great and Joan of Arc were not acknowledged in the *great-man* era (Bass, 1990, p. 37; Komives et al., 1998, p. 35).

Jacobs (1970) reminded us that "every theory seems to be capable of generating an antithetical position" (p. 3). Thus, *cultural determinism*—which advocated that forces in society rather than individual great men—brought about sweeping changes (Jacobs, 1970, p. 3). Accordingly, early leadership philosophers debated whether leaders shaped history or history shaped leaders. In the 1880s, William James advocated the idea that individuals do make a difference in history and that such people of influence should be studied (Bass, 1990, p. 37). Eugene Jennings (1960) noted that Thomas Carlyle believed that "among the undistinguished, antlike masses are men of light and leading, mortals superior in power, courage, and understanding. The history of mankind is a biography of these, its great men" (p. 5). In his 1902 essay on heroes, Carlyle (as cited in Wren, 1995) viewed leaders as omnipotent:

> We come to the last form of Heroism; that which we call Kingship. The Commander over Men; he to whose will our wills are to be subordinated, and loyally current themselves, and find their welfare in doing so, may be reckoned the most important of Great Men. (p. 53)

Conversely, Tolstoy, in his 1933 classic *War and Peace* (as cited in Wren, 1995), argued that a leader is no more than the slave of history:

> In historic events, the so-called great men are labels giving names to events, and like labels they have but the smallest connection with the event itself. Every act of theirs is in an historical sense involuntary and is related to the whole course of history and predestined from eternity. (p. 59)

Jennings (1960) noted similar paradoxical views: "From one standpoint the
group, public, or mass is the repository of all that is wise, moral, and desirable, and from another standpoint the mass is not capable of discerning itself and its direction without conspicuous aid from its leadership” (p. 18). Still, the fact that significant individuals have shaped history—Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., and Mother Theresa, for example—fuels the insistence that “great” individuals do make a difference. In this context Bass (1990) suggested that the debate should focus on understanding the extent of the difference leaders do make and the conditions under which they do so (p. 38).

**Trait Theory**

From 1920 to 1940, *trait theories* of leadership focused on the belief that “great” people must have specific common characteristics, such as intelligence or self-confidence, which bring success. These theories focused on *what* makes an effective leader rather than on *how* to lead. Trait theories were questioned when they failed to (a) identify a consistent list of effective traits and (b) to account for the notion that different situations may call for different traits and skills. Stogdill’s (1948) review of the evidence showed that “persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in another situation” (Bass, 1990, p. 76). Rost (1991) observed that when research failed to find a list of traits proven to be effective in predicting leaders, the door opened to the behavioral approach (p. 18). Still, contemporary theorists such as Shelly Kirkpatrick and Edwin Locke (1991) attested that the specific personal traits of charismatic leaders that contribute to their success (p. 49).
Behavioral Theory

With the growth of behaviorism the focus shifted away from what leaders have, to what leaders do. For example, at the University of Iowa, as Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph White (1939) developed what they called field theory, they also studied leadership styles and categorized them as being autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire. In the 1950s and 1960s, researchers conducted several landmark studies in order to discover common behavioral leadership practices. Scholars at Ohio State University, for example, studied effective leadership behaviors and classified the two dimensions of consideration and initiating structure (Yukl, 1994, p. 129). A general finding of the Ohio study, according to Andrew DuBrin (1995), was that "the most effective leaders emphasize both initiating structure and consideration" (p. 80). At the University of Michigan researchers studied and categorized three types of behavior: task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and participative leadership (Yukl, 1994, p. 129). The University of Michigan study showed that "the most productive workgroups tend to have leaders who are employee-centered rather than production-centered" (DuBrin, 1995, p. 82).

Although a common theme emerged showing that effective leadership balanced both task and relationship orientation, these studies were not able to fully predict leader behavior or to determine the proper level of balance (Jacobs, 1970, p. 93). As early as 1880, theorists such as James (as cited in Bass, 1990) took issue with the first leadership theories, contending that "the great man needs help—that his talents needed to fit with the situation" (p. 39). Trait theories and behavioral theories had failed to find an effective universal style and had yet to consider the impact of complex relationships, situations, and...

Contingency and Situational Theories

The 1950s and 1960s brought the emergence of situational and contingency approaches. Bass (1990) oversimplified this leadership theory as “the leader is the product of a situation” (p. 38). In the contingency model, to appropriately understand and adapt a leadership behavior, the situation must be examined. Thus, there was a shift from the focus being solely on the leader, to considering that the interaction of the qualities of the leader in conjunction with the dynamics of the situation will shape the outcome. Fiedler’s 1960s study of the least preferred co-worker determined that there is no best way to lead and that situational variables must be considered (Yukl, 1994, p. 135). However, the contingency theory did not explain how leaders develop.

In the 1970s, Robert House formulated the *path-goal theory* of leadership. The path-goal theory proposes that the behavior of a leader can influence the performance and satisfaction of a group toward the attainment of goals by offering rewards, clarifying paths, and removing obstacles (as cited in Komives et al., 1998, p. 40). Critics find this theory complex, ambiguous, and focused on the motivational functions of leaders to the neglect of other leader behaviors (Yukl, 1994, p. 152). In his own multiple-linkage model, Yukl (1994) proposed that “a leader’s effectiveness in the short run depends on the extent to which he acts skillfully to correct any deficiencies in the intervening variables for his work unit” (p. 159).

In an attempt to explain leader effectiveness, Hersey and Blanchard (1972, 1977)
extended Blake and Mouton's (1964) managerial-grid model to focus on follower maturity, motivation, and willingness to take responsibility (as cited in Yukl, 1994, p. 140). The situational approach identifies leader effectiveness when the leader diagnoses the level and needs of the followers and then matches a leadership style to the situation.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) built on earlier approaches in order to develop the normative-decision model which identifies the decision-making procedures appropriate for particular situations (as cited in Yukl, 1994, p. 220). Critics of situational theories contended they were (a) too complex, (b) lacked research support, (c) were significantly ambiguous regarding the development levels of subordinates, and (d) proposed no plan to further develop subordinates (Northouse, 1997, pp. 59-60; Yukl, 1994, p. 273).

Influence Theories

The interest in charismatic leadership grew out of large movements and times of crisis when a leader emerged with extraordinary vision to solve a problem (Bass, 1990, p. 244; Komives et al., 1998; Yukl, 1994). House (1977) identified how charismatic leaders behave, how they differ from other leaders, and how the conditions in which they usually flourish as followers are more receptive to their ideas (as cited in Yukl, 1994, p. 60).

Although some scholars describe charismatic leaders almost synonymously with transformational leaders, others distinguish charismatic leaders as those who are more motivated by personal interests and who function less as a coach and mentor than as a transformational leader (Northouse, 1997, p. 132; Manz & Sims, 1989, p. 225). Charismatic leaders may misuse their influence to attract and have a negative influence on...
followers obsessed with hero worship, and they can ultimately fail to deliver on their compelling vision (Komives et al., 1998, p. 42; Yukl, 1994, p. 59). In light of this caution, it is difficult to ignore the old but familiar strains of the great-man theory, in which a dependency on exceptional traits existed (Rost, 1991, p. 19). Still, Katz and Kahn (1978) maintained that "every act of influence on a matter of organizational relevance is in some degree an act of leadership" (pp. 527-528).

Reciprocal Leadership Theories

For much of the 20th century, Rost (1991) contended, leadership theories were embedded in an industrial paradigm. He describes this era as

structural-functionalist, management-orientated, personalistic in focusing only on the leaders, goal-achievement dominated, self-interested and individualistic in outlook, male-orientated, utilitarian and materialistic in ethical perspective, rationalistic, technocratic, linear, quantitative, and scientific in language and methodology. (p. 27)

Wheatley (2005) described the futility of control by picturing the world as a great clock:

"As with any machine, we would understand it by minute dissection, we would engineer it to do what we say fit, and we would fix it through our engineering brilliance" (p. 17). As Wheatley (1999) further explained,

If people are machines, seeking to control us makes sense. But if we live with the same forces intrinsic to all other life, then seeking to impose control through rigid structures is suicide. If we believe that there is no order to human activity except that imposed by the leader, that there is no self-regulation except that dictated by policies, if we believe that responsible leaders must have their hands into everything, controlling every decision, person, and moment, then we cannot hope for anything except what we already have a treadmill of frantic efforts that end up destroying our individual and collective vitality. (p. 25)

According to Wheatley (2005) the price of having conceived of ourselves as machines is
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that "we gave up most of what is essential to being human. We created ourselves devoid of spirit, will, passion, compassion, emotions, even intelligence" (p. 19).

Since 1970, scholars have developed leadership theories that focus on the synergistic relationship and interactions between leaders and followers (Block, 1993; Kelley, 1992; Rost, 1991; Wheatley, 1999). Komives et al. (1998) described such leadership as "a process that meaningfully engages leaders and participants, values the contributions of participants, shares power and authority between leaders and participants, and views leadership as an inclusive activity" (p. 42).

According to Uhl-Bien (2003), the Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX), first appeared in the work of Dansereau, Graen, and Haga in 1975 (as cited in Uhl-Bien, 2003, p. 130). LMX, which addressed leadership as a relational process between the leader and followers, was one of the first theories to challenge the assumption that leadership is something leaders do to followers. The LMX approach lacked evidence regarding the processes used to influence the relationship between the leader and follower (Uhl-Bien, 2003, p. 130).

Wren (1995) posited that "leaders and followers do not act in a vacuum. They are propelled, constrained, and buffeted by their environment. The effective leader must understand the nature of the leadership context, and how it affects the leadership process" (p. 243). Peter Northouse (1997) cautioned that "despite the popular appeal of these approaches . . . they have not been tested by published, well-designed research and success stories seems to be mostly anecdotal in nature" (p. 244).
Transactional Leadership

A transactional leader engages in a contract of exchanging goods or services between leaders and followers to achieve a specified reward or goal. The appearance of the transactional theory brought the emerging role of the follower to the forefront. Transactional theory shares common elements with Hollander's (1964) and Jacobs's (1970) exchange theories (as cited in Rost, 1991, p. 30).

It is noteworthy that in both the exchange and transactional forms of leadership, the people involved have short-term relationships that result in superficial gratification (Burns, 1978, p. 258). Although a leadership act takes place, Burns (1978) argued that transactional leadership fails to bond leaders and followers together toward an enduring purpose and that it falls short of raising the level of moral commitment beyond self-interest (pp. 19-20).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership expands the charismatic focus on the leader into a process of attending to the needs and growth of the followers. A co-creator of transformational leadership theory, Burns (1978), introduced a bold moral component into his leadership theory. Burns (1978) contended that the test of moral leadership "is its capacity to transcend the claims of the multiplicity of everyday wants, needs, and expectations, to respond to higher levels of moral development, and to relate leadership behavior to a set of reasoned, relatively explicit, conscious values" (p. 46). Bass (1990) suggested that a sign of transforming-leadership may be when followers are able to look to
the future range of needs of the organization rather than to promote their current personal need (p. 53). A powerful aspect of transformation is visible in what Burns (1978) described as “leadership that begat leadership and hardly recognized its offspring,” as followers in the process of being transformed into leaders (p. 424).

Northouse (1997) noted that transformational leadership is so broad that it lacks clarity and that it should be interpreted more on a continuum (pp. 144-145). According to Yukl (1994), leadership-development that is composed almost exclusively of either transactional or transformational approaches is incomplete (p. 212). As Jonathan Cox, Craig Pearce, and Henry Sims, Jr. (2003) explained, “this duality paints an incomplete developmental picture because it misses two additional leadership alternatives; this time-tested (but presently unfashionable) directive leadership approach and the empowering leadership approach” (p. 63). Accordingly, they and others believed that leadership can be directive without being coercive (Cox et al., 2003; Manz & Sims, 1989; Quinn, Faerman, Thompson, & McGrath, 1990). Although the pervasive quality of transforming-leadership is compelling, critics argue that it may at times be distracting and has the potential to be abused (Northouse, 1997; Rost, 1991).

**Servant-Leadership**

In the servant-leadership model, first presented by Robert Greenleaf (1977), a great leader first acts on his or her natural desire to serve (p. 14). Greenleaf’s theory was inspired by and crystallized in the Hermann Hesse (1956) story about a spiritual journey. In the Hesse account, the story-teller describes a servant who does all the menial tasks while
displaying a gracious spirit that, in turn, unites the travelers in a shared hope. When the travelers lose their way after the servant disappears, they discover that the servant was actually their leader. Servant-leadership theory is closely interwoven with the Christian framework of “whoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all” (Mark 10:44).

With a primary focus on the needs of others rather than his or her own needs, the servant evolves into the leader (Block, 1993; Covey, 1991; De Pree, 1989; Spears, 1995). Fairholm (1998) agreed: “The leader is a servant first and then a boss. . . . The great leaders have always served their followers first and then led them into a new, better, more productive life” (p. xi). According to Covey’s (1991) perspective of the servant leader, “every morning they yoke up, and put on the harness of service” and have the habit of thinking of others (p. 34). According to Kouzes and Posner (1995) the most powerful and rewarding of all leadership tasks is “when we give our own power away” (p. 185) in the service of others.

Block (2003) called for such a servant-leader to relinquish care-giving, explaining that care-giving so often is control: “We do not serve other adults when we take responsibility for their wellbeing” (p. 18). He advocated the shared responsibility of the group to collaborate and to care for the needs of others while uplifting the goals of the organization (Block, 2003, pp. 18-19). Greenleaf (1977) further advised that a critical test for a servant-leader must include evaluating whether or not the people being served have the freedom to grow as well as the desire to follow the path of servanthood. De Pree (1989) agreed, noting that good leadership occurs when followers reach their potential and when
a leader "abandons oneself to the strength of others, being vulnerable to what others can do
better than we can" (p. 78). In questioning whether one can really abandon oneself and
choose the spirit of a servant, Klyne Snodgrass (1993) contended that the transformation of
becoming a servant leader transcends all human ability to choose or determine to serve (p. 14).

**Participative/Shared Leadership**

The common view that followers are lost without a leader has been aptly questioned by theorists. Edwin Hollander (1997) pointed out that although the term *followership* has been around for years, its use seems to be cyclical. From 1940 though the 1990s, a participative leadership approach developed in which followers have active participation in the leadership relationship. Rost and Barker (2000) described this relationship as one that influences without coercion and that there are no followers because everyone is engaged in the same relationship (pp. 2-3). Many scholars are no longer comfortable with using *followers*, as the word implies a low level of input. Consequently they selected terms that denote greater engagement. Rost (1991) reserved the word *followers* for when he calls the industrial paradigm. He further explained, "I use the word *collaborators* when I write about leadership in the post industrial paradigm. . . . No amount of reconstruction is going to salvage the word [follower]" (p. 109). Gardner (1990) made "frequent use of the word *constituent*" (p. 2), whereas Komives et al. (1998) preferred the term *participants* to describe all active group members (p. 13). Robert Kelley (1988, 1992) viewed followers as equal and highly valued *co-adventurers* with leaders. Thomas Crum
(1987) explained the rationale for the term *co-creators*:

> When we choose co-creation, we end separation, the root cause of conflict. They know through responsible participation that they can empower each other and ultimately their institutions and society, thereby creating a life that is meaningful and satisfying for everyone. (p. 175)

James O'Toole (2001), in describing the need to look away from super-heroes, explained, “Instead of leadership being a solo act, an aria sung by the CEO, in these organizations it is a shared responsibility, more like a chorus of diverse voice singing in union” (p. 19). Shared leadership describes a distribution of power to all members who are full participants in the functions and outcome of the team. Drath (2001) contended that “individual people do not possess leadership: leadership happens when people participate in collaborative forms of thought and action” (p. 8). Cox et al. (2003) noted that “followers should be included in leadership-development to prepare them to exercise shared leadership” (p. 162).

The trend to think of leadership as a group dynamic has its critics, though, as Daniel Born (1996) shows:

> It has by now become a cliche of current leadership studies to throw out the emotion of the Great Man Theory and to substitute it with vaguely beneficent notion of group dynamics. Hierarchy is out, loosely-coupled organic networks are in. On the face of it, this decentered, non-hierarchical vision of leadership [is] a warm fuzzy that empties “leadership" of all its hard, hierarchical, and lordly overtones. (p. 52)

Several other scholars expressed concern regarding the duality of analyzing the leader versus the follower (McCaslin, 2001, p. 8; Wheatley, 1999, p. 10). McCaslin (2001) clarified that “the true essence of leadership does not rest within the leader or within those who would follow. The true nature of the relationship is that leadership rests within the
conjunction and" (p. 7).

**Little Leadership and SuperLeadership**

Bennis and Nanus (1985) observed that “leadership seems to be the marshaling of skills possessed by a majority but used by a minority. But it's something that can be learned by anyone, taught to everyone, denied to no one” (p. 27). McGill and Slocum (1997) referred to ordinary people doing little acts that make a difference as "little leadership."

The term SuperLeadership describes the innovative paradigm of Manz and Sims’s (1989) in which the most appropriate leader is the one who can lead others to lead themselves (p. xvi). Rather than using threats or controls, SuperLeadership stimulates self-leadership in others and views self-influence as a powerful opportunity for success (Manz & Sims, 1989, p. 10). Manz and Sims (1989) declared that “it's time to transcend the notion of leaders as heroes and to focus instead on leaders as hero makers” (p. 225).

Proponents of this paradigm insist that leadership and leadership-development should not be restricted to extraordinary individuals (Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Uhl-Bien, 2003). As the access to leadership broadens to the point where everyone can be a leader and almost everything a person does can be leadership, some critics question whether or not anyone really is a leader (Harter, 2003, p. 9). Nathan Harter (2003) further explained the concept by asking, “How exactly would leadership be taught prescriptively, for those who want to learn how to do it, when they already are leading in everything they do?” (p. 9).
Emerging Leadership Concepts

Adaptive Leadership

Bolman and Deal (1997) posited that effective leaders should view organizations through the multiple perspectives of (a) structures, (b) human resources, (c) politics, and (d) symbols, and call upon their own combinations appropriate for the time in need.

"Depending on [the] leader and circumstance, each can lead to compelling and constructive leadership: but none is right for all times and all circumstances" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 303). The subsequent comparison—no one perspective is effective for the range of situations that leaders encounter—rings similar to situational leadership theories. However, Bolman and Deal (1997) contended that traditional-contingency leadership theories do not grapple with structure, politics, and symbols (p. 296). Additionally, "single frame managers are unlikely to understand and attend to the intricacies of a holistic process" (p. 296).

Ronald Heifetz (1994) suggested that leaders who lead without being in a formal position are still leaders, even if they have not received official authority. In Leadership Without Easy Answers, Heifetz (1994) raised an important issue, attesting that leaders appointed with formal authority succeed largely because of informal authority and the trust generated from those they serve. Heifetz (1994) observed that "authority constrains leadership because in times of distress people expect too much. They form inappropriate dependencies that isolate their authorities behind a mask of knowing" (p. 180). Heifetz (1994) further noted that leaders "delude themselves into thinking that they have to have the answer when they do not. Feeling pressured to know, they will surely come up with an answer, even if poorly test, misleading, and wrong" (p. 180). According to Heifetz (1994),
adaptive action is transformational leadership. “The hardest and most valuable task of leadership may be advancing goals and designing strategy that promote adaptive work” (p. 23).

The Social and Cultural Landscape of Leadership

Despite a growing consensus of the primary nature of relational perspectives in emerging leadership theories, some scholars contended that social relationships are still contractual in nature and fall short of the broader landscape of leadership processes. One of the first scholars to articulate this comprehensive view was Selznick (1957), who proposed that leadership is a culture-building, value-infusing, mind-changing activity (as cited in Fairholm, 1998, p. 87).

Decades later, Kotter (1996) claimed, “only leadership can blast through the many sources of corporate inertia. Only leadership can get change to stick by anchoring it in the very culture of an organization” (p. 30). Barker (1997) attested that the concept of leadership as a relationship must move from the reciprocal leader-follower concepts, to the concept of leadership as a social process, containing complex interactions (Barker, 1997, p. 6; Hunt & Dodge, 2001, p. 448). Barker described this leadership process as both the vehicle for creating leadership and a river contained in the bed of culture (p. 6). McCaslin (2001) embraced the term landscape of leadership to depict the breadth of purpose, opportunities, and relationships (p. 3). Hurst (1996) described the new terrain as a dynamic field of magnetic collaboration creating change for the common good (p. 126).

Drath and Palus (1994) proposed that “the most general tool for meaning-making in a society is culture. . . . Culture-building is the primary process of meaning-making in
collective experience and thus the primary leadership process” (p. 10). The application of this concept is that rather than developing individuals as leaders, we can best develop leadership by enhancing every member of the community to engage in the leadership process: “In this view, leadership development is closely related to the process of leadership itself. In fact, it is the renewal of leadership itself” (Drath & Palus, 1994, p. 21).

**Civic Leadership**

Wren (1994) asserted that in order to “produce citizens capable of confronting and resolving the complex problems which would face tomorrow’s society” (p. 74), leadership education is increasingly important to this country. Trudie Reed (1996) clarified that civic leadership is different from civic participation in that civic leaders do more than volunteer their services to a local organization. By identifying issues and leading out of conviction in causes that are intended to create a better world, civic leadership focuses on challenging and shaping society from a global perspective (p. 100). Peter Drucker (as cited in Tichy, 2002) observed that “citizenship in and through the social sector is not a panacea for the ills of post-capitalistic society and post-capitalist polity, but it may be a prerequisite for tackling these ills. It restores the civic responsibility that is the mark of citizenship, and the civic pride that is the mark of community” (p. 257). Drucker (1995) further contended that individuals actually need another sphere of life in which they can be citizens in order to contribute outside of their jobs, to make a difference beyond their areas of specialized knowledge (p. 257).

**Ethical Leadership**

According to Day and O’Connor (2003):
Historically, leadership has been one of the potent forces for good—or evil—in society. Within the corporate sector, the financial collapse of several high-flying organizations has been directly traced to failures in leadership among those who were entrusted with the firm's reputation and well-being. This underscores the proposition that ethics and leadership are inherently intertwined. (p. 25)

Ciulla (2004) contended that leadership “is a complex moral relationship between people, based on trust, obligation, commitment, emotion, and a shared vision of the good. . . .

Ethics lie at the heart of all human relationships and hence at the heart of the relationship between leaders and followers” (p. xv). Other scholars agreed, and they advanced the notion that the ethical nature of leadership provides the only significant difference between leading and managing (Burns, 1978; Potts, 2001). There is, however, confusion over the meaning of ethics. Barker (1997) defines ethics in this way:

Efforts should not be understood as merely sets of rules, principles, or standards that are consciously applied to behavior or behavior systems; those could be called morals (from the Latin word for customs). An ethic, based in the Greek word for character, is a magnetic north, or more specifically, a primarily subconscious guide toward life's ultimate purpose. It is a person's general idea of life's greatest good. . . . An ethic is not a canon or a maxim, rather it is a spiritual definition of life. (pp. 6-7)

Al Gini (1998) offered a more detailed explanation:

The term 'moral leadership' often conjures up images of sternly robed priests, waspishly severe nuns, carelessly bearded philosophers, forbiddingly strict parents, and something ambiguously labeled the 'moral majority.' These people are seen as confining and dictatorial. They make us do what we should do, not what we want to do. . . . But there is more to moral leadership than merely telling others what to do. . . . Leaders can drive, lead, orchestrate, and cajole. But they cannot force, dictate, or demand. Leaders can be the catalyst for morally sound behavior, but they are not, by themselves, a sufficient condition. By means of their demeanor and message, leaders must be able to convince, not just tell others, that collaboration serves the conjoint interests and well-being of all involved. Leaders may demonstrate conviction and willpower, but followers, in the new paradigm of leadership, should not allow the leader's will to replace their own. (pp. 39-40)

Komives et al. (1998) challenged leaders to work spiritually smarter, by embracing the
values that build character, "instead of bouncing around with the swirl of the rapids, knowing our values and beliefs provide a rudder to guide ethical actions" (p. 7).

**Spiritual Leadership**

A growing number of scholars contend that spirituality is a core component of leadership (Fairholm, 1998; Matusak, 1997; Moxley, 2000; Vaill, 1998; Wheatley, 2005). There are an array of perspectives on the meaning of spirituality and its relationship to leadership. Larraine Matusak (1997) explained that "for some, spirituality involves the belief in a god" (p. 35), while for others spirituality involves a world with balance and purpose or has the focus on serving others. According to Fairholm (1998), some theorists have confused dedication, mission, and vision with spirituality (p. 118). Parker Palmer (1990) attested that a "spiritual renaissance" (p. 6) springs from a desire for reflection and the need to find an anchor from the turbulent activity of our lives. Other theorists, such as Fairholm (1998), believe that the discussion of spirituality arises out of feelings of isolation and lack of purpose: "Spirituality is a new tool leaders can use to respond to this worker disconnection by making a concern for spiritual needs a part of their vision for the team" (p. 130).

Fairholm (1998) described spiritual leadership as "the process of living out a set of deeply held personal values, of honoring forces greater than the self. Recognition of the spirit of work and of workers endows the corporation with soul—or at least recognizes the soul of the corporation that we have previously ignored" (p. 131). Whether or not spirituality is part of a formal theory or practice, it will shape how we work. Fairholm (1998) explained that spirituality stimulates caring actions, transforms the nature of
communication, generates powerful ethics, increases collaboration, and creates a vibrant culture (p. 129).

Summary of History of Leadership Theory

The many seeds of thought from the philosophers of the 20th and 21st centuries have played a role in the development of leadership studies. Despite the phenomenal growth of leadership studies and the quantity of leadership publications, there is still a poor understanding of the process of how leaders make a difference and how a leadership identity develops (Day & O’Conner, 2003; Komives, Mainella, Owen, Osteen, & Longerbeam, 2005). As Yukl (1994) commented: “The confused state of the field can be attributed in large part to the sheer volume of publications” (p. 269) and further noted, “As the old adage goes, it is difficult to see the forest for the trees” (p. 269).

Some scholars, such as Chester Schriesheim (2003), contended that many leadership theories are too complex for most leaders and managers to understand and use on a daily basis. Schriesheim shared an example of the normative decision-making model of Vroom and Yetton (1973) and Vroom and Jago (1988), which outlines seven different leadership decision-making styles, as well as eight questions and 18 endpoints that can be used to determine an individual’s decision-making style (p. 188).

Although leadership theories are often presented in a style that seems to indicate new directions, Rost (1991) does not see them as novel. He explained that transformational leadership has merely been revamped to make it acceptable to the industrial paradigm:

Knowingly or unwittingly, the authors of some of the most popular books on leadership in the 1980s have dressed up Burns’s major ideas of leadership in designer outfits that appeal to Fortune 1000 companies and those to whom they deliver their goods and services. What we have at the beginning of the 1990s is
clearly old wine in new bottles: great man/woman, trait, group, organizational, and management theories of leadership that look new because they bespeak excellence, charisma, culture, quality, vision, values, peak performance and even empowerment. It’s a snow job, not a new paradigm. And, mind you, I was taken in, just like everyone else. (p. 91)

Burns, in his forward to Rost’s (1991) *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, applauded Rost’s outstanding contribution to the field of leadership studies but cautioned that Rost minimizes the important roles of ethics and morality as well as conflict (Rost, 1991, p. xii). Ciulla (2004) echoes Burns’s concerns when she disagrees with Rost’s dismissal of ethical theories and the “paucity of research energy expended on ethics” (p. 5) in other major works such as *Bass and Stogdill’s Handbook of Leadership*.

Clearly, Rost (1991, in his determination to end the mystery surrounding the meaning of leadership, has made a significant contribution to the understanding of leadership by identifying the source of confusion as the lack of a common working definition of *leadership*. Some authors, such as Bridgeforth (2005), view aspects of the collective confusion as a positive indicator that at least people are paying attention and learning (p. 9). Rost’s (1991) contention that there has been little advancement in understanding leadership may have had merit in the early 1990s. In the past decade, however, scholars have observed shifts and an emerging understanding of leadership as a complex process of complex relationships (Barker, 1997; Bridgeforth, 2005; Day, 2000; Rost & Barker, 2000; Uhl-Bien, 2003).

Wheatley (1999) proposed that to embrace a new quantum world filled with complex changes, we must engage in new ways of leading away from our isolated parts and silos and wake up to the fact that “we participate in a world of exquisite interconnectedness” (p. 158). A few years later, Wheatley (2005) expressed sadness
regarding her observations of a return to old paths:

I'm sad to report that in the past few years, ever since uncertainty became our insistent twenty-first-century companion, leadership strategies have taken a great leap backward to the familiar territory of command and control. . . . The need is urgent, because people are forgetting there is any alternative to the deadening leadership that daily increases in vehemence. It's truly a dark time because people are losing faith in themselves and each other and forgetting how wonderful humans can be, how much hope we feel when we work well together on things we care about. (pp. 4-5)

Still, Komives et al. (2005) are optimistic about the changing theoretical frameworks and see a dynamic shift in the study of leadership identity and developmental process from a "hierarchical, leader-centric view to one that embraced leadership as a collaborative, relational process" (p. 609).

**History of Leadership-Development in Higher Education**

Early developments in the study of leadership were an outgrowth of war. Following the Civil War, students were viewed as adults and given more opportunities to engage in leadership activities (Caruso, 1981, p. 9). In the 1940s, after WW II, in order to support an effective military, early leadership studies were enhanced by large-scale government-funded leadership projects (Riggio et al., 2003, p. 224).

In the 1950s and 1960s, sociologists and psychologists in several public universities (Ohio State, University of Michigan, Southern Illinois at Carbondale, and Michigan State) conducted research on leadership. Researchers at Ohio State studied effective leadership behaviors while researchers at the University of Michigan studied the relationships among leaders’ behavior, group process, and outcomes (Yukl, 1994, p. 54).

In the 1970s, two landmark publications heavily influenced
leadership-development. A 1966 grant from the Smith Richardson Foundation provided the first comprehensive review of literature on leadership and led to Stogdill's (1974) *Handbook of Leadership*. Then, in 1978, Burns of Williams College published *Leadership*, a seminal and revolutionary work still used in leadership classrooms today. This book gave birth to an enormous growth in research, literature, publications, and training programs along a wide spectrum of leadership areas, as well as on the more specific aspects of charismatic and transformational leadership (Freeman, Knott, & Schwartz, 1996).

Interest in leadership-development programs has grown rapidly in recent decades. In 1976, a commission of the American College Personnel Association developed a task force to study and survey undergraduate leadership programs in higher education (Caruso, 1981). The work of this taskforce produced the *Student Leadership Programs in Higher Education* (Caruso, 1981). According to Riggio et al. (2003), prior to the establishment of formalized leadership programs in higher education, the division of student affairs in a university often was the main provider of leadership-training programs through student organizations (p. 228). These programs often lacked an approach that combined theory and practice.

In the 1980s, there was an emerging theme that the purpose of higher education was to develop citizens for leadership (Boyer, 1987; Caruso, 1981; McIntire, 1989; Roberts & Ullom, 1989). In 1980, a doctorate in leadership was offered at Gonzaga University, and the James MacGregor Burns Academy of leadership was established in 1981 at the University of Maryland. The McDonough Leadership Program at Marietta College established the first undergraduate liberal-arts leadership program in 1986. Then, in 1992, the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond offered a 2-year
curriculum and became the first degree-granting School of Leadership.

In 1979, Peter Simonds (1979) found that 44% of 200 educational institutions surveyed had leadership programs and 41% were planning to initiate a program (p. 36). Nearly 20 years later Keri Leigh McMillon (1997) reported significant growth; 74% of the institutions surveyed had leadership programs and, of the institutions that did not have a leadership training program, 66% were planning to initiate such a program (p. 29).

In 1998, William Honan (1998) accounted for almost 700 leadership-development programs in academic institutions in the U. S. and noted that the number had doubled in only 4 years. By 2003, there were almost 1,000 recognized leadership-development programs in institutions of higher education (Riggio et al., 2003, p. 223). It has been generally believed that for leadership studies to become a recognized academic pursuit, some form of academic authorization is necessary. Yet, until recently, few undergraduate leadership-development programs have strong curricular components that offered a major, minor, or academic certificate. In 2000, in an interview with Mary Schwartz (from the Center for Creative Leadership), Riggio et al. (2003) confirmed that there were more than 100 leadership-development programs offering some form of academic recognition. These offerings ranged from leadership resource centers to graduate programs in leadership, including double majors, leadership majors, leadership minors, certificates in leadership, and doctorates in leadership (Riggio et al., 2003, p. 226).

According to Mary Schwartz, Kristin Axtman, and Frank Freeman (1998), in Leadership Education: A Source Book of Courses and Programs, leadership programs now permeate an array of disciplines. Riggio et al. (2003) concluded that today "scholars in academic fields as divergent as political science, psychology, business, education, history,
agriculture, public administration, management, anthropology, biology, military sciences, philosophy, and sociology have contributed to an understanding of leadership" (p. 225).

Early leadership training focused mostly on management. Bennis and Nanus (1985) explained that "management education is, unfortunately, the appropriate description for that which goes on in most formal education and training programs, or within and outside universities" (p. 219). In the early 1990s, Rost (1991) continued to argue that most of what has been labeled leadership in the past was essentially good management. In the industrial era, when production and efficiency were dominant themes, management-based trait, behavioral, and situational leadership styles were considered effective.

William Howe's 1997 analysis found that in the behavioral and social sciences and business management were still the foundational forces behind most leadership studies in the U. S. (p. 286). Howe (1997) also discovered that 44% of the courses offered, focused on moral and ethical leadership, 23% emphasized transformational leadership, and five courses still centered on transactional leadership (p. 286).

By the close of the 20th century, the approach to "teaching" leadership began to change. The global, complex, rapidly changing era, along with the flattening of the U. S. company, fostered new visionary leadership theories with new models of learning, connecting, relating, and influencing (Bennis, 1989; Komives et al., 1998; Komives et al., 2005; Rost, 1991; Wheatley, 1999). These new paradigms of leading by building collaboration and principle-centered values have also impacted the way we train student leaders (Komives et al., 2005; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; McMillon, 1997, p. 37; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000).
Leadership-Development Resources

The support system for leadership education is expanding. Leadership approaches were reconsidered, following a gathering of leadership educators in the early 1990s at the Leadership Symposia (Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, et al., 2006). The International Leadership Association and the Association of Leadership Education emerged as learning communities for leadership educators, and in 2003, leadership standards for the Council for the Advancement of Standards (2003) were proposed. According to Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, et al., (2006), both the LeaderShape Leadership Forum (for senior leadership educators) and the Leadership Educators Institute meet annually (p. ix). The Leadership Educators Institute is co-sponsored by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), and the National Clearing House for Leadership Programs (NCLP).


Related publications and professional journals include the *Journal of Leadership Studies, Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, Leadership Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Leadership Education*. Foundations such as Kellogg, Pew, and Lilly have directed attention and financial support for leadership-development (Komives, Dugan,
Research on Leadership-Development Programs

Schriesheim (2003) declared that "in general (and with few exceptions), leadership research is largely irrelevant for leadership development" (p. 181). Schriesheim offered the following reasons for that reality: (a) researchers do not speak the same language as managers, (b) researchers look for statistical significance whereas managers want other outcomes, (c) theories are not valid, (d) theories are highly complex, (e) theories assume that the leader has the ability to make good decisions and give clear directions, and (f) leadership involves the investment of time (p. 182).

What follows is a brief overview of the research in higher-education leadership-development related to program evaluation, program feasibility, and program outcomes.

Program Evaluation Studies

From 1960 to 1990, a number of studies focused on program evaluation, common components, and best practices. These studies include those conducted by Donald Wright (1967), Daniel Breen (1970), Simonds (1979), Robert Gregory and Sarah Britt (1987), and McMillon (1997). More recently, the Kravis Leadership Study (Olsen, 1999) and the study by Ayman et al. (2003) evaluated leadership-development programs.

Wright (1967) identified seven exemplary programs from 87, 4-year undergraduate institutions that received excellent reviews. Wright provided recommendations from the seven best programs. Breen (1970) found that student activities departments provided the major direction and support to the leadership-training programs. Common elements of effective leadership training programs included student planning and participation,
interactive experiential learning, small groups, weekend formats, and strong financial support (Breen, 1970, p. 17).

In another study that also included 87 institutions with leadership-training programs, Simonds (1979) found the goals of these training programs to be: (a) developing effective leadership skills, (b) developing additional educational components for student-activity programs, and (c) promoting smooth transitions between and among student leaders (pp. 36-37). Additional findings were related to the impact of the multiple distractions of college life and a lack of intentionality on potential program effectiveness (pp. 72-92).

In 1987 Gregory and Britt (1987) evaluated 469 leadership-development programs and found best common practices which included the importance of program participant selection, a sound philosophical foundation, an interdisciplinary/multi-method approach, and a comprehensive long-term plan. In addition, Gregory and Britt (1987) found that programs with credit-based aspects were treated with more credibility (pp. 32-35).

The McMillon (1997) replication of the Simonds (1979) study found that there were “significantly more leadership training programs at colleges and universities in 1997 than in 1979” (p. 71). Compared to 20 years earlier, although leadership-training program goals remained stable and staff members continued to be initiators, implementers, and evaluators, faculty members’ involvement focused on instruction and did include planning and evaluation (McMillon, 1997, p. 71). McMillon (1997) also found an increase in funding and staffing while noting that “although the majority of programs are evaluated, there continues to be a lack of systematic evaluation and documentation processes (p. 71).

A study at the Kravis Leadership Institute (1999) looked at undergraduate
leadership programs that offered leadership degrees, minors, or certificates. Interviews were conducted at 10 of the 49 institutions that had formal academic programs (Olsen, 1999). The Kravis study found that only 3 of 10 schools had conducted any follow-up with alumni of the programs; all 10 had community-service requirements, most had an internship component, several included an experiential-learning and research component, and more than 90% had a course on leadership (as cited in Ayman et al., 2003, p. 203).

Ayman et al. (2003) conducted a web-based survey of 63 schools in order to study leadership programs that were more developmental than formal, curriculum-based leadership-studies programs. Of the 30 institutions that appeared to have a developmental-leadership program and the 20 of those that responded, Ayman et al. found only 9 to be truly developmental (p. 216). Ayman et al. (2003) discovered that “perhaps the most serious deficiency of the reviewed leadership-development programs was the absence of a foundation based on leadership theory(ies)” (p. 218). Most university-based leadership programs appeared to have a learning-theory multi-methods approach that included a variety of traditional and experiential methods but failed to incorporate a leadership theoretical-framework into the program (p. 219). Additional weaknesses in the programs were the lack of formal feedback, the brief exposure to a short-term program rather than the long-term impact of process-driven programs, and the lack of systematic evaluation of leadership programs (pp. 219-220).

Feasibility and Implementation Studies

Ghodsi (2000) conducted a feasibility study to determine interest in the development of an undergraduate leadership program at Seattle University. The findings
showed that there was significant support for a minor and academic certificate in leadership and less support for a bachelor's degree in leadership (p. 107). Participants also believed that leadership studies would help graduates to make meaningful contributions to society and would contribute to the critical-thinking capabilities of students. There was additional support for the prospect of leadership-development serving as a recruiting tool for the university. Furthermore, potential employers indicated an interest in hiring graduates of leadership-development programs (Ghodsi, 2000, p. 108).

Cynthia Marconi-Hickman (2001) investigated the process of organizational change in the development of a credit-based undergraduate leadership-program at Rowan University. She focused on how campus culture both encourages and impedes collaboration. The study showed that whereas institutional culture drives practice, real change requires a shift in the values and beliefs of the culture. Challenges that emerged during program implementation included (a) creating an interdisciplinary program within a culture that values specialization, (b) promoting holistic learning within segregated in-class and out-of-class experiences, (c) collaborating in a micropolitical environment, and (d) taking the time that making deep change requires (Marconi-Hickman, 2001).

Doug Berg (2003) studied the perceptions of leaders, educators, and students in relationship to the development of leadership programs at Canadian colleges and universities. Berg (2003) also constructed a program model that included (a) articulating the role of students, educators, and the university, (b) assessing participants and skill development, (c) designing components related to leadership education, and (d) training and developing leaders (Berg, 2003).
Program Outcome Studies

Despite the number and variety of leadership programs and models, published research about and evidence of the effectiveness of leadership-development programs was scarce until the turn of the century. Jack Zenger, Dave Ulrich, and Norm Smallwood (2000), in reviewing the state of executive leadership-development programs, noted some immediate results that included a few new ideas and tools but questioned the true outcomes: “There was no evidence of permanent improvement or that the participants were better leaders in the end—and that ostensibly, was the purpose for which the programs were given” (Zenger et al., 2000, p. 22).

Although program-evaluation and feasibility studies in institutions of higher education have offered important insights, leadership-development-program outcome-studies were rare to nonexistent until the late 1990s:

1. 1996—Curt Brungardt and Chris Crawford’s (1996) evaluation of participants of Fort Hays State University’s program

2. 2000—W. K. Kellogg Foundation longitudinal study conducted by Kathleen Zimmerman-Oster and John Burkhardt

3. 2004—Craig Russon and Claire Reinelt’s evaluation of the W. K. Kellogg participating institutions

4. 2006—the current Susan Komives, John Dugan, and Julie Owen’s *Multi-Institutional Study.*

**W. K. Kellogg Foundation Study**

From 1990 to 1998, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation funded 31 leadership-
development programs. In 1999 Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) conducted two independent evaluations of these programs. A panel of experts in leadership-development reviewed the variety of models and methods of leadership-development that included the use of mentors, guest speakers, and community-service opportunities. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) found that 77% of the programs were directed or co-directed by students, 72% used their graduates as mentors, 58% developed new courses, 14% developed leadership minors and major areas of study, and 35% used faculty awards and grants.

The second 3-year study compared 10 of 31 Kellogg Foundation grantee institutions that had implemented leadership-development programs and evaluated students on 14 measures. The students from institutions that received Foundation funding were compared with students from similar institutions that did not receive funding. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) reported that the “findings were significant. When compared to nonparticipants, students who participated in funded leadership projects were much more likely to report significant changes on the measured leadership outcomes” (p. 13). Overall, leadership-program participants showed “an increased likelihood of demonstrating growth in civic responsibility, leadership skills, multicultural awareness and community orientation, understanding of leadership theories, and personal and societal and values” (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000, p. 14). Furthermore, Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) found that participation in a leadership-development program (a) strengthened the undergraduate experience in unexpected ways, (b) increased retention, (c) fostered engagement with the community, and (d) impacted students beyond graduation (p. 23).
More recently, Craig Russon and Claire Reinelt (2004) reported on an evaluation of 55 leadership-development programs that were part of the W. K. Kellogg-funded study. Russon and Reinelt (2004) found (a) an increasing emphasis on program outcomes, (b) program evaluations were more focused on the impact on various individual, organizational, and community levels, (c) few programs had a theoretical framework, (d) a disconnect between program goals and program activities, and (e) programs desired to evaluate longer-term goals but often evaluated short-term outputs such as participant enrollment and workshop satisfaction to justify funding (p. 105). According to Russon and Reinelt (2004), the experimental approaches are less sensitive to the uniqueness of participants, and the mixed-methods design is often selected “because it allows [researchers] to combine qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods in such a way that they are able to compliment each other’s strengths and compensate for each other’s weakness” (p. 106).

Fort Hays State University Study

Brungardt and Crawford (1996) used multiple assessment methods to measure the outcomes of the leadership-studies program at Fort Hays State University. Brungardt and Crawford (1996) found that (a) students expressed more competence and confidence in knowing and understanding the nature of leadership, (b) students reported significant changes in their leadership activities (such as challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others, and encouraging the heart) which ranked them above national norms, and (c) students were able to apply the results of what they learned. In general “the aggregated student evaluation suggests that students reacted well to the program, increased
their knowledge and behavioral skills, and applied their training to become more effective leaders" (Brungardt & Crawford, 1996, p. 47).

According to Riggio et al. (2003), to accurately determine the added value of leadership-education studies, more studies need to be designed that compare the outcomes of students who did not receive leadership education with the outcomes of students who did receive leadership education. Riggio et al. (2003) also suggested the need to determine if broad-based leadership-studies programs have "provided access to students who might not have the opportunity or the inclination to study leadership" (p. 232). In addition, Ayman et al. (2003) pointed out the need to answer questions regarding how students are able to juggle their existing majors with the additional requirements of formal academic leadership programs (p. 203).

Multi-Institutional Study

Susan Komives, John Dugan, and Julie Owen’s (2006) current *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership* of 52 participating institutions offers significant insight to the impact of the higher-education climate for leadership-development growth (Komives, Dugan, & Owen, 2006). The conceptual framework of the study considered students’ pre-college characteristics in relation to the experiences of the collegiate environment and the students’ characteristics after being a part of the college environment. The study used the social change model values—leadership efficacy, appreciation of diversity, cognitive and leadership identity development—to measure growth. According to Komives, Dugan, and Owen (2006), the college environment explains between 5% and 13% of the variance. Of the variables considered, diversity discussions and mentoring were identified as important
factors in predicting leadership. Additionally, the preliminary findings of the *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership* supported non-positional models and the need to target a wide spectrum of students (Komives, Dugan, & Owen, 2006).

**Designing Leadership-Development Program Models**

Summarizing interviews with leadership educators, Jonathan Doh (2003) concluded that leadership can be taught, but noted that the critical problem is to determine the most appropriate model and methodology for the desired outcome. Ayman et al. (2003) suggested that prior to building a model, one should review three formats for teaching leadership: (a) training, which is learning related to the present job, (b) education, which is learning to prepare for a different, identifiable job, and (c) development, which is comprehensive learning for personal growth and is unrelated to the job (p. 204).

Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) noted that great leadership-development programs can be found in many types of institutions and that all hallmarks of great programs will not be found in all situations. Thus, the appropriate design should be shaped from the intersection of the goals of the program and the mission of the institution (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000, p. 19). In order to assist in the process of leadership-curriculum development, Hosford (as cited in Watt, 2003) developed guidelines to address pertinent questions regarding professionalism, practicality, political climate, the package, the organization, teaching and learning, and implementation (p. 13).

Astin and Astin (2000) offered seven important questions that should be addressed:

1. What values should guide the leadership process?
2. Toward what end(s) is the leadership effort directed?
3. How do individuals initiate change efforts?
4. How are leadership groups formed?
Leadership-Development Program Models

Three leadership-development models that have been used as frameworks in institutions of higher education include (a) the leadership challenge model, (b) the social change model (SCM), and (c) the relationship leadership model (RLM).

Leadership Challenge Model

Kouzes and Posner's (1987) model identified five critical leadership disciplines: (a) challenging the process, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way, and (e) encouraging the heart. Each of these five practices also includes an additional subset. Together they are called the Ten Commitments of Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Although this approach is practical in its directive to encourage the practice of leadership behaviors, Rost (1991) questioned the behavioral aspect noting that good leaders may or not practice some of the identified leadership practices.

Social Change Model

The University of California's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI, 1996) developed the guidebook, *A Social Change Model of Leadership-Development*, for college students studying leadership-development. This text departs from the traditional linear approach that views leaders as those who occupy a position. Instead, the social change model embraces leadership as a process where “the leader functions as a catalyst and
facilitator in enabling the group to act collectively in accomplishing the common vision” (pp. 4-5). The SCM is comprised of seven values that are clustered within three broader categories of values (a) individual values—consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment, (b) group values—collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility, and (c) societal or community values—citizenship (HERI, 1996).

**Relationship Leadership Model**

Komives, Lucas, and McMahon’s (2006) relational leadership model (RLM) depicts leadership as a relational and ethical process between people in order to create positive change. The RLM focuses on competency of knowledge, attitudes, and skills within the framework of knowing, being, and doing. According to Keith Edwards (2006), “this model encourages leaders to be active in: knowing yourself and others as well as how things work; being ethical, inclusive, and caring; and doing or acting in a socially responsible way” (p. 11). The model has evolved from the use of *process-orientation* as a connective concept to the use of *purpose* as the core connecting value (Edwards, 2006, p. 11). Komives et al. (2005) recognized six stages of leadership identity development: (a) awareness, (b) exploration/engagement, (c) leader identified, (d) leadership differentiated, (e) generativity, and (f) integration/synthesis.

Even with the emergence of new frameworks, there appears to be a significant gap between theory and practice (Schriesheim, 2003, p. 181). Ayman et al. (2003) noted that “with few exceptions leadership theories are not incorporated into the design of university based leadership-development programs” (p. 220). Day and O’Connor (2003) cautioned: “Given the lack of empirical evidence to support the proposition that systemic approaches
yield significantly greater returns to organizations, it is difficult to argue for a long-term, systemic strategy for leadership development" (p. 11). They further suggested three areas to advance the science of leadership-development: (a) development of theory, (b) advancement of multidimensional perspectives, and (c) application of sophisticated models of change (Day & O'Connor, 2003, p. 12).

Leadership-Development Approaches

According to Rost and Barker (2000), the three most common approaches to leadership education are (a) a liberal-arts approach, (b) a multi-disciplinary approach, and (c) a student affairs and non-academic (non-credit) approach focused on governance. Additionally, leadership themes are covered in electives, seminars, or retreats and opportunities for development are available in leadership dorms, leadership clubs, and leadership councils (p. 1). Riggio et al. (2003) identified three general curriculum-based models: (a) a business model (heavily driven by management and organizational psychology approaches), (b) a multi-disciplinary model (utilizes a social change approach supported by Astin & Astin, 2000), which focuses on civic engagement, and (c) a liberal-arts model (championed by Gardner, 1990), which emphasizes a broad educational experience (p. 227).

Curricular Model Guidelines

Riggio et al. (2003) suggested six foundational guidelines for effective leadership education. They stated that leadership studies should (a) be multi-disciplinary, (b) be authorized academically, (c) be guided by theories and research on leadership, (d) be driven by proven models of learning development, (e) cultivate the values of the field, and (f) be
focused on outcomes (pp. 227-231). Within the organizational framework of these guidelines, a brief description of these principles follows.

**Multi-disciplinary**

Burns (1978) concluded that leadership bridges all academic disciplines and declared that "leadership is—or can be made to be—the most genuinely interdisciplinary program I have known" (p. 26). Other scholars claimed the study of leadership should be a multi-disciplinary approach and argued that studying leadership from a single discipline provides a limited view of the leadership process (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2002; Wren, 1994). According to Riggio et al. (2003) the contribution to the body of leadership research from a multitude of perspectives offers greater breadth, insight, and opportunity for learning (p. 228). However, with the knowledge explosion and the subsequent challenge of trying to cover content in a specified time, there may be legitimate resistance to an edict to incorporate leadership training into every class. Ciulla (1996) noted that it will not happen without intentionality:

> Leadership education has the potential to revitalize and reapply the traditional values of the liberal arts by focusing learning on the development of responsible citizen leaders. This means that we intentionally enlist the arts, sciences, social sciences and humanities in the case of getting students to think about their lives and what it means to live in this world. This has always been the goal of the liberal arts, but we can’t reach this goal by keeping our fingers crossed and hoping students will make all the right connections. (pp. 118-119)

**Authorized Academically**

There is a growing sense that leadership-development studies and activities should be recognized on a student’s academic record: “If leadership studies is truly an emerging discipline . . . then academic credit must be offered, as well as academic authorization”
Guided by Theories and Research on Leadership

A leadership-development program should be grounded in leadership-foundations, theories, and practices that have undergone rigorous evaluation and should be consistent with the results of leadership research (Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, et al., 2006; Riggio et al., 2003).

Driven by Proven Models of Learning and Student Development

The collaborative utilization of classroom learning, group processes, and applied experiential learning (internships, service learning, and so forth) is a particularly effective learning method in the area of leadership. Additional methods include case-study and simulations (Riggio et al., 2003, pp. 229-230).

The framework of (a) student development theories proposed by Arthur Chickering (1993), and Marcia Baxter Magolda (2004), (b) learning theories such as David Kolb’s (1984) experiential-learning model that includes concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation, and (c) Howard Gardner’s (1999) multiple intelligences (logical-mathematical, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and more recently, naturalistic, spiritual and moral) should be considered in the design of a leadership-development approach.

Cultivate the Values of the Field

Riggio et al. (2003) suggested that the field of leadership values should include ethics, civic/social responsibility, service learning, and, more recently, global awareness.
Ethics

Generational theorists Howe and Strauss (1997) predicted that there would be a crisis in 2005, which would usher in the weakening of institutions and strengthening of individualism, the decay of civic order, and the upheaval that comes with the planting of a new values framework (p. 3). Howe and Strauss (1997) contended these circumstances call for ethical leadership and that “Americans of all generations should work to elevate moral and cultural standards” (p. 3). According to Ciulla (1996) it is especially important during times of chaos and uncertainty that the leader is trustworthy. Ciulla (1996) further urged that ethics should play a key role in leadership education (p. 200).

Barker (1997) contended that in leadership education “the primary role of all leadership participants should be active shapers of their world” (p. 9). According to Astin and Astin (2000), “any form of education, including leadership education, is inherently value-laden. Value considerations underlie virtually every educational decision. . . . The real question is more which values should govern these decisions” (p. 9). Nevertheless, Ciulla (2004) observed that many scholars who write about leadership “genuflect at the altar of ethics and speak with hushed reverence about its [ethics] importance to leadership,” and yet produce little methodical and continuous management of the subject of ethics (p. 1).

Service learning

Astin and Astin (2000) contended that students will find it challenging to implement what they have learned unless they have actually experienced leadership as part of their education.
If the next generation of citizen leaders is to be engaged and committed to leading for the common good, then the institutions which nurture them must be engaged in the work of the society and the community, modeling effective leadership and problem solving skills, demonstrating how to accomplish change for the common good. (p. 2)

Some scholars suggested that one of the most powerful effects of engagement in community service during the undergraduate years is the development of the student's leadership skills (Astin & Sax, 1998).

Civic responsibility

Rost and Barker (2000) attested that the goal of leadership education should be to produce citizenship for a democratic society (p. 1). Drucker (1995) stated that citizenship "is not a panacea for the ills of post-capitalist society and post-capitalist polity, but it may be a pre-requisite for tackling these ills. It restores the civic responsibility that is the mark of citizenship, and the civic pride that is the mark of community" (as cited in Tichy, 2002, p. 257). Tichy (2002) went so far as to predict that every successful leader and institution in the 21st century "will also be highly visible as a dedicated global citizen" (p. 261).

Komives et al. (1998) described civic responsibility as an attitude that declares, "If I am a member of this community, I have a responsibility to work with others to keep it functioning and even make it better" (p. 15). Wren (1994) concurred that leadership education is critical to this country in order "to produce citizens capable of confronting and resolving the complex problems which will face tomorrow's society" (p. 74).

Global challenges and opportunities

Kotter (1996) noted that globalization is "creating both more hazards and more opportunities for everyone" (p. 18). Gayle Avery (as cited by Robinson, 2005) contended
that leadership must be considered in context that the world is “more differentiated and yet more similar globally, and more intricately connected both internally and externally. We exist in a globalizing world of multicultural and multinational workforces” (p. 6).

Accordingly, there is a “renewed interest in the phenomenon of leadership being generated around the globe” (Robinson, 2005, p. 78). Consequently, global leadership is an exploding priority within leadership education, forging the development of new competencies embedded in leadership curriculums to propel the preparation of students to serve and change the world nationally and internationally. Christina Bueno and Stewart Tubbs (2004) identified six competencies that would foster effective global leadership: (a) communication skills, (b) motivation to learn, (c) flexibility, (d) open-mindedness, (e) respect for others, and (f) sensitivity (p. 83).

Focused on Outcomes

Even with the growing consensus that leadership can be taught, some critics argue that leaders are born (Thomas Cronin, as cited in Wren, 1995, p. 30), that leadership is too complex to be taught, and that those who can learn, can learn only through direct experience (Riggio et al., 2003, p. 231). Clearly, models should be developed with a focus on how to achieve the desired outcomes in the graduates from the program. Some scholars doubt the impact of short-term leadership training. According to John Dugan (2004),

It is critical that professionals begin to re-think their existing program structures and expand curriculum to provide opportunities that go beyond leadership training. Learning and development opportunities that foster the establishment of a leadership identity must be deeply embedded in the programmatic offerings of comprehensive leadership programs. (p. 5)
Co-Curricular Model Components

There is growing consensus that the landscape of a university, with its wealth of opportunities in both curricular and co-curricular components, provides the ingredients for the strongest leadership-development models. Recognizing that the entire campus is a resource for providing leadership-development and that out-of-class experiences are part of a holistic education, the term “co-curricular” is the preferred terminology (Astin & Astin, 2000; Smist, 2006, p. 131). Students spend substantial time in college, engaged in campus activities—spiritual, recreation, athletic, and community service—participating in student organizations and clubs, multicultural affairs, residence life, student employment, and academic departments (Astin & Astin, 2000; Smist, 2006, p. 131).

Many students fail to recognize that these activities provide opportunities to develop and practice leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000). According to Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000), "co-curricular experiences not only support and augment the students' formal classroom and curricular experience, but can also create powerful learning opportunities for leadership-development through collaborative group projects that serve the institution or the community" (p. 13).

Given the framework that the purpose of leadership training is to assist students in developing skills in their current jobs and that leadership education is intended to benefit students in their future endeavors, leadership-development represents the comprehensive long-term goal of developing the process of interactions within a complex system (Brungardt, 1996; Nadler & Nadler, 1989; Roberts & Ullom, 1989). In this context some aspects of co-curricular leadership programming focuses more on training and education than on leadership-development.
Jennifer Smist (2006) noted that "co-curricular leadership development programs can exist in a variety of formats, such as one-time conferences, a series of workshops, or a comprehensive developmentally sequenced model that results in a leadership certificate or other credential" and can be designed to attract different student populations (p. 131). According to Ayman et al. (2003), the majority of existing programs appear to be one-time or short-term programs which include on-campus leadership conferences, retreats, workshops, and lectures (p. 219). Leadership training for positional leaders, such as resident assistants and officers of student organizations, is usually short-term or interim. Some campuses offer sequential, longer-term programs that may span a semester or last several years, ranging from emerging leaders programs—which often target first-year students—to the multi-year comprehensive leadership-development programs (Smist, 2006).

Exemplary Leadership Programs

The most exemplary leadership-development programs in the W. K. Kellogg study, according to Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000), shared a number of defining elements in context, philosophy, and sustainability.

The shared context of these programs included (a) a strong connection between institutional mission and leadership-development, (b) broad campus support and a linkage of the curricular and co-curricular activities, (c) collaborative structure beyond the departmental level that included academic and student affairs, and (d) strong program leadership, such as a tenured faculty with expertise in leadership or youth development, or a highly respected student-affairs professional (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000).
The common elements regarding the philosophy of program leaders were a (a) deep commitment to the leadership-development of students, (b) clear theoretical framework, working knowledge of the literature, as well as defined values and assumptions, (c) working definition of leadership developed by all stakeholders, (d) comprehensive educational strategy that includes experiential learning, and (e) search to develop an understanding of leadership, skills of collaboration, critical thinking, systemic thinking, and cultural dexterity (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000).

According to Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) the components that contributed to the sustainability of exemplary leadership-development program include (a) committed faculty and administration, (b) identifiable and measurable processes and outcomes, (c) a clear plan for evaluation, (d) a design that ensures institutional impact and sustainability, and (e) the fostering of institutional and cultural change.

Summary

As noted by leadership scholars, it is imperative to reach an understanding of what leadership is before we would attempt to teach or develop leadership (Barker, 1997). Upon this spectrum of leadership literature, research, and program models, I will identify a framework of leadership-development opportunities that align with individual and institutional goals. I designed a research approach to examine the perspectives, potential interest, opportunities, and challenges related to implementing a comprehensive leadership-development plan for Andrews University. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of this study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Research Questions

The research questions have been selected to determine the interest and challenges related to formalizing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University. The research questions are:

1. What perspectives and characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University have related to undergraduate leadership-development programs?

2. What characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University interested in participating in leadership-development programs have compared to students less interested in participating in leadership-development programs?

3. How might an undergraduate leadership-development program align with the mission of Andrews University?

4. What level of interest do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University have for an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

5. What components do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University report would be needed for implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

6. What obstacles or challenges would exist in implementing an undergraduate
leadership-development program at Andrews University?

Overview

This chapter contains an overview of research approaches involved in this study. This mixed-methods approach employs both quantitative methods of inquiry and qualitative methods of inquiry. This chapter explains the rationale for this research design. The chapter also includes information related to populations, sampling, data collection, data analysis, validity, and reliability.

According to Walter Borg and Meredith Gall (1983), the quantitative researcher gathers knowledge “by collecting numerical data on observable behaviors of samples and then subjecting these data to numerical analysis” (p. 28). Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (as cited in Borg & Gall, 1983) described qualitative research as an approach where researchers “study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 29). Sharan Merriam (1988) pointed out that in qualitative research “the interest is in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation” (p. xii). M. Lee Upcraft and John Schuh (1996) simplified the discussion by suggesting that, in general, quantitative methods answer the “what” questions, whereas qualitative methods answer the “why” questions (p. 55). Since the research questions for this study had both “what” and “why” questions, the mixed-methods approach was needed.

Michael Patton (1990) offered definitions and strengths of both methods. “Qualitative methods permit the evaluator to study selected issues in depth and detail. Approaching fieldwork without being constrained by predetermined categories of analysis
contributes to the depth, openness, and detail of qualitative inquiry" (p. 12). “Quantitative methods, on the other hand, require the use of standardized measure so that the varying perspectives and experiences of people can be fit into a limited number of predetermined response categories" (Patton, 1990, pp. 13-14). Qualitative methods can provide a depth of understanding, but they are less generalizable. The large samples of quantitative methods provide more opportunity to generalize findings. Once again, there was a clear need for both approaches in this study.

Borg and Gall (1983) contended that in educational research, where the goal may be to gain a deep understanding from human subjects, the qualitative approach is especially effective. Frances Stage (as cited in Upcraft & Schuh, 1996) observed that researchers who have worked with college populations “have discovered that many of their most burning questions could not be answered through simple quantitative approaches to data collections and analysis” (p. 52). Merriam (1988) concurred that “research focused on discovery, insight, and understanding from the perspective of those being studied offers the greatest promise of making significant contributions to the knowledge base and practice of education” (p. 3).

Biddle and Anderson (as cited by Borg & Gall, 1983) support the need for both approaches:

It is inappropriate to compare the relative efficacy of these two traditions (quantitative and qualitative research) since each has different purposes; broadly these are the generation of insights on the one hand and the testing of hypotheses on the other. Although advocates for discovery (qualitative researchers) decry the arid tautologies of confirmationists (quantitative researchers), and the latter express disdain for the sloppy subjectivism of discovery research, the two perspectives have complementary goals. We need them both. (p. 29)

Even as the place of both research approaches has become more accepted in recent
decades, a significant debate continues about the level to which both qualitative and quantitative methods should be used in the same study (Merriam, 1988, p. 2). Some researchers suggest that the largest part of the debate and the biggest challenges of a mixed-methods approach are the result of the divergent paradigms of the two methods (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 31; Merriam, 1988, p. 2).

Consideration was given to David Day and Patricia O'Conner's (2003) observation that "because leadership is a highly contextual construct that emerges through a complex interaction of leaders, followers, and situations," the scientific, experientially controlled method "does not serve the study of leadership-development particularly well" (p. 12). Given these factors, a carefully developed mixed-method approach was selected for this study.

**Rationale for Mixed-Methods Design**

Mixed-methods designs are referenced in the literature by the varied terminology of multitrait-multimethod research, multi-methodological research, integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches, methodological triangulation, multimethodological research, combining qualitative and quantitative research, and mixed model studies (Creswell, 2003, p. 18; Creswell, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 212). Several authors recommend that the terminology mixed-methods, frequently used in current literature, is most appropriate and therefore will be the term utilized in this study (Creswell et al., 2003, p. 212; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 10). Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie (1998) define mixed-methods studies as "those that combine the qualitative and quantitative approaches into the research methodology of a single study or multi-phased study" (pp.
17-18). Creswell et al. (2003) offer this definition that emphasizes the mixing of methods:

A *mixed methods study* involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research. (p. 212)

According to Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003), a mixed-methods design and analysis offers a more comprehensive analytical technique than does either quantitative or qualitative data analysis alone. In particular, mixed methods data analysis allows the researcher to use the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques so as to understand phenomena better. The ability to “get more out of the data” provides the opportunity to generate more meaning, thereby enhancing the quality of data interpretation. (p. 353)

Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (as cited by Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003) outlined five purposes of mixed-methods designs. These include:

(a) triangulation (i.e., seeking convergence and corroboration of results from different methods studying the same phenomenon), (b) complementarily (i.e., seeking elaboration, enhancement, illustration, and clarification of the results from one method with results from the other method), (c) development (i.e., using the results from one method to help inform the other method), (d) initiation (i.e., discovering paradoxes and contradictions that lead to a reframing of the research questions), and (e) expansion (i.e., seeking to expand the breadth and range of inquiry by using different methods for different inquiry components). (p. 353)

This study employs (a) triangulation and (e) expansion. The quantitative component examines Andrews students’ interest whereas the qualitative explores faculty, administration, and staff views regarding student interest and contextual issues in more detailed ways. As Robert Yin (1993) notes regarding triangulation, “the most robust fact may be considered to have been established if three (or more) sources all coincide” (p. 69).

According to Creswell (2003) the philosophical underpinnings of the pragmatism paradigm do not view quantitative and qualitative methods as mutually exclusive; rather
they look to the purpose of the study and the research questions to drive the research design. As a result when pragmatic researchers focus on a problem, they are not limited to a prescribed methodology that separates theory from practice. In contrast, as noted by Creswell (2003), “pragmatism opens the door to multiple methods, different worldviews, and different assumptions, as well as to different forms of data collection and analysis in the mixed methods study” (p. 12).

I selected the mixed-methods approach for this study because the focus of the study was to explore the level of interest and issues related to the pragmatic implementation of a formal undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University. In light of the rich educational setting of Andrews University, a mixed-methods research design provided me with the opportunity to discover the broad qualitative themes from a smaller population as well as to validate the themes with detailed correlations and frequencies from the quantitative survey of a larger population of students. The intentional gathering of data from a mixed-methods design increased the ability to answer the six research questions and to provide multiple perspectives of program feasibility.

Elliot Eisner (1991) offered six guidelines I considered in developing the qualitative phase of the study. First, it should be field based; second, it should relate to the self as an instrument; third, it has an interpretive quality; fourth, it uses expressive language; fifth, it gives attention to particulars; and sixth, it is believable because it is coherent, insightful, and has instrumental utility.

Feasibility Study of Seattle University

In reviewing the research related to leadership-development programs, I discovered
a study conducted by Ghodsi in 2000. Ghodsi’s intent was to determine the need for an undergraduate leadership-development program at Seattle University. I considered the issues related to conducting aspects of a related study.

William Wiersma (1986) pointed out that most research is an extension of a previous study and that the extent of duplication depends upon the area and conditions of the current study (p. 29). Meredith Gall, Walter Borg, and Joyce Gall (1996) generally discourage exact replication for dissertation research. They outlined legitimate grounds for replicating and extending previous research: (a) to check the findings of a “breakthrough” study, (b) to check the validity of research findings across different populations, (c) to check trends or change over time, (d) to check important findings using different methodology, and (e) to develop more effective and efficient interventions (Gall et al., 1996, pp. 52-54).

The research design of my study extended the Ghodsi (2000) study in several significant ways. First, in the design of the research questions, my study framed research question 2, to determine the characteristics of students who would most likely participate in leadership-development programs. Additionally, research question 6 was designed to discover the opportunities and the barriers that could be a threat to the implementation of a formalized undergraduate leadership-development program.

Further key differences from the Ghodsi (2000) study were that my design selected the different case-study population of Andrews University and employed varied sampling methods. Ghodsi (2000) selected a non-random sample of primarily undergraduate student leaders and business students with the assumption that they might characterize the type of student most interested in a leadership-development program (p. 49). My study built on a
different assumption. Rather than suggest that formal student leaders are more interested in leadership-development programs than students not in leadership position, I extended the research design to the entire undergraduate student body of Andrews University as the sample population. Despite these differences my study allowed some comparison to the Ghodsi (2000) study and provided another study to inform the field of undergraduate leadership-development.

Finally, I used varied instrumentation and statistical analyses compared to Ghodsi’s (2000) study. The student survey instrument in the case study of Andrews University differed significantly in construction from the Ghodsi instrument, especially in regard to question 9 and the use of a forced choice design. I also broadened the survey to include additional demographic questions such as student’s current involvement or noninvolvement in leadership activities. These demographic questions were used with a discriminate statistical analysis process to determine not only the characteristics of students who felt Andrews should provide leadership-development, but those who were most likely to participate in leadership-development programs.

I considered interviewing prominent leadership experts to gain insights regarding effective leadership-development programs. I concluded that such insight and recommendations were incorporated in the literature review and best practices segment of chapter 6.

Description of Phases and Populations

The mixed-methods research design in this case-study included two phases of data collection and two different population components:
1. The collection of data and analysis from a survey of the undergraduate student-body of Andrews University in order to determine their perspectives, interest, and potential participation in an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University.

2. The collection of data and analysis of interviews with Andrews University faculty, administration, and staff regarding their thoughts on the value and challenges of developing an undergraduate leadership program.

Student Survey Sample Selection

I sent an e-mail to all undergraduate students (approximately 1,527) of Andrews University who were 18 or more years of age. Following a brief description of the purpose of the study and survey, I provided an address or URL (uniform resource locator) to an electronic version of the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey (see Appendix C). Two weeks after sending out the survey, I sent a second e-mail to all undergraduate students, thanking those who had participated and encouraging responses from those who had not. I sent a final notification 1 week later. I used Zoomerang software to develop and manage the survey responses (Zoomerang, 2005).

Interview Sample Selection

I selected a purposive or "criterion-based" sampling strategy to identify potential interview respondents from the administration, faculty, and staff of Andrews University. According to Merriam (1998) purposive sampling is desired when one wants to discover and understand a topic from those who know it best (p. 48). Judith Goetz and Margaret LeCompte (1984) described the process of selection as being similar to developing a recipe.
of essential attributes and then locating an ingredient to "match the recipe" (p. 77). Isidor Chein (1976) compared purposive sampling to a situation in which expert consultants are called in on a difficult medical case.

These consultants—also a purposive sample—are not called in in order to get an average opinion that would correspond to the average opinion of the entire medical profession. They are called in precisely because of their special experience and competence. (p. 536)

Accordingly, I initially selected 12 expert consultants from the Andrews University faculty, administration, and staff. I selected these individuals because of their (a) perceived relationship to a leadership-development program, (b) administrative position, (c) relationship in the University structure, and (d) significant role in the strategic plan for Andrews University. Merriam (1998) and others explain that as the data unfold the researcher should look for and seek exceptions and variations to the emerging data (p. 51).

In keeping with these suggestions, 12 individuals were selected and 2 additional ones were "discovered" during the interview process. These 2 candidates were identified by the original 12 candidates as colleagues who may have opposition or perceived resistance to a leadership-development program. Oddly 1 of the 2 new candidates suggested was already in the list of potential respondents. As such, only 1 of these 2 individuals was new to the final list.

Ultimately, I selected and interviewed 13 candidates: 4 general administrators (including 2 high-ranking central administrators), 3 academic deans, 5 faculty (four of whom were department chairs), and 1 staff. Departmental chairs and faculty candidates were selected from the disciplines of communications, religion, business, behavioral sciences, and education, all of whom demonstrate curricular and internship connections to
leadership studies, constructs, and skill development. I also selected the co-chairs of a leadership-exploration task force because of their growing expertise on leadership-development and research, as well as their recent bench-marking of other institutions.

Noticeably, non-academic staff are not well represented in the interview process. My concern was that many staff are already involved in training leaders and would have natural support for a leadership-development program. However I feared they would lack the contextual background to respond to the challenges of formalizing such a program. Additionally, many of the directors and staff who develop leaders are part of the University structure that report to my position as the vice president of student life. I also feared that my selection of their participation in the interview process may have been perceived as being biased. As I point out in chapter 6, in hindsight I believe more staff should have been included in this study.

**Data-Collection Procedures**

In preparing the design of this study I reviewed a variety of resources in consultation with dissertation committee members and in the context of published research methodology (DuBrin, 1995; Gall et al., 1996; Merriam, 1988; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996; Wiersma, 1986).

**Student Survey Design**

In developing the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey, I reviewed general survey-development principles and those that Ghodsi (2000) incorporated in his study as recommended by other researchers (Bourque & Fielder, 1995; Creswell, 1998;
Ghodsi, 2000, pp. 54-55; Suskie, 1992; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). These principles are as follows:

1. Review what has been done and recommended from previous studies.
2. Determine parameters of the study.
3. Use a standard questionnaire if available.
4. Simplify analysis and maximize close-ended questions.
5. Make response categories both exhaustive and not too long.
6. Adapt questions from other questionnaires.
7. Develop new questions when no set of questions can be adopted.
8. Make questions short and specific.
9. Avoid jargon and abstract terms.
10. Move from the simple to the more difficult in a logical order.
11. Determine whether instructions will be part of the questionnaire or in a separate cover letter.
12. Tell participants about the study and what they are being asked to do.
13. Be aware of bias.
14. Determine the need for a pilot test and make appropriate adjustments.
15. Pay attention to results of a pilot to determine if questions were understood, instructions are clear, the order appropriate, and the objectives are clear.
16. Utilize an easy-to-read type size (10-point) and style of font, avoiding italics.

I also sought survey design expertise from the dissertation committee and from other leadership-development consultants. I reviewed several instruments including The Seattle University Leadership Development Survey (Ghodsi 2000). I designed specific
questions and sought additional demographic information to learn the characteristics of students more likely to participate in leadership-development programs. Furthermore, I developed a subset of questions to discover how undergraduate students of Andrews University assessed their leadership skills.

I piloted the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey for face validity. I evaluated the questions with feedback from the pilot group in order to determine whether or not they were interpreted consistently, and made appropriate adjustments to resolve inconsistencies.

With regard to statistical analysis of the survey data, I used descriptive measures, which included frequencies, percentages, and means. I also conducted inferential statistics, which included analysis of variance (ANOVA), t tests, and correlations. Additionally, I used discriminate-analysis processes, which will be defined and described in chapter 5.

Interview-Design Considerations

I considered the following observations and guidelines in contemplating interviews and analyzing their qualitative data. According to Patton (1990) there are three types of interviews: (a) the informal interview, which is comprised of spontaneous questions; (b) the general interview guide, which outlines a set of issues explored with each respondent before the interview begins, which frames the questions; and (c) the standardized open-ended interview, which utilizes the same set of questions for each respondent. My interviews most mirrored the structured questions of the last approach. Upcraft and Schuh (1996) offered keys to effective qualitative-question design: (a) assume nothing; (b) use open-ended and neutral questions; (c) utilize one singular question; (d) use clear terms; and
be careful what you ask (pp. 66-67). Although I generally followed these guidelines, I chose not to include a direct question related to the meaning of leadership or to clarify the meaning of the term leadership. This allowed diverse views on the nuances of the meaning of leadership to freely emerge throughout the interview process.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) refer to the unstructured interview as “the backbone of field and naturalistic research and evaluation” (p. 154). The unstructured interview is less formal than a structured one, with no set adherence to guidelines. This gives the interviewer freedom to add new questions and to make comments (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 443). Guba and Lincoln (1981) added that “the unstructured interview has a very different rhythm from that of the structured interview; it tends to be very free flowing, and it is likely to move however the respondent causes it to move” (p. 166). Patton (1980) advocates that the purpose of the interview is “not to put things in someone else’s mind . . . but rather to access the perspective of the person being interviewed” (Patton, 1980, p. 196). After considering the goals and flow of the unstructured interview, I concluded that the more structured interview would provide the best framework and outcome for my study.

In contemplating the options of an electronic versus face-to-face interview, I noted that although respondents may be more guarded in a face-to-face interview, when the interview is complemented with additional data sources, it may be one of the most powerful research tools available (Kerlinger, 1986).

Wiersma (1986) defined validity as the accurate interpretability and generalizability of the results, and reliability as the replicability and consistency of methods, conditions, and results (pp. 6-7). In the process of ensuring internal validity, Merriam (1988) offered six strategies: (a) member checks; (b) long-term observation; (c) peer examination; (d)
participatory modes of research; (e) identifying researcher's biases; and (f) triangulation or multiple methods (pp. 169-170).

I utilized member checks (comparing the derived data with the original source to confirm that it reflects what was said), participatory research (engaging interview respondents in an aspect of the study), and in addition I acknowledge my own biases. I then distilled the descriptions and insights from the interviews into themes that are reported within the structure of the interview questions in chapter 4. The emerging findings from the interviews were confirmed for additional validity though triangulation with the data gathered from the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey, which is included in chapter 6.

Researcher Bias

As the researcher I have biases in that I am passionate about the great potential for developing a comprehensive undergraduate leadership program at Andrews University. I believe that a leadership-development program has the potential to add immense value to the educational experience of Andrews University students while preparing them to make powerful differences in their workplace and world. However, in the context of my position as vice president for student life at Andrews University, my bias for leadership-development, in a case study of Andrews University, presented additional limitations.

I have attempted to minimize these biases by selecting methodology that included triangulation of the mixed-methods design and maintaining an open spirit of discovery. In addition, effort was made to suppress biases by using: (a) an interview sample selection
process that intentionally sought and reported opposing viewpoints, (b) structured
interviews, (c) open-ended questions, (d) member checks, (e) and rigorously scrutinizing
of all aspects of the research design. Because of my position as chief student affairs officer
for Andrews University, some students, faculty, and staff may have been more guarded in
their willingness to share openly, especially in the face-to-face qualitative aspects of the
design. As a result, effort was made to minimize this aspect by protecting confidentiality,
encouraging multiple viewpoints, and by using member checks.

Interview Protocols

I asked all respondents the same set of questions designed in an open-ended manner
in order to encourage a wide spectrum of responses and to reduce the threat of bias. The
structure provided natural boundaries against using my knowledge, personal advocacy, and
bias for a leadership-development program, which could influence the flow of a more
informal conversation. In some cases, the order of the questions varied because a response
had already been given to a related question. On occasion, the respondent led the
conversation in such a way that a portion of the interview was spent in a more informal
style, which produced tangential material as well as fresh insights.

First Interview Protocol

I posed a common set of questions to each respondent.

1. What do you think about the idea of exploring the development of a formal
undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

2. How might an undergraduate leadership-development program align with the
mission, vision, and the motto of Andrews University which is to Seek Knowledge, Affirm
Faith, and Change the World?

3. Many campus entities would have to get on board this program for it to be a success.
   a. How would students respond?
   b. How would faculty respond?
   c. How would administration respond?
   d. How would staff (such as student services and campus ministries who provide leadership training) respond?

4. What components would have to be in place for a leadership-development program to be a success?
   a. What changes should be considered for the curriculum?
   b. What changes should be considered in the leadership opportunities outside of the classroom?
   c. What changes should be considered in the relationship between curricular and co-curricular (out of the classroom) components?

5. What would be the obstacles to implementing a leadership-development program?
   a. What would be the obstacles in your school?
   b. What would be the obstacles in your department?
   c. What would be the obstacles for you, personally?

6. How would you summarize the potential of a formal leadership-development program at Andrews University?
Follow-up Interview Protocol

The follow-up interview protocol was an electronic communication to each respondent that included an attachment of the full transcript of the interview (see Appendix B). I asked each respondent to review the transcripts of the interviews to ensure that it accurately reflected their thoughts, and I gave them the opportunity to add additional thoughts. Finally, I also requested that, after reflecting upon the interview conversation, they share a metaphor that captured their ideas about the potential of an undergraduate leadership-development program on the campus of Andrews University. Three respondents responded with edited copies of their transcripts, one shared an additional metaphor, and several others indicated that they did not have any corrections or additions.

Institutional Review Board

A research proposal and formal request to administer this case study was sent to Andrews University Institutional Review Board. It requested approval to administer a survey instrument to undergraduate students over the age of 18 and to conduct interviews with Andrews University administrators, faculty, and staff. This board has the responsibility to ensure research done by/with/or for Andrews University breeds confidentiality and freedom from harm for research participants. The proposed quantitative and qualitative subject matter and questions were not perceived to be invasive or to create discomfort for respondents to the survey and interview process. The board was notified that: (a) I would inform all subjects that their participation was voluntary; (b) I would obtain written consent from all participants (see Appendixes B and C); and (c) I would obtain permission to record and transcribe the interviews from all participants.
Approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (see Appendix D).

Interview Data-Analysis Preparation

In preparing for the interpretation of the results, I considered Eisner's (1991) admonition: "Learning to see what we have learned not to notice remains one of the most critical and difficult tasks of educational connoisseurs" (p. 77). At the same time, Eisner suggested that "exhaustiveness is not always salutary. How much to say, what to say, and how to say it requires a consideration of its effects on the audience to whom one speaks or writes" (p. 117). These tensions guided the construction of my findings in chapter 4.

Validity and Reliability

I taped the interviews and labeled each tape numerically according to the sequential date of the interview. The interview tapes were transcribed by an associate with experience in transcription. In order to enhance internal validity, I implemented a member-check process. In the follow-up interview protocol, I sent each respondent a copy of his or her transcript with the opportunity to review, correct, or rephrase any aspect of the response (see Appendix B).

Data File

The member-check process reduced the possibility of misrepresentation either because of a gap in the transcriber's ability to understand a word or phrase or because of error and bias in interpretation. I stored each complete transcript in a data file in the chronological order in which the interviews were conducted. Then I identified the
complete inventory of transcripts as the Leadership-Development Interviews; Responses of Administrators, Faculty, and Staff. The inventory was paginated so that the data (observations and quotations from respondents) can be referenced by page number in this study. This helped to ensure the thorough inclusion of data from all respondents.

Summary

In view of the goal to determine the interest in leadership-development as well as the practical implications of implementing a formalized leadership-development program, the mixed-methods approach offered the best design plan. This approach set a stage for the complex nuances surrounding leadership-development to emerge into important themes from the smaller selected interview process that are reported in chapter 4. In addition this design yielded detailed statistical data, which are reported in chapter 5, from the quantitative survey of a large sample of students.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND PRESENTATION OF QUALITATIVE DATA

Introduction

The results of the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study are reported separately. The presentation of the qualitative phase of the study is reported in this chapter and the quantitative data are presented in chapter 5. Chapter 6 presents a discussion of the findings from both the quantitative data and the qualitative data. The qualitative data reported here were generated from 13 interviews with administrators, faculty, and staff of Andrews University. The interview design called for data to emerge that would address research questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this study. Those research questions were:

3. How does a leadership-development program align with the mission of Andrews?

4. What level of interest do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University have for an undergraduate leadership-development program?

5. What components and resources do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University report would be needed for implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program?

6. What obstacles or challenges would exist in implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?
Interview Data Analysis

First, I read each transcript, highlighting what initially appeared to be salient points. Second, I carefully studied each transcript individually. Third, I studied the transcripts as one complete document, looking for patterns and noting possible themes in the margins. According to Eisner (1991) themes are “recurring messages construed from the events observed” (p. 189). I found that a number of thoughts seemed to cluster naturally as described by Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman (1984): “The human mind finds patterns so quickly that it needs no how-to advice. Patterns just ‘happen’, almost too quickly” (p. 216). Thus I focused carefully on respondents’ descriptions of reality in relationship to observations of other informed respondents. Heeding the advice of Miles and Huberman (1984), I also subjected patterns to skepticism by identifying “real added evidence of a pattern and remaining open to disconfirming evidence” (p. 216).

I compiled brief descriptions of the salient points and organized them by commonalities in the left column of an informal working chart. I assigned each cluster of points a theme number. The first row of the working chart listed the code number label for each respondent who was interviewed (R1 = Respondent 1, R2 = Respondent 2, etc.) which is also used for references in the texts of chapter 4 and chapter 6. I recorded the frequency with which a theme appeared in the transcript of each respondent in the intersection of the related theme for each respondent in the working chart. The total frequency with which each theme was expressed within the complete inventory of transcripts was tallied and recorded on the working chart.

The initial process produced approximately 105 different points. Upon extended exposure to the data and closer examination, some similar points seemed to cluster within
a related theme, and I collapsed the number of major points to 81. I discovered the steps of
data reduction and the process of determining overarching themes as challenging and open
to my own subjectivity as a researcher. To minimize this potential pitfall, I returned to the
original transcripts numerous times, when clarification was needed or where I found myself
trying to read something into the noted points. With the goal of reducing the number of
themes as much as possible without overgeneralizing, I sought and discovered more
relationships and commonalities, and reduced the number of themes to 36, then to 24.

Even with several intensive reduction processes, several themes continued to
overlap other themes. After careful consideration, rather than force the data into a category
for which an appropriate common new overarching theme did not readily emerge, and fail
to note a key concept, I elected to have the overlapping cases remain as stand-alone themes.
I originally discarded several themes based on the infrequency of their expression. Upon
further reflection, I determined that it was more important to seek variations and exceptions
rather than a singular focus on the average, majority, or frequency of responses. Thus
several themes with a low overall frequency are still included in the theme inventory.

According to Upcraft and Schuh (1996) when a more structured interview protocol
is used, the consistent format of the interview questions often provides a natural
organization system for reporting the data (p. 78). Thus, the interview questions will
provide the general organizational framework for presenting the themes that emerged.
First a simple table is provided to show the number of respondents and frequency of their
responses to recurring themes of these interviews (see Table 1).

As one would expect from a structured interview, each of the major themes
embedded in the interview question was addressed by respondents. However, before I
Table I

Interview Themes and Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Themes and Question Categories</th>
<th>No. of Respondents Who Mentioned Theme</th>
<th>No. of Respondents Who Mentioned Theme Twice or More</th>
<th>Total Theme Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea of a Leadership-Development Program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LDP Is Worth Exploring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LDP Will Attract Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LDP Is Needed by World, Church, Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Mission and Values Relationship to LDP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meaning of Leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Align with Andrews Mission</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Andrews Should Be the Leader</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses From Campus Entities About a LDP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students Will Be Interested</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty Interest and Support if LDP Enhances</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Administrators Will Have Positive Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Staff Will Have Positive Response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components Suggested for a LDP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Harness Current Resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Target all Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Collaboration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Curriculum Components</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles to Implementation of a LDP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Financial Constraints</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Faculty and Students Too Busy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lack of Collaboration and Change</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Moving From Idea to Implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential of a LDP at Andrews?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Potential for Added Value to Andrews</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total number of Interview Respondents \(N = 13\). LDP = Leadership-Development Program. The categories in italics relate to the main idea of the interview questions.
proceed to describe these themes, several findings are evident from the table. Although respondents were not asked to provide close-ended responses of ‘yes’, ‘unsure’, or ‘no’ it is possible to glean from their comments the essence of their perceptions. Consequently, when one considers the total number of respondents \((N = 13)\) it is obvious that there was general consensus in many themes. The following themes stand out because of the number of respondents who mentioned the theme and also because of the overall total frequency of themes from all interviews. These include:

1. Theme 1 — Leadership-Development Is Worth Exploring
2. Theme 5 — Alignment With Mission
3. Theme 7 — Student Interest
4. Theme 8 — Faculty Interest and Resistance
5. Theme 11 — Harnessing Current Resources
6. Theme 14 — Curriculum Components
7. Theme 15 — Integration of Theory, Practice, Reflections
8. Theme 20 — Financial Constraints

As previously noted, there were several themes that were less frequently identified. These were in response to curriculum components that included a multi-disciplinary design, the need for academic recognition, a spiritual component, and new pedagogies. However, because of the qualitative nature of this study, this simple table cannot do justice to the complex responses provided. As such, the rest of this chapter attempts to show the varied comments from the respondents. I will follow the structure of the chart (see Table 1), which corresponds to the structure of the interviews.
Idea of Leadership-Development Program: Theme 1; Leadership-Development Is Worth Exploring

Of the 13 respondents, 11 expressed clear support for exploring the idea of a leadership-development program; 2 were unsure and more cautious. Supportive respondents expressed unqualified comments that included; “I think it’s a wonderful opportunity” (R9, p. 63). “There is a great potential for a formalized program for leadership-development” (R11, p. 85): “I think this is a good idea. It’s one that I have believed in for a couple of years now, quite strongly. . . . I think there is a lot of potential for Andrews University” (R1, p. 1). “Exploring the development of a leadership program is a good idea. We need to turn out more than just good technical people today. We need people with moral fiber” (R2, p. 9). “I’m majorly for the idea. . . . When students come to the university. . . . I think it’s just an ideal time for them to stop and reflect about who they are, what God wants them to do, why they were born” (R6, p. 40). Another respondent added,

We’re known and thought about as an institution that develops leadership, although in our curriculum we currently offer primarily leadership through graduate program with mid-life adults. Young people develop a vision of themselves much earlier than that. So having a way to facilitate both undergraduates and graduates in capturing a sense of the potential in themselves for leadership would be very appropriate. (R3, p. 17)

Others affirmed the idea of a leadership-development program within certain contexts (R 8, p. 55). A departmental chair stipulated, “My strongest interest or support of this would be if it was incorporated, perhaps as an emphasis, an interdisciplinary emphasis” (R12, p. 86). This respondent made it clear that he would not be supportive if the program resulted in a new department (R12, p. 93). An academic dean qualified, “If it can dovetail with their major and/or their minor, and give a kind of emphasis, then I think it would have
real possibilities” (R2, p. 9).

An ambivalent respondent who felt “it would probably be an interesting thing to explore” also acknowledged that “it’s the time in their lives when opportunities are open to them and they are exploring lots of options,” noting that “the formal part may be more problematic” (R5, p. 30). A cautious respondent declared, “Andrews has too many priorities” and was reluctant to affirm the idea of leadership-development unless it becomes a recognized priority (R10, p. 79).

**Potential to Attract Students: Theme 2**

In an enterprise where the consumer and the product are students, it was not surprising that 2 respondents identified the need to determine if leadership-development could attract students to Andrews.

You can’t just like in a cafeteria set stuff out there and assume that people are going to take it, it’s good to know what the appetites are for certain things before you put it out there. Rather than a complete top-down kind of mentality of coming up with a curriculum and then handling it to them, is to find out as best you can if there is interest out there in it. (R2, p. 12)

The other alluded to doubt, “I would hope it’s marketable. I think it is” (R10, p. 71) but subsequently questioned whether leadership-development was added value and wanted by our customer (R10, p. 73).

A departmental chair predicted questions regarding the potential of a leadership-development to propel students into the job market.

Whenever a course or a program straggles in both a professional and an academic world, students and their parents ask the question, “Will I get a job?” I think that the challenge . . . is to remain liberal arts but at the same time to provide the opportunities for the students to develop those kinds of skills that they need for a profession. (R8, p. 59)
One administrator stated, “I think it’s an excellent match for the mission of Andrews. It’s a match I think for especially the millennial generation. I think they are interested in becoming more involved in society” (R4, p. 23). He further explained about the millennial generation who are beginning their college journey, “One of the hallmarks of this release is that this is a group that is very much interested in spiritual things, they’re interested in service” (R4, p. 24). An administrator with enrollment responsibilities expressed confidence that a formal plan to develop leaders would add a compelling feature to attract students to Andrews University.

Andrews is attracting already a group that’s interested in doing stuff outside of the classroom. They want to be active participants. So I think this clearly can and should and would be added value for this group of students. (R4, p. 24)

There are areas of recreational programming, spiritual, and social programming on campus, all of which may provide direct and indirect opportunities to reinforce the theme. That function has the opportunity to really create a core benefit for students that would help them choose Andrews. That is, it’s not just the academic quality, but it’s the life quality that makes Andrews a compelling choice. (R4, p. 26)

An academic dean, who had hosted a leadership workshop for potential students in another institution, divulged the affirmation he received from participant parents, “You’re running the best recruiting program you could ever dream up” (R13, p. 97). Another respondent agreed that leadership-development could be an attractive niche, “I really believe in niche marketing in the sense of some packaging and re-packaging in new ways that attract perhaps new students or making them more enthusiastic” (R12, p. 97). He also offered contextual caution, “It’s a rich program. Expanding and developing new niches, as long as the costs aren’t increased is a good marketing tool” (R12, p. 87).

Acknowledging the challenge of successfully portraying and marketing the essence
of a leadership-development program, an administrator saw more opportunities than obstacles. "The opportunity would be that it would be a niche that would be able to position and market Andrews" (R4, p. 29). A faculty member stipulated the need to market a proposed leadership-development program so that students clearly understood the benefits. He further declared, "If our mission is to train leaders for the world and the church, it should not be difficult for us to sell it. We would just have to do it" (R11, p. 81).

Leadership-Development Is Needed: Theme 3
by Society, Church, Students

A faculty member pointed out the need for leadership in a complex society. Leadership is of real interest to our society to understand how it evolves . . . how different styles work at different times and in different organizations. Theoretically, methodologically, doing research in this area is really crucial for a complex, holistic society. So I think there's a real need for it. (R12, p. 93)

An administrator saw the need in his church and declared, "I have seen fewer and fewer good leaders in our church today. What are our schools, our churches, our institutions doing to train young people?" (R13, p. 95). He concluded, "I think the idea of exploring leadership types of course work or formalizing that work where we can teach undergraduate students to be good leaders is an excellent idea" (R13, p. 95). In this context he expressed growing enthusiasm,

It's just been hitting me the last 2 years. Leadership is so important for all our graduates to realize their God-given responsibility is to go out and be a pilot for the Lord because your commission is to ultimately bring members into the church of God. . . . To me this is thrilling because it's paralleling my own thinking. Leadership is a key component. (R13, p. 102)

A dean agreed, "The church needs this at a grass roots level" (R13, p. 108).

Another administrator testified of a long-held burden about students leaving the richness of
campus life, returning to small churches around the world only to complain of boredom. Catching a promising vision of how to prepare graduates to be servant leaders in their communities, he declared, “If you can somehow incorporate that into this leadership initiative, boy, I think it would be an invaluable service for our young people” (R2, p. 15).

The Meaning of Leadership: Theme 4

Consistent with the literature, a major theme emerged throughout the interview process surrounding the wide spectrum of views on the meaning of leadership. Participants discussed the meaning of leadership in response to interview question 1 (the idea of leadership-development), question 2 (leadership-development alignment with mission), question 3 (projected response from campus entities), and question 6 (the potential of a leadership-development program). The views were varied and abundant, but space allows only a short review here.

While positive towards the idea of leadership, one respondent admonished, “We all need to agree on what leadership is, if we are going to teach students how to lead. They have to know toward what [goal] and for what purpose” (R1, p. 4). An administrator identified a changing view of leadership,

Leadership has been broadened such that we don’t think of it only as something that pertains to CEO’s or people in the army. Leadership nowadays is also a term used to describe the life of a person who takes specific directions in her or his life, or focuses the life in such a way that the living of their life is a model for others to follow. Even the life of a person who is not professionally designated as a leader in her or his job description, just being a leader in a neighborhood, for example would be recognized nowadays as leadership. Therefore, when you think of developing a leadership program for students we don’t think of them entering professional positions that would picture them as leaders in the traditional sense. We think of them living a life that is a model life for others. That would be the life of a leader. (R7, p. 48)
One respondent alluded to the ambivalence in his own beliefs declaring, “Not everybody has the potential to be a leader” then interjecting, “but they can be trained” (R11, p. 83). The same faculty member, uncertain about the value of a formal leadership program, expressed that many of his colleagues believe that leadership is innate, “They really believe that leadership will come naturally. If you know your stuff, you’ll be the leader. You’ll be on the top” (R11, p. 81). Another faculty member insisted, “You need to be up-front enough to say certain leaders are just born, and whatever training they get they still seem to know how to lead. But there are some of us who are enhanced with ideas and help” (R9, p. 68).

One faculty acknowledged a desired leadership quality, “I’d like to see graduates of Andrews go out into the world and be Daniel-quality people, or like his four friends who were noted to be stronger than everybody else” (R9, p. 63). An administrator contended that the very word, leadership, conjures up resistance and is not welcomed by some, “Therefore, when talking about what ‘baggage’ may exist, it often revolves around the expressed belief that it is impossible to be both a leader and a manager” (R5, p. 35). She explained,

Some individuals have used the term “leadership” in a way that makes it very clear that “leadership” and “management” are mutually exclusive concepts. . . . As you can imagine, people who teach management will counter with the statement: “You cannot have a strong leader unless you also have a good manager.” Business teachers question someone who just casts visions but doesn’t provide a framework with which to put feet on any ideas, or even exhibit the ability to delegate plans to people who can put feet on them. Business people would not consider such individuals to be good leaders. (R5, p. 35)

One respondent advised against promoting leadership as a solution, “One of the obstacles you might meet is that people might think that you’re saying that this is the
panacea to solve all problems” (R9, p. 68). Another urged that careful thought be given to communicating a substantial plan to develop leaders, noting that leadership can be perceived as a cliché (R5, p. 38).

Alignment With Mission and Values: Theme 5

All respondents described a direct alignment of leadership-development with the mission and values of Andrews University and Seventh-day Adventist education. An administrator who was instrumental in the development of the Andrews motto, Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World, explained that it is how the three are interconnected that makes an Andrews education distinctive.

It wasn’t just simply seeking knowledge which you found anywhere, or simply affirming faith which you find at a Bible college with little focus on academics. The Seek Knowledge and Affirm Faith need to blend together. The reason you did that is that you had a responsibility not only to go be successful on your own terms, but to be successful in God’s terms. The implied statement in Change the World is Change the World for God. (R4, p. 23)

Reflecting on the phrase, “training for generous service to the world” from the Andrews mission statement, he added, “From a Christian perspective you say I can do that through leadership, not necessarily in the traditional sense of leadership of power, but servant leadership, which is a vulnerable and transforming approach to serving the world for God” (R4, p. 24).

Several respondents agreed that the Change the World aspect of our motto lacked intentionality in implementation; one found the gap between mission and practice even incongruous.

When we speak about changing the world and rendering effective service to the world that really is the realm of leadership development. Teaching our students how they can take what they know and use it in a way that will, indeed, change the
world. I think it’s a great fit. I think that we’ve got the supporting players, if you will – the intellectual formation, the spiritual formation, and what we need now is to add that third piece which is leadership formation and development so that our mission can be actualized to the fullest potential. (R1, p. 2)

I’ve always thought, seek, yes; affirm, yes; but change the world? What a joke! Because how can people change the world, you know, if we don’t give them some tools. If we don’t really support them in their youthful desire to change the world. I think young people want to change the world. But I think they need more than just a motto. People really do need to have some leadership training so that they know how to change the world. And in their efforts to change the world, they have to have realistic kinds of expectations about what they can pull off and how change happens so they don’t get disgruntled and just go. (R6, p. 41)

Another faculty member reflected on the potential of leadership-development to actualize the Change the World aspect of motto.

Our mission is not to just train students; it’s to send a missionary force into the world. We used to be called, Emmanuel Missionary College, and so I think we have a clear mission that our students are to go out and effect change. How do they effect change? They need to know how to be good leaders. I think that a leadership development program would be very much an integral part of our mission and vision for Andrews. (R9, p. 63)

One administrator contended that developing leadership not only fits theoretically but, more importantly, is necessary to achieve the ambitious vision of changing the world.

The idea fits in perfectly well to train young people for selfless service to the community. That assumes some form of leadership, moral leadership, and community leadership. This is an integral part of what the mission is all about. As I said before, we don’t want to just train students to be even just good thinkers—that’s part of it—but to participate in their community and thus to be leaders. A person with an education today needs to use that education in some kind of leadership position if Andrews is all about changing the world. That’s pretty ambitious, but in order to do that you need some kind of leadership principles instilled in our product. (R2, p. 9)

Two respondents noted that the word leadership and the Andrews motto were so broad they risk losing meaning. One charged, “When you use the word leadership in today’s society, you can get it to align with almost any mission” (R5, p. 30). The other
agreed,

If you look at private liberal arts colleges, you could take their motto, their mission, take their name out and put Andrews University in. These terms are so global that they include everything. . . . *Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World* certainly could include leadership. In many schools of higher education it does. Whether it does in a meaningful way is another question. (R10, p. 70)

**Relationship to Church Values:**

**Part of Theme 5**

Several respondents addressed the relationship of leadership-development to the mission of Seventh-day Adventist education and values.

All of our Adventist colleges were formed and clearly built because we had a passion that the most important thing for us is to train people to go out and make a difference in the world. It’s a way to take that passion. It’s a way to take that core vision of mission of the institution. To say this is what it means to you as a student, as a part of your journey not just to figure out all the technical terms and to make a commitment to Christ, but also to understand what it means to be a leader in God’s work. It’s a different kind of leader than the way the world defines the description. To me that’s the power. It simply articulates that vision. (R4, p. 29)

It draws together a number of things that we really, really value in Seventh-day Adventist education such as the development of character, purpose and calling in a person’s life or the ability to communicate effectively and to use one’s influence for good, for change, for the personal transformation of others. . . . I think leadership just provides the natural organizing principle for many of those values. So it seems like a really good fit for a Seventh-day Adventist university. (R1, p. 1)

Several commented that a key aspect of our mission is to provide leaders for the church and to help students take seriously leadership responsibility (R11, p. 80; R13, p. 101).

**Andrews Should Be the Leader: Theme 6**

One administrator’s vision for Andrews included being “seen as leading other institutions,” which is the rationale for how the term “legacy of leadership” was chosen for
the capital campaign. Recently returned from visiting an international institution, he described how Andrews is viewed:

The people there, with their huffing and puffing about many things, nevertheless, look at Andrews as a kind of model Adventist institution just as we like people to look at our graduates as model Christian leaders by just the way they lead or live their life. (R7, p. 49)

A department chair also connected Andrews’ position of leadership to the development of leaders.

I know that many, many people see Andrews as the leader in the Adventist Church. And so, from that point of view, I think that the mission and the vision of Andrews should include the development of leaders because many, many people come here from all over the world. . . . It is expected that people would be able to develop those skills while they are here at Andrews. (R8, p. 44)

A faculty member declared, “Andrews definitely needs to take a stand on the fact that we have a faith and that we are proud of it and that we’re leaders in this area” (R8, p. 55). One administrator described the need for Andrews to lead by providing needed services to the community and living our mission (R13, p. 95). Another concurred that the core of leadership is about enacting faith, developing the heart of a leader, not just the head (R8, p. 62).

Several respondents expressed the belief that Andrews faculty should be leaders in seeking new knowledge from their disciplines and from their students (R7, p. 49; R13, p. 99). One respondent envisioned avenues to advance each aspect of the motto through leadership-development including adding to the body of leadership knowledge.

We could seek new knowledge in many areas. We could affirm faith by understanding how faith community leadership might differ from secular or non-faith community leadership. Leaders are part of what changes the world. We could contribute to the advancement of knowledge of what leadership is; how it works from individual to organizational characteristics. . . . It is leadership that is very dramatically involved in changing the world. (R12, p. 87)
Campuswide Response to Leadership-Development

Student Response: Theme 7

Students Like New Ideas

All but 1 of the 13 respondents anticipated that students would be interested in a more formalized leadership-development program. Several of their comments follow,

Students are quite open to new ideas. . . . They come as not exactly empty vessels waiting to be filled. They have plenty of their own ideas, and yet there is a seeking and searching time. . . . I think you would find a lot of responsiveness on the part of students. . . . There is openness on the part of the students as they are searching for a career choice that meshes with their own makeup, talents, and abilities. I think they would respond favorably. (R2, p. 10)

Students are always intrigued by something new. . . . [But] that is a challenge because here we have a traditional academic program. We have a traditional religion. We always go about things in the same manner. We have the cultural expectations that are always so similar. And yet, if we can take the educational component and turn that upside down, and have some new ways of teaching leadership, I think the students would just eat it up. (R13, p. 98)

A departmental chair advised that students would be attracted by a new campus culture that would intentionally seek to understand the importance of how leadership emerges, what difference it makes, and how to more rigorously and academically approach it (R12, p. 87). One administrator credited potential enthusiasm to the fact that students prefer activities to the traditional classroom.

Today's generation in general prefers activity-focused learning over course work. . . . Therefore, the chance to get academic credit for not having to go to class, but instead, being involved in some leadership activity will be exciting and appealing. I'm sure the students would be absolutely ecstatic and probably would respond very favorably. (R5, p. 31)

A professor predicted that students would be more attracted if we develop leadership training in a serious, professional, and formalized format (R11, p. 80).
Students Need Coaching

A sceptical respondent explained that students who want leadership-development were already leading, proposing that “one could argue that you don’t need a leadership program to create leaders.” Additionally, he finds students are often overwhelmed or in academic trouble trying to balance academics with leadership roles (R10, p. 72).

Other respondents expressed that students do need more intentional guidance. One argued that it is the very state of overwhelmed students that provides the compelling reason to formalize a leadership-development program.

Clearly, there are students that I’ve talked to, who are involved in leadership activities and opportunities. They feel, however, that they need more assistance, more help in this area. Some have asked if they could start a club. So I think there is a felt need among some students for a leadership program. (R1, p. 2)

An administrator with extensive experience in the leadership-development of youth projected that students greatly value leadership training.

I found college students were very receptive to [leadership] opportunities and found them life changing. I think of the enthusiasm students have for being given guidance in how to do good leadership and to be given feedback, encouragement, and support. So I have no question that many students would be interested in this opportunity. (R3, p. 17)

Another administrator insisted that an ongoing mentoring role would be vital.

Empowering students is more than just saying you have permission to do this thing. You have my permission, but I’m staying right with you or behind you to steer you a little bit. . . . Empowerment and mentoring would probably be the most powerful things outside the classroom. (R7, p. 52)

Leadership for Some or All?

As reflected in theme 4, the meaning of leadership, a respondent advised that students may be hesitant unless it is clear that the leadership can be for all students:
I think students would respond feeling a little threat because I think that’s just how they are put together. I think the more that they understand what we are really talking about when we say leadership, and that everybody can be exerting some form of leadership, then I think that you’d see a lot of people shining. I think people would step up to the plate. I think people would see that we’re making this a possibility for everybody and not just a select few. (R6, p. 41)

**Involve Students in Program Design**

One respondent suggested that students be involved in the design of the proposed program, “Our students have a gazillion ideas about how to make this a better place that we don’t ever get around to hearing. Or they never talk because we never ask them.” She continued, “Heaven forbid, redesigning the core. What would happen really, if we had students who sat down with us at the table and said, ‘The core at Andrews has to be this, and this, and this’?” She compared the process to a pastor asking what topics to preach and being challenged by student responses.

We want you to be tough with us. We want you to hit the strong moral stuff. We don’t want you to do sugar-coated stuff. Well, you know, I think it would be the same way with academics. I think they would give us some really good feedback. . . . I think that the hardest thing, now back to administration and faculty, would be to listen to our students and say you know, their suggestions are worthy. (R6, p. 45)

**Faculty Response: Theme 8**

**Some Faculty Are Already on Board**

A taskforce began exploring the idea of a leadership-development program at Andrews University prior to the interview process. An administrator shared findings from a faculty focus group which portrayed a surprising number of faculty already on board.

There are faculty who have done leadership-development as part of their classes and have students emerge as leaders. Others taught leadership through a ropes course or through varying leadership assignments as part of stagecraft or business
courses. Those faculty said yes, we would like to see an undergraduate leadership emphasis. We could use our service learning requirement in the undergraduate arena. About 15 faculty are already on board and very eager and probably, if anything, impatient that we have not done anything. (R3, p. 18)

She summarized, “It seems obvious that we have a significant potential. It isn’t going to be an uphill battle where we have to go and coerce people to get involved. They are eager to be involved” (R3, p. 18). An enthusiastic voice declared, “There would be absolutely no obstacle in our department outside of time. . . . Our department is majorly ready for this. We would feel bad if we were left out” (R6, p. 47).

**Faculty Resistance**

Less resistance if leadership-development enhances faculty work

According to several respondents, a successful model would enhance or further develop work already being done in the faculty environment. One clarified, “I’m not saying that they wouldn’t be willing to give to a greater good, or a common goal, yet given that their lives are all so busy, I think it would be important that faculty see this as something that can enhance their work” (R1, p. 3). He further cautioned,

I just don’t think the faculty responds well to things that are brought down from the top. So if this is felt to be a top-down program, it won’t work well. If it is, however, felt to be in the form of faculty development, then I don’t know that very many faculty members will turn aside the opportunity. (R1, p. 3)

A respondent contended there would be more support if leadership-development can connect with, rather than replace, a major or minor (R2, p. 9). A departmental chair, who recently implemented a collaborative program generating more majors, concluded that the administration will be more positive if the leadership-development program is shown to increase resources.
That’s why I think an interdisciplinary approach, which we may feel could add majors, is going to be the way you’ll get the broadest support. If we feel, ‘Oh good, there goes 10% of our majors and 20% of my budget,’ then you’re not going to get a whole lot of support. But if you feel, ‘I might get five more majors if I’m a part of this,’ then you’re going to find a lot more support. (R12, p. 92)

An administrator reflected on the need to do homework before approaching faculty,

They’ve evaluated their curriculum a hundred times, and now they’ve narrowed it down to the very best courses they can offer. With a new thing, they are going to throw up an obstacle. The only way you can sell them is to have done your homework ahead of time, and say here’s the outcome we would like to see. Here are the things that it’s going to take to get there, and we think . . . it would even draw a few more students into your department. (R2, p. 14)

Faculty resistance due to resisting change

Several respondents conjectured that there would be plenty of resistance. According to one administrator, “educators are very set in their ways.” He explained,

I’ve been in this work long enough to know that when you try to introduce some kind of change . . . faculty are very, very slow to do those things. There is a lot of inertia. . . . We are great thinkers and we like to think new things, but when it comes to changing our process I have observed a great deal of inertia. (R2, p. 10)

Faculty resistance due to curriculum changes

Several respondents identified specific curriculum changes that would bring considerable resistance, especially from faculty. According to one, most majors or professional programs do not have any room for elective credits, and faculty would question which of their requirements would be replaced by proposed leadership credits (R5, p. 31). Another clarified that if it means that students have to take additional classes and somehow work them into their already full program, something else would be deleted. He contended that “[Faculty] would rather you do it on an informal basis so it doesn’t affect a course plan. Bottom line, I think faculty would probably not respond favorably if the
program is a formal program that takes resources away from them” (R11, p. 81).

An administrator predicted heated conversations if changes in the General Education curriculum were proposed. “Whenever one begins to think of substitute classes for General Education requirements, one is quickly into a very political discussion. I don’t know if I want to engage in it! Strong feelings and opinions would rise so fast!” (R5, p. 34).

Faculty resistance due to belief they already make leaders

According to one respondent, some resistance would come from faculty who feel they are already creating leaders.

I think that many faculty believe that that’s part of their reason for being here is that they want to help students become leaders... Many faculty believe that they are doing that. So to them, leadership is an important thing but do we need to have a program to do that formally? (R8, p. 56)

A member of the faculty focus group cautioned, “There’s a great deal of enthusiasm, but it was within the context of what faculty are already doing with their students... I don’t think the faculty’s response was, to do more, it was yes, discover what we’re doing” (R10, p. 72).

Mixed Faculty Reaction

Two respondents predicted a mixed reaction from faculty. One divulged that it would not be welcomed with open arms by the faculty at large.

With any faculty of 300-400 people... you’ve got a whole spectrum of responses and you’ll have a few gung-ho people who will say, “Hey! This is a terrific idea.” That will be enough to encourage you, perhaps, to keep plugging ahead. There will also be the other kind, I can assure you, who will sit back and say we’ve got enough issues, enough programs, and students are confronted with so many choices there’s no sense giving them more choices. (R2, p. 11)
A departmental chair agreed and simply suggested, “You take the ones that go for it and work with them. You don’t want people in this program that are not sold on it” (R9, p. 64).

Administration’s Response: Theme 9

Of the 12 respondents who commented on the perceived view of the Administration for a leadership-development program, 8 felt there would be a favorable response. Two felt the President and Vice Presidents would generally be more in favor than the academic deans, who would likely share the same curriculum-related concerns as the faculty (R5, p. 32; R11, p. 82). An academic dean refrained from speaking of the administrators as a monolithic whole (R2, p. 11).

Some of them have developed a certain kind of hard crust that has built up on them due to years of seeing things come and go. There, too, there will be those who will drag their feet. In a day and time when we Adventist educators are struggling for students and to build up our schools more and to appeal to the Adventist kids who are not in our schools, that’s one of our markets out there that we’re really anxious to appeal to, and there are administrators who will welcome a new initiative. . . . Again, there will be a mix of reactions. (R2, p. 11)

A respondent reported that although the administration has not yet seen an actual proposal, there had been enthusiasm and a generally favorable response (R1, p. 3).

An academic dean contended, “If a plan could be articulated where it shows how this plan is thoughtfully considered from all these different angles, I think the administration would wholeheartedly accept it” (R13, p. 99).

Two respondents conjectured that the administration would be uncertain where a leadership program should be housed (R6, p. 42; R12, p. 92). One questioned a focus on a specified structure, “There’s a mindset that says leadership, like chemistry, belongs in a space rather than leadership is fundamentally relational, fundamentally about change. Can
we reach across? Do we have to be in this little space to do this thing?” (R6, p. 42).

Staff Response: Theme 10

Twelve respondents felt the staff would be supportive. The uncertainty of 1 respondent was more related to lack of clarity about a role for staff to play, rather than the degree of staff support. One respondent, lamenting a disconnect between staff and faculty, saw an opportunity in leadership-development, “I would love to see there be a greater integration of the staff with the curriculum. . . . Key staff ought to be involved a lot more in the evaluation of students” (R13, pp. 99-100).

An administrator envisioned that the development of a culture of leadership would require seeking key ways for staff to be involved (R7, p. 51). According to the recollections of a faculty chair, “Staff hold a lot of things together around here. So you’d want them on board. . . . Staff could be recognized and trained as leaders. . . . It would be good if we could all be involved in leadership” (R6, p. 43). Another agreed and added, “My impression of many of our staff is they really care about the students who work for them” (R9, p. 65).

Four respondents reported that the major reason staff would respond positively was because they already are a significant provider of leadership-development training for students (R8, p. 57). Student Services and Campus Ministries were cited as examples (R5, p. 32). Another further explained why staff would be willing partners,

We will get our most enthusiastic response from staff, because they are out there doing this every day working with leaders, doing their best to train leaders, be it residence hall staff training or training ministry leaders. They’ve been doing this for decades at Andrews. I think this will bring a level of recognition to their good work, and also support to what they are already doing. I think staff are likely to be the group who will see the sense in this the most readily. (R1, p. 3)
Several respondents suggested the staff would be more willing to get involved than the faculty (R9, p. 65). One administrator acknowledged the Shakespearian adage, "Mine is not to question why, mine is but to do and die" when contemplating staff response.

There's a certain element of that that makes the staff operate, makes them run. They faithfully perform their tasks. If a new program comes along, they will say, "OK, sure." There are some, again, in the staff who have been there long enough and have experience and their ideas should be listened to. . . . They are intelligent people. I think they will be more open to trying new stuff or a new program on balance than some of the faculty. (R2, p. 12)

Another administrator argued the staff is eager to be involved at a much deeper level. Rather than responding from obligation, she proposed that they would only need an invitation (R3, p. 19).

Recognizing the current role that the staff is already playing in training students, 2 respondents recommended that staff be encouraged to access the leadership-development program to enhance their own growth (R11, p. 82; R12, p. 89). One suggested, "If they want to develop their leadership skills or understand leadership, I can see them taking a class or completing an undergraduate degree in this" (R12, p. 89). In assessing how the various campus entities, including the staff, would respond to a proposed leadership program, an administrator voiced a repetitive theme: "Again, the disclaimer that I have had on each one, they need to be involved in the planning so they can support the execution" (R4, p. 26).
Twelve respondents echoed the charge to harness the current pulse of leadership activities already taking place on campus, suggesting the current non-formal leadership opportunities were not being maximized (R8, p. 59). One respondent identified three current Andrews University resources. First, because of the number of informal leadership opportunities that already exists at Andrews, we have a lot of activities that are developing leadership skills in students. The second thing I'd say is that I think we have a great deal of diversity here at Andrews, and I think that provides us a laboratory for exploring how people from diverse backgrounds can work together to achieve goals. I think that leadership in today's environment calls for those kinds of skills. And then I'd say I think there exists within the curriculum already a number of opportunities—or I should say a number of courses—that provide the supporting material, for a formal leadership minor or academic certificate. (R1, p. 1)

Other interviewees also noted that many leadership activities are already happening in and out of the classroom in many disciplines. One pointed out that rather than adding more courses, merely a vehicle for drawing together what is already happening was needed (R1, p. 2). He explained,

Our ability to touch as many students as possible with a program like this would depend on our ability to weave it into what they are already involved in, whether that would be in the way we would teach a course, or if it be in the way that we complement a leadership position that they are already involved in. . . . Or if it is in creating an academic certificate or minor that works with their endeavors in a particular discipline of their choice. I think that creating those kinds of complementary vehicles for leadership development will be a key. (R1, p. 2)

One faculty member doubted that change was needed, but suggested encouraging clubs to do more formal experiential learning activities rather than just the social activities (R11, p. 84). Another identified other forums to learn leadership,

It would be a service to your student organizations, and it would start putting some
formality or intentionality into your co-curricular. . . . I think you can learn leadership on the sports field, or maybe even all the team captains of your sporting events need to get some sort of leadership component training. (R9, p. 67)

Harness Endorsement of Prominent Leadership

One participant encouraged capitalizing on the network of prominent leaders.

We need people that can reflect leadership that are recognized as leaders right now for the mentorship piece of this. Whether they are a subcommittee, a steering committee, or a board. . . . I know who I think are leaders on this campus, and I stay at Andrews University because they are here. (R10, p. 74)

He suggested that although these leaders might not have time to dream up or develop the program, they would have time to endorse the program. Believing that God has blessed these leaders with recognizable success, he envisioned that their endorsement would appeal to students, knowing that if they engage in leadership at Andrews they will be exposed to this kind of dynamic energy (R10, p. 74).

Harness Workplace Opportunities

Seven interviewees suggested harnessing opportunities for learning leadership in the student work environment. They saw many untapped opportunities in the workplace that could have an important connective role with leadership-development (R13, p. 100).

Several observations follow:

I think it’s important to realize that those who are student work supervisors often have the most extended contact with students of anybody on campus. . . . Do we structure student jobs that give those opportunities or do we have some sort of seminars or training or mentioning or whatever within our team to more clearly address that dimension? But again, the fact that our student worker supervisors spend so much time with these students creates incredible opportunities that I think we don’t often recognize. (R4, p. 26)

There needs to be willingness on the part of employers and sponsors who guide student leaders to work with a process that documents student achievement and
growth. That may mean a little extra effort on their part. I know that some of our sponsors are giving what they can to a club. . . . In a program like this, they might have to give just a little bit more—have a willingness to sit down with students at least a couple of times a semester to talk about their progress. (R1, p. 5)

One administrator likewise surmised, “One could do things that bring learning into the job and the job into the learning and in each case when you do that, probably an opportunity for leadership development would occur” (R7, p. 53).

Target Leadership-Development for All Students: Theme 12

Some of the divergent assumptions found in the literature regarding the type of students who should be involved in leadership-development emerged. One respondent assumed that leadership was for a select type of student. “There will be many students who are not leader types, so we have to recognize that only a percentage of students should probably be a part of this program” (R9, p. 64). Conversely, several respondents contended that a leadership program must be designed to include unlikely leaders. An academic dean explained,

History has taught us that not all good leaders are charismatic. Often these leaders had the ability to choose people who could make up for their own deficiencies and then led their team in a way that guided the organization toward new heights, even if that required making hard decisions. Often at the end of the day, one may look back and say, “That person was an incredible leader. That person got us through very difficult times.” (R5, p. 36)

With Education Unlikely Leaders Become Likely Leaders

One administrator cited “how vision can be caught and lead to transformation.” She described a student who was recommended just because he was a good kid.

He wasn’t a campus leader—very quiet, unobtrusive, wallpaper kind of kid. Through his experiences he developed into a very fine leader. He got his M.Div.
from the Seminary and is now a pastor. . . . He said, “I never thought I could do anything like that, until I participated in this.” That anecdote is an example of catching a vision. We have to think about that as a component. Somewhere there has to be an early opportunity for kids to see, “Oh that’s what it’s like. I could do that.” (R3, p. 19)

A departmental chair shared a similar perspective,

Leadership does include many people who, like the disciples, probably did not have those strong leadership abilities. The disciples were not chosen because of their capabilities but because they were simple. So I’m not so sure leadership is always about the big, articulate, large, popular people. I think that we need to consider those who actually do make changes in a very quiet way. Therefore it is not always those who appear to be leaders in the traditional sense that are worthwhile to train as leaders. (R8, p. 56)

Likely Leaders Also Need Education

According to one respondent, the program design needs to portray a compelling message that leadership education is needed by all, so that it will attract both the unlikely leaders and those who think they know it all. She explained,

They sit in a classroom and they see the smart, good-looking kids get all the leadership kind of opportunities. So I think there’s a whole bunch of students who would say, “Oh yeah, that’s for that group of people.” It’s always for that group of people—the smart, bright, pretty, beautiful half of people. But you know, the dumpy sort of average kids? I think that those are the kids that would definitely need to have some education about what leadership is and give them a sense that anybody can be involved with leadership. And then I think that those kids that are typically in leadership positions . . . that might already feel that they know everything. Those folks would also need to have some education. (R6, p. 41)

Collaboration: Theme 13

Seven respondents emphasized that collaboration was an essential ingredient to implement a leadership program. One respondent advocated the need for eager partners who are passionate about the enterprise of leadership development, as well as selfless in their willingness to give whatever it takes to make such a program work, even if it doesn’t necessarily enhance their personal standing or the credits brought to their department. We need people to come around this effort because
it’s the right thing to do in terms of educating and developing our students. I think if we find people with that spirit, and that component is in place, there really shouldn’t be a lot of things holding us back. (R1, p. 4)

Another respondent warned of potential failure if there is even the appearance of exclusion and predicted success if colleagues are widely involved in the process.

A mark of either struggle or success on this campus is how inclusive you are of the different players. And I think whatever model we choose, that if faculty are properly involved in the development and implementation, it will all contribute to its success. If they are excluded or perceived to be excluded, I think that could only contribute to at least potential failure. (R4, pp. 24-25)

An administrator added, “There needs to be a partnership concept” (R3, p. 21). One respondent recognized a need for greater collaboration in creating “a similar look and feel” for leadership training throughout his own division (R1, pp. 5-6).

Several respondents recommended that a partnership could be designed in the form of a steering committee or advisory board (R3, p. 21; R10, p. 74). One suggested that the working models that seem to work best have the crucial component of a steering committee that is made up of individuals from the major participants who have strong commitment and understand the potential (R3, p. 21).

Several respondents contended that leadership, by its relational nature, is collaborative. One commented, “Leadership, I think, suggests collaboration. We should not try to do a leadership program that’s isolated because I think we’ve tried to launch a number of things on this campus and they tend to fall by the wayside” (R10, p. 73). A departmental chair anticipated that implementing a leadership-development program would provide an ideal opportunity for collaboration.

Leadership like communication is a chance where you can actually do that thing called collaboration. I believe that the administration does respond very positively when we build on our strengths and not making things more expensive
or more difficult for everybody. (R8, p. 57)

Another respondent was passionate about the fact that there would be no relationship between the curricular and the co-curricular aspects without buy-in. “You will have a relationship if you have buy-in. If you don’t have buy-in, you won’t have a relationship. Good organizations don’t divide themselves up” (R10, p. 78). The same respondent was convinced that the partnership between the classroom and out-of-the-classroom was pivotal and more important than either component. Having visited several institutions for benchmarking, he shared the recommendation from one leadership-development professional that even if the leadership-development program was not started by the academic community, it will need to spring out of the academic community. “Even if it’s not owned by them; let them believe that they own it” (R10, p. 78).

Curriculum Components and Options: Theme 14

**Multi-Disciplinary Enhancement of Disciplines**

Four faculty respondents insisted that a leadership-development program must be multi-disciplinary. One declared, “I can’t imagine a leadership program that’s not cross-disciplinary. . . . Cross-disciplinary is important because leadership is multi-disciplinary in its sort of approach” (R6, p. 43). Two program directors displayed openness to housing leadership within their departments. One believed that their field of study lends itself to supporting a leadership-development program.

So that’s perhaps a little bit out there, but I do think that we have what it takes because of the acknowledgment of communication and leadership. The two things seem to go together well. I think that it could become something that could be housed in Communication. (R8, p. 61)
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The other conjectured, however, that despite the willingness of their department to
play a key role, it may not be welcomed.

I actually think that in our school there would be quite a bit of openness about it. I
think that if people thought it was associated only with our department . . . there
might be a little bit of a scuffle. You know, worry that someone else is getting an
opportunity and why aren’t we? (R6, p. 47)

According to one departmental chair, there is a concern that a stand-alone undergraduate
degree in leadership is not thought of as rigorous enough. He also noted that other chairs
feel that “the degree by itself is hokey” (R9, p. 69).

One respondent with a significant role in strategic planning stressed the need for
integration with established theoretical disciplines noting, “One of the weaknesses of
leadership programs in the country is that they stand nonintegrated from the disciplines that
had 100 years of studying leadership” (R12, p. 92). He further expounded,

I would be interested in [a model] that will enhance the disciplines that already
have leadership as part of their components of study, research, analysis, and
curriculum. . . . Increase those components of the discipline so that we focus on
leadership. You’d expand perhaps course offerings in that area as well as (like our
research methods sequence) these students’ research projects would focus on
leadership issues, from organizational to individual, from personality to
organizational structure, to training, to models of effective leadership. (R12, p.
89-90)

Leadership is part of management—it is part of sociology, psychology, economics,
and communication—so I’ve always had trouble seeing this as a separate program,
because, in fact, there’s a chapter on leadership in almost every text in psychology,
social psychology, communications. . . . It would strengthen both the theory and
the research methods because most departments have strong theoretical
foundations and methods courses. If leadership were integrated, it wouldn’t have
to invent a whole new curriculum but would have the discipline-based theory on
leadership and research methods to study leadership inherent in existing majors as
opposed to creating a brand-new, expensive, duplicate structure. (R12, p. 86)

Another departmental chair emphatically affirmed the multi-disciplinary
nature of leadership and offered a solution to avoid the fight over resources:

It’s definitely multi-disciplinary. Now what would have to happen for it to become multi-disciplinary? Well, an administrator would have to say, “Look! You, you, you! We’re going to give you X number of dollars to do it, and we’re not going to count how.” You know, the problem with anything inter-disciplinary is whose getting paid for it and who’s doing the work. You know that’s the issue. So if some administrators were able to say, “We’re going to make sure that everybody across the board has their full load, and we’re not going to fight about whether this tuition dollar is going here or there.” (R6, p. 44)

**Leadership Certificate/Emphasis With Existing Courses**

Eight interview subjects suggested the development of a leadership certificate or minor. Several referenced existing courses and the use of electives in various programs that could contribute to a program model (R8, p. 58; R1, p. 1).

There exist in the curriculum already a number of courses that provide the supporting material, if you will, for a formal leadership minor or academic certificate. We lack some of the core leadership courses that might begin and end a program like that, but we have a lot of material already there. (R1, p. 1)

You could begin with a certificate or minor program with adding only two or three courses to begin with. I think you could generate sufficient interest to populate those courses quite easily. And then, hopefully, populate existing courses that are sandwiched by those introductory and capstone courses to a degree that they might not have been otherwise. My hope is that we could accomplish, at least at the outset, a program design that had minimal impact on the curriculum in terms of adding courses, rather draw together in a powerful way what is already there for developing leaders. (R1, p. 4)

The curriculum as it stands is full. What do you do? You can repackage some stuff, and not add anything to the curriculum. Or you can put in a minimum number of courses and say, “OK, here’s an emphasis.” You may discover that in this department and in this department there are three courses that, put together, provide an initiative you hadn’t thought of before. (R2, p. 12)

An administrator suggested, “One could string classes together and develop a curriculum of study for leadership... have two or three leadership classes and a bunch of
cognate ones that already exist” (R7, p. 51). A respondent added, “Organizing it as an emphasis is a very reasonable thing to do” (R12, p. 90). Another commented that “a certificate in leadership is feasible” (R3, p. 21). One acknowledged, “The formal program could be a minor” (R11, p. 83). A dean discouraged adding to expectations for majors,

To “add-on” to what is already being done in a particular major in order to make it acceptable for a leadership focus is not the best direction to go. There are many ways to build leadership skills and get students involved in experiential learning. We want to be open to and respect the opportunities already in place on campus, even as we try to build a more formalized program. (R5, p. 35)

Reshape Aspects of General Education

All 13 participants discussed reshaping aspects of the curriculum. Ten identified various ways to restructure, integrate a leadership component into an existing course, exchange a course, or add a leadership course. Some of their ideas follow:

General Education teachers should be alerted or sensitized to the fact that this is the time for developing leadership. . . . I’m not so sure that there’s room for any more General Education. But I do think that a Liberal Arts college does look to its General Education to develop some of these [leadership] characteristics within young people. (R8, pp. 57-58)

Can we repackage a few things and not have to come up with a whole new curriculum? . . . Looking at a full curriculum, you will need to stop and ask yourself, do we want to add three new courses, or do we want to look carefully at some courses that are there to see if they can be restructured? . . . Obviously, if it’s going to be a new initiative, a new program of some sort, then students will just have another choice and they won’t be able to do all of the stuff they had planned to do . . . if it’s a minor and they switch to the leadership program. (R2, p. 13)

We’ve talked about several options: (1) Some kind of a requirement for exposure in the General Education curriculum which all undergraduates do. . . . (2) The service learning requirement is another option. This requirement is already there. It’s very difficult right now, given how tight we are with general education at Andrews to do anything more. If we can subtract something, or if we can maneuver such as shifting a course emphasis in some way. (R3, p. 18)

Two respondents predicted that there would be major resistance from teachers
asked to sacrifice credits and challenges for transfer students if General Education became too specialized (R5, p. 31; R10, p. 76). Recognizing that General Education is overloaded, a department chair still advised that the changes have to be within General Education. He further recommended engagement in conversations to garner support from department chairs before making a proposal to the General Education committee (R9, p. 66). An administrator predicted a positive outcome if integrated into the curriculum.

Our job then is to give them the tools that they need to get skilled as a leader. But if we do it in a way that can knit itself into the existing curriculum, where the faculty that want to be involved are able to get involved, I think the academic part will work well. (R3, p. 19)

**Reshaped Service Learning Course**

Seven respondents identified the service-learning component of the General Education package as having an expansive relationship that could embrace a leadership component. The faculty chair who supervises the service-learning component opened the door for a leadership component,

Like the science majors do tutoring in science. Perhaps those that are interested in a leadership emphasis in their undergraduate program could be involved in working with city planners, city managers, and corporate executives in playing leadership roles. Their volunteer work could be working with some successful leaders in the corporate, public, and faith community sectors. (R12, p. 90)

According to one dean, although students were more reluctant to substitute a class in their major because of its relationship to their potential career, they would be more open to new leadership activities in the General Education requirements. She suggested that it might replace certain classes currently required in General Education or be an expansion of the service component (R5, p. 34). However, the dean found the thought of the ensuing political battle disturbing, “I don’t know if I want to engage in it! Strong feelings and
opinions would rise so fast!” (R5, p. 34; R7, p. 51).

One respondent argued that if the administration wants to make leadership-development a University priority, then it should be embedded in the general-studies program (R11, p. 83). He and two other respondents were not opposed to adding a leadership class to the General Education, “I think the normal thought would be . . . to add some classes in leadership, the same way we have with service” (R7, p. 51). A faculty member shared a suggestion of designing a leadership class which you would require of all the student leaders (R9, pp. 66-67). Another suggested that, rather than adding requirements, to give students the choice of a service class or a leadership class, in the General Education curriculum (R11, p. 83).

A departmental chair could not imagine how credit hours could be added to the credit-based curriculum but explored an idea of a leadership component being part of a candidacy requirement that would be generated from the co-curricular leadership arena.

I could get excited about saying one of the components of our ministerial candidacy program is that they have the major, and then in the co-curricular side of life . . . you go and do this and do that. . . . We can start combining it with our candidacy requirements for graduation with a religion and theology major. You can’t graduate unless you’ve gone through the leadership component. (R9, p. 67)

An administrator admitted that the process of changing something in the General Education curriculum was tedious but suggested there are still connections to leadership in existing classes such as Bible, business, and communication. He further suggested that “throughout the General Education curriculum . . . there could be things where there could be a module that would relate to the issue of leadership” (R4, pp. 26-27).

A dean reflected, “One component of the GE package should include a requirement that forces us outside of our niche” arguing that students would benefit from a major course
outside the comfort zone of their major field of study. The expansion of their horizons would help them develop additional leadership skills (R13, p. 103).

**Shaping the General Education Core to Be Unique**

A respondent who works closely with General Education expressed major concerns about designing a package that has unique and specific curriculum requirements that does not allow transferable credits. He cited an example of a diversity focus. Students who transferred in speech credits from a community college but did not have a diversity component in that course were being required to take an additional credit of diversity.

There’s a real dilemma. . . . Now there’s an academic community that’s saying, “Well, you missed our diversity piece. Now you’ve got to take a one credit diversity piece because it’s unique.” So if we integrate leadership into religion, leadership in communication, how will we deal with all these petitions? . . . We have to be careful with the idea of a unique curriculum. . . . It tells transfer students, “come one come all, but realize you’re starting over.” (R10, p. 76)

The same respondent insisted, “I would not endorse growing our required courses in any way, shape, or form.” He further warned that most majors already have increased required credits compared to other universities and all this leaves no wiggle room (R10, pp. 76-77).

Several suggested that a proposed model might draw from the current structure of the existing Honors program—at Andrews University—that allows replacements for specified General Education classes and requires additional components such as papers and oral presentations (R4, p. 27; R9, p. 63).

**Graduation Recognition and Academic Transcript**

After reviewing the current campus resources, 1 respondent exclaimed, “Really, what’s needed right now is some type of vehicle that can draw all of that together so that
there is formal recognition on graduation” (R1, p. 21). Another agreed, suggesting possible formal acknowledgments that ranged from a pin of recognition or all the way up to a formal certificate (R8, p. 58).

**Spiritual Framework**

In direct response to the question relating to desired components for a leadership-development program, 4 respondents identified the need for spiritual components. Woven throughout the interviews, as many respondents discussed the meaning of leadership and alignment with mission, a spiritual framework emerged as a ubiquitous theme. One departmental chair commented, “You can’t have leadership without spirituality. That doesn’t happen in Bible class I don’t think. It might. But I think that somehow people have to come to the place of knowing who they are in relationship to God, the Creator God” (R6; pp. 43-44).

Integration of Theory, Practice, and Reflection: Theme 15

**Determine Theoretical Foundation**

One respondent identified that one of the first components needed would be to determine the theoretical underpinning of leadership.

My forays into leadership theories and models say that there is the whole gamut there. And yet, there are some predispositions that we have as a Christian university that would guide us in making choices about what streams of leadership theory we should draw. I think we need to take a careful look at the enterprise of leadership and decide where we are going to draw our information. (R1, p. 4)

Another pointed out,

Without a theoretical base, they shouldn’t be out there doing this stuff. They have to understand where it fits in organizational theory, personality theory, communication theory, and management theory, or their experience doesn’t have
a thing to work with. They also need research methods to understand the basis for leadership styles, for leadership approaches, for how leadership works in an organizational structure from private, to public, to faith communities. (R12, p. 91)

**Experiential Learning, Internships, and Practicum**

Several individuals emphasized the role of experiences in learning. One departmental chair shared her work to trim the teaching component and increase the practical component in her courses,

"Okay! I’m teaching this 3 credit class. I’m going to back it off and only teach 2 and that extra credit is going to be an outside practical sort of experience including reflection and a portfolio." Hard work! But, you know, it’s really important to learn that less is more. (R6, p. 46)

She also acknowledged that that there should be a plan to develop portfolios and shape credits “when students go off and teach for a whole year in . . . Timbuktu school,” as well as ways to evaluate what is being learned in local leadership activities.

There have to be things that we could help them to pull out and say I’ve grown in this way because of this experience. I’m a different person and I’m clear in my mind about what God wants me to do. So, yeah, what changes should be considered an opportunity outside the classroom. I think we’d have to be open to a whole bunch of things. (R6, p. 44)

In pondering out-of-the-classroom experiential learning, a dean declared that there are lots of opportunities to develop leadership through internships by placing students with local employers (R13, p. 107). Two respondents from different disciplines described their models for internship and practicum development. One program developed a manual in which students identified and wrote about their learning experiences. The respondent noted that “every curriculum lends itself to a co-curricular component” (R8, p. 59). Another dean believed that one could design an internship with depth and breadth and document it with the guidance of a mentor.
We permit only one 3-credit internship per major (one class in the major can be replaced with an internship). A student may choose to do more internships than one (we may even encourage it), but only one can count for credit. . . . We want the internship to be something in more depth than what we can give the student in the classroom. (R5, p. 33)

Role of Reflection

According to several respondents, the reflective process is an essential connection between theory and practice and must be included in a leadership-program curriculum. One noted that leadership-program participants needed to be more reflective in their way of thinking, helping them to see even in some of those learning style things that some people are actually more reflective and other people are more naturally the doers. The doers are the ones that get in your way when you try to get them into doing this reflective stuff, because they'd rather go do it. They might think about it afterwards. (R6, p. 46)

They need that reflective time in their theory and methods classes and their content classes to reflect on how it worked, why it worked, what needs to be changed, how it can be done differently next time. (R12, pp. 91-92)

Students' preconceived expectations of the learning process were identified as a challenge by a department chair.

If they've had 16 years of someone dishing it out to them, they're not going to have any confidence to be able to learn something for themselves. . . . It's a lot easier to sit and just write down the notes and memorize them and stuff, and then give them back and you've got your A and you're done. But when someone pushes you and says, 'No, you've got to sit in the corner over there half a day and write in your journal' . . . that's huge torture. (R6, pp. 44-45)

An administrator highlighted the importance of reflection, "If the kid has these 'aha ha' moments and no place to capture them for later reflection or discussion with some knowledgeable person, they lose some of the impact of such moments" (R3, p. 21).

One respondent recommended a capstone format which would be designed to require students to make meaning of their journey (R6, p. 46).
Need More Tools Than Motivation

One administrator championed, repeatedly, the need to equip students with tools for success, noting a backlash against motivational seminars and those that cast visions but fail to provide a framework or to delegate someone to build the framework for those visions (R5, p. 35). Accordingly, she pointed out the difficulty of measuring progress and the direction of the progress with such motivational approaches, insisting that a formalized leadership program needs to be stronger than students telling incredible stories about marvelous experiences (R5, p. 36). She further clarified that such seminars often promote hype:

People leave, feeling like they can conquer the world—at least immediately after the seminar. This can be particularly true if the speaker is very charismatic. Unfortunately, the feeling may not last when the attendees move from the seminar into the marketplace. . . . Not every student comes with a charismatic personality. Some do—but they may or may not be successful leaders. Charisma isn’t required for leadership—it’s an add-on. Thus we need to include the tools needed to help students make a difference. (R5, pp. 36-37)

Relationship of Curricular and Co-curricular: Theme 16

Several respondents suggested a need for a holistic approach. One contended, “It should not only be academic; but it should include academics” (R10, p. 75). An administrator concurred,

It shouldn’t be solely academic or solely extracurricular. My bias is it needs to be a bit of both. And again, probably the easiest and most powerful way to integrate it is to ask ourselves what things can or should be engineered rather than created anew. (R4, p. 27)

An academic dean acknowledged credible ways to be involved in co-curricular leadership opportunities and receive course credit, which could include a syllabus, maintaining activity logs, reading and reflecting on leadership books, documentation,
feedback, and evaluation (R2, p. 13). He envisioned that a leadership retreat could be held at the beginning of the school year where requirements for those desiring academic credit could be outlined, “I think it’s feasible. I think it ought to be pursued” (R2, pp. 13-14).

Integration of Credit Bearing and Co-Curricular Activities

A respondent suggested that there were opportunities to award credit for things that could be adapted from the curriculum and for some things that students are already doing (R6, p. 44). At the same time she urged caution, pointing out the potential for a diminished educational experience where students pay thousands of dollars for an experience they have already had, thus getting credit with just “a little reflection and you’re done” (R6, p. 45). Occasionally she asks such a student if they got their money’s worth and noted, “Some people absolutely are convinced they got their money’s worth” (R6, p. 45). An administrator also pointed out the need for training for staff to mentor such experiences, “It took as much training for the adult staff to learn to be a coach as it did for the kids to learn to be a leader” (R3, p. 20).

Concern About Diminished Voluntarism

One academic dean raised the possibility that a formal credit-based program could diminish students’ current voluntary leadership experiences where credit was not available.

A formal leadership development program [could] drive out [other] very valuable experiences. We may watch the economic model, “survival of the fittest,” work on our campus through this process. That may not be a bad thing, but we may also discover that we lose some good things in the process. (R5, pp. 33-34)

The respondent advocated respecting the experiential learning already provided by faculty, keeping in mind that “faculty would not favor reducing their current out-of-the-classroom
experiences in favor of a [new] leadership out-of-the-classroom experience” (R5, p. 35).

Institutional Priorities: Theme 17

Seven respondents championed the importance of alignment with institutional priorities. Two passionate respondents focused the majority of their interview on this single theme. An administrator described the enviable confusion emerging from the three committees meeting simultaneously, the Strategic Planning Team, the A-Team (a strategic financial planning team), and the Blue Ribbon committee (a strategic development planning team) all trying to determine priorities for the future of the University. According to 1 respondent, unless the President or the Provost articulates the priority role of leadership, it will compete with a thousand other voices and risk perpetuating the sense of malaise and even exhaustion leading to the feeling of “just tell me which one is most important . . . but I don’t have time or energy” (R4, p. 28).

Several others were equally adamant about the need for institutional commitment if a formal leadership program was to be successful:

Will it give added value to the University and help us reach our goals and mission? Do we see that developing leaders is part of what we hope Andrews is doing for its students? If that was affirmed in the strategic plan, then that would be a visible signal to the marketplace, that we are serious about leadership development at Andrews, and we intend to do it the right way, in a formal way, with thoughtfulness. (p. 37) R5

Andrews University has too many priorities, and they are all good. But the resources to do them well probably go beyond what resources the University has. I’m hoping as the University has opportunity to re-define itself, if the decision is made to go leadership undergraduate programs, then I hope we get resources adequately to do it in a very meaningful way. (R10, p. 70)

One interviewee implied that his own support of leadership-development was contingent on leadership being a well-defined University priority. “If this is one, I will
stand behind it 100%” (R10, p. 70). He also confessed misgivings about implementing any new program on a shoestring “because you could kill something” if it is not done well. He argued that it is critical to have solid commitment from the University and subsequent funds to be able to invest in programs that are targeted as a priority (R10, pp. 73-74). A personal illustration was offered, “If it’s a priority even if you’re highly out of money, you’ll give it resources, not just lip service. If the lawn looks [neglected]—and you know I love a sharp, manicured lawn—then it doesn’t look like it’s a priority” (R10, p. 79). Although the majority of the respondents felt there was more potential if the administration identified leadership-development as a priority (R8, p. 62), 1 respondent contended that the idea “has a lot more potential than when it comes from the grassroots level up” (R8, p. 13).

An academic dean reflected on previous initiatives that came and went, having been add-ons rather than strategic decisions. “We also would not want to see that happen to plans for leadership in the curriculum. Thus we need the commitment of the strategic plan behind whatever direction is taken” (R5, p. 38). Another agreed, “If it’s going to be a ‘let’s see if it flies’ attitude, I don’t need another one of those. I want somebody coming in and telling me what will fly or is likely to fly, and we’ll give it everything we can to make it fly” (R10, p. 79). A respondent involved with the exploration team benchmarking observed,

There are a large number of institutions for whom leadership development has become something du jour, something they just do on the side: it was the idea of the day, or of the year. There’s a few artifacts out there on the web that indicate sort of a flash of activity, but I would suspect if you went to those institutions you would find that little else has happened beyond the year in which that leadership-development event occurred. It really hasn’t taken root. (R1, p. 7)
Find a Flexible and Promising Path: Theme 18

Two respondents felt that a plan that anticipated challenges was an essential ingredient to successful implementation. One stated, “If a plan could be articulated where it shows how this has been thoughtfully considered from all these different angles . . . I don’t see an obstacle” (R13, p. 99). Another warned, “Unless you have done your homework very well and have anticipated some of the objections you are going to run into, you will be stymied” and encouraged the need to anticipate all possible outcomes (R2, p. 10). An administrator advised a team to sort through the current maze of leadership conversations “and pick a pathway that is practical, that is promising, and that is forward looking instead of backward looking” (R7, p. 54).

According to several respondents, key components in a leadership program must include flexibility and simplicity (R11, p. 83).

If it doesn’t force things too much in a single line but is something that can kind of suffuse the many and various ways we think and practice on a university campus, then it will succeed in making a greater impact. If it’s a lock-step program, it will be just that . . . a program. To have greater potential as an organizing theme for the way we do lots of different things, it will need to be able to find a life of its own and adapt to a lot of different situations. (R1, p. 7)

If you make the program too big, I think you’ll reduce the potential for success. If you can keep it simple enough so it’s doing what you want it to do without requiring too much time consumption . . . The potential of it is going to be colored by mainly how time-consuming and complex you make it. (R9, p. 69)

New Methods and Pedagogies: Theme 19

Several interviewees stressed the need for changing the way the faculty and staff thought about learning as a crucial step in creating the optimal culture for the leadership-development program. One key administrator suggested teaching
leadership through the pedagogy of discovery.

We teachers have the habit of assuming that students don’t know anything, they come here to learn. We lecture by saying unfortunately you don’t know that, but fortunately you’re lucky enough to be in my classroom and you’re going to find out. What happens when teachers say to students, “You actually go and find that out on your own and here are a couple of hints?” I’ve heard that those who understand learning theory would say that the latter way of teaching, at least some of the ways, is much more effective because students remember much more what they do or what they discover than what they hear. So I think there is such a thing as kindergarten of leadership or leadership-development through pedagogy. We’re saying, students, you can serve ice cream in the summertime or do camp counseling or pitch tents or do all sorts of things and that develops leadership. Now I’m going to teach you leadership in learning, the way you learn... That becomes like a treasure hunt our students can join. Maybe one can look at pedagogy itself as an avenue for leadership. (R7, p. 53)

According to another dean, the students need a passion for their quest for learning (R13, p. 99). He called for the faculty to be more engaged in the learning process,

Boy I don’t know, but I’ll work with you and I’m going to have to prove my own knowledge again to myself and reassure myself that I know how to get to that answer. It’s exciting. It’s stimulating. And I think once the faculty get into that, everyone comes out winners... Wow! (R13, p. 99)

A department chair explained how one could easily design student-directed programs.

Give them 10 options and say, “Okay! How do you want to finish your course?”... I can teach you for two weeks, and then you’re on your own. You got to figure some stuff out here, and I’m not going to decide for you... Probably the biggest obstacle is letting up the control and saying, they’re not going to become leaders if we don’t give them a chance to lead. (R6, p. 47)

The Obstacles

Many obstacles to the development of a leadership-development program were identified. Some of these were also stated as the essential components. For example, lack of becoming an institutional priority would result in a leadership program with no resources and limited impact. This section reviews three of the most commonly
mentioned: lack of finances; lack of time by faculty, staff, and students; and lack of collaboration.

Financial Constraints: Theme 20

Ten respondents shared their views about the lack of funds from the perspective of having wrestled with financial challenges for 5 or more years. There was a generally understood challenge in the context of rising health care and energy costs, along with stagnant undergraduate populations in higher education institutions. Thus, several believed the administration's biggest question would be, "How is this thing going to be funded?" (R6, p. 42). One admonished,

I think that it would be foolish for us to just be naive and say, Well, we just think this should be done and these are the good, philosophical reasons why. I think that we need to make sure that in the circumstances in which we find ourselves that we are not adding to the burden. (R8, p. 61)

A department chair reported a general mantra of concern about course proliferation (R8, p. 57). Another asked, "If you're going to add some new courses, is this new faculty? Where is the budget going to come from?" (R2, p. 21). A department chair insisted that there could be no more new costs, "We've done this at Andrews at extraordinary cost, and that's part of our financial crisis because we create more programs and more costs and no more income" (R12, p. 86). He further noted,

We've gone down so many opportunity paths here that didn't work out, that I would guess the administration feels burned out. . . . We were going to make a fortune in many things, and they've all ended up being at best marginally cost covering, which means they actually contribute very little to overhead, so they lose a lot of money. So I would think that whatever is done, if it would move forward, it would have to be done in a way that would enhance the existing programs and not add a lot of costs on. (R12, p. 88)

If we think here's another program that will cost me a 10% reduction in my budget, I'll be a major obstacle because I can't afford any more reductions. Every new
program means a few percent reduction in my budget, and that’s just ridiculous. So I think you’ll have obstacles if you feel it hurts us as schools and departments, rather than enhances us. (R12, p. 92)

According to 1 department chair, there “is a heart on the part of the faculty and departments to reach across” but she also stressed that the administration must develop strategies for this collaboration that prevent financial and productivity issues from interfering with the generous spirits (R6, p. 44). An enthusiastic respondent used an example of a successful collaboration that added majors to both disciplines as something possible for a leadership program.

We can identify people who wouldn’t be here without [this collaboration]. . . . We’ve enhanced both of us, so both departments are very enthused and both of us have more resources because of it, as opposed to giving up 2% of our budget in order to support a new program. (R12, p. 93)

One academic dean cautioned against a bare-bones financial view that looks only at tuition revenue. He used research as an example.

We end up not doing things the best way because we’re only looking at it from the dollar standpoint. If we would look at it from the viewpoint where we are bringing in dollars for cutting-edge research, then the faculty gets excited. The students see what’s going on. They’re more stimulated and, wow, you mean I can be part of this research? It’s a win-win on all accounts. (R13, p. 103)

Others noted ways to save money with creative options. One dean considered personally teaching a capstone course for his seniors and harnessing the wealth of local expertise as mentors (R13, pp. 105-106). After describing the financial picture as the “tightest strait jacket I could ever imagine,” he contended that he does not see finances as the biggest issue, but admits he may have become numb to the subject. Still he insisted, “You just have to get used to thinking outside the box and not let finances dominate” (R13, p. 107).
In relationship to the University President’s vision statement for the *Legacy of Leadership Campaign* (see Appendix A) several respondents offered insight. “I think if people knew we were actually seriously, formally developing leaders, they would support that campaign” (R8, p. 62). Another noted,

> We have donors and friends who can do something, and so we see promise to it. The chance that we can present this as a way to improve the undergraduate experience is good enough that we may uncover people who will say ‘Yeah, I’ll give you some money.’” (R3, p. 19)

**Busy Lives of Faculty, Staff, and Students: Theme 21**

Concern about the busy lives of faculty and staff was designated as an obstacle by 7 respondents. One faculty described the reluctance to take on more responsibilities, with a personal example. His role as a sponsor of a student organization was not calculated as part of his load. He pointed out that some clubs demand far more time than others, and despite promises, few colleagues had actually volunteered assistance (R11, p. 85). Other comments included: “I think that faculty is overwhelmed” (R8, p. 56). “We have so much on our plate right now. We have many major problems to solve. We have financial issues to solve; we have enrollment issues to solve; we have marketing issues to solve; we have strategic issues to solve. It’s a lot” (R5, p. 37). “I think we’re all busy and all caught up in our own little worlds. I think there is a desire to collaborate and yet there is also the need to kind of ‘mind my own store’” (R1, p. 3). “Faculty will sit back and say, We’ve got enough issues, enough programs” (R2, p. 11).

One departmental chair declared that the main obstacle will be “the faculty, who are very, very busy on this campus, will say, ‘What? Another thing?’” (R9, p. 68). On the other hand, he anticipated that some faculty may initially say, “No! You’re not loading us with
more work,” but may return and ask to participate (R9, p. 64). He clarified, “You won’t have to sell this chair on the need. It’s going to be the time issue” (R9, p. 68). According to another,

The greatest obstacle I see in this department is how we would begin to absorb and balance new responsibilities that might come our way in the process of developing such a program. Let’s just say that our leadership-development program was a resounding success and we had 50 students lined up at the door who wanted to be involved the first year. Someone has to track all those students in their progress... So if the spotlight swung on this department to fulfill a fair share of those responsibilities, how would we adjust? (R1, p. 6)

Five respondents acknowledged challenges regarding the busy lives of students.

An administrator shared feedback he had received from students,

They made real clear that they don’t need anything more than what they are already doing... In fact, they probably suggested they were a bit overwhelmed, trying to balance academics and the leadership roles they already took on this campus. (R10, p. 72)

Two respondents identified the need to pay attention to the impact of leadership activities on students’ academic program and progress.

My experience has been that there’s a fair amount of bravado at the beginning, and then the reality of their academics sink in... Those students that really step up to the plate can often find themselves in academic trouble... To be able to attract students we need to certainly build it in such a way that it does not create more of a burden for the student. (R10, p. 72)

Sometimes those who love extracurricular stuff have a hard time staying focused on academic responsibilities. For example, some students are so involved in the Passion Play that they drop out of school for a semester because they found that they could not do both. (R5, p. 33)

A dean projected that faculty will say, “Students are confronted with so many choices, now there’s no sense giving them more choices. It will just confuse them more” (R2, p. 11). He further commented, “The students, of course, are full with their majors and/or minors as it is. The idea of something in addition is hard to square with the amount
of money that it costs and the time that it takes to get a degree” (R2, p. 9).

According to another respondent, given that students feel they are already too busy, “there is a felt need among some students for a leadership program” (R1, p. 2).

A chair insisted that the case of students’ full schedules supports the rationale for an academic credit component as it provides time for students to be able to participate. She warned, “If we were to do it on a non-credit basis, unless it had some kind of portfolio work, or they were actually student leaders with other incentives—maybe even being paid, it won’t work” (R8, p. 56).

Lack of Collaboration and Willingness to Change: Theme 22

Several respondents agreed that lack of collaboration in the planning and implementation stage would be a major obstacle. “If we don’t involve others in the decision process, they will criticize” (R4, p. 28). An administrator identified the communication aspect of collaboration as an obvious obstacle. “If you’re dealing with people who have a variety of calendars, you have to use certain thoughtful techniques to include all” (R3, p. 21). A department chair stated, “Trying to come up with a way to show that this is really important will be your biggest obstacle” (R9, p. 68).

A departmental chair described an exciting collaboration with other disciplines to develop an attractive new program. After successfully collaborating she found it disheartening to be accused by some administrators of proliferating and adding majors when she had actually opened up more opportunities for students without adding cost (R8, p. 60). One of the most adamant diatribes was expressed by a departmental chair who stipulated that the major obstacle would be if a new program was mandated rather than
developed as a collaborative, interdisciplinary enterprise (R12, p. 92).

A twin roadblock to the lack of collaboration is the resistance to change. Four respondents identified this obstacle. According to a dean, “Everyone resists change when it comes right down to it. Change takes effort. It takes lots of planning and pushing” (R13, p. 107). Another noted in his own division “some fairly well-entrenched leadership training systems. To ask them to come around some common themes might be challenging” (R1, p. 6).

Others attested that, ironically, although educators are renowned for having freedom of thought, they do not like to make changes. One observed, “I think it’s amazing that we who work in a university sometimes get lazy in our minds” (R7, p. 53). Another stated,

In spite of the notion that educators are well read and we have wonderful views of the world and so on, we don’t like change. . . . We are great thinkers and we like to think new things, but when it comes to changing our process I have observed a great deal of inertia. It takes a lot of patience and stick-to-it-ness on those who do have a new vision to actually get something changed. (R2, p. 10)

An administrator warned that the temptation to resist change may come in the form of looking around and imitating others. He championed the need to create a fresh approach,

Usually they did not become successful because they said “Me, too.” They became successful because they dared to do something new. That will be an obstacle to success if we were to approach this as imitating everybody else’s approach, even sometimes at a point when they’re moving out of it because it’s a 10-year course. To make it genuinely new and fresh would be a solution; to make it imitative of what has been done would be an obstacle. (R7, p. 54)

Resistance to Changes in Curriculum

Five respondents predicted that resistance would be the most evident in attempts to reshape or add to the General Education package (R7, p. 53; R9, p. 66; R13, p. 107). One
declared, “General Education will be a hard sell” (R9, p. 66). According to 1 respondent, there were already major curriculum concerns with “the maxed out number of 123 credits for graduation.” Any new program must be shaped so that the educational journey is not extended to negatively impact retention and graduation rates (R10, p. 78).

One respondent projected that the most resistance from the academic arena would be to giving credit for practical experiences and portfolio development (R1, p. 5). An administrator recommended that faculty be part of the planning so they would have confidence in the value of the learning experience. She explained,

Anything which is going to be in a transcript or that could be seen as evidence of academic accomplishment is going to have to be at an academic standard. Now I don’t think that’s necessarily an obstacle, but some people outside of the academic administration area may see it that way. (R3, p. 22)

Moving From Idea to Implementation: Theme 23

Five respondents commented on the challenge of moving from talk to action. For example, I said, “Yes, the idea is a good one. Implementing it in terms of the curriculum, that’s where it gets a little tough. As we often say, the devil’s in the details. So it will be interesting to see how much devilment we get in the details” (R2, p. 9). Others observed,

There is a difference between talking about an idea and gathering people around an idea to develop something, and then actually developing it and implementing it. . . . Having gone from idea to implementation on other projects, I know that it’s sometimes not always possible to anticipate everything. (R1, p. 6)

The idea of leadership is certainly clear in my mind that that’s the kind of student we want Andrews graduates to be. We want them to be leaders in their communities. How to incorporate that into a full curriculum and give a special push toward leadership is going to be the challenge. (R2, p. 16)

An administrator did not recommend removing the word leadership from our rhetoric but expressed concern that leadership was losing meaning in repetition. “I’m sorry in a way
that leadership is being talked about so much because words are like people, and anything else living. They can be used so much there’s a danger on our campus of taking a holiday” (R7, p. 54).

Other respondents seemed to indicate the campus was ripe for implementation.

Legacy of Leadership. Every time I hear that I say, ‘Now what does that mean to you?’ Surely it’s more than that statue out there. So, I think we’ve had enough jargon. I think it’s time for us to really encourage students so they can go away from this place . . . feeling confident that they can change the world. (R6, p. 47)

The respondent who depicted the need for collaboration as a major component for success also named collaboration as a major obstacle to implement,

It’s easy to say ‘collaboration’ but it’s hard to spell it. What is meant here is getting a significant grasp of what it takes in order to act it. Talking is easy. Acting it becomes a lot harder. . . . The human tendency to silo and protect undermines collaboration and creates challenges. I see a great deal of that siloing in academics. . . . The process isn’t necessarily something which involves a group. (R3, p. 21)

Leadership-Development Potential for Andrews: Theme 24

Eleven of the 13 respondents envisioned that the development of an effective leadership-development program held great potential for the whole campus. Two respondents stipulated that there was potential for success only if a commitment was made to identify a formal leadership program as a University priority. One declared, “We must make serious our intent if we decide that the development of leaders is one of the major goals of this academic institution—as serious as is the goal that we want our students to be able to write well and speak clearly” (R5, p. 38). Another said, “The potential is as great as our collective will to see leadership-development become a paradigm for educating not only the mind, but the heart and the hands, as well. If that
kind of support materializes, then I see great potential” (R1, p. 7). He continued, “So to the extent that a group of people can agree to that, and say, “Yes, this really does it for us . . . I think it will succeed” (R1, p. 7).

Potential to Impact the Campus Culture

Five respondents described the impact of leadership-development as powerful enough to transform the whole culture of Andrews University. A department chair conjectured that although “faculty generally are stuck in their own little world” they would venture out of their worlds in a spirit of cooperation, if they could understand “how they could educate for leadership in their sphere” (R6, p. 42). She envisioned everyone involved in leadership.

If the initiative could be for the whole campus, not just students, the initiative would be so that everybody could have an opportunity to develop leadership skills, so we legitimize this notion of leadership not just for the people who are young and paying tuition but for the people who are on campus making a difference. (R6, p. 42)

The scope described by several respondents depicted the need for a paradigm shift to be able to harness and unleash the full potential:

It’s difficult for me to project how deeply this could affect the Andrews culture. The potential is there. Some people have taken the idea of leadership development, and it has affected every layer of the institution, not just the teaching layer or the extracurricular layer. But it has affected the way that every employee thinks about their job. They have operationalized the leadership concept at every layer of the institution. (R1, p. 7)

If leadership becomes an integral part of our learning experience for students on campus, I think it will have a penetrating influence on the institution itself. . . . It’s not just something attached to an office, it’s to a life. . . . I don’t know the degree to which students understand that shift in our understanding. But leadership is not just student leaders. Leadership is developing leading lives, if I can use that term, for all students as well as students in leadership. (R7, p. 50)
One administrator envisioned transforming potential: “It would be too simplistic and perhaps even too ineffective to make it solely an academic pursuit,” insisting it needs to be an organism that spreads throughout the entire campus (R4, p. 25). He explained,

Since Adventist education has historically been holistic, we’ve said you need to educate the whole person, that the three sides in one—the physical, the mental, the spiritual, the *Corpus Mens Spiritus*—that we would want to be challenged to say, How does this infuse every element of life on campus? So it wouldn’t simply be a curriculum that would be done either in or out of the classroom, but it would be something that would each be part of students’ lives. (R4, p. 25)

He advocated that we should inspect the entire campus and deconstruct all the places where students connect with faculty and staff and then ask how we are going to make leadership a part of everything that students experience on campus in the workplace, in the residence hall, in the social and spiritual arenas, rather than a series of Sunday evening seminars. He concluded, “Probably the best way for leadership-development to be a distinctive part of Andrews is to develop and stay on top of both the explicit formal leadership courses and the myriad array of organic things going on behind the scenes” (R4, p. 25).

Potential for Added Value

Several respondents identified that an added value of leadership-development was in helping students discover purpose in their lives. An administrator acknowledged,

In our curriculum we currently offer leadership primarily at the graduate-level programs with mid-life adults. Young people [however] develop a vision of themselves much earlier than that. Having a way to facilitate both undergraduates and graduates in capturing a sense of their potential in leadership would be very appropriate. (R3, p. 17)

She added, “There’s a point in which a young person gets a vision for themselves. If they get that vision, they can hardly be stopped. Our job then is to give them the tools that they need to get skilled as a leader” (R3, p. 19). A interviewee brightly declared,
I am majorly for the idea. I think that when students come to the University, they look like they are too immature to be leaders. I think it’s just an ideal time for them to stop and reflect about who they are, what does God want them to do, why were they born? (R6, p. 40)

Reflecting on her own journey, she remembers being a busy student leader and doing all kinds of stuff, but also being a most confused kid. “I really didn’t have those pieces glued together” (R6, p. 40). She described what she needed most was not busy activity but a sense of belonging and purpose.

That you’re not an accident and that God put you together for a divine purpose. . . . I would just love it to death if undergrads could get that at age 20 instead of waiting until they are graduates like what we deal with. You have people that are 45 and 50 and are falling apart because they are pulled in so many directions in trying to please too many people. (R6, p. 40)

A departmental chair expressed that the College of Arts and Sciences “should support leadership because it’s one of the characteristics of being an all-rounded liberal arts graduate” (R8, p. 60). An administrator noted, “Leadership gives them something beyond just a traditional degree that gives them a dimension that makes them more employable, smarter in their careers but selflessly better children of God” (R4, p. 24). An academic dean shared his passion.

As I’ve said over and over, it’s not enough that we train them to be excellent technicians. Any school can turn out that kind of people. We want our people to go out there and make a difference morally and spiritually. There are leadership qualities that we need to incorporate into their education that go beyond smart people. A top education thought of in a kind of secular way can simply turn out more efficient embezzlers. So what we need to turn out are people with certainly good financial savvy, but with moral fiber as well and the ability to foster that in the community. That to me says leadership. (R2, p. 16)

According to 1 dean, this is a critical opportunity to teach leadership before they are out doing leadership.

I’m sending out people that need to know agriculture. But really now with a
college education, they are going to be leaders in the agricultural field. They are not just simply farm laborers. They have a college education that has given them additional skills. And that's where this emphasis on leadership could even give them more skills. (R13, p. 101)

A faculty member advised that leadership skills such as basic financial skills would benefit students from all majors. He shared the example of theology students who will lead a church organization that often is without financial tools. Our current lack of intentionality fostered sarcasm in his question, "Is it important to learn to be a leader, or shall we just leave you to the wolves and you just learn to become a leader? If you succeed, hurrah! If you don't succeed, then, well, you still graduate" (R11, p. 81).

One administrator believed the added value of leadership-development is that students can "focus on changing the world before they graduate, not just after" (R4, p. 23). Another administrator sees leadership-development as an element that infuses the process of becoming a distinctive leader, which is the core of who we are as a Christian university.

We're not just training accountants, doctors, pastors, photographers and physical therapists, we're training people who will be distinctive leaders in their field. Even though their title may not be leader, they will behave as leaders and they will behave as Christian leaders. So one of the ways to do that is to say, again, that it's this value-added element that infuses the process so that you're not being just well academically prepared, but you're being in a sense spiritually and fundamentally prepared to be a different kind of whatever you want to be. (R4, p. 25)

Potential for Unifying and Integrating

Several respondents agreed that leadership-development has great unifying and integration potential. An administrator explained, "I think leadership, especially in the Christian context, ties all of that together. It says how all of these elements blend together in your academic journey, your spiritual journey" (R4, p. 23). The same respondent
described leadership as a "connecting approach to making those things not just a nice theme but a reality in student lives" (R4, p. 23). A department chair envisioned that the greatest value of leadership-development as "one of those things that would bring us together as opposed to re-inventing the wheel" (R12, p. 88).

If it's interdisciplinary integrated, then it helps bring the silos of the University together as opposed to creating another silo... You have cross-departmental and school programs that help people communicate, work together, and facilitate all involved. (R12, p. 92)

Another respondent agreed wholeheartedly, "I think it draws together a number of things that we really, really value in Adventist education. Perhaps draws them together and organizes them... in a way that few concepts before them really ever have" (R1, p. 7).

Right Time for Change

One issue broached by several comments was the issue of the context of Andrews University for starting a leadership-development program at this time. Most shared insights about the state of the health of Andrews University as a factor in determining the success of this program. One reported that the need to right-size ourselves may take precedence over developing any such program. The respondent questioned if (a) leadership should be fueled as a priority right now, or (b) our fuel should be used to downsize and later determine if leadership should be a priority, or (c) if both should be done at the same time? (R10, p. 73). His appeal continued, "Whatever Andrews does, I pray to God it will pull itself beyond where it is because we're in a rut. Right now, we're all feeling a little beat up and yet we're working our hardest" (R10, p. 79).

Despite this caution, he mused that maybe the leadership program could help give direction during this time of rediscover:
Andrews right now, I think, is ready to be re-ignited. And whatever we want to re-ignite ourselves with, whatever fuel source we use, if that’s leadership, then that needs to be part of Dr. Andreasen’s conversation at every turn. It needs to become part of his rhetoric, his vision. (R10, p. 73)

The respondent reflected that during its recent years of scarcity, Andrews has become more divided and recommended the timely and healing role of a collaborative endeavor. “This could help the University in a very significant way if [leadership] could build relationships” (R10, p. 78). Both an administrator and a dean viewed the current state of the University as the opportune time to discover new approaches and seek change:

One of the things that has come out of [this past year] is we need to think about and approach things differently. So, if anything, properly approached, it leverages the opportunities for a program like this rather than threatens. (R4, p. 25)

I think there’s a level where the campus is hungry right now for out-of-the-box thinking that will make a difference, which will more clearly position Andrews as a flag-ship university, as a leader. . . . I think properly positioned and pursued, this [leadership-development] fits into that. (R4, p. 25)

According to an academic dean, a leadership-development program could be a historical moment for Andrews University. “I think it is timely and the potential is excellent. If we could pull this off, I think Andrews would be noted. We could make a mark in history” (R13, p. 108).

Challenge Is Worth Confronting

A number of the respondents expressed personal readiness for this leadership-development project. One volunteered to sacrifice time, “I’m committed enough to take some time out and do whatever contributions that I might be able to do. Even though it would be an extra burden, I would still have enough personal commitment” (R9, p. 69). Two respondents anticipated being energized by new challenges. One stated,
“I’ve come to the place that the bigger the obstacle, the more fun it is to actually make sure that people are persuaded” (R8, p. 61). The other admitted there was “absolutely no obstacle in our department outside of time” and volunteered, “I’m the kind of person that gets energy from something different” (R6, p. 47).

One optimistic departmental chair declared, “I don’t believe there are any obstacles that you can’t overcome” (R8, p. 61). An academic dean concluded, “I think it is a challenge worth confronting” (R2, p. 16). Finally, a respondent called for mobilizing together toward a shared vision, “Let’s join arms and take on something as an institution that we know we’ll give our best shot” (R10, p. 79).
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND PRESENTATION OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

The results of the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study are reported separately. The presentation of the qualitative data was provided in chapter 4. The presentation of the quantitative phase of the study is reported in this chapter. Chapter 6 presents a holistic discussion of the findings from both the quantitative data and the qualitative data.

Introduction

This chapter presents statistical findings from the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey (see Appendix C). The survey was designed to gather data that would address four of the six research questions.

1. What perspectives and characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University have related to undergraduate leadership-development programs?

2. What characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University interested in participating in leadership-development programs have compared to students less interested in participating in leadership-development programs?

3. How does a leadership-development program align with the mission of Andrews?
6. What obstacles or challenges would exist in implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

Within the framework of these questions, findings from the survey provide characteristics about students and also student perspectives on leadership-development related to Andrews University’s mission and potential implementation issues.

**Data Processes**

Descriptive statistics (including frequencies, percentages, and means) and inferential statistics (including analysis of variance [ANOVA], *t* tests, correlations, and discriminate analysis) were the processes used to analyze the data. Gall et al. (1996) defined discriminate analysis as a type of multiple regression that “involves two or more predictor variables and a single criterion variable. Discriminate analysis, however, is limited to the special case in which the criterion is a categorical variable” (p. 441). A major research question in this study (research question 2) was designed to learn what demographic factors and other variables might be the best predictors of who might likely participate or enroll in leadership-development programs. The process of discriminate analysis was selected as an appropriate process to evaluate a range of independent variables for predicting the type of student that is most likely to participate in different levels of concentration of leadership-development programs.

**Data Preparation**

The data from the on-line Zoomerang (2005) management system were downloaded into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The data were categorized and recoded where appropriate. Responses from survey questions such as
question 25 on ethnicity that fell into the category of other were placed into the closest related category or were discarded. In some cases, for example in question 29 regarding current leadership involvement, if the same response was frequently identified by respondents under other, a new category was created and labeled as church service.

To better manage the data and analysis processes, the responses from several questions were recoded and relabeled. These included question 30 in which the 50 majors that emerged were recoded into six main categories: (a) Applied Sciences, (b) Social Sciences, (c) Sciences, (d) Humanities, (e) Professional, and (f) Undecided. In question 27, the age options were recoded into three main categories: (a) 17-20, (b) 21-23, and (c) 24-31+. To better evaluate the broad issues of students involved in leadership that emerged from question 29, all students who selected one of the given leadership options or identified one of their own were reclassified and coded as involved in leadership. Respondents who had selected the option none, continued to be classified as not currently involved in leadership.

According to William Estes (1997), communicating the results of the analysis of data “too often stops with the display of sample means in tables or figures together with citations of significance levels that provide virtually no help to readers concerned with understanding in detail the story that a set of data has to tell” (p. 339). David Walker (2005), in an article titled, “A Graph Is Worth a Thousand Words,” concurred that the use of graphs often provides a clearer picture than the traditional tables to show the relationship of variables under study. He explained,

In the social sciences, the scholarly literature indicates that quantitative researchers have called for the increased use of graphs as a means of promoting sound methodology, where graphs may depict ideas or findings that illustrate
Thus, in addition to tables, several graphs will be used to augment the text description.

Demographics of Survey Respondents

The Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey was sent electronically to the entire population of undergraduate students of Andrews University, 18 years of age or older. In the allotted timeframe, 418 students completed and submitted the survey, representing approximately 27% of the 1,527 registered undergraduate students making up the total population. Table 2 displays the demographic representation of the sample of students who took the survey in relationship to the general population of Andrews University undergraduate students.

Of all those who took the survey, 38.5% \((n = 161)\) were between the ages of 18-20; 44.3% \((n = 185)\) were between the ages of 21-23; 14.4% \((n = 60)\) were 24 years of age or more, and 2.9% \((n = 12)\) did not identify or submit their age. As shown in Table 2, 58.9% \((n = 246)\) were female and 41.1% \((n = 172)\) were male. In relationship to class standing, 19.9% \((n = 83)\) were freshmen, 15.6% \((n = 65)\) were sophomores, 27.7% \((n = 116)\) were juniors, and 36.8% \((n = 154)\) were seniors. The undergraduate population of Andrews University is 24.9% freshmen, 22.5% sophomore, 22.8% junior, and 29.8% senior. Thus in the sample population, freshman and sophomores were less represented and the juniors and seniors had a higher representation than the actual undergraduate population (Andrews University Office of Institutional Research, 2006).

As depicted in Table 2, the ethnic backgrounds represented by those who took the survey were: 54.5% \((n = 228)\) White, 19.6% \((n = 82)\) Black, 12.9% \((n = 54)\) Asian, and
10.3% \((n = 43)\) were Latino. The undergraduate population of Andrews University is 50.1% White, 26.2% Black, 12.1% Asian, and 11.2% Latino, which indicates that White respondents in the sample were represented slightly higher and the Black respondents were represented slightly lower than the actual undergraduate population (Andrews University Office of Institutional Research, 2006).

Table 2

*Survey Sample Demographics in Relationship to the Andrews Undergraduate Student Population \((n = 418; N = 1527)\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Sample Population</th>
<th>Andrews Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Andrews University population data are provided by the Andrews University Office of Institutional Research.

The 418 respondents represented 50 different majors and areas of study. The largest representation included 35 (8.4%) from Biology, followed by 23 (5.5%) from
Architecture, and 28 (6.7%) from Nursing. To be able to identify characteristics of students interested in various levels of leadership-development, the 50 majors were recoded into six categories. This recoding resulted in the 28% (n = 117) classified as Professional, 18.9% (n = 79) as Applied Sciences, 18.9% (n = 79) as Social Sciences, 16% (n = 67) as Sciences, 13% (n = 56) as Humanities, and 4.8% (n = 20) remained coded as Undecided.

As shown in Figure 1, 59% (n = 247) identified themselves as already involved in leadership; with 40.9% (n = 171) indicating that they were not currently engaged in a leadership activity. Of the 59% of respondents engaged in leadership, 42.1% (n = 176) were involved in one leadership position, 12.9% (n = 54) were involved in two positions, and 4% (n = 17) were involved in three or more leadership positions.

Of the total respondents, 60.8% (n = 254) lived in on-campus residence halls, 4.3% (n = 18) in on-campus apartments (where married students and singles 22+ years are eligible to live), and 34.9% (n = 146) lived off campus. Only 3.2% (n = 13) of respondents identified their GPA as 2-2.49; 14.6% (n = 59) as 2.5-2.99; 32% (n = 129) as 3-3.49; and 50.1% (n = 202) identified their GPA as 3.5 and above.

Current Leadership Involvement

Figure 1. The percentage of respondents currently involved or not involved in leadership activities represented in the sample of the Andrews Leadership-Development Survey.
Presentation of Quantitative Data by Research Question

Research Question 1

Research question 1 sought to determine the perspectives and characteristics of undergraduate students related to leadership-development programs. The undergraduate survey questions 2-9, and 13 were designed to gather data related to this question (see Appendix C). Questions 2-8 were designed on a 4-point Likert scale. Response values were assigned: strongly disagree (SD) =1, disagree (D) =2, agree (A) =3, and strongly agree (SA) = 4.

Tables 3 through 10 present data using cross-table analysis to display what respondents think about various leadership-development delivery structures in relationship to the selected demographic variables of all students, gender, class standing, ethnicity, majors, current leadership involvement, and residency.

Andrews Should Offer a Major in Leadership-Development

The responses to survey question 2, which asked about students’ perspectives regarding Andrews offering a major in leadership-development, are displayed in Table 3. When responses for those who selected agree or strongly agree were combined and responses for disagree and strongly disagree were combined, a robust 70% (n = 291) of respondents thought Andrews University should offer a major in leadership-development and 30% (n = 122) disagreed, for an overall mean of 2.81. Male and female responses were similar with 70% (n =173) of females and 68.6% (n = 118) of males indicating support. In relationship to class status, freshmen showed the strongest agreement at 78.4% (n = 65), while 61.2% (n = 71) of juniors indicated the lowest agreement. Asian respondents had a
Table 3

Survey Question 2: Andrews Should Offer a Major in Leadership-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .661.
higher level of agreement at 87% \((n = 47)\) than the 67.1% of Black \((n = 55)\) and the 67.1% of White \((n = 152)\) respondents who agreed that Andrews should offer a major in leadership-development.

Respondents from the social science field of study indicated the most agreement at 78.5% \((n = 62)\) while 65% \((n = 76)\) of those from the professional areas or who were undecided agreed or strongly agreed that Andrews should offer a major in leadership. Approximately 70% of students both involved in leadership positions and those not involved in leadership activities agreed or strongly agreed. Almost 78% \((n =14)\) of respondents who lived in on-campus apartments and 69.3% \((n = 171)\) of respondents who lived in the residence hall thought Andrews should offer a major in leadership-development.

Overall, as indicated in Table 3, the only areas of statistical difference between diverse categories of demographic variables—regarding respondents’ perspectives about Andrews offering a major in leadership-development—were evident in ethnicity \((F = 2.944; p = .033)\). None of the other demographic variables were significant.

Andrews Should Offer a Minor in Leadership-Development

Table 4 displays the data from the survey question exploring whether Andrews should offer a minor in leadership-development. More than 86% \((n = 360)\) of all respondents believed that Andrews should offer a minor in leadership-development, for an overall mean of 3.11. This was significantly higher than the 70% \((n = 297)\) who indicated Andrews should offer a major in leadership-development.

Eight-nine percent of females (6% more than males) agreed or strongly agreed that
### Table 4

**Survey Question 3: Andrews Should Offer a Minor in Leadership-Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 418; SD = .629.*
Andrews should offer a minor in leadership-development. Freshmen again showed the highest level of agreement at 92.8%, while sophomores showed almost 10% less agreement at 83.1%. Asian respondents registered the highest level of agreement at 90.7%. Ninety-five percent of respondents from the social sciences believed Andrews should have a minor in leadership-development, 15% higher than the 80% of undecided respondents who support offering a minor in leadership-development.

Respondents involved in leadership and those not involved had approximately the same 86% level of agreement. All 18 (100%) of the respondents who lived in the apartments thought Andrews should offer a minor in leadership-development, 15% higher than the support reported by respondents who lived in the residence halls and off campus.

Overall, as indicated in Table 4, the only areas of significant difference between diverse categories within independent variables—regarding respondents' thoughts about Andrews offering a minor in leadership-development—were evident in field of study ($F = 2.361; p = .039$) and approached significance in gender ($F = 3.376; p = .059$). None of the other demographic variables were significant.

**Andrews Should Offer a Certificate in Leadership-Development**

Table 5 illustrates that 88% ($n = 358$) of all respondents (slightly higher than 86.2% of respondents supporting implementing a minor) believed that Andrews should offer an academic certificate in leadership-development for a combined mean of 3.13. Ninety percent of females, compared to 84.3% of their male counterparts, agreed or strongly agreed. At 94.5% all but 5.5% ($n = 3$) of Asian respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Andrews should offer a leadership-development certificate, 8.5% higher than the 86% of
Table 5

Survey Question 4: Andrews Should Offer a Certificate in Leadership-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.697</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.697</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = 637.
agreement from White respondents.

From the academic fields of study, students from the humanities showed the highest level of agreement at 96.4% for a leadership-development certificate program, 16% more than students who were undecided. The data showed 89.9% (n = 222; m = 3.21) of respondents involved in current leadership support a certificate in leadership-development, representing 5.2% more agreement than respondents not involved in leadership activities (m = 3.02).

Overall, as indicated in Table 5, the only areas of significant difference between diverse categories within demographic variables—regarding respondents’ perspectives about Andrews offering a certificate in leadership-development—were evident in gender (F = 4.697; p = .031), ethnicity (F = 3.669; p = .012), and involvement in current leadership activities (F = 8.610; p = .004). None of the other demographic variables showed significant diversity within categories.

Andrews Should Integrate Leadership-Development Into General Education

Table 6 depicts responses related to integrating leadership-development into the General Education curriculum. The approximately 80% (n = 334) of all students who agreed or strongly agreed that leadership-development should be integrated was a higher level of agreement than those (70%) who felt a major should be offered. This represented a lower level of agreement than the 88% of students who supported offering a certificate and the 86.2% of students supporting offering a minor in leadership. Asians registered a 3.17 mean level of support for integrating leadership into General Education, while Whites recorded the lowest mean score of 3.06. Sophomores showed a 5% higher level of
Table 6

Survey Question 5: Andrews Should Integrate Leadership-Development Into General Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .738.
agreement at 83.1% than freshmen at 77.1%.

Students from the humanities showed a higher level of support at 94.7% than the next closest field of study, which was represented by 80% of undecided students who agreed with integrating leadership-development into General Education. (Whereas the humanities also showed the highest mean at 3.25, students from the social sciences had the next highest mean at 3.13.) The 83.8% \((n = 207)\) of students involved with leadership activities represented approximately 10% higher support for integrating leadership-development into the curriculum than students not involved in leadership activities.

Overall, as indicated in Table 6, there were no demographic variables related to respondent thoughts about the integration of leadership-development and General Education that showed significant diversity within categories.

*Andrews University Should Offer an Internship in Leadership-Development*

Table 7 illustrates respondents’ thoughts about Andrews offering internships in leadership-development. This question represents the second highest overall mean at 3.20. In fact, means were fairly high across all respondents. More than 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Andrews should offer leadership internships. Approximately 92% of freshmen and seniors and 84% of sophomores expressed support. One hundred percent of Latinos \((n = 43)\) and 98.1% of Asians \((n = 53)\) agreed or strongly agreed in leadership internships. The level of support for leadership internship by majors ranged from 86.6% of students from the sciences, to 92.9% of students representing the humanities. Students involved in leadership registered a 93.5% agreement that Andrews
Table 7

Survey Question 6: Andrews Should Offer an Internship in Leadership-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .609.
should offer leadership internships, at a 7.5% higher level support (at 93.5%) than students
not involved in leadership activities.

Overall, as indicated in Table 7, the areas of significant difference between diverse
categories within demographic variables—regarding respondents' thoughts about Andrews
offering an internship in leadership-development—were evident in gender ($F = 19.023; p
= .000$), ethnicity ($F = 6.728; p = .000$), and involvement in current leadership activities ($F
= 8.77; p = .003$). The other demographic variables showed no such significant differences.

**Andrews Should Offer a Class in Leadership-Development**

Table 8 portrays students' opinions exploring whether Andrews should offer a class
in leadership-development. Of the survey subset of questions 2-8, students' support for
offering a class in leadership-development reflected the highest means, at 3.44. Support of
a leadership-development class represented a higher level of agreement than that reflected
for leadership internships ($M = 3.20$) and a leadership certificate ($M = 3.13$).

All but 19 students ($n = 418$), 95.4%, agreed or strongly agreed that Andrews
should offer a class in leadership-development. Approximately 96% of White, Black, and
Asians respondents had similar levels of agreement. Ninety percent of undecided students
($n = 19$) agreed or strongly agreed, while 97.5% (all but 2 students) of respondents from the
social sciences felt Andrews should provide a class focused on leadership-development.
Students from the social sciences reflected the highest mean ($M = 3.54$), followed closely
by students involved in leadership activities and students from the apartments, both
indicating a mean of 3.50.
Table 8

Survey Question 7: Andrews Should Offer a Class in Leadership-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .589.
Overall, as indicated in Table 8, the only area of significant difference between diverse categories within independent variables—regarding respondents’ perspectives about Andrews offering a class in leadership-development—was evident in involvement in current leadership activities ($F = 6.374; p = .012$). None of the other demographic variables showed such significant difference.

**Andrews Should Offer a Non-Credit-Based Program**

Respondents’ ideas about a leadership-development program without an academic credit component are displayed in Table 9. Sixty-three percent ($n = 264$) of all students agreed or strongly agreed and 37% ($n = 154$) disagreed or strongly disagreed that a program should not be credit based. These responses represent the lowest means at 2.77 (which reflects the least agreement) regarding what type of leadership-development program respondents felt Andrews should implement.

The highest percentage of those who disagreed or strongly disagreed, by demographic units, included juniors at 40.5% ($n = 47$), Blacks at 46.3% ($n = 38$), professional majors at 43.6% ($n = 51$), and 44.6% ($n = 8$) of students living in the apartments. The lowest overall mean score by demographic unit was reflected in a mean of 2.66 for off-campus respondents.

Overall, as indicated in Table 9, the area of significant difference—regarding respondents’ perspectives about Andrews offering leadership-development that is not credit-based—was found in the demographic variable of ethnicity ($F = 4.980; p = .002$).
Table 9

Survey Question 8: Andrews Should Offer a Leadership-Development Not Based on Academic Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .832.
Respondents' Perceptions Related to Program Options

An overall composite of the data related to survey respondents' levels of disagreement and agreement in response to a variety of leadership-development programs Andrews University could offer are displayed in Table 10. The program options that reflect the strongest agreement among respondents include a class in leadership ($M = 3.44; SD = .589$), an internship in leadership-development ($M = 3.20; SD = .609$), and a certificate in leadership ($M = 3.13; SD = .647$).

Table 10

Respondents' Perceptions Related to Leadership-Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Credit</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 shows the percentages of survey respondents' agreement when the responses for *strongly agree* are combined with responses for *agree.*
Respondents' Agreement Regarding Leadership Programs Andrews Should Offer

Figure 2. Percentage of respondents' agreement related to leadership-development programs Andrews should offer.

Motivation to Enroll in a Leadership-Development Program

Survey question 13 asked respondents to indicate what can best describe their motivation to enroll in a leadership-development program. The survey offered the opportunity to select one or more of the following options: (a) to learn how to use knowledge to influence and change the world, (b) to keep up with the complex changes of society, (c) to prepare for a better job, (d) to develop my leadership potential, (e) to obtain certification or a degree in leadership-development, (f) to acquire academic credit to
complement my current leadership responsibilities, (g) to help me to be more successful in my field, and (h) other. Table 11 depicts a summary of the motivational reasons selected by the respondents of the survey.

The motivation to (d) develop my leadership potential was the most selected option, 73.4% (n = 307). Option (g) to help me be more successful in my field was the next most often selected motivation to enroll, 64.1% (n = 268). The motivational reasons (e) to obtain certification or degree in leadership and (f) to acquire academic credit to complement my current leadership had the lowest level of support (15.3%, n = 64).

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation to Participate</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use knowledge to influence and change world</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up with complex changes in society</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for better job</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop my leadership potential</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain certification or a degree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire credit to complement leadership</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more successful in my field</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3: Leadership-Development Alignment With Andrews Mission

The survey included a subset of three questions (10-12) which provided data related to research question 3. These questions explored the degree that a leadership-development program would help graduates to Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World. Survey respondents’ perspectives about the degree to which participating in
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leadership-development programs could help graduates develop these qualities are displayed in Tables 12-14.

Nearly 88% \((n = 367)\) of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed, resulting in a mean of 3.16, that leadership-development programs would help graduates affirm their faith. More than 94% \((n = 394)\) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, for a combined means of 3.34, that leadership-development programs would help graduates seek knowledge. The number of students \((n = 396)\) who agreed that leadership-development programs would help graduates *Change the World* was almost identical to the number of students \((n = 394)\) who agreed that such program would help graduates *Seek Knowledge*. However, the mean of 3.43 represented an overall highest level of agreement for respondents who felt that leadership-development programs would help graduates *Change the World*.

Overall, undecided majors had the lowest mean \((M = 2.90)\) for connecting leadership-development with the aspect of the Andrews motto, *Affirm Faith*. Latinos and respondents who reside in the apartments reported the highest connection between leadership-development programs and the mission aspect, *Change the World*, with a mean of 3.56.
### Table 12

Survey Question 10: Participating in a Leadership-Development Program Helps Graduates Seek Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .624.
Table 13

Survey Question 11: Participating in a Leadership-Development Program Helps Graduates Affirm Faith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 11: Participating in a Leadership-Development Program Helps Graduates Affirm Faith</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .662.
Table 14

Survey Question 12: Participating in a Leadership-Development Program Helps Graduates Change the World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>6 1.4</td>
<td>16 3.8</td>
<td>190 45.4</td>
<td>206 49.3</td>
<td>418 3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2 .8</td>
<td>11 4.5</td>
<td>100 40.7</td>
<td>133 54.1</td>
<td>246 3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 2.3</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>90 52.4</td>
<td>73 42.4</td>
<td>176 3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>6 7.2</td>
<td>37 44.6</td>
<td>39 47.0</td>
<td>83 3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>40 61.5</td>
<td>24 36.9</td>
<td>65 3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>4 3.4</td>
<td>2 1.7</td>
<td>45 38.8</td>
<td>65 56.0</td>
<td>116 3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1 .6</td>
<td>7 4.5</td>
<td>68 44.2</td>
<td>78 50.6</td>
<td>154 3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
<td>9 3.9</td>
<td>107 46.9</td>
<td>108 47.4</td>
<td>228 3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>5 6.1</td>
<td>27 32.9</td>
<td>49 59.8</td>
<td>82 3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>31 57.4</td>
<td>21 38.9</td>
<td>54 3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>16 37.2</td>
<td>26 60.5</td>
<td>43 3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>3 3.8</td>
<td>5 6.3</td>
<td>34 43.0</td>
<td>37 46.8</td>
<td>79 3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>3 3.8</td>
<td>31 39.2</td>
<td>45 57.0</td>
<td>79 3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>2 3.0</td>
<td>32 47.8</td>
<td>32 47.8</td>
<td>67 3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>24 42.9</td>
<td>31 55.4</td>
<td>56 3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1 .9</td>
<td>4 3.4</td>
<td>57 48.7</td>
<td>55 47.0</td>
<td>112 3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1 5.0</td>
<td>5 5.0</td>
<td>12 12.0</td>
<td>6 6.0</td>
<td>20 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>9 3.6</td>
<td>115 46.6</td>
<td>123 49.8</td>
<td>247 3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>7 4.1</td>
<td>75 43.9</td>
<td>83 48.5</td>
<td>171 3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>2 .8</td>
<td>8 3.1</td>
<td>113 44.5</td>
<td>131 51.6</td>
<td>254 3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>8 44.4</td>
<td>10 55.6</td>
<td>18 3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>4 2.7</td>
<td>8 5.5</td>
<td>69 47.3</td>
<td>65 44.5</td>
<td>146 3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 418; SD = .639.
Research Question 6

Research question 6 concerned what obstacles or challenge would exist to implement an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University.

Barriers to Participation

Survey question 14 explored what barriers students indicated might keep them from engaging in a leadership-development program. Question 15 inquired how time influenced respondents’ ability to participate in leadership-development programs. As shown in Table 15, the barriers identified by respondents most frequently were as follows: 327 respondents selected option (a) having no more time in their academic course plan, and 159 respondents selected option (b) I’m already involved in too many activities. As many as 52 respondents noted a potential barrier as the (c) current level of satisfaction with their leadership expertise. Option (d) relating to lack of interest in leadership-development was selected by 28 respondents, and option (e) leadership-development lacks a relationship to their goals was identified by 40 respondents as a barrier to participating in leadership-development programs. Because this was not a forced choice, percentages were reported within each choice, not across choices. Nevertheless, some comparisons across choices are possible. For example, about twice as many respondents selected no more time available in my academic course than selected I’m already involved in too many activities. Three times as many respondents selected I’m already involved in too many activities than selected I’m satisfied with my level of expertise. About the same selected satisfied with level of expertise as selected unrelated to educational goals.
Table 15

Survey Question 14: Frequency of Barriers Related to Participating in Leadership-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Participating in Leadership-Development</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No time available in my academic course plan</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already involved in too many activities</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not interested in leadership-development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm satisfied with my level of leadership expertise</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not related to my educational goals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No more time available in academic course plan

Within their demographic groups, females (60.6%; n = 198), seniors (40.1%; n = 131), Whites (57.8%; n = 186), and residence hall (62.1%; n = 203) respondents reported most (a) having no more time in their academic course for leadership-development programs.

Already involved with too many activities

Demographic group entities that identified barrier (b) as already involved in too many activities, most often included 22.6% (n = 36) of freshman, 58.3% (n = 91) of Whites, 18.9% (n = 30) of respondents from the sciences, 67.9% (n = 108) of those involved in leadership, and 7.5% (n = 12) of apartment residents.

Satisfied with level of leadership expertise

Demographic groups that expressed satisfaction with their level of leadership expertise at a higher level consisted of 46.2% (n = 24) of males, 23.1% (n = 12) of sophomores, 62.0% (n = 31) of Whites, 14.0% (n = 7) of Asians, 23.1% (n = 12) of social
science majors, 19.2% (n = 10) from the sciences, and 63.5% (n = 33) residence hall respondents.

Not interested in leadership-development

Respondents who indicated they were not interested in leadership-development at a higher level included 48.3% (n = 14) of males, 24.1% (n = 7) of freshmen, 70.4% (n = 18) of Whites, and 34.5% (n = 10) of professional majors. Approximately 79% (n = 23) of respondents who selected as a barrier option *(d) that they were not interested in leadership,* were not currently involved in leadership activities. In this same demographic group in which 59% of the total number of respondents identified themselves as involved in leadership, only 20.7% (n = 6) selected the potential barrier of not being interested in leadership-development. Only 3.7% (n = 1) of Asians, 3.7% (n = 1) of Latinos, and 3.4% (n = 1) of respondent(s) from the Humanities selected as a barrier that they were not interested in leadership-development.

I’m satisfied with level of leadership expertise

Of the respondents who selected *satisfaction with level of leadership expertise,* as a barrier to participating in leadership-development programs, 53.5% (n = 28) were females, 32.7 (n = 17) were seniors, 63% (n = 31) were White, 28.8% (n = 15) were from the applied sciences, 59.6% (n = 31) were involved in leadership, and 53.5% (n = 33) lived in the residence halls.

Leadership-development is not related to respondent goals

Seventy percent (n = 28) of females, whereas only 30% (n = 12) of males, selected
as a barrier option (e) leadership-development is not related to my goals. Of those who selected this barrier, 27.5% \( (n = 11) \) were freshmen and 37.5% \( (n = 15) \) were juniors. Only 10% \( (n = 4) \) of those who selected the lack of a relationship of leadership-development to their goals were from the social sciences and 37% \( (n = 15) \) of these respondents identified themselves as currently involved in leadership.

Table 16

Survey Question 14: Barriers to Participating in Leadership-Development With Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>No more time</th>
<th>Already too involved</th>
<th>Satisfied with expertise</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
<th>Unrelated to goals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Applied</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Self-Assessment of Leadership Qualities

Survey questions 16-23 asked students to assess their leadership qualities related to general categories of Awareness, Congruency and Character, Commitment, Collaboration, Communication, Creative Problem Solver, Citizenship and Service, and Change Agent. As shown in Table 17, respondents generally rated their leadership qualities high, as indicated by means that ranged between 3.00 and 3.49 for all qualities. The one exception, *Know God’s Plan for My Life*, reflected a mean of 2.66. However there were five leadership qualities where more than 15% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating a gap in their development of a specified quality. In order of strongest disagreement, these included, *Know God’s Plan for My Life* (38.2%), *Power of Influence on Others* (20.6%), *Contribute Services to Campus and Community* (19.2%), *Articulate a Compelling Vision* (18.7%), and *Able to Speak Effectively* (15.1%).

Research Question 2

Research question 2 was designed to learn the characteristics of Andrews students interested in participating in leadership-development programs, compared to those who are less interested in participating. This question differs from research question 1 in that question 2 examines students who will likely participate in leadership programs whereas question 1 examines student perspectives about leadership-development programs. Survey subset questions 2-8, 9, 10-12, 16-23, and the demographic questions, 24-31, provided data related to this research question (see Appendix C). Discriminate analysis was used to examine the specified variables to provide insight regarding what type of students would most likely participate in different levels of leadership-development programs.
### Table 17

*Survey Questions 16-23: Students' Self-Assessment of Leadership Qualities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Qualities Assessed</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know God’s plan for my life</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand others</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have code of values and ethics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act with authenticity and integrity</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persists towards goals</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to faith and God</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships with diverse people</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective team member</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective listening skills</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to speak effectively</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to write effectively</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical thinking skills</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to express divergent views</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to solve complex problems</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to volunteer my services</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service campus and community</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate a compelling vision</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong power of influence on others</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to take action and make changes</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Students' Likely Participation

Table 18 exhibits various leadership-development program options. Unlike survey questions 2-8 where students shared perspectives on what Andrews should do, the structure of question 9 was designed to assess what type of leadership-development program students would likely participate in if they were at the beginning of their course of study. Respondents had a forced choice and were able to select only one option (see Appendix C).

Four percent (n = 17) said they would be interested in a leadership major, 12% (n = 52) said they would be interested in a leadership minor, 17% (n = 72) indicated they would be interested in an academic certificate, 11% (n = 46) would be interested in participating in a leadership internship, 38% (n = 158) would take a class in leadership. Only 6% (n = 24) would participate in leadership programs with no academic credit available, and 11% (n = 48) were not interested in any of the above.

According to class status, a much higher percentage of freshmen (18.1%) selected none, than the 7.1% of seniors who indicated the same. Almost twice as many respondents not currently involved in leadership activities (18.1%) identified their interest level as none, than those (6.9%) that are currently involved in leadership.

More than any other leadership-development option, students expressed the highest support for a leadership class. Asians (53.7%), undecided students (50.0%), and juniors (45.7%) were highly favorable to this option. An academic certificate (17.2%) and a minor (12.4%) were the second and third overall choices of students. Within the academic certificate option, apartment students (27.8%), Blacks (23.2%), off-campus students (20.5%), students from the humanities (19.6%), and seniors (19.5%) reported higher support than other groups. For the minor, humanities (19.6%) reported the highest support.
Table 18

Survey Question 9: Respondents’ Likely Participation in Leadership-Development Programs if Beginning Their College Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not credit</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lead Class</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Internship</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Academic Certification</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Applied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependent Variable Preparation: Survey Question 9

Research question 2 was designed to discover the characteristics of undergraduate students of Andrews University who are interested in participating in leadership-development programs. In this study, survey question 9 explored potential participation levels in leadership-development programs if respondents were just beginning their college education and able to select their future course of study. Therefore, survey question 9 was identified as the major dependent variable. The forced-choice structure of the dependent variable, question 9, provided options that were categorical; however, they did not describe or measure the level of interest or participation in leadership-development program choices. In order to more clearly distinguish interest in leadership-development participation, the six options in question 9 were regrouped into one variable with four possible responses, which created an ordinal variable. The four new options were high interest, medium interest, low interest, and no interest.

The responses in question 9 which represented the most concentration and time commitment labeled major in leadership-development, minor in leadership-development, and an academic certificate in leadership-development were combined, recoded as high interest, and assigned a value of 4. The responses to options labeled leadership internship and leadership-development class were combined, recoded as medium interest, and assigned a value of 3. The responses to the option leadership-development not based on academic credit were recoded as low interest, and assigned a value of 2. Responses to the option none of the above were coded as no interest and given a value of 1.

Table 19 exhibits an overall mean of 3.05 for all respondents when the selections of interest in leadership-development were recoded as high (4), medium (3), low (2), and
### Table 19

**Survey Question 9: Respondents' Likely Level of Participation in Leadership-Development if Beginning Their College Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium Interest</th>
<th>High Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Applied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leadership</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $N = 418$; $SD = .924$.

* A *t* test is displayed for the variable of gender.
none (1). A total of 137 students (33.7% of respondents) can be described as having high interest from their indication that they would participate in a leadership-development program that offered either a certificate, minor, or major. A total of 203 students (49.9%) are identified as having a medium level interest from their indication that they would participate in a leadership internship or a leadership class. A low level of interest was identified by 23 students (5.7% of respondents) from their indication that they would participate in leadership-development programs not connected to an academic credit component. There were 44 students (10.8%) who did not select any of the leadership-development program options and were classified as having no interest.

Overall, those who indicated a higher interest in participation in leadership programs (those with the highest means on this recoded variable), were those residing in the apartments ($M = 3.33$), Blacks ($M = 3.21$), those in humanities ($M = 3.20$), those involved in leadership ($M = 3.19$%), and seniors ($M = 3.19$). Those showing lower interest were freshmen ($M = 2.81$), not in leadership ($M = 2.85$), and in the sciences ($M = 2.94$).

In the class-status demographic, seniors registered the highest mean, 3.19, in relationship to their potential participation and freshmen the lowest mean at 2.81. In ethnicity, Blacks with a mean of 3.21 reflected the highest interest and Whites the lowest with a mean of 2.99. In majors, the humanities represented the highest mean of 3.20 and those from the sciences the lowest with a mean of 2.94. Respondents involved in leadership activities indicated a higher mean ($M = 3.19$) in relationship to program participation than those not involved in current leadership activities ($M = 2.85$).

Overall, as indicated in Table 19, the only area of significant difference between diverse categories within demographic groups—regarding what level of
leadership-development students would be interested in participating in—was evident in class standing \((F = 3.110; p = .026)\) and involvement in leadership \((F = 13.473; p = .000)\). Differences within all other groups related to this question were not significant.

**Factor Analysis of Leadership Self-Assessment**

A factor analysis is a multivariate analysis process used by researchers to measure and reduce a large number of variables to fewer variables that are moderately or highly correlated with each other. The wide range of data units and variables found in the survey self-assessment segment—questions 16-23 and their subset of 20 questions—benefited from a factor analysis to determine the variables that clustered with common elements.

From the combined variables, five factors emerged that were further analyzed for reliability. The fifth factor had a low reliability/alpha score of .56. Thus, the loadings (individual variable coefficients) and related questions that correlated close to or below .50 were removed to produce a higher alpha score/reliability score. This process reduced the five factors to four factors. Another reliability analysis was conducted within Factors 1-4. The remaining factors and alpha scores respectively were: .866 (Awareness), .784 (Values), .744 (Service), and .752 (Collaboration). Finally, new variables were created to represent these four new clusters of factors using the sum of the values. The new variables generated became part of the set of independent variables used in the discriminate analysis process.

**Correlation of Selected Variables**

As shown in Table 20, there is a high correlation between students who are likely to participate in leadership-development at higher levels with students who feel *Andrews should* offer leadership-development programs \((r = .402; p < .01)\). There is also a
relationship between students who are likely to participate in leadership-development at higher levels with those who feel that leadership-development will help \((LD \text{ Helps})\) them \textit{Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World} \((r = .302; p < .01)\).

The highest relationship is between students who feel \textit{Andrews should} offer leadership-development programs and students who feel leadership-development will help \((LD \text{ Helps})\) them \textit{Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World} \((r = .634; p < .01)\).

There were also correlations between students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Service} with students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Values} \((r = .376; p < .01)\), high in \textit{Awareness} \((r = .359; p < .01)\), and high in \textit{Collaboration} \((r = .374; p < .01)\). The relationship between students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Values} and students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Awareness} was \(r = .522; p < .01\), and between students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Values} and students that assessed themselves high in \textit{Collaboration} was \(r = .554; p < .01\). Additionally the correlation between students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Awareness} and students who assessed themselves high in \textit{Collaboration} was \(r = .483; p < .01\).

Table 20

\textit{Intercorrelations Between Variables With Students’ Likely Participation in Leadership-Development (LD) Programs (n = 418)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LD Participation</th>
<th>Andrews Should</th>
<th>LD Helps</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.131**</td>
<td>.154**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Should</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>.132**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD Helps</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>.149**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.554**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>.131**</td>
<td>.132**</td>
<td>.149**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correction is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Independent Variable Preparations

Survey questions 2-8 asked respondents what level of leadership-development programs Andrews should offer regarding major, minor, academic certificate, internship, class, and non-credit options. Statistics from questions 2-8 were provided earlier in this chapter (see Tables 3-9). I combined these program options into one new variable by finding the mean of the values and recoded it as AU Should. In order to identify and represent the levels of interest and concentration in leadership program options (1 representing low concentration and 3 representing high concentration), the weight of 1 was given to question 8, representing the program option of leadership-development not based on academic credit. A weight of 2 was given to questions 5 through 7, representing the program options of general education integration, leadership internship and leadership-development class and a weight of 3 was given to questions 2 through 4, representing the program options of major in leadership-development, minor in leadership-development, and an academic certificate in leadership-development.

Survey questions 10-12, asked respondents how leadership-development would align with the Andrews motto components—Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World. Statistics on questions 10-12 were presented earlier in this chapter (see Tables 12-14). I computed questions 10-12 into one variable and recoded as Leadership-Development Helps by finding the mean of the values. Demographic questions related to gender, class standing, ethnicity, and major were restructured using dummy variables, which require the assignment of one less variable than the number of categories.

In survey question 29, respondents were given the option to identify their current involvement in seven identified leadership roles: Student Association, Resident Assistant,
Campus Ministries, Clubs and Organizations, Class Officer, Andrews Ambassador, First Year Family Group Leader, and none (to indicate no current leadership role) or to select other and supply an additional leadership role. Some of the responses that fell into the category marked other were placed in a related existing category. The remaining responses from the category marked other were various types of church related leadership activities and thus were placed in a new category (option 8), labeled as church service. The responses were recoded into two categories, to be able to identify as a group, those involved in leadership and those not involved in leadership. In order to examine the impact of general involvement in leadership and those not involved in leadership activities, those currently involved in leadership activities (options 1-8) were recoded as leader and assigned the value of 1. Those not currently involved in leadership activities (option 9) were coded as no leader and assigned the value of 0. Responses were also restructured so that those who were involved in one leadership position were assigned a value of 1, those involved in two leadership positions were assigned a value of 2, and those involved in 3 or more leadership positions were assigned a value of 3.

The final set of independent variables that were entered into the formula for the process of discriminate computation included the following:

1. Andrews Should offer a leadership (major, minor, certificate, general education, class, internship, none).

2. Leadership-Development Helps me (Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World).

3. Gender: Male, Female

4. Class Standing: Freshmen, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior
5. Ethnicity: White, Black, Asian, and Latino

6. Major: Applied Sciences, Social Sciences, Sciences, Humanities, Professional, and Undecided

7. Self-Assessment Factor Analysis Variable: Awareness, Values, Service, and Collaboration

8. Current Leadership Involvement: Leader, involved in leadership, or no leader, not involved in leadership activities

9. Number of Leadership Positions Currently Held: 1 position, 2 positions, 3 or more leadership positions.

**Results From Discriminate Analysis**

Discriminate analysis is a variation of multiple regression with two or more predictor variables and a single criterion or categorical variable. The variables from the discriminate analysis process were used to predict one of four criterion levels that included: none, low, medium, or high interest in leadership-development.

Table 21 depicts the discriminate analysis process portraying significance in function 1 at .000, well below the standard of \( p = < .05 \). As displayed in Table 21, both function 2 at .110 and function 3 at .251 clearly exceeded the \( p = < .05 \) standard level of significance and were discarded as not significant. However, as also shown in Table 22, 70.3% of the variance that is explainable is related to function 1 and will be interpreted.
Table 21

**Discriminate Analysis of the Functions of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 though 3</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>160.163</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 through 3</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>51.239</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>22.695</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

**Discriminate Analysis of the Variance That Is Explainable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function 1</td>
<td>.309a</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function 2</td>
<td>.073a</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function 3</td>
<td>.058a</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 and Table 24 display the functions of the variables considered in the discriminate analysis process. The first column in Table 23 describes function 1 that is interpretable in terms of undergraduate student characteristics. Table 23 describes how that function is related to interest in participating in leadership-development programs.

A common way to interpret discriminate analysis functions is in relationship to variables that are half or more of the highest correlation. Function 1 shows that students who indicated the higher levels of agreement that Andrews Should offer leadership-development programs (.815) and believe Leadership-Development Programs Help them Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith and Change the World (.637) will most likely participate in the higher levels of leadership-development programs. As noted, the higher
Table 23

_Discriminate Analysis Matrix of Recoded Survey Question 9 (Dependent Variable) and Selected Independent Variables_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
<th>Function 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews should offer leadership-development</td>
<td>.815*</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Development helps</td>
<td>.637*</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.348*</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>-.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership involvement</td>
<td>.340*</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.230*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>-.222*</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior a</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male a</td>
<td>-.166*</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.593*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>-.436*</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.349*</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.146*</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.067*</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of leadership positions</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.344*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.340*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.327*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.276*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided a</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Applied</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.127*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminate functions.

*a. Largest absolute correlation between each variable and any discriminate function
b. This variable is not used in the analysis*
levels of concentration of leadership program participation were identified as a major, minor, and an academic certificate in leadership-development.

The correlations of all other variables in function 1 were less than half of the top variable, *Andrews Should offer leadership-development programs*, and thus are not considered characteristics that are likely predictors of participation levels in leadership-development programs. This means that the characteristics related to students’ gender, class standing, ethnicity, major field of study, involvement in leadership, their self-assessment (recoded variables of service, values, collaboration, and awareness) are not predictors of potential participation in leadership-development programs.

Table 24 shows that the relationship shown in function 1 and the dependent variable. As there is more and more interest in participation there is also a higher score in the function but the relationship is not a linear relationship. Figure 3 graphically portrays that the difference between *none* (-1.469) and the next level, *low* (-.158), is much larger than the difference between *medium* (.090) and *high* (.396). This function discriminates well between *none* and *low* levels of leadership participation but not as well between *low*, *medium*, and *high* levels of leadership participation.

Table 24

*Discriminate Analysis Functions at Group Centroids of Recoded Survey Question 9 in Relation to Level of Participation in Leadership-Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recoded Question 9</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
<th>Function 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-1.469</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>-.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Figure 3. Means of discriminate analysis from function 1 in relationship to the level of interest and likely participation.

In order to determine how well the current classification functions predict group membership of cases, a classification matrix is recommended. Table 25 portrays the results of the discriminate analysis process with four membership groups: none, low, medium, and high, and notes that 47.1% of the original grouped cases were correctly classified. With this in mind, the four groups—1 (none), 2 (low), 3 (medium), and 4 (high)—were recoded into two groups, those with no interest remained at the value of 1, and those that had either low, medium, or high interest in leadership-development were recoded as interest and given the value of 2. The discriminate analysis process was then rerun. As shown in the classification matrix of Table 26, with two group memberships, 1 representing no interest
and 2 representing interest, 80.6% of the cases are now correctly classified.

Table 25

*Discriminate Analysis Classification of Participation Levels With Four Membership Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Interest</th>
<th>1. No Interest</th>
<th>2. Low Interest</th>
<th>3. Medium Interest</th>
<th>4. High Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Interest</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Medium Interest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High Interest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No Interest 66.7% 12.5% 12.5% 8.3% 100
2. Low Interest 20.87% 54.2% 16.7% 8.3% 100
3. Medium Interest 13.7% 21.5% 36.1% 28.8% 100
4. High Interest 14.9% 13.5% 16.3% 55.5% 100

*Note.* 47.1% of the original grouped cases are correctly classified.

Table 26

*Discriminate Analysis Classification of Participation Levels With Two Membership Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Interest</th>
<th>1. No Interest</th>
<th>2. Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Interest</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interest</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No Interest 72.9% 27.1% 100
2. Interest 18.4% 81.6% 100

*Note.* 80.6% of the original grouped cases are correctly classified.
Summary

The data from the survey show that Andrews University students have a high level of interest and agreement that Andrews should offer a variety of leadership-development programs and that leadership-development will help them *Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World.*

The findings also show that students who indicated higher levels of agreement that *Andrews Should* offer leadership-development programs and believe that *Leadership-Development Programs Will Help* them *Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World* will likely participate in the higher concentration levels of leadership-development program options. A discussion of these data in relationship to the findings from the qualitative findings and their implication for Andrews University will follow in chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter I summarize the findings from this study. First, I review prominent issues surrounding the field of leadership-development that informed and fueled this study. Second, I summarize and discuss the results from the qualitative and quantitative phases of the study presented in chapters 4 and 5. Third, I recommend some best practices—promising components—that should be considered in designing leadership-development at Andrews University. Finally, I review the limitations of the study and make suggestions for further study.

Study Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to explore the level of interest of Andrews University students, faculty, and staff in fostering a comprehensive plan for undergraduate leadership-development at Andrews University. In conducting the study, I also examined the desired components of such a program and the challenges inherent in implementing such a plan.

The Need for Leadership-Development

This study emerged on the landscape of a planet rocked by turbulent times and
colossal change. Although history is replete with stories of magnificent, exploited, and squandered leadership, these challenges are more glaring in the dearth of trustworthy leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000; Boyer, 1987; Gini, 2004). The demise of the Industrial Age and the rise of the Information Age have ushered massive changes and challenges in the workplace. Daniel Pink (2005) contends that in the face of rising abundance, globalization, and automation, the Information Age of the knowledge worker is less prominent. As Pink (2005) implies, in A Whole New Mind, employers are calling for a whole new mindset, and value interpersonal and communication skills, team-building skills, critical-thinking skills, and conceptualization skills (Pink, 2005, pp. 2-3). Leadership is needed to meet this challenge.

This new world requires new maps, new navigation systems, and a new generation of leaders who will harness and unleash the untapped treasure of human capital (Komives et al., 1998; Stacey, 1992; Uhl-Bien, 2003; Wheatley, 1999). There is a deep yearning for leadership that identifies the potential in each individual and weaves his or her gift into the fabric of shared vision and goals. This kind of leadership has a remarkable opportunity to transform lives and change the world. But where will this leadership come from?

As noted by Jay Conger (1992), although “the potential to lead is not uncommon, the scarcity of actual leaders is a reflection of neglected development rather than of a dearth of abilities” (p. 29). Higher education has both a responsibility and an opportunity to purposefully develop this new generation of leaders (Astin & Astin, 2000; Boyer, 1987; Brungardt et al., 1997; Gardner, 1990). As advocated by Ciulla (1996), an intentional and planned change is needed: “Different times call for different emphases in education. In the age of information, constant change, and emotional turmoil we can’t develop ethical and
socially responsible students without developing their critical skills and their hearts” (pp. 118-119). This case study of Andrews University examined the feasibility of an undergraduate leadership-development program to develop such leaders.

Growth of Leadership-Development in Colleges and Universities

As noted in the literature review, a wide spectrum of perspectives regarding the meaning of leadership exists, but there also is a consistent concern for the need for leadership-development. As such, although consensus is still missing on the characteristics or components of leadership, many have called for increased leadership preparation. That call has generated the initiation and growth of leadership-development programs in colleges and universities.

According to Schwartz et al. (as cited in Riggio et al., 2003), the number of leadership-development programs doubled from 1994-1998 and “are now embedded in every imaginable discipline.” By 2003, of the almost 1,000 recognized leadership-development programs, more than 100 had formal academic components, ranging from resource centers to academic concentrations, minors, majors, and PhD’s in leadership (Riggio et al., 2003, pp. 223-226). There also has been a growth in co-curricular-based programming—in quality rather than quantity—attributed to the increase in for-credit academic opportunities (Schwartz et al., 1998).

Studies have been conducted regarding leadership-development programs (Breen, 1970; Gregory & Britt, 1987; McMillon, 1997; Olsen, 1999; Simonds, 1979; Wright, 1967), providing information related to effective practices and program models. More recently, the Ayman et al. (2003) study of leadership-development programs found the presence of multi-methods delivery systems but the absence of theoretical foundations and systematic
program evaluation. In addition to this body of research, as noted in chapter 2, I also reviewed Ghodsi’s (2000) feasibility study at Seattle University, Marconi-Hickman’s (2001) study on the design and implementation of a leadership program at Rowan University, and Berg’s (2003) prospective for leadership-development in Canadian institutions of higher education.

The Research Design

The research plan for my study was a mixed-methods design. I gathered data from 418 students—out of approximately 1,527 undergraduate students—who responded to an electronic survey. I selected a purposive sample strategy and interviewed 13 Andrews University administrators, faculty, and staff. The rich data that emerged from these interviews were carefully analyzed and presented in 24 dominant themes in chapter 5. I examined the data that were generated from the mixed-methods design to address the research questions:

1. What perspectives and characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University have related to undergraduate leadership-development programs?

2. What characteristics do undergraduate students of Andrews University interested in participating in leadership-development programs have compared to students less interested in participating in leadership-development programs?

3. How might an undergraduate leadership-development program align with the mission of Andrews University?

4. What level of interest do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews University have for an undergraduate leadership-development program?

5. What components do faculty, administration, and staff of Andrews
University report would be needed for implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

6. What obstacles or challenges would exist in implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University?

Discussion of the Findings

Sampling Considerations

In the design of this study, I selected the entire undergraduate student body for the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey as the sample population to test my assumption that students from a wide spectrum of backgrounds are interested in leadership. Thus, my sample differed significantly from the Ghodsi (2000) study in which he sampled only students currently serving in more-traditional and positional leadership roles (p. 64).

Research Question 1: Student Perspectives and Interest in Leadership-Development

Research question 1 was intended to reveal the perspectives, interests, and characteristics of students regarding leadership-development programs. The results from both the student survey as well as from the faculty, administration, and staff interviews showed strong collaborative agreement regarding students’ strong interest in leadership-development. Figure 4 shows that the survey respondents had positive perspectives about offering leadership-development programs at Andrews University. Both groups—Andrews University undergraduate students and Seattle University’s respondents from leadership roles and disciples—showed similar support regarding their respective University’s offering of leadership programs (Ghodsi, 2000, p. 64). Seventy percent of the survey sample believed that Andrews should offer a major in
leadership-development; 86.2% believed that Andrews should offer a minor in leadership-development, and a robust 88% believed an academic certificate in leadership-development should be available. These high percentages closely reflected Seattle University's 71% who favored a major in leadership-development, 90% who supported a minor in leadership-development, and 83% who supported offering a certificate in leadership-development (Ghodsi, 2000, p. 64).

The University Should Offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Andrews University</th>
<th>Seattle University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should Offer a Major</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Offer a Minor</td>
<td>86.20%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Offer a Certificate</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Comparison of Andrews student perspectives to Seattle student leaders regarding offering leadership-development programs. The data in column 1 are from “A Study to Determine the Interest and Need for an Undergraduate Leadership Development Program at Seattle University,” by Faizi Ghodsi, 2000, Dissertation Abstracts International, 64(11), 3638A, pp. 64, 65.

Alongside the strong support from survey respondents for leadership-development opportunities at Andrews University, there were significant statistical differences within the demographic variables of gender, ethnicity, field of study, and current involvement in leadership activities as reported in chapter 5 (see Tables 2-8). However, these levels of significance difference do not represent disinterest in other groups as there are clearly high levels of interest from all demographic groups.
Research Question 2: Students' Likely Participation in Leadership-Development

The strong support and interest by Andrews University students in leadership-development programs was a clear finding of this study. In addition to indicating high agreement that Andrews should offer such programs, Andrews students indicated strong interest in participating in leadership-development programs.

This finding may be even more significant than the Seattle study because of the use of the *forced-choice* structured questions in this study. A *forced-choice* question structure (Bownas & Bernardin, 1991, pp. 592-594; Cooper, 1981, p. 220) allows only one selection among several options and generates a stronger connection to the actual choice students must make when planning their course of study than does a structure in which respondents reply to all given options. Question 9 in the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey was designed to require from respondents a *forced choice* between the program options of major, minor, certificate, internship, class, not for credit, and the selection of "none" (see Appendix C).

The forced-choice structure also controlled for the *illusory halo effect*. Surveys that are constructed with similarly worded questions and are designed to gather responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree for *all given options* are repetitive in nature. Studies have shown that such construction may result in less careful discrimination on the part of respondents and thus be more prone to the *illusory halo effect* (Bownas & Bernardin, 1991, p. 592; Cooper, 1981, p. 220). The Ghodsi (2000) study survey has such structure in the questions seeking to determine the potential participation of students.

When given no forced choice, respondents may easily agree in high proportion to items that are similarly constructed. Accordingly, this may offer some understanding as to
why 29.8% of the Seattle student leaders selected strongly agree or agree regarding their interest in participating in a leadership-development major, 68% in a minor, 68% in an academic certificate, and 83.5% in a leadership class (Ghodsi, 2000, pp. 69-72). Andrews students were not given such an option but instead were asked to select only one of several choices. This sheds light on why 4.1% \((n = 17)\) of Andrews students indicated interest in a major, 12.4% \((n = 52)\) in a minor, 17.2% \((n = 72)\) in an academic certificate, and 38% \((n = 159)\) in a leadership class, whereas 11.5 \((n = 48)\) indicated they were not interested in participating in any level of leadership-development (see Table 18). However, given this structuring of questions, the results are likely to be a more realistic estimate of actual Andrews student participation in leadership-development program options.

Given the rigor of the structure of survey question 9 in the Andrews Leadership-Development Survey, it is realistic to extrapolate some indication of the level of serious interest that Andrews students may have in participating in leadership programs. If the sample is indicative of the population, Figure 5 suggests some possible extrapolated figures. As many as 62 \((1,527 \times 4.1\%)\) students may be willing to take a leadership major, 189 \((1,527 \times 12.4\%)\) students a leadership minor, and 262 \((1,527 \times 17.2\%)\) students an academic certificate in leadership. Overall, 33.7% of the students who took the survey indicated likely participation in higher levels of leadership-development programs—a major, minor, or certificate.

Therefore, as shown in Figure 5, this could mean that as many as 514 of the entire undergraduate Andrews student population could potentially participate in leadership-development programs, including a major, minor, and certificate. Consequently, if Andrews University selected one of these three levels of leadership-development
concentration, such as an academic certificate, it is conceivable that those who may have leaned toward a major or minor might consider participating in the available academic certificate, thus generating a pool of 514 likely participants.

Figure 5. Respondents’ interest and likely participation in leadership-development in a forced-choice selection process extrapolated to total undergraduate population.

The interviews concurred with the survey data. Twelve of 13 respondents anticipated that Andrews University students would be interested in a more formalized leadership-development program. One exclaimed, “If we can . . . have some new ways of teaching leadership, I think the students would just eat it up” (R13, p. 98). Another respondent reflecting on experiential-learning aspects declared, “The students would be absolutely ecstatic and probably would respond very favorably” (R5, p. 31).

One respondent predicted that “there will be many students who are not leader types” (R9, p. 64). However, several respondents passionately called for a leadership program designed to attract and transform those who express interest in leadership as well
as those who may see themselves as leaders (pp. 19, 41, 56). Furthermore, this finding is also supported by leadership theories emerging from the late 20th century that contend that leadership and leadership-development should not be restricted to the extraordinary or chosen few (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Gabriel, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Mahoney, 2000; Uhl-Bien, 2003).

As noted in chapter 5, the sample was pulled from a cross-section of the entire undergraduate population. The robust finding of nearly 34% \( n = 514 \) students of the undergraduate student body expressed interest in participating in the higher more concentrated levels of leadership-development, suggests that leadership-development programs at Andrews University would have relatively high enrollment and *should be available to all students*. Some detractors might suggest that this interest may not translate into actual student participation. However, given the widespread interest across many types of students, these findings do suggest that if made available, a wide array of students would respond. Thus a leadership-development program should *not* be designed for a select few.

**Discriminate Analysis and Predicting Variables**

Research question 2 was designed to determine the characteristics of students more likely to participate in leadership-development programs compared to students less interested in participating in leadership-development programs. Discriminate analysis reported in chapter 5 showed that only two variables were actual predictors of students more likely to participate in higher levels of leadership-development program options—major, minor, and certificate. These were Andrews students who indicated high levels of agreement that (a) *Andrews should* offer leadership-development programs and
(b) leadership-development programs will help students Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World. Interestingly, these two predictors signify some of the highest levels of interest and perspectives in agreement with leadership-development represented in the Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey (see Tables 10, 12-14).

The discriminate analysis also showed that the variables of gender, class standing, ethnicity, major field of study, self-assessment of leadership values, and current involvement in leadership are not predictors of likely participation in leadership-development programs. One major reason for a lack of characteristic predictors may be the low variability in the dependent variable—interest in participating in leadership-development programs—or generally high interest found in every demographic group.

Differences Within Demographic Variables

As shown in Table 19, the only areas of significant difference between diverse categories within demographic variables—regarding students' likely participation in various levels of leadership-development—were evident in class standing ($F = 3.110; p = .026$) and involvement in leadership ($F = 13.473; p = .000$). The data showed that more than twice as many freshmen (18%; $n = 15$) than seniors (7.1%; $n = 11$) indicated no interest in participating in leadership-development. Conversely about 15% more seniors than freshmen (39.5% of seniors; 24.1% of freshmen) expressed a high level of interest in participating in leadership-development programs. Seniors' greater interest may be the product of 3 to 4 additional years of exposure to opportunities for cognitive development and actual leadership engagement as well as of their impending interest in full-time employment. On a related note, more than twice as many students not involved in
leadership activities (18.1%; \( n = 31 \)) selected \textit{no interest in participating in leadership-development} than those involved in leadership activities (6.9%; \( n = 17 \)).

Notwithstanding the finding that students involved in leadership activities and seniors reported higher levels of interest in participating in leadership programs, the level of significance as well as the data \textit{do not indicate an absence of interest in the other groups}. Clearly, a robust 76.6% (\( n = 131; \ M = 2.85 \)) of students not involved in leadership and 74.7% (\( n = 62; \ M = 2.81 \)) of freshmen indicated that if they were beginning their college education they would participate in medium or high levels of leadership-development programs (see Table 19). As such, the data do not support exclusively targeting leadership-development programming for either seniors or those involved in leadership activities.

Research Question 3: Leadership-Development Alignment With Mission

Research question 3 asked how an undergraduate leadership-development program would align with the mission of Andrews. The findings from both the student survey and the interviews indicate that most see leadership-development programs as strongly linked to the central mission of Andrews University as articulated in the motto, \textit{Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World}.

The mission alignment with leadership-development was evidenced by the frequency (in the top 5 of the 26 themes) in which the theme emerged in the interview conversations. Approximately 88%-95% of the survey respondents and 100% of interview respondents indicated that leadership-development had direct alignment with elements of \textit{Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and Change the World}. As noted in chapter 4, the hesitation
expressed by 2 respondents had more to do with the universal nature of the motto than with a sense of misalignment (R5, p. 30; R10, p. 70).

As reported in chapter 4, some respondents believed that in one aspect of the motto, *Change the World*, there was a gap between theory and practice. Arguably, this may be a strong rationale for the development of an action-orientated leadership-development program. The respondent’s view that leadership-development may be necessary to achieve the ambitious vision of changing the world is noteworthy.

This [leadership] is an integral part of what the mission is all about. As I said before, we don’t want to just train students to be even just good thinkers—that’s part of it—but to participate in their community and thus to be leaders. A person with an education today needs to use that education in some kind of leadership position if Andrews is all about changing the world. That’s pretty ambitious, but in order to do that you need some kind of leadership principles instilled in our product. (R2, p. 9)

Research Question 4: Administration, Faculty, and Staff Interest in Leadership-Development

Although most (10 of 13) respondents’ comments regarding faculty interest in leadership-development were generally positive, some were qualified, noting that faculty support would be dependent on how things were linked to what was already being done. Some respondents even predicted ample resistance and identified curriculum changes as a major source of resistance (R5, p. 31; R11, p. 81). One respondent acknowledged that although educators prided themselves on creative thinking, they were reluctant to change their routines to new activities (R2, p. 10). Not surprisingly, given the closer proximity of academic deans to program implementation, respondents stated that deans would have more program-design concerns than would the President and vice presidents, who would generally favor leadership-development programming.
Finally, almost unanimously, respondents indicated that the Andrews staff would not only be supportive but also would and should play a significant role in leadership-development. They identified residence halls, student clubs and organizations, campus ministries, athletic and intramural sports, and mentoring in the workplace as optimal arenas for staff involvement in leadership-development. The opportunity to harness the underutilized resources of staff will be discussed in more depth in my recommendations for best practices.

Several respondents reported that the challenge to grow enrollment and improve quality programming with shrinking resources has created opposition to the propagation of new programs. At the same time, the promise of new programs has the opportunity to attract new students. In spite of the challenges, as respondents expressed their willingness to embrace collaborative endeavors that seek to bind together and ignite the campus, they mirrored the level of dedication of Andrews University administrators, faculty, and staff (R6, p. 47; R8, p. 61; R9, p. 69).

**Recommendations**

Research Question 5: Best Practices for Andrews University

*Best practices* are the program designs and activities that are found to be most effective. In the context of this study, the following summary of recommended *best practices* for undergraduate leadership-development programming at Andrews University emerged:

1. *Centrality of Mission Alignment.* There was a clear alignment of leadership-development with Andrews University’s mission. This was evident in student interest in leadership-development. It was also evident in the interviews (R4, p. 23; R1, p. 225).
Although there was positive response related to a leadership-development curriculum supporting aspects of the Andrews motto, *Seeking Knowledge* and *Affirming Faith*, there was significantly less reported practice aligning Andrews graduates’ preparation to *Change the World* (R6, p. 41; R2, p. 9). A carefully designed leadership-development agenda would have to clearly strengthen the undergraduate experience to provide a collaborative effort to better equip students to change the world.

2. **Identification as a Priority and Embraced Campuswide.** Seven respondents advocated that an effective leadership-development program must be advanced as a University priority (R4, p. 28; R5, p. 37; R10, pp. 73-74). Several pointed out that three multiple campus entities—(a) a strategic planning team, (b) a strategic financial-planning team, and (c) a strategic development team—are simultaneously trying to determine University priorities. They further expressed the need for these conversations to be united into one plan. The risk of regressing to hierarchical directives that could grow out of a sense of confusion or exhaustion was evident in one respondent’s plea, “Just tell me which one is most important” (R4, p. 28). Unheralded as a University priority, it was noted that leadership-development chatter could float aimlessly in a sea of many voices and never lead to change.

3. **Building on Current Resources.** From the interviews it appears that in designing a program model, administrators should conduct a complete audit of available leadership resources. The most effective kind of audit would deconstruct the entire campus to determine how leadership can “infuse every element of life on campus” (R4, p. 25) and become a part of existing practices and student experiences.
This audit would reveal valuable potential resources in (a) existing academic and student life components, (b) workplace mentoring opportunities, (c) opportunities for learning from diverse cultures and viewpoints, (d) external local and national human resources, (e) national organization resources for effective leadership-development models, and (f) internal and external fiscal resources. These areas are reviewed below.

a. Academic and student life opportunities. A comprehensive audit would highlight a host of current curricular and co-curricular resources and activities already taking place at Andrews University that should be integrated into a leadership-development agenda. A partial list was developed by the Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce (see Appendix A). A faculty focus group conducted during this study showed that a number of faculty were already promoting leadership through experiential learning, service learning, and team-building activities. A key administrator concluded that if the current curricular leadership activities were harnessed in a comprehensive plan there would be great leadership-development potential for undergraduate students. She encouraged, “It isn’t going to be an uphill battle where we have to go and coerce people,” because they are already involved (R3, p. 18). In the context of learning leadership outside the classroom, a respondent recommended to “start by putting formality or intentionality into your co-curricular” (R9, p. 67). In addition, rather than adding too many courses, a successful plan should intentionally integrate the rich variety of engagement already happening through first-year orientations, student-led ministries, and training and development for campus organizations (R4, p. 14).
b. Workplace mentoring. The workplace as a forum for learning leadership could begin with the organizational team that directs student employment. This team should determine current effective efforts to learn leadership in the workplace and develop an agenda of strategies for further development. The goal could be to regularly engage all employees in an active role of enacting the mission of one's institution. This will be further described in the best practice related to inclusive programming.

c. Diversity. With the exploding focus on global leadership, Andrews University has an optimal opportunity to harness its international and domestic diversity—sixth in the nation for its percentage of international students and 14th in the nation for ethnic diversity—as a rich learning laboratory (“What Are National Universities?” 2006). As noted in chapter 5, although there was strong interest in participating in leadership-development opportunities across all ethnic entities, Black (m = 3.21), Latino (m = 3.14), and Asian (m = 3.09) students indicated higher overall means than did Whites (m = 2.99).

d. Human resources. There are people interested in Andrews University success inside and outside of the University who may be interested in fostering the development of leadership in Andrews University students. Leadership-development can be facilitated through the support of all faculty and staff, as well as with other recognized local or national leaders (R10, p. 74).

e. National resources. A collaborative leadership-development program should embrace the host of national organizations, conferences, centers, and publications now available as detailed in chapter 2.
f. Fiscal resources. Concerns about current financial constraints appeared 36 times in respondent conversations, representing the third highest theme frequency. Andrews University either would have to keep this program to a minimal additional cost or raise funds for this program. However, the reshaping of current internal resources should not be overlooked. Megan Forbes and Angie Vineyard (2006) also suggested that administration should pursue avenues of outside funding from private donors and foundations (pp. 159-166). Harnessing multiple resources would be a central challenge and would be more than a wise economic strategy. As noted by one respondent, our ability to have an impact on as many students as possible is directly related to our ability to weave leadership into activities that they are already involved in (R1, p. 2).

4. Multi-faceted and Multi-disciplinary. Given the fact that students from many disciplines were interested in leadership-development programs (see Tables 2-9), and given the collaboration required to utilize existing leadership opportunities and fiscal resources, a campuswide multi-disciplinary model is the only recommended approach (R6, p. 43; R12, p. 86; Riggio et al., 2003). A respondent noted that some at Andrews may believe that leadership separated from a discipline lacks rigor and is called “hokey” (R9, p. 69). Nevertheless leadership is an essential component in all disciplines and it would be wise to infuse it throughout all disciplines (R6, p. 43; R9, p. 69; R12, p.92). To do that, a multi-disciplinary structure is needed.

Although success would depend on interdisciplinary approaches that employ a holistic environment, it might be easier “said than done.” In The Leadership Pie: Grab Your Piece Before It’s Gone, Penny Pennington (2005) described the growing cynicism...
regarding current collaborative efforts. After a vivid description of the confusion and competition, using the metaphor, *when there are too many cooks in the kitchen*, she questioned,

> Is it naïve to hope for collaboration, to pool our efforts to make sure that the expertise and talents of our faculty are fully utilized? Can we quit arguing about who gets what piece of the pie, but rather work from the common ground we do share—the student learning? How can we ensure leadership for all? . . . Are we allowing equal opportunity for everyone to join the ranks? (pp. 77-78)

As the interview responses indicated, a successful outcome of this enterprise would require a paradigm that—in the processes of assuring full loads of teaching faculty—refuses to be immobilized by pressures of productivity and tuition dollars (R6, p. 44; R13, p. 103). A successful collaborative structure would have to free academic departments from the unhealthy rubric of competition for credits or rivalry to attract students away from other disciplines to join their department. Some respondents believed that a fluid collaborative venture that would focus on what adds value for our students should and could happen (R6, p. 44). The multi-faceted, multi-disciplinary leadership program that would emerge could be marketed to all campus entities, prospective students, and employers as a value-added ingredient of all aspects of an Andrews education and employment opportunity.

5. *Programming for all students*. The once-prevalent view that leaders are born—and its adjunct that leadership is for a select few—still lingers in modern culture and at Andrews (R9, p. 64). However, research supports the notion that everyone can learn leadership skills (Astin & Astin, 2000; Doh, 2003; Gemmill & Oakley, 1992; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; McGill & Slocum, 1997; Parks, 2005; Rost, 1991; Tubbs & Schulz, 1994; Watt, 2003; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 2000). As Conger (2004) explained,
our foundations for leadership qualities of self-confidence, achievement drive, communication skills and interpersonal competence are formed principally in our family environments. . . . However, research suggests that successful performance in most forms of work endeavors can be attributed to experience and coaching, rather than simply to in-born talent or early-life experiences. (pp. 136-7)

Furthermore, Joseph Raelin (2004) noted that leadership-development is reported to be a $50 billion-a-year enterprise, suggesting that there is a great investment in the belief that leadership can be learned. I believe that such evidence along with the widespread student interest and views expressed by several respondents supports the need for leadership-development at Andrews to be designed for all students.

Ron Heifetz’s (1994) depiction of the heart of leadership being primarily about discovery of purpose is a helpful framework for understanding why leadership can be learned by all. Kouzes and Posner’s (1987) challenge to work together to “liberate the leaders within each and every one of us” (p. 387) is a key reminder that everyone—students, faculty, and staff—has something to learn, something to teach, and something to contribute. The supreme value that each individual is created in the image of God for a holy purpose is a core tenet of the Christian heritage and of the educational values of Andrews University.

A leadership-development program at Andrews University should be created to attract and develop opportunities for all types: likely leaders who may need to learn relational leadership and the gift of humility, as well as unlikely leaders who may catch a vision, and in so doing, seek an educational experience to fulfill that vision (R3, p. 19; R6, p. 41). Some students may have a vision but no map. Others may have a map but no vision. Some may be awaiting only a vision-caster—a caring mentor to make the journey with them. Everyone can be transformed as they catch and practice the vision.

Although some students may desire and select a deeper level of
leadership-development concentration and actual engagement with leadership
opportunities, a campuswide action plan that would include a common leadership language,
a reshaped General Education, and a strengthened array of curricular and co-curricular
pedagogies and activities would provide accessibility and potential impact for all.

6. Inclusive Programming. Student responses and faculty and staff interviews
indicated that the best way to target all students is to have a comprehensive
leadership-development plan that is designed to penetrate all campus areas. This would
include (a) General-Education leadership components, (b) an academic certificate or
concentration, (c) strengthened integrated co-curricular components, and (d) mentoring in
the workplace.

education programs in most institutions are still notably lacking in requirements or
other content that focuses either directly or indirectly on leadership” (p. 3).
However, several respondents expressed concern about the fireworks ahead for
anyone who would dare to change the current General Education structure (R5, p.
31; R10, p. 76). Still, there appeared to be consensus that General Education was one
of the areas that should be infused with leadership-development (R2, p. 3; R3, p. 18;
R7, p. 51; R8, pp. 57-58; R11, p. 83). Almost 80% of students who responded
indicated that leadership-development needed to be part of General Education. As
noted in Table 10, 95.4% (n = 399) of students believed that Andrews should offer
a class in leadership-development. This was the highest mean (M = 3.44) of student
support for various levels of leadership-development. Although Andrews might
consider offering a class in leadership to undergraduate students, to do so in a
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manner that is accessible to all students would require integration into some aspect of General Education. A number of respondents noted the commonalities between the current General-Education service-learning class and leadership-development. Thus, if initially it is prohibitive to add additional credit requirements to the General Education package, an expansive plan to include leadership-development in the service-learning class offers a promising General Education prospect.

b. *Academic certificate.* Student responses (see Table 16) and employee interviews indicated that a credit-based approach with an academic certificate would provide a desirable emphasis in leadership-development (R8, p. 58; R1, p. 1; R2, p. 12; R3, p. 21; R12, p. 90). A certificate might be comprised of 12 credits: an introductory course, cognate courses offered in a student’s current program, co-curricular experiences, mentoring, a change project, a capstone seminar, and a portfolio. This modest concentration in leadership-development, as proposed by the Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce, would harness existing resources, courses, and co-curricular activities in a flexible framework that would be ideal for students with full course plans and already packed schedules (see Appendix A).

c. *Integrated co-curricular components.* Respondents also viewed co-curricular activities as crucial in leadership-development. Opportunities could be integrated with an academic certificate in leadership or be available for students who have full course plans but who desire to maximize learning. One respondent’s advice brought together two opposing respondent views—those who felt students and faculty were too busy to take additional work and those who believed that some
would gladly take on any new creative idea. Given the hectic, chaotic lives of students and faculty, the respondent advised that a credit-based option should be part of a formalized leadership-development plan (R8, p. 56).

d. Workplace mentoring. Mentoring in the workplace provides a wealth of leadership learning opportunities. According to Morgan McCall, Michael Lombardo, and Ann Morrison (1988), the most powerful influence for leadership development occurs in the context of engagement in work experiences rather than in the formal classroom. Gardner (1990) concurred: “But where leadership development is the goal, the most effective arena for growth continues to be the workplace” (p. 173). Bass (1990) noted a study of graduates who reported that they rarely used the skills learned from their academic degree-program in their first work assignment, hence concluding that leadership is learned by “serving as a leader” (pp. 553-583).

Conger (1992) contended that “certain types of work experiences emerge as the primary development forces behind leadership” (p. 30). For example, researchers concur that the experiences that become the most memorable and “are the best teacher” are presented in the form of challenging and difficult tasks (McCall et al., 1988, pp. 17-18).

7. A Strong theoretical foundation and practice that coalesce with and propel the mission of Andrews. Student responses and administration, faculty, and staff interviews indicated that the institutional mission should have a central role and that the mission should be fused with a strong theoretical framework. Within this frame the cherished core values of a Seventh-day Adventist education is the development of the whole person:
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To restore in man the image of his Maker, to bring him back to the perfection in which he was created, to promote the development of body, mind, and soul, that the divine purpose in his creation might be realized—this was to be the work of redemption. This is the object of education, the great object of life. (White, 1900, pp. 15-16)

Leadership-development at Andrews University that would be holistic in theory and practice—seeking to develop the whole person: mind (Mens), body (Corpus), and spirit (Spiritus)—would provide a strong link to Adventist core educational values (R1, p. 1; R4, p. 29).

Three unique components that were mentioned as part of the fabric of Andrews University could be embedded in the model. These include incorporating (a) the ethical-service framework, (b) the work of leading students to discover their life purpose, and (c) the microcosm of the global community.

a. Ethical-Service framework. Potts (2001) contended that whereas "management has to do with survival; leadership is service" (p. 15). In the context of an educational environment, the seeking of knowledge is considered a supreme act. However, if the seeker fails to act on the acquired knowledge, there is no leadership. A leader's acquisition of an encyclopedia full of knowledge is a worthless exercise if he or she cannot apply that knowledge when facing a crisis. As Michele Doyle and Mark Smith (2001) explain, "Wisdom is not something that we possess like a book or computer. It is a quality that appears in action. . . . Wisdom is wrapped up with morality" (Learning section, para. 3). The image of goodness portrayed in Micah 6:8 is filled with action, "He hath shown thee or man what is good. Act justly and love mercy and to walk humbly with our God."

As one respondent pointed out, rather than thinking of leadership as the
person in charge, the concept of leadership is more about *living leading lives*:

"Leadership nowadays is also a term used to describe the life of a person who . . . focuses the life in such a way that the living of their life is a model for others to follow" (R7, p. 48). As important as it is for leaders to be able to articulate a compelling narrative, it is far more important for them to be ethical leaders who epitomize the story, act their calling, and serve others.

b. *Discovering a purpose.* As Heifetz (1994) contended and experience teaches, leadership is born primarily from a *sense of purpose.* A respondent noted that “this is the time to reflect on who and what God is calling them to be” (R6, p. 40). However, the data from the survey showed that 38.2% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they knew God's plan for their life. In spite of strong interest in leadership, if Heifetz (1994) is correct, 4 out of 10 Andrews undergraduate students lack the very seed of leadership. This finding suggests a critical need for leadership-development programming to help students to *discover their purpose.*

Malcolm Gabriel (2006) contended that rather than selecting key individuals for leadership positions, leadership-development was about discovering the key strengths of each individual and aligning that to a discovery of purpose or pursuing a calling (p. 39). *The Center for Life Calling and Leadership* of Indiana Wesleyan University offers insight as to how discovering one’s purpose could be incorporated into a leadership-development program (Bill Millard, personal communication, April 20, 2005). The Indiana Wesleyan model is uniquely designed to revolutionize the educational process by guiding students to find their life calling, rather than just a career. As a respondent reflected, “[leadership] draws together a
number of things that we really, really value in Seventh-day Adventist education such as the development of character, purpose, and calling in a person’s life” (R1, p. 110). Combined with the service component, students can work out their calling as they work on service. They can discover their calling while serving.

c. Global community. An exploding new priority of leadership education is international awareness and global competency. It is a new paradigm for educators to prepare students to be successful partners in our dynamic global society (Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Robinson, 2005). The super-highway of the World Wide Web has made current college students the first generation of graduates who will truly communicate in a global arena (Grossman, 2006). A leadership-development program on the international campus of Andrews University has the potential to create an environment that would foster global understanding and service to the world. This fertile landscape of interaction with others of different nationalities and ethnicities would also help each student embrace the global gospel commission, Go ye into all the world. “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations” (Matt 24:14). As a faith-based, purpose-driven, microcosm of the global community, Andrews University has the mission and the raw materials to shape a strategic and distinctive niche of leadership-development.

8. Praxis—Integration of Theory and Practice. It may be that Christian university communities are more prone to fail to integrate theory and practice. As Dwight K. Nelson (2007), senior pastor of the Andrews University parish, noted, “I’ve lived around this Christian community long enough to know that the presence of orthodoxy—right thinking—is ever threatened by the absence of orthopraxy—right practicing.” Joan Wink
(1997) views the pedagogy of praxis as “the constant reciprocity of our theory and our practice” (p. 48), and according to Moacir Gadotti (1996) it is “hope and action together” (p. xxiii). Thus, although theory and practice are essential components of leadership-development, they are impotent unless fused together in praxis.

Leadership learned and practiced equips the learner with a deeper understanding of knowledge and most importantly with the acumen to act wisely. Coming to a deeper understanding of the theoretical framework and learning how to practice and make wise choices to respond to change and need is one of the highest possible outcomes of higher education (Astin & Astin, 2000; Heifetz, 1994; Watt, 2003). An essential connective ingredient in the integration of theory and practice is reflection (R3, p. 21; R6, p. 46; R12, pp. 91-92). The digestion of data as a precursor to articulating meaning prepares and helps the process of making good choices. Collaboration, critical thinking, communication, interpersonal relationships, change making, and so forth are powerful skills and tools that, with practice, would prove to be far more valuable than the ability to regurgitate answers or make charming speeches (R5, pp. 35-36).

The design of a comprehensive leadership-development enterprise calls for leading pedagogies and holistic delivery systems to put theories into practice and words into action and to connect the head with the heart and the hands (R8, p. 62). Foundational to a shared leadership outcome would be a shared learning quest to discover the complex and powerful process of leadership in the context of experiential learning. Such a framework of integrating theory and practice would call upon Andrews University to actually be a model of the integration of leadership theory and practice. This would require Andrews University to become a culture of leadership for every member of its community, those paid
by the University and those who pay tuition to the University.

The Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce selected several established leadership-development programs for the purpose of making site visits. On one such visit, Bonnie Pribush, Franklin’s director of leadership-development, described the birth of the Franklin College model, which was fueled by a revelation from personal consultation with John Gardner (1990), a well-known leadership sage. Gardner (1990)—who insisted that leadership was, first and foremost, a rejuvenation of teaching on campus—generated a transformation in the Franklin faculty from “What will we do to students to what will we do to ourselves to how will we teach?” (Bonnie Pribush, personal communication, March 22, 2006). After several years of implementation, Franklin’s academic administrators, David Brailow and Tim Garner (2006), lamented a focus on content and requirements and concluded that the most significant leadership-development innovations are not so much in course content as in pedagogies (personal communication, March 22, 2006). As Garner further noted, “Somehow, we tend to think that by merely controlling course input we can control student output” (personal communication, March 22, 2006).

The Franklin model has emerged from having a focus on course content, to having a focus on making leadership-development transparent in the process of education. “We see leadership-development as a way of focusing on how students learn and on how to help faculty achieve the maximum outcomes appropriate for their disciplines” (David Brailow & Tim Garner, personal communication, March 22, 2006). In order to inspire and infuse such a vision and path for the practice of transparent leadership-development, I recommend the design of a pedagogical summit for all employees of Andrews University. This could
revolutionize how we teach, how our students learn, and most importantly how our students are transformed—mind, body, and spirit.

9. Have a Flexible-Structure. Several contradictory and even oxymoronic claims have to be realized in a leadership-development program. Several of these tensions are evident in these contradictions: flexible verses structured, organic verses formal, and diversity verses university. These word-pairs describe seemingly opposing frameworks that must be woven into the fabric of leadership-development at Andrews University. Respondents called for a simple, fluid, organic, and adaptable plan to maximize the contribution of teachers and learners from every discipline and from every arm of the campus (R11, p. 83; R1, p. 7; R4, p. 24; R9, p. 69). At the same time, without some intentional, formal structure, the multiple facets of a flexible system are so elusive that individuals would be left without ways to celebrate and document their leadership journey. What is valued should be measured and celebrated. Thus, if leadership-development is identified as a priority of Andrews University and made accessible to all students, the development journey should be marked and recognized with the credibility of other distinctive academic entities such as credits, grades, and transcripts. The successful completion of an academic certificate or concentration in leadership should be recognized in graduation ceremonial documentation and symbols. An avenue to document non-credit-based leadership activities could be the format of a developmental transcript.

The Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce suggested that an electronic portfolio for both curricular and co-curricular leadership activities could provide useful structure. This format could be a valuable tool for students to document their growing skills and substantiate learning outcomes in their leadership-development journey.
A portfolio would also produce a marketable product for future employment (see Appendix A).

In addition to the tensions between flexibility and structure, leadership programming would also have to deal with the need for diversity and individuality as well as foster a unity of purpose. For example, one respondent stated that Andrews should never give up its diversity of thought and mused, “If all that diversity can be harnessed and united for the single purpose of changing the world, then I think we have a very powerful thing going” (R1, p. 7).

Despite varied views on the meaning of leadership and how leadership should be developed, there was strong consensus among respondents that students needed to have the experience of leadership-development. They represent diverse voices on the same unified theme. The need to grow the individuals while simultaneously growing communities presents another important challenge. Therefore leadership-development programming at Andrews University must maintain a healthy tension between shared community values and enough diversity to meet individual, church, and global needs.

One respondent helped to frame the issue of these tensions by noting the need to navigate through the maze of leadership conversations and “pick a pathway that is practical, that is promising, and that is forward looking instead of backward looking” (R7, p. 54). In order to balance these tensions, Andrews must resist the tendency to follow in another’s footsteps, “to copy and paste” another institution’s programs and, instead, step boldly and imaginatively forward in the image of Andrews, creating a distinct international Adventist legacy of leadership (R7, p. 54; Ainsley, 2006). Thus, these best practices should be considered within the context of promising new bold practice.
Create a Value-Added Culture. This study started with my interest in examining the feasibility of a leadership-development program at Andrews University. Throughout the study, it became increasingly evident that a singular “program” would fall short. Andrews should have several programs and, at best, Andrews should create a culture of leadership-development that permeates the whole campus. This was one of those subtle findings that has significant meaning for Andrews University planning. Most students and employees would welcome a well-crafted leadership-development program, but it seemed that many of them would embrace even more a better-crafted culture of leadership woven into the fabric of Andrews University. A respondent shared this appropriate metaphor from the business world for envisioning such a value-added culture of leadership:

BASF is a chemical company that adds value to other people’s products through collaborative effort. Their marketing slogan says, “We don’t make a lot of the products you buy; we make a lot of the products you buy better.” For instance, an ad might say, “We don’t make the ball; we make the ball bounce higher” or “We don’t make the bridge; we make the bridge more durable.” (R1, p. 8)

In an educational environment where the focus is more on the concern related to the proliferation of courses than on the desire for new programs, the analogy might be, “We won’t teach most of the classes you’ll take; we’ll teach you how to make the most of them.” Creating a culture of leadership is “finding ways to assemble the best of what a liberal-arts education has to offer, and re-delivering it in ways that help students use what they know more effectively for the good of churches, communities, and workplaces” (R1, p. 8).

The most transforming kind of leadership-development is not about creating a new class or program. Leadership-development is not “another” product; it is about adding value to our existing products. Value is added as we draw together the various
elements of our whole-person education into a cohesive journey—to make an impact on the way that teachers teach, that work supervisors mentor, that student-life professionals train, and that students discover and develop—and thus infuse the entire culture of Andrews University. Ultimately the most powerful added-value to the culture of Andrews University may be in the immeasurable value that comes from the unifying process of campus-wide collaboration to fully embrace leadership-development. As Kotter (1999) so aptly proclaimed, “Institutionalizing a leadership-centered culture is the ultimate act of leadership” (p. 65). To emphasize the importance of a comprehensive, campus-wide framework, the chair of the Andrews Leadership-Development Taskforce created an action agenda for the development of a culture of global leadership (see Appendix A).

11. Be Collaborative. If leadership-development is designed with a shared vision that engages all campus entities in the enterprise, the collaborative framework could be the fuel to generate a culture of leadership on the campus of Andrews University. The operationalization of leadership-development at every level and between every entity of the institution requires continuous and sacrificial teamwork. As one respondent appealed,

> We really have to find a group of willing and eager partners to come together . . . people who are passionate about the enterprise of leadership development, as well as selfless in their willingness to give whatever it takes to make such a program work, even if it doesn’t necessarily enhance their personal standing or the credits brought to their department. We need people to come around this effort because it’s the right thing to do in terms of educating and developing our students. (R1, p. 4)

Furthermore, the very act of partnering in a dynamic venture could be the nucleus to penetrate and eradicate the silos and could foster a revolution of relationships (R1, p. 7; R4, p. 25). Such rewarding endeavors could usher in a new era of collaborative partnerships at
Andrews University as portrayed by Hurst’s (1996) compelling vision, “May collaborative fields arise everywhere, and may we move within them together” (p. 128). Sadly, the findings from this study also indicated that such collaboration is far from reality at Andrews and presents a major obstacle to best practices (more on this later).

12. Have a Structured Accountability. Several respondents believed that the administration would be perplexed regarding how to structure a multi-disciplinary leadership-development program within a traditional department or school academic structure. Notwithstanding the importance of the role of the division of student affairs, the findings of this study and the Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce show that ideally a leadership program director reports to the Provost, who in turn directs all facets of campus life—academic, student, and spiritual. If this option were not available, the program director should report to the vice president for academics (R10, p. 78; B. Millard, personal communication, April 2005). Although student-affairs professionals on many campuses are providing quality leadership-development opportunities, collaborative academic partners are essential for success in implementing formal credit-bearing opportunities.

An internal Leadership-Development Council of administration and program staff from academic and student life, as well as student representatives, could provide ongoing guidance in the implementation and evaluation processes. A Leadership Advisory Board of prominent campus, church, and community leaders could provide visibility and market expertise, human resources, and at times even monetary resources to the leadership-development enterprise (Ainsley, 2006; R10, p. 74). Both groups could keep leadership-development programming personnel and participants accountable for
leadership-development goals.


Recent studies have shown a major gap between leadership-program desired outcomes and appropriate steps and activities to achieve those outcomes (Russon & Reinelt, 2004, pp. 105-106). Creators of new leadership-development programs have an opportunity from the inception, to build a model with a curriculum rightly shaped to match desired outcomes. Additionally, Schwartz et al. (1998) note that as universities plan for re-accreditation, they should consider that “leadership has been identified as a key quality improvement strategy” (p. ix).

Research Question 6: Barriers to Best Practices

Three of the themes that were identified as barriers to implementing leadership-development programming included the conflicts regarding busy schedules and load, lack of real collaboration, and too much dialog with too little action.

Everyone Is Too Busy

The concern about busy lives and little time was a pattern that emerged from both student responses and employee interviews. Having no time available in academic course plans and being involved in too many activities were selected as the top barriers to participating in leadership-development activities by student survey respondents (see Table 15). Similarly, several interviewees insisted that Andrews students were too busy to take on aspects of a new leadership-development program (R2, p. 9; R5, p. 33; R10, p. 72). That opinion notwithstanding, one respondent stated that the time-management challenge was precisely the rationale for why leadership-development should have an academic
component (R8, p. 56). As shown in Figure 6, when given a forced-choice question, 82% (n = 348) of the respondents were interested in some form of credit (major, minor, certificate, internship, or class) for leadership-development. Only 5.7 (n = 24) indicated that they would prefer a non-credit-bearing experience. Ultimately, many students may be too busy to participate in a leadership-development program unless it is integrated with their academic work.

![Figure 6. Number of students who selected varying levels of leadership-development when asked to select only one option.](image)

**Lack of Campuswide Collaboration**

Although we are inspired by the powerful vehicle of campus-wide collaboration to change a culture, this study uncovered the challenge to such collaboration. A concept that is so heterarchical by nature will be difficult to incorporate into a higher-education
institution that is fundamentally hierarchical. “The traditional approach to academic governance taken by most colleges and universities makes it very difficult to model collaboration” (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 4).

Educational philosopher Alfred Whitehead (1929) eloquently proclaimed, “You can’t divide the seamless coat of learning” (pp. 11-12). Despite such compelling language and goals of higher-education administrators who seek “to change the culture of learning separatist to seamless” (Kellogg, 1999, p. 1), I concur with those who find the collegiate environment is “more often than not, more seam than coat” (Bloland, Stamatakis, & Rogers, as cited in Schroeder & Mable, 1994, p. 15). Although this study leads me to conclude that it is vital that Andrews develop a model in which collaboration is the fundamental ingredient, collaboration is far from becoming a household practice at Andrews.

Although collaborative processes exists within many departments and committees abound, the silos between departments, turf wars for student credits and tuition dollars, and the bifurcation of staff from faculty have immobilized the campus from holistic collaborative practice. As one respondent explained, collaboration is easy to say but hard to spell. “Talking [collaboration] is easy; acting [collaboratively] becomes a lot harder” (R3, p. 21). Rost and Barker (2000) explained,

We decry lackluster participation, yet we practice control by the elite. We complain about poor critical thinking skills in students, yet we reward conformance and mimicry. . . . All in all, we may conclude that educators of the Twenty First Century must begin by updating their own education. They must let go of their notions of leadership as being good management, and they must begin to embrace ideas of leadership that are more in tune with democratic practices which will clearly be the wave of the future. (p. 8)

Still, some university personnel appear to have grown comfortable with directives,
content to be told what to do (R10, p. 62). Others seem resistant to “metanarratives that tell everyone what to think and how to do their jobs” (R1, p. 7), believing that leadership-development would only thrive from the grass roots (R8, p. 13). As Argyris (as cited in Stacey, 1992) cautioned, “Studies have shown that widening participation and empowering people by no means guarantees that organizational learning will improve” (p. 175). Wilfred Drath (2001) asked a helpful question about the issue: “When there is shared work among people who make sense of that work and [of] the world from differing worldviews, how can those people accomplish the leadership tasks while holding those differing worldviews as equally worthy and warrantable?” (p. 151). This question must be answered. How do those at Andrews University work together to seek approaches that value and integrate differing assumptions and views? One way is through the metaphor of flying geese, where leading and following—self-direction and self-surrender—take place simultaneously and change constantly.

It should be noted that in addition to the more obvious hierarchical nature of the top-down levels between administration and faculty/staff, the division between the faculty (teaching) and staff (non-teaching) is an equal barrier to collaboration. Perhaps one of the largest barriers to best practices at Andrews University would be a model that selected a level of the administration and faculty but neglected the expertise of the Andrews staff. As Zohar (as cited in Polleys, 2002) points out, organizational consultants marvel at “how much the janitors and tea ladies, never mind the secretaries, know” (p. 119). According to Ray Mahoney (2000), “leadership must exist at all levels in an organization, regardless of the size, for it to consider itself a learning organization. . . . There is no excuse for them [leaders] not creating an environment where everyone can participate in this process” (p.
Kouzes and Posner (1995) stated that "leadership is everyone’s business" (p. 17) and, along with Drath and Palus (1994), believe that everyone can contribute to leadership and be developed for leadership (Drath, 2001; Drath & Palus, 1994; Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

In my review of multiple models of leadership-development programs, with the exception of co-curricular programs directed by student affairs personnel, staff continue to be left out of the learning process. Finding ways to involve staff would create a more holistic model. One respondent dreamed, "If the initiative could be for the whole campus, not just students . . . everybody [italics added] would have opportunity to develop leadership skills" (R6, p. 42). Faculty would learn from staff and students, staff and students would learn from faculty, everyone would learn from each other. A dynamic of learning would create the leadership culture that Andrews needs to foster a value-added university experience. Malcolm Gabriel (2006) advised against traditional approaches to leadership-development that unduly focus on the select few, noting that "the chosen few reflects a limited paradigm for leveraging the full potential in a learning organization" (p. 39). Gabriel explained:

Limiting understanding of high potential to a select group of employees misjudges the real potential of all employees. When everyone is considered talent there is an underlying expectation that everyone must grow outside of their comfort zone and stretch their performance boundaries. True learning organizations aim to optimize all growth and not only that of a small group of chosen ones. A chosen one approach reinforces an expectation that growth is limited only to a few. (p. 39)

In light of the findings of this study, it would be an error to design, structure, and implement leadership-development solely in any one discipline, or department, or division, or even one area or level of Andrews University. Clearly, a new compartmentalized major or minor in leadership-development would not only drain one department’s resources but, more importantly, it would rob the campus of the promise of drawing all entities together in
a collaborative enterprise of holistic leadership-development. As Astin and Astin (2000) remind us, “Leadership occurs when people become concerned about something and work to engage others in bringing about positive change. Student leadership in other words, is inherently about purposeful change, regardless of who is officially in charge or who receives credit” (p. 23).

**Too Much Talk and Too Little Action**

Brungart et al. (1997) challenged higher education to focus leadership-development on visible and deliverable products.

Liberal learning must be conceived and implemented as a dynamic rather than as content if leadership educators are to do more than simply talk about leadership. In this sense, leadership education represents a credible response to societal demands that higher education in general be held accountable to clearly justify its continued existence. No longer is it enough to talk about the products of liberal education. Now we must deliver. (p. 66)

In conducting this study and as a member of a team exploring leadership-development at Andrews University, I became aware of the real threat of too much talk and too little action. In the milieu of numerous conversations in both arenas, the skepticism was often palpable. As one administrator who embraced the idea of leadership claimed, “We often say, ‘The devil is in the details.’” Even so, he appeared curious enough to add, “It will be interesting to see how much devilment we get in the details” (R2, p. 9).

The concern about too much talk was expressed by another administrator, who although he would not discard the word *leadership*, bemoaned the proliferation of leadership conversations. He explained, “Words are like people. . . . They can be used so much there’s a danger on our campus of taking a holiday” (R7, p. 54).

Al Gini’s (2004) personal insights on the lessons to be learned from corporate
failures offer a simple but transforming plan that includes the practice of leadership:

Mistakes, mismanagement, and, yes, malevolence, are part of the human condition. There is, I think, no permanent cure for any of this. . . . Leadership like ethics and trust do exist as a body of knowledge; but they only truly exist when practiced face to face. Like medicine—leadership, ethics and trust are “lived experiences”: Learn one, do one, teach one—and so pass it on. (p. 15)

As Andrews University moves from ideas and theories toward implementation, the individuals involved in the leadership-development programming must make certain that the execution is rich with action. Bigelow (as cited by Burns, 1996) chided, “Instead of spending time to develop theories of leadership and to write more books about it, doesn’t it behoove the leaders in leadership studies to get on the ball and begin to develop an educational strategy?” (p. 157). John Burns (1996) called such action “a new transforming leadership gestalt—adaptive—action” (p. 157). Likewise, I would urge Andrews to beware of too much talk and too little action. I propose that we talk while we walk from ideas to enacting a distinct plan for leadership-development for all members of Andrews University.

Additional Factors Influencing Findings

The following section reviews some additional factors that are likely to be influenced by the findings of this study. After reviewing the halo effect and its relationship to the concept of leadership, I share an observation related to the sample selection.

Halo Effect

Leadership is popular in many circles. Given this popularity the halo effect is a potential limitation of this study. In view of the high interest in leadership-development as evidenced in this study, the Ghodsi’s (2000) study, the explosion of leadership programs...
(Riggio et al., 2003, p. 223; Schwartz et al. 1998), and the proliferation of positive leadership notions throughout the literature, the potent impact of the word leadership suggests a partial explanation for my findings.

Edward Lee Thorndike (1920) first documented and defined the halo effect as “a problem that arises in data collection where there is carry-over from one judgment to another” (p. 25). Researchers have studied the halo effect and its inverse, the devil effect, to explain variance in testing (Cook, Marsh, & Hicks, 2003, pp. 257-278). Theodore Newcomb (1931) described an aspect of the halo effect as a tendency of logical error and concluded that raters will often give similar responses to categories that seem to be logically related. According to Newcomb (1931), “the close relation between the intra-trait behaviors which is evident in the rating may, therefore, be presumed to spring from logical presumptions in the minds of the raters, rather than from actual behaviors” (p. 288).

Most of the literature related to the halo effect surrounds the making of general assumptions about a person from a single positive attribute. The underlying principles and psychology of the halo effect, however, also may be manifested in perceptions regarding concepts such as leadership. It is especially challenging to suppress a bias for respondents who are oblivious to the cognitive leap in assumptions. William Cooper (1981) described the halo effect as ubiquitous and suggested that “the origins of illusory halo may be largely in raters’ cognitive distortions, making halo more recalcitrant to attempts to reduce it than has been envisioned in much of the halo reduction literature” (p. 219). Regardless of raters’ cognitive distortion, it is clear that the word leadership generally denotes positive attributes and therefore is likely to have an impact on aspects of this study.
Leadership Is Laden With Preconceptions

There has been prolific growth in contemporary leadership literature and theory as well as the number of bookshelves touting best leadership practice in a process-driven, relational framework of leadership (Astin & Astin, 2002; Bennis, 1989; Borwick, 1995; Heifetz, 1994). However, despite this growth and the halo effect of the word leadership, others have an opposite reaction to leadership. Some find the word leadership to portray preconceptions that are more in tune with the devil effect, the inverse of the halo effect. According to Block (1993), the concern is “inevitably associated with behaviors of control, direction and knowing what is best for others” (p. 13). For others, such as a respondent interviewed in this study, the leadership baggage lies in (a) the often high-on-charisma and low-on-tools-or-results approach, (b) substituting sizzle for substance, and (c) a general aura of disrespect for the study and profession of management (R5, p. 35).

In his paper, No Such Thing as a Leader, Doug Borwick (1995) states that—despite friendlier labels such as servant-leadership and leader-follower models—the term leader continues to be “inherently hierarchical” and difficult to divorce from connotations of power and authority (p. 104). Block (1993) also claimed that “although there is great appeal to the concept of leadership, it will not take us the distance we need to travel... Strong leadership does not have within itself the capability to create the fundamental changes our organizations require” (p. 13). According to Block (1993), the alternative is stewardship, a notion that centers on responsibility and service rather than on control (pp. 18-19). Hurst (1996) proposed extreme measures: “If we want to talk about how we are going to create monumental social and organization change, that is where leadership
nomenclature must fade from the English vocabulary and be replaced by the relational and mutual aspects of collaboration, combined with a deep commitment to personal responsibility for change” (p. 128).

The baggage embedded in *leadership* notwithstanding, the word continues to have widespread appeal (Rost, 1991). Meindl and Ehrlich (1987), in coining the term *romance of leadership*, offer valuable insight: “The romanticized conception of leadership denotes a strong belief—a faith—in the importance of leadership factors to the functioning and dysfunctioning of organized systems” (p. 92). They further illuminated,

> Despite the misgivings, dissenting options, and questions about leadership and its traditional significance, it is easy to conclude that a rather intense commitment to and investment in the concept has developed over the years. Leadership appears to have been sanctified and to play a key role in our phenomenological construals of organized activities and their outcomes. This observation underlies what we refer to as the romanticized conception of leadership. . . . Leadership has assumed a special status—not merely a prosaic alternative that people dispassionately consider on an equal footing with other explanations, it has achieved a heroic, larger-than life value. (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1987, pp. 92-93)

**Leadership Appeals to College Students**

The findings in this study, the Ghodsi (2000) study, and the rapid growth of leadership-development programs around the country are additional clear indicators that the word *leadership* continues to have major appeal to the millennial generation and college-age students. What is unclear is the reason for such high interest in leadership.

Some may suggest that college-age students, unexposed to contemporary leadership models and seeking an edge in the job market, tend to focus on the prefix *leader* and on the positional attributes that urge staying ahead of the pack. Research shows that almost half of students new to college do not operate at the advanced stages of cognitive development and the use of critical thinking skills (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). This
reality suggests that those who respond with misgivings to the aura of leadership are more likely to be the post-college population, who may be less attracted to the power and positional construct of leadership.

However, after reviewing the promise of the Millennial generation I would propose another explanation. There is growing evidence that the generation currently entering colleges and universities has a predisposition to teamwork, cooperative activities, and service (Howe & Strauss, 2003; Tapscott, 1998). According to Don Tapscott (1998), “they thrive on collaboration, and many find the notion of a boss somewhat bizarre” (p. 10). Edward Headington (2001) observed that it is a generational endeavor to define leadership. Although many of the qualities of leadership are ageless, “each generation has to filter the meaning through its own experiences and collective anchors” (pp. 228-229). Additionally, there is support for the notion that leadership shapes culture and is a culturally shaped phenomenon (Bass, 1990; Berg, 2003; Komives et al., 1998). Therefore, this generation may be poised to usher in a shift in both paradigm and practice regarding leadership nuances—from the hierarchical structures to more heterarchical processes.

The Attraction of Leadership

Although the elusive and unconscious attributes to the concept of leadership may appear to be immeasurable, they represent a potential limitation of any study in the field of leadership. Consequently, given the strong interest in leadership-development reported in my study, rather than ignore the halo effect, we should be mindful of Meindl and Ehrlich’s (1987) observation that the “romanticized conception of leadership and the values and ideology it represents are likely to be an important part of this paradoxical receptivity” (p. 107). At the very least, an awareness of the attraction of leadership, however idealistic or
ill-informed, reminds educators and program developers to be aware of convoluted understandings that may exist in promoting leadership training. Such awareness could be accomplished by clearly defining and identifying desired outcomes in all phases of a leadership-development program's design, marketing, and implementation.

Ultimately, the most important consideration should be to inform students about the phenomenon of leadership. Therefore, it is appropriate both to recognize and to harness the enormous current attraction for the concept of leadership while it still serves as a magnet. At the same time, we must be intentionally educative about the vibrant, collaborative process of leadership which transforms culture. As noted by Envision Software (1998), the halo effect is a reality, and “rather than fighting these socialized norms, catering to them can allow one to slingshot from existing biases and harness their power to attain a more desirable decision” (Making Friends With the Halo Effect, para. 3). Becoming an astute student of social norms and biases, with a watchful eye on the halo effects, provides a means to leverage social biases toward leadership in a manner that welcomes and engages all members of a community into a personal and cultural transformation.

Over time, the daily practice of leadership that is relational and collaborative holds the promise of dispelling the halo effect and promoting a view that replaces positional hierarchal leadership views with a dynamic collaborative process that revolutionizes the culture of a group, a community, and large organizations.

Sample Selection Reflections

Leadership-development is a primary focus for student affairs professionals such as I am. We promote it often. Thus, it is with chagrin through motivation by a deeper need for authenticity in my study and in my work that I share this observation. I selected and
interviewed only one member of the Andrews University staff. This was an unfortunate oversight and indicates that I was influenced by a pervasive mental model that the academics are the ones who count most in student leadership-development. Although I began this study expecting to find examples of limiting mental models, I was not fully prepared to find them so transparent in my own practice. In my assumption that it was more important to gain credibility from academic colleagues, I potentially limited my findings. This reality contributed to my ardent concern that all staff have an opportunity to be involved in the future of leadership-development at Andrews University.

Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendations for further research are as follows:

1. A study of the assumptions surrounding the terminology of word *leadership* in order to determine why students express strong interest in leadership-development and to examine the impact of the *halo effect* on their response to leadership-development. As noted by Russon and Reinelt (2004), in order to capture the complex nuances of the term *leadership*, qualitative methodology is recommended (p. 106).

2. Use additional qualitative methods to triangulate student survey data from this study and to reduce over-reliance on the self-reported data of participants from other program-evaluation studies. As noted by George Kuh and Rosalind Andreas (1991), in a field such as Student Affairs which hold such ideals as “the unique value of each person” and “the impact of feelings on learning” it is ironic that few qualitative studies exist (Kuh & Andreas, 1991, p. 397). Surrounded by the rich pulse of campus life, researchers should use approaches, such as interviews and focus groups, which recognize individual differences.
3. Documentary research of established undergraduate leadership programs in order to determine how to design a leadership-development curriculum and co-curriculum to best align with and produce desired outcomes.

Conclusions

I believe that the field of leadership-development will be a transformational force in this century. Those who continue to question the level of rigor in the field of leadership should consider the pathways of change in other disciplines. Georgia Sorenson (2000) noted that leadership may be like “other disciplines” where coherence itself may be undesirable “and each are approaching each other’s boundaries at breakneck speed” (p. 19).

I believe that in the not too distant future, the transformation in leadership theory and practice will be embedded in egalitarian practice that empowers all to discover their calling and act on it. This will revolutionize institutions of higher education to a lofty mission. It will bring a rebirth of the collaborative enterprise of leadership. This transformation will generate and ignite students. Students as well as faculty and staff will have discovered their purpose on the planet—and emerge from the once Ivory Towers wearing a mosaic gown for service, stitched with threads of leadership: knowledge, faith, action, and a passion to serve others.

Current State of Students for Leadership-Development

Howe and Strauss (2003) concluded that “for a college or university to be successful today, the administration and faculty must respond to Millennials’ needs, expectations, and aspirations. A college or university that fails to respond will find itself at a disadvantage in recruiting and retaining top students and will find that the students it
does recruit will be less likely to perform up to their potential” (p. 144). According to Howe and Strauss (2003) in addition to being more numerous, affluent, ethnically diverse, and better educated, Millennials are displaying a broad spectrum of positive qualities including a new focus on teamwork, service, modesty, good conduct, and participation in causes larger than themselves (p. 14; p. 99). They offer a further Millennial depiction,

Expect teamwork instead of free agents, political action instead of apathy, technology to elevate the community and not the individual, T-shirts with school colors instead of cooperate swooshers, on-your-side teamwork in place of in-your-face sass. (Howe & Strauss, 2003, pp. 21-22)

Tapscott (1998) noted that today’s college students reject top-down management.

They thrive on collaboration, and many find the notion of a boss somewhat bizarre. Their point of reference is the Net. . . . Corporations who hire them should be prepared to have their windows and walls shaken. The N-Gen will cause a rethinking of management’s attitude toward its people. Senior management will have to treat people as if they are the enterprises’ most valuable resource. (p. 10)

Accordingly, leadership in the 21st century, with its new and more compelling arms of collaboration, community, and change, embraces many of the qualities embedded in and sought by the college-age population. A prime example of this paradigm shift was evidenced in the abrupt change in the legendary selection of Time’s Person of the Year. Previous selections, typically mirrored Thomas Carlyle’s great-man theory, that took “a serious beating this year” as “you” were given the honor (Grossman, 2006, p. 40). A mirror on the front cover made the point. Lev Grossman (2006) explained why the stories of conflict and great men were replaced in 2006 with the astonishing but appropriate choice, You.

[2006 is] a story about community and collaboration on a scale never seen before. It’s about the cosmic compendium of knowledge Wikipedia and the million-channel people’s network YouTube and the online metropolis MySpace. It’s about the many wrestling power from the few and helping one another for nothing and how that will not only change the world, but also change the way the
world changes. (p. 40)

Grossman (2006) concurs that “America loves its solitary geniuses—its Einsteins, its Edisons, its Jobses”—but projected that these brilliant lone rangers may need to share their toys as the once-obscure planet of minds parades ubiquitously into the global World Wide Web and the new digital democracy fueling this revolution of change (p. 40).

This new perspective of the importance of everyone—each person—promises to create a revolution of thought and action regarding the essence of leadership. As noted by Howe and Strauss (2003), “rebellions peter out—but revolutions produce long-term social change” (p. 23). However, this revolution of tomorrow may be more a network of influence that arises from a new vision of leadership. Rather than merely fastening our seatbelts for the last part of this decade, as some suggest, I count it a privilege to have a role in teaching, learning, and rising with the Millennials.
CHAPTER 7

POSTSCRIPT

Through the Woods to Leadership-Development at Andrews University

The maze of dense leadership history, tangled theory, and jumbled practice is monumental. Alongside a second looming tower of data that emerged from this study, I empathize with the visual metaphor “can’t see the forest for the trees” (Burns, 1996, p. 148; Yukl, 1994, p. 269). Yet the importance of this journey to understand the potential of leadership-development for Andrews University was an inspiring theme that propelled me through the woods, towards the vision and transformation of a forest of leadership.

Clearly, Andrews University offered an optimal vista to test the raw materials: (a) the goals of the harvest, (b) the fertility of the soil, (c) the will of the gardeners, and (d) the seeds themselves, to determine their interest and the potential viability to grow a culture of leadership-development. And now, through the lens of this study, I am able to view both the forest and the trees.

This study has found widespread interest in leadership-development at Andrews and reviewed some of the components that would support such a program. This chapter contains some final wisdom about the potential of leadership-development at Andrews University.
Current State of Andrews University for Leadership-Development

The vision statement by the President of Andrews University, *A New Andrews for a New Century: A Legacy of Leadership* (see Appendix A), has set leadership as a strategic priority, a core value of the University. During the duration of this study, with a request from the President for a proposed Andrews brand of leadership-development and the arrival of a new Provost, there has been progress—the engines are charging.

In the fall of 2006, an administrative retreat was held to explore the process of moving Andrews University from *Good to Great*, the title of Jim Collins's best-selling leadership book. Collins (2001) describes an element of that process as the *hedgehog* concept. That concept is a “simple, crystalline concept that flows from deep understanding about the intersection of the following three circles” (p. 95): (a) what you can be the best at, (b) what drives your engine, and (c) what you are passionate about.

The Provost challenged University personnel to determine our *hedgehog* to guide our efforts. Following a conceptual overview, participants were divided into groups and asked to identify—within the three key intersecting circles—the *hedgehog* for Andrews University. The themes of student transformational learning, leadership, and service emerged from the core value statements. Given these developments—the President’s *Legacy of Leadership*, the submission of a proposal to develop a culture of global leadership by the Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce (see Appendix A), and the Provost’s emphasis on hedgehog—creating a culture of leadership-development may be the fuel for these fires.

Andrews University Is Rightly Positioned

As a flagship institution of higher education in the Seventh-day Adventist church,
many look to Andrews to provide its future leaders. Andrews University is well positioned to be at the forefront of the lofty vision and promising enterprise of leadership-development. Andrews University has a prime and promising vista to harness its microcosm of the international community to be a nucleus of learning for a global leadership program. Preparing graduates who leave such an environment and become beacons of hope and influence, to transform the world with a new freeing, collaborative understanding of leadership, is an extraordinary prospect.

**Now Is the Time**

If one eavesdrops while wandering the halls of Andrews University, one may hear caution from the guards, calling for the status quo and stabilizing the ship, by improving a little here and a little there. The lone rangers may offer a cogent argument for working harder from our silos to continue building the best discipline specialists or leadership training programs. However, if one pays close attention, through the cacophony of voices, to today’s colossal human needs, massive changes in workplace expectations, competitive global markets, and exploding technological boom, one will hear Andrews educators seeking new maps. Andrews University has the mission and the raw materials to be a *New Andrews for a New Century for a New World*. Thus as Andrews University steps boldly into the 21st century it must heed the call to prepare graduates for the new world they will enter and seek to change.

Gardner (1965/1993) told the story of little girl who informed her teacher she was going to draw a picture of God. The teacher in surprise exclaimed, “But, Mary, no one knows what God looks like”; and Mary simply replied, “They will when I get through” (p. 197). Likewise, Gardner (1965/1993) calls educators to emulate the little girl and truly
model the leadership we claim to teach. Heifetz (1994) observed that leadership often
demands taking “responsibility without waiting for revelation or request. One may lead
perhaps with no more than a question in hand” (p. 276).

And so the first of two questions: Does Andrews emulate the leadership we hope to
teach? Curt Brungardt and Larry Gould (2001) raised a pivotal issue in their
leadership-development proposal at Fort Hayes State University that has great relevance to
Andrews University,

The will to stabilize is not going to be the answer for organizational success but
rather, a ticket to sure failure. . . . The will to stabilize no longer guarantees growth,
success or even survival. The will to change has now become the answer. (p. 2, para. 3)

An Andrews respondent echoes the theme, “I think the potential is as great as our
collective will to see leadership-development become a paradigm for
educating not only the mind, but the heart and the hands as well” (R1, p. 7). Rost and
Barker (2000) contend that leadership is the product of “numerous individuals—the
sum of individuals will” (p. 5). Ghandi was known to advocate, “Be the
change you wish to see.” Thus, the lingering last question: Does Andrews University
have the collective will to change, to be The New Andrews for a New Century, a
Legacy of Leadership?

The answer may be found in my final reflections. In my dissertation journey I have
been privileged to explore many campus corners and Andrews avenues. I have listened
carefully and reflected deeply. I believe that Andrews University is ready to embrace
change that presents a vehicle, such as leadership-development, that promises to unite and
ignite all members of the community in a shared adventure to a worthy destination.

264
The Mark Will Be Born of Collaborative Spirits

Finally, I ponder the passion of the academic dean, who believes building a culture of leadership-development could be a historical moment for Andrews University, “If we could pull this off, I think Andrews would be noted. We could make a mark [italics added] in history” (R13, p. 108). I too share this belief. However, I think that the mark will not shine on a program; rather the mark will be born from practicing the brilliant essence of leadership, the vibrant process of collaborative spirits unified in a glorious mission.
APPENDIX A

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY DOCUMENTS
A Legacy of Leadership

I came to Andrews as president ten years ago because of my deep commitment to this university's legacy of leadership within the Adventist world church. Our claim to such a legacy has its roots in the past: Andrews was the first Adventist college established near church headquarters in 1874; and then, over a century later in 1959, the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and the denomination's first graduate school, known jointly then as Potomac University, joined the college to form a new General Conference institution--Andrews University--which quickly became the premier international educational center for the Adventist world church.

The Adventist church, led then by General Conference president R. R. Figuhr, demonstrated extraordinary courage in the face of criticism, when it established Andrews University. Adventists had never operated a real university before, and some doubted that it could be done. The daunting challenge--to bolster academics and thoughtfully implement the broader activities of the college, the seminary and the graduate school with relatively limited resources--fell on some remarkable university administrators, among them, Dr. Richard Hammill, and his successors.

The result of their work is well known to us all, but it is not complete. In fact, our world church needs a premier institution of higher learning even more in the 21st century than it did 45 years ago, and Andrews must continue its legacy of leadership once again.

While it is true that since 1959 colleges and universities have opened around the world, few, if any, have the educational resources--along with the spiritual and intellectual strength--to continue the legacy of educational leadership Andrews began more than a generation ago. That leadership role still falls upon Andrews. However, rapid changes in education and in our world church mean that the university as established in 1959 is no longer able to adequately meet current educational needs in our church.

We need a new Andrews for the new century. To accomplish that goal in our time will require the same kind of courageous actions as those taken by our leaders in 1959. These new courageous actions in the interest of continuing the legacy of leadership here at Andrews for the new century--will need the participation of new supporters, individuals committed to excellent Christian education for the world church. This bold plan of action calls for a three-way partnership between Andrews, church leadership and lay supporters of Christian education. Accordingly, we are inviting our church leaders to help us define the legacy of leadership needed for the new century, and we are
inviting our lay supporters to help us develop the resources needed to continue that legacy.

Challenges to Adventist Education in the 21st Century

Forty-five years ago when Andrews began serving the world church, our denomination numbered one and a quarter million members and enrolled 300,000 students in its schools worldwide. The post-war period was waning and the turbulent 60's and 70's threatened to fracture our society and our church. But wisely—and surely under divine guidance—our church leaders decided to put their arms around the whole, increasingly diverse Adventist family, just in time for what happened next—an explosion of church membership around the world.

The result is nothing less than a fulfillment of the three angels' messages in the Apocalypse, so central to Adventist theological thinking. These end-time messages to every nation, tribe, language and people describe not only the Adventist proclamation, but they also define the emerging Adventist church community and its remarkable diversity. Various languages and cultures, diverse thinking and every type of social, economic and political system are represented in the Adventist church family. If these trends continue, by the year 2020 the Adventist church family will number approximately 50 million members, and about 44 million of them will have joined the church in the 21st century. This new Adventist world church will continue to grow rapidly; its membership will become younger and more diverse; and it will reach out for education and leadership—the legacy of Andrews.

Such growth and diversity have enormous implications for Adventist education and for Andrews University. Let me mention just a few of the challenges and opportunities we face in the 21st century:

1. When Andrews began its current assignment, Adventist schools enrolled one student for every four church members. As the 21st century emerged, that ratio dropped to one student enrolled for every ten church members. Thus, a steadily declining number of future church members will receive their personal, educational and professional formation by our church, placing at risk the celebrated worldwide Adventist “family culture,” which has done so much to keep the church and its mission in focus. Adventist education under the leadership of Andrews must again grow.

2. Church leaders have always been educated in Adventist schools. In fact, it could be said that the mission of our church was incubated, not in mission societies, but in our schools. However, the enrollment of Adventist students, and hence potential church leaders, in our colleges and universities is declining and is expected to approach the 50% level at the end of this decade, if left unattended. Indeed, the church will likely rely increasingly on lay leadership in need of continuing education. The demand for leadership training will increase, and I believe Andrews must lead the response.

3. Church growth is uneven now, and money to fund the church’s mission, including its educational work, comes from a diminishing proportion of church membership. This reality might well require entirely new financial and managerial systems for the church and its institutions in the future, until we find a new balance of members, resources and organizational structure. Andrews must help devise new ways of delivering Adventist education in this new world church.

4. The world of our church keeps shrinking geographically, as it brings different economical,
political, ideological and cultural ideas together. Meanwhile the church grows, not merely numerically, but also in terms of ideological, cultural, economic and political diversity. Increasingly, Adventist church members interact with their communities, whether as a major force or as a minority, leading the church to become ever more engaged in public affairs. This interaction will depend on a new class of church leaders, such as diplomats, lawyers, educators, business leaders, social agents, politicians, and community leaders, who are able to serve as bridges between church and society. Andrews must help lead the way through its educational programs and public service.

New and Courageous Steps

In order to respond effectively to the challenges of the 21st century, Andrews University must exercise its legacy of leadership within Adventist education by taking new and courageous steps:

To begin, we must make Adventist higher education affordable for all qualified students who cherish our educational values and commit to our educational goals. We must seek, court, enroll and educate the intellectually best and spiritually brightest students for the sake of our church.

Adventist higher education in North America has presumed upon our secondary schools to provide a good freshman class every year, and we have relied upon parental commitment to “Christian education” to pay the tuition. In response, Adventist colleges and universities have kept costs relatively low, thanks in part to generous church subsidies. But the picture is changing. Adventist students and their parents have choices when it comes to meeting their educational needs, and Adventist education is only one of many options. In this country only one third of young Adventist college students attend Adventist colleges, and that number is much smaller abroad. Therefore, in the future, Andrews University will seek, recruit and enroll Adventist students wherever they are found—in homes, churches, public and private secondary schools, and in segments of the adult workforce seeking career change or educational upgrading. In order for Andrews to fulfill its legacy of leadership, we must help our most able and dedicated young people choose Christian education. To do so, Andrews must challenge them with superior learning opportunities and make it affordable for them to attend. These young people are the raw material from which our church will be led in the 21st century, and Andrews must have a chance to educate them.

Andrews can only recruit and admit such students if we offer them the best quality of education and provide them with adequate financial support. Current student financial aid policy at Andrews, known as APS, or Andrews Partnership Scholarship, is designed to provide such financial support. It includes a basic scholarship, or "entrance award," that favors the most promising and industrious students. That scholarship is then supplemented by the need-based support, the amount of which depends upon family resources. This plan makes an Andrews education affordable, and it is making Andrews competitive with comparable Christian colleges and universities. Furthermore, the APS plan supports our students for their entire college career, not just the first year, and it is available to both national and international students. The Financial Aid department is developing a similar system of support for graduate students. The current cost to the University of the APS program exceeds $7 million annually, representing a recent increase in excess of 33%. We must find ways to sustain this level of support.

The second step we must take is to maintain and increase the quality of an Andrews education. This university has made a strong commitment to offering quality education without losing its faith and traditions. Andrews must now deliver on that promise. This is not a new idea, for Adventist education long ago promised to move to the forefront in quality (to be the head and not the tail.) But...
the need to act upon the promise is acute, as the whole nation, indeed the world, speaks not just about accessibility of education but of the quality of education. Let me share some evidence explaining that quality in education matters.

Published ratings of colleges and universities, while criticized by some, have the attention of parents and students. They can now read on the newsstand how the quality of Andrews University compares to nearly 4000 other North American institutions. International students are keenly aware of program accreditation in the health sciences, business, theology, education, and other programs, and national students pay increasing attention to the ratings. Institutional accreditation assures the students of public financial support while studying, and program accreditation vastly improves their chances of getting good jobs after graduation. Inattention to quality control threatens accreditation and can mean public warnings or even censure for a college or university, which can lead to closure. Adventist education is not exempt from this requirement, as we know. So quality in education matters, and Andrews must keep its promise to be best.

Being best is demonstrated by best practice in teaching, learning and by serious research—both priorities at Andrews. Andrews University administers $2.6 million of externally provided research funds which support teaching and learning for senior students who in many cases are invited to participate in research projects. At the other end of the spectrum, Andrews looks for the best freshman instructors to give first-year students a solid start in college. In the related area of international education, Andrews has already earned a well-deserved reputation of delivering high quality education at a distance or in collaboration with sister institutions around the world through its extension and affiliation programs—all of which are covered by our institutional accreditation.

In a Christian university, excellence in education must extend to personal, spiritual, and moral development. That too is part of the Andrews legacy of leadership, and this responsibility falls upon every faculty, staff and administrator. It permeates every committee room, lecture theater, laboratory, work space, office, residence hall and recreational center. No Christian university can be "educationally" strong and be "spiritually" weak and vice versa. Both areas must be strong, and that they will be when they reinforce each other. That is our aim.

Let me offer a third step in addressing the challenges of the 21st century: The new Andrews must become the university of choice not only for the most able Adventist students but also for the most committed and gifted teachers and administrators our church can produce.

To decide to teach or work in an institution like Andrews is increasingly a matter of choice for professors and support staff. One evidence of that is the growing number of Adventist faculty persons recruited to teach at Andrews from outside the Adventist system of higher education. Andrews, therefore, must become the University of Choice for the most gifted Adventist faculty and staff. The quality of students and faculty in turn builds the institution’s reputation using these building blocks: The maturity with which we combine faith and learning; the seriousness with which we take academic achievement, the degree to which we support and improve our campus infrastructure and educational resources; the imagination with which we serve our community; the regard in which we are held by sister institutions within and without our church. As the university’s reputation grows in these ways, Andrews will become a distinctive Christian university in the Adventist tradition and a beacon of hope in the world and in the church which hungers for educational opportunities.

Why Andrews?

While no longer the largest comprehensive Adventist university in the world, Andrews is the
oldest. With the largest collection of diverse human and educational resources, it is attached directly to the General Conference and it has an enviable track record in fulfilling its original assignment established more than forty years ago. Andrews is fully accredited to offer degrees up to the doctoral level, and it is authorized to provide educational services on all church-related sites around the world. Finally, graduates of Andrews occupy positions of leadership in every division of the world church and in nearly all of its major educational institutions.

This is the 20th century foundation upon which I propose to build the Andrews University of the 21st century. It will be the same Andrews, but enriched in skills, faith, people, and resources in line with the challenges of the new century. To illustrate, Andrews University will become for the Seventh-day Adventist church what Notre Dame has become for the Catholic church, what Brandeis has become for the Jewish community, and what Hope and Calvin have done for the Reformed and Christian Reformed churches.

A Courageous Plan for Courageous Action

What imaginative and courageous steps must we take to empower Andrews University to enter this new phase of its development? What barriers must be removed? What resources must we find? What ideas must we dare advance? What level of support must we seek? What commitments must be made? Here is a brief summary of things we have mentioned:

1. We must provide adequate financial resources to enable the most gifted and committed students to attend. They will become the future leaders of our church. Yes, a good education is expensive, but as the saying goes, if you think education costs too much, try ignorance. We must chose education—Christian education—and make it accessible through ongoing scholarship support.

2. We must recruit, attract, and support the best Adventist faculty our church can produce to educate our students. That means engaging and growing expert teachers, researchers, and individuals for whom the doctorate is merely a springboard to a highly productive career of generous service to the university—and supporting them. It means devising and delivering educational programs and services needed in the 21st century Adventist world church.

3. Andrews has added new and highly valuable facilities in recent years—Harrigan Hall for technology, Chan Shun Hall for business, Tan Hall for the Seminary, and the Howard Performing Arts Center for lifting our spirits through first-rate musical and educational events. But we will need more. Buller Hall for the humanities must be completed, a health and fitness center will greatly benefit our students and community, and the Division of Architecture is hoping for new facilities and has some promise of support from individuals who see the value of this discipline for our world church. The residence halls and student center need to be updated and equipped for the 21st century. And the whole campus needs a new entrance to bring Andrews out of hiding.

Financing Andrews for the 21st Century

What will it take to move Andrews into the 21st century as outlined above? We are asking you to help us determine the answer to that question. We think that the largest amount of resources will be needed for student financial support, followed by capital needs and improvement in educational programming and faculty development. I can say that the late 20th century campaign I and II for Andrews set total goals of $25 million, and these were reached. However, we think that the Legacy
of Leadership campaign for the new century will likely have to be set at several times the former goal.

We invite you and smaller groups of concerned persons around the world to join us in review and discussion of the direction the university should take. We have talked for several years with our consultant for planning and development. He will guide in developing these plans and help us determine their financial viability. Please be assured that the consultant's work will be completely confidential and will involve persons with a deep and abiding interest in Andrews University. Your counsel and the consultant's follow-up work will help us determine if we have the resources necessary to achieve our vision for the 21st century—Andrews, the university serving the Seventh-day Adventist world church—a legacy of leadership.
Andrews University
Undergraduate Leadership-Development
Program Proposal

October 19, 2006

1. Undergraduate leadership development is a phenomenon that has swept through higher education in the last couple of decades. While leadership programs vary, many are driven by three common convictions, with which we concur:

   - Leadership can be taught.
   - Leadership is personal (often shared) rather than positional, and can be exercised by anyone.
   - Leadership should be exercised on behalf of positive change, and ought to serve the good of all.

2. By some estimates, there are over a thousand programs in colleges and universities around the nation. Why should Andrews University join this movement?

   - Leadership development offers an intentional plan for producing students who are equipped to “change the world,” a key aspect of the University’s mission.

   - Leadership development draws together various elements of our whole-person education into a single, cohesive learning journey focused on specific outcomes.

   - An increasingly complex world, as well as our rapidly growing denomination, is in desperate need of ethical, creative, globally-conscious leaders who can work collaboratively with others to navigate the difficult challenges ahead.

   - Andrews University, with its diverse student population, its world-wide connections, its low faculty-to-student ratio, and its strong faith-orientation is well-positioned to produce this kind of leadership.

3. After reviewing scores of undergraduate leadership programs online, making site visits to three programs in the Midwest, and conducting an assessment of our resources and student/faculty interest, we are now prepared recommend a program outline. Our recommendations are in line with the mandate we received to offer a low-cost/no-cost entry-level plan that utilizes, as far as possible, existing academic and co-curricular resources.

4. What follows is a description of a multi-disciplinary, competency-based, portfolio-driven academic certificate program intended to complement most any undergraduate degree. The proposal should be seen as a starting point, not a final product. There are many design choices that can be made, and may yet be necessary before implementation.
I. Academic Requirements for a Leadership Certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership I (Introductory)*</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (from Leadership Cognate courses, see attached list)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Project (TBA under Independent Study courses in depts.)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership II (Capstone)*</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credit Hours (11)

* In order to minimize the impact of the Certificate on the student’s program, it has been suggested that Leadership I & II be offered as RLGN courses, and that they count toward the required nine (9) hours of General Education religion electives.

1. In addition to the courses listed above, students are already required to take the following General Education courses relevant to our competencies in leadership:

   - BHSC100 Philosophy of Service
   - BHSC100 Fit and Well
   - COMM104 Communication Skills
   - ENGL115, 215 English Composition I & II
   - IDSC211 Creativity and the Arts

2. We propose that students be additionally required to choose the following General Education religion elective:

   - RELT340 Religion and Ethics in Modern Society or RELT390 Christian Business Ethics

3. Electives are to be drawn from the list of Leadership Cognate Courses (Appendix I).

4. The Change Project is to be initiated by the student with a church, community, campus, or discipline-based partner. It will require 120-150 hours of field work, and will be presented to fellow students, the student's mentor, and Advisory Board during the Leadership Capstone course. Proposals for projects must be submitted to the Program Director/Leadership Council for approval before students may begin their work.

5. Students will be asked to subscribe to an electronic portfolio system throughout the duration of the program, and to document their learning against as set of competencies (Appendix II). Students are not expected to master the competencies, but to demonstrate growth. This will be done through a variety of artifacts such as awards/certificates, pictures, reflection pieces, coursework, performance assessments, etc. The portfolio will be honed in the Capstone Course for use with potential employers.
II. Co-Curricular Requirements for the Leadership Certificate

The student may use any number of co-curricular activities to demonstrate growth and progress toward competency satisfaction. However, there are some minimum co-curricular requirements. We propose that students:

1. Engage in at least one (1) University-led or University-approved international experience (a trip, tour, short-term mission experience, student missionary year, study abroad, etc.)

2. Document holding at least one (1) student leadership position (in a campus ministry, club/organization, student government, residence hall, family group, athletic team, etc.)

3. Document growth toward at least one (1) leadership competency in a work-based environment, either through campus employment or an internship.

4. Be an active member of the Leadership Society every year while in the program.

5. Attend at least two (2) of the Annual Leadership Conferences.

6. Select a mentor who will follow them for at least their final year in the program and offer guidance as they complete their Change Project and Portfolio.

III. The Leadership Society

Students in the Leadership Program will not be following a prescribed course, but rather will take highly personalized academic journeys. The “life” and continuity of the program, therefore, will be sustained through the Leadership Society – a student-run organization, to which all program participants will belong. The Society will be responsible for planning Annual Leadership Conferences, and for organizing social, spiritual, educational, and outreach activities.
IV: Leadership Cognates

Vocational Cognates

- PSYC204 Personal, Social and Career Development
- IDSC250 Career and Life Planning

Contemporary Issues Cognates

- SOCI350 Introduction to Social Policy
- SOCI360 Introduction to International Development
- SOCI425 Racial and Ethnic Relations
- CHEM340 Environmental Chemistry
- RELT348 Christians and the Environment
- BSAD345 Business and Society
- ECON427 Economic Development
- PLSC430 Contemporary Political Issues
- COMM425 Media Literacy
- PSYC319 Stress Management

Communication Cognates

- COMM320 Interpersonal Communication
- COMM340 Argumentation and Debate
- COMM405 Persuasion
- COMM445,446 Family and Gender Communication
- COMM436 Intercultural Communication
- COMM456 Group Dynamics and Leadership
- ENGL315 Professional Writing
- ENGL345 Introduction to Rhetoric

Artistic Influence Cognates

- PHTO300 Media Ethics
- PHTO425 Travel Photography
- JOUR375 Photojournalism
- ENGL467 Creative Writing

Marketing/Management Cognates

- FMST460 Management and Decision Making in the Family
- BSAD355 Management and Organization
- BSAD436 Motivation and Work Behavior
- BSAD450 Multicultural Business Relations
- BSAD515 Organizational Behavior
- MKTG310 Principles of Marketing
- MKTG320 Consumer Behavior

History/Political Science/Philosophy Cognates

- HIST468 Multi-cultural America
- HIST465 American Foreign Relations
- PLSC120 Analyzing Politics
- PLSC430 Political Thought, Culture, and Change
- PLSC520 Human Rights, Violations, and Reconciliations
- PLSC307 Comparative Politics
- PLSC 350 Government Affairs
- PLSC/HIST478 Study Tour
- PHIL320 Critical Thinking

Christian Influence and Ethics Cognates

- RELP235 Christianity in World Context
- RELP240 Christian Witnessing/Public Evangelism Seminar
- RELP340 Strategies for Service
- RELP442 Introduction to Church Leadership
- RELT390 Christian Business Ethics
- RELP200 Pastoral Practicum
- RELP325 Preparation for Mission Service
- RELT235 Principles of Bible Instruction
- RELT216 Workshop in Prayer

* Global Understanding Course
## V: Leadership Competency Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEADERSHIP AND THE SELF</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEADERSHIP WITH OTHERS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEADERSHIP THROUGH ORGANIZATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEADERSHIP THROUGH INQUIRY</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEADERSHIP THROUGH THE ARTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEADERSHIP OVER TIME</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFLECT</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESPECT</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESPOND</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESEARCH</strong></td>
<td><strong>REVEAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>RENEW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Awareness &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Valuing Diversity &amp; the Common Good</td>
<td>Enabling Accomplishment &amp; Change</td>
<td>Gathering, Interpreting &amp; Using Data</td>
<td>Offering Unique Perspectives &amp; Possibilities</td>
<td>Sustaining &amp; Transitioning Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing self, identity, worldview; Engaging God, others, world; Discerning calling &amp; purpose; Listening &amp; remaining teachable</td>
<td>Understanding cultures; Valuing differences; Inviting unique contributions; Seeing multiple perspectives; Committing to social responsibility &amp; justice</td>
<td>Envisioning &amp; facilitating change; Fostering creativity; Modeling commitment &amp; persistence; Forming partnerships &amp; alliances</td>
<td>Reading &amp; evaluating research; Conducting research; Reporting findings; Implementing results</td>
<td>Critiquing society; Testing new ideas; Offering alternate perspectives; Exposing realities and falsehoods; Inspiring &amp; envisioning</td>
<td>Networking/mentoring; Succession planning; Perpetual learning; Recognizing phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REACH</strong></td>
<td><strong>RELATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESOLVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REDEEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuing Integrity &amp; Excellence</td>
<td>Maximizing Interactions &amp; Impact</td>
<td>Problem-solving &amp; Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizing &amp; Seizing Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing character &amp; ethical practices; Setting goals &amp; standards; Taking responsibility &amp; initiative; Seeking accountability &amp; mentorship</td>
<td>Serving first; Building relationships; Communicating effectively; Developing &amp; affirming others; Working collaboratively</td>
<td>Thinking critically &amp; systemically; Encouraging innovation; Weighing risks, benefits, ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding the times; Developing instincts; Acting decisively; Accepting risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFRESH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REGULATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintaining Order &amp; Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making healthy choices (diet, sleep, exercise, substances, etc.); Connecting socially &amp; spiritually; Managing stress; Maintaining balance</td>
<td>Creating &amp; managing resources; Developing &amp; applying policy; Assessing &amp; documenting performance; Continuous improvement</td>
<td>Creating &amp; managing resources; Developing &amp; applying policy; Assessing &amp; documenting performance; Continuous improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Leadership Taskforce Members
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Developing a Culture of Global Leadership at Andrews University: An Action Agenda
Prepared by: Steve Yeagley, chair, Andrews University Leadership-Development Taskforce

PROPOSED: That Andrews University leverage its diverse campus environment to educate active global citizens who will be able to address the complexity, differences, and challenges of a global church and society with understanding, skill, and moral courage. Furthermore, that a campus-wide agenda for developing a culture of global leadership be adopted and implemented in classrooms, residence halls, workplaces, and board rooms. This would entail commitments to:

1. Building Collaborative and Conversational Skills
Collaborative and conversational skills (and a collaborative spirit) are vital to exercising shared leadership in a flattened world of team-based organizations, networking, global interdependence, and interdisciplinary effort.

Opportunities
- cooperative learning
- research teams
- taskforces
- community partnerships
- student organizations
- collaborative software
- residential environments

2. Using Reflective Practices
Reflective practices give us opportunities for learning and self-awareness, align us with our core values, beliefs, and purposes, invite personal accountability and growth, challenge our assumptions, and inspire us to renew our commitments.

Opportunities
- spiritual disciplines
- reflection papers
- personal inventories
- coaching
debriefing
- retreats
- small groups
- portfolios
- storytelling
- blogs

3. Stimulating Creativity and Critical Thinking
Creative processes are an essential companion to critical thinking skills in helping us to reason clearly and flexibly, respond to rapid and complex challenges, adapt to diverse contexts, envision new possibilities, and lead change.

Opportunities
- brainstorming
- questioning
- discussion and debates
- problem-based learning
- proposals and presentations
- assessments
- written assignments

4. Developing Cultural Competencies
Cultural competencies enable us to understand and respect cultural differences, appreciate multiple perspectives, manage blended identities, invite unique contributions, communicate across cultural lines, and engage our differences productively and with civility.

Opportunities
- cross-cultural dialogue
- diversity training
- cultural clubs and showcases
- international tours/study abroad
- multi-cultural programs
- language study

5. Fostering Global Understanding and Engagement
Global understanding involves engaging local and global contexts, understanding the relationship between the two, becoming aware of social, economic, environmental, and spiritual conditions and their causes, weighing roles and responsibilities, and participating with others in creating change and serving the common good.

Opportunities
- mission and outreach programs
- service learning
- community partnerships
- international tours/study abroad
- engaged research
- sustainable practices
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APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM AND PROTOCOLS
APPENDIX B

Interview Respondent Invitation Protocol

Dear Potential Respondent,

You may know that I am enrolled in the Leadership Program and at the research stage of my graduate studies. My topic is, "A Case study to determine the interest and challenges of implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University".

I have worked closely with my dissertation committee members in the development of my research questions and methodology and gained approval from the Institutional Review Board to gather data related to Andrews University. My research plan includes the collection of data from 1) a survey of Andrews University undergraduate students, 2) focus groups of undergraduate students, and 3) interviews of selected Andrews University administrators and personnel.

Your relationship to this topic and/or position in the administrative structure and program development of Andrews University would provide valuable insight for my study. Therefore, I am inviting you to participate in the interview process. I anticipate that the interview could span 45 minutes. Allowing for an overview and closure it would be best to plan on 1 hour. I have outlined some suggested interview times during the last week of May as well as two options in June. If you are willing to participate please note a time frame that would work for you. If none of these timeframes will work for you but you would like to participate I will work with you to arrange an alternate time.

If you are willing to participate in this study please let me know what time will work best for you. If you are not able to participate you may want to suggest another individual that I should consider interviewing.

Frances Fachner
Vice President for Student Life
Andrews University
269-471-6686 Office
269-471-3524 Fax

"My dream is to create a campus culture where students are drawn to Love their Creator with all their hearts and souls and minds."
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Interview Overview and Consent Form for Participation in
Andrews Undergraduate Leadership-Development Program Study

Dear Participant,

Andrews University is exploring the idea of creating an undergraduate leadership-development program. A leader may not necessarily be a person who holds a formal position. Leadership is a relational process of people working together for change. Therefore all students are capable of learning to be effective leaders.

Traditionally, education focuses on acquiring knowledge. In a world of rapid change and complex problems education should also prepare students to use their knowledge to influence and change the world. An effective education should help students go beyond their own interest, learn about the world, develop a sense of civic responsibility, and discover how they can contribute to society (Astin & Astin, 2000; Boyer, 1987; Gardner, 1990).

Riggio, Ciulla, Sorenson (2003) recorded close to 1,000 recognized leadership-development programs in institutions of higher education. These programs represent a wide variety of models. Some are short-term, co-curricular leadership training programs. Others have a curriculum that combines theory and practice. The spectrum of common practices include: (a) experiential learning components, (b) general education requirements, (c) certificate programs, (d) leadership courses, (e) leadership minors, and (f) leadership majors. Students that participate in a leadership-development program would likely be involved in a process of self discovery, mentoring, experiential learning, service learning, and formal recognition upon graduation.

My study will gather data from a survey of undergraduate students, two student focus groups, and interviews of faculty, administration, and staff. By participating in this interview you have an opportunity to share your ideas about the potential and the challenges related to implementing a leadership-development program at Andrews University.

Informed Consent Form

Purpose of Study: I understand that the purpose of this study is to learn about the interest and challenges in developing and leadership development program at Andrews University. A leadership development program can build upon the content of a field of study and help students learn how to use their knowledge to influence and change the world. The title is “A case study to determine the interest and challenges of implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University.”

Inclusion Criteria: In order to participate I recognize that I must be an adult of 18 years of age (or older) and of a sound mind.

Risks and Discomforts: I have been informed that there are no physical or emotional risks to my participation in this study and that anonymity will be preserved at all times. As a participant my responses will not in any way impact my standing or relationship with Andrews University. I understand that my interview will be taped so that my ideas and perspectives can be captured in their complete context.

Contact Information: If I have any questions or concerns with regard to my participation in this study, I understand that I may contact the researcher, Frances Faehner at frances@andrews.edu or her advisor, Jim Tucker, adjunct professor in the School of Education, Leadership program, at jatuck@mac.com.

Benefits/Results: I accept that I will receive no remuneration for my participation. My ideas and insight will help the researcher arrive at a better understanding of the interests of Andrews undergraduate students in leadership-development and the challenges of implementing a leadership-development program at Andrews University.

Voluntary Participation: I understand that my involvement in this interview is voluntary and that I may
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withdraw my participation at any time without any pressure or negative impact on me. My signature below indicates that I am consenting to participate in the leadership-development study.

Signature of Respondent ___________________________ Date ____________

Thank you for your interest and your participation,

Frances Faehner
Graduate Student, School of Education

Follow up Interview Respondent Protocol

Dear Respondent,

Thank you for your willingness to participate in my research related to leadership-development and being a participant in my interview process.

In the interest of ensuring that your thoughts and ideas are accurately depicted, I hope you’d be willing to take a few moments to quickly review the transcript of our recent interview. After a brief review of the transcripts, I noted several places where the transcription may miss a word or intent and greater clarity would be helpful.

Rather than take too many liberties in my own interpretation, I wanted to give you and the other respondents, the opportunity to review your attached transcript and make any changes in wording and sentence structure that best represents your thoughts. I would caution you to not feel compelled to overly polish or perfect the transcript as I don’t want to loose the freshness of your expression. You are welcome, however, to add an additional or final thought.

Following your review please return the revised transcript to me via email, if possible before July 5, 2006. If you are comfortable that the attached transcript is an accurate depiction of the interview and that you do not desire to make any changes, please also confirm that choice with me.

Frances Faehner
Vice President for Student Life
Andrews University
269-471-6686 Office
269-471-3524 Fax

"My dream is to create a campus culture where students are drawn to Love their Creator with all their hearts and souls and minds."

Updated: May 31, 2006
APPENDIX C

Andrews University Leadership-Development Survey

1. I have read and agreed with the Informed Consent Form received through email from the researcher.  ○ Yes (If not, open your email and read it)

   Andrews University is exploring the idea of creating an undergraduate leadership-development program. A leader may not necessarily hold a formal position. Leadership is a relational process of people working together for change. Therefore all students are capable of learning to be effective leaders. Traditionally, education focused on mastering the content of a discipline. However, in a world of rapid change and complex problems an effective education should prepare students to use their knowledge to influence and change the world.

   If you were to participate in a leadership-development program, you would likely be involved in a process of self discovery, mentoring, experiential learning, service, and formal recognition upon graduation.

   Through the completion of this survey you have an opportunity to share your ideas about how leadership-development might be implemented at Andrews University.

Your Ideas

2. Andrews University should offer a major in leadership-development
   ○ Strongly Agree   ○ Agree   ○ Disagree   ○ Strongly Disagree

3. Andrews University should offer a minor in leadership-development (a minor may consists of 20 credit hours)
   ○ Strongly Agree   ○ Agree   ○ Disagree   ○ Strongly Disagree

4. Andrews University should offer a certificate in leadership-development (a certificate may consist of 12 credit hours)
   ○ Strongly Agree   ○ Agree   ○ Disagree   ○ Strongly Disagree

5. Andrews University should integrate leadership-development more fully into general education
   ○ Strongly Agree   ○ Agree   ○ Disagree   ○ Strongly Disagree

6. Andrews University should offer an internship in leadership-development (a credit-based actual leadership activity)
   ○ Strongly Agree   ○ Agree   ○ Disagree   ○ Strongly Disagree

7. Andrews University should offer a class in leadership-development
8. Andrews University should offer a leadership-development program that is not based on academic credit
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

9. If Andrews University offered a leadership-development program and I was beginning my college education, I would be interested in:
   - A major in leadership-development
   - A minor in leadership-development
   - An academic certificate in leadership-development (a certificate may consist of 12 credit hours)
   - An internship in leadership-development
   - Taking a class in leadership-development
   - Leadership-development that is not based on academic credit
   - None of the above

Andrews University's Motto is: “Seek knowledge. Affirm faith. Change the world.”

10. Participating in a leadership-development program could help graduates seek and use their knowledge
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

11. Participating in a leadership-development program could help graduates affirm their faith
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

12. Participating in a leadership-development program could help graduates change the world
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

13. Please indicate which reason(s) best describe(s) your motivation to participate in a leadership-development program at Andrews University. Select all the options that apply:
   - To learn how to use my knowledge to influence and change the world
   - To keep up with the complex demands and rapid changes of society
   - To prepare me to be more marketable for a better job
   - To develop my full leadership potential
   - To obtain certification or a degree in leadership
   - To acquire academic credit to complement my current leadership responsibilities
   - To help me be more successful in my field
   - Other

14. What barriers or obstacles would exist for you to participate in a undergraduate
leadership-development program? Select all the options that apply:

- I have no more time available in my current academic course plan
- I'm already involved in too many activities
- I'm satisfied with my level of leadership expertise
- I'm not interested in leadership-development
- It is not related to my educational life goals
- Other

15. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7 day week doing each of the following during a semester?

A. Preparing for class (studying, doing homework, papers, etc.)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

B. Working for pay

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

C. Volunteering your time and services (to on-campus and off-campus organizations)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

D. Participating in campus planned co-curricular activities (attend programs, music, athletics, clubs, etc.)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

E. Relaxing alone or socializing with friends (watching TV, computer, phone, video games, off-campus activities, etc.)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

Your Self-Assessment

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following descriptions of your leadership qualities?

16. Awareness

a. I clearly understand my strengths, weaknesses, emotions and values

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
b. I know God’s plan for my life
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

c. I have a good understanding of other people
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

17. Congruency and Character

a. I have a developed personal code of values and ethics
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

b. I act with authenticity and integrity
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

18. Commitment

a. I have the ability to invest in and persist towards achieving a goal
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

b. I am committed to my faith and a relationship with God
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

19. Collaboration

a. I develop positive relationships with people of diverse backgrounds
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

b. I am an effective team member working toward a shared goal
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

20. Communication

a. I have effective listening skills
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

b. I am able to speak clearly and effectively
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

c. I am able to write clearly and effectively
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree

21. Creative Problem Solver

a. I have analytical thinking skills
   ○ Strongly Agree ○ Agree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly Disagree
b. I am able to express divergent viewpoints with candor and respect  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

c. I am able to solve complex problems  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

22. *Citizenship and Service*

a. I have a desire to volunteer my service to others  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

b. I contribute my services to this campus or the local and global community  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

23. *Change Agent*

a. I am able to articulate a compelling vision  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

b. I have a strong power of influence on those around me  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

c. I am able to take action and make changes even with challenging obstacles  
   O Strongly Agree   O Agree   O Disagree   O Strongly Disagree

*Demographic Information*

24. Your gender:  O Female   O Male

25. Do you consider yourself:  
   O Asian/Pacific Islands  
   O Black or African American, not Hispanic  
   O Latino, Mexican American, Puerto Rican or other Hispanic  
   O American Indian, Native Alaskan, Native Hawaiian  
   O White, non-Hispanic  
   O Other

26. Your class standing:  
   O Freshman  
   O Sophomore  
   O Junior  
   O Senior

27. Your age ____
28. Your residence is:
   ○ On campus residence hall
   ○ On campus university apartments
   ○ Off Campus

29. Currently, I'm involved in one of the following leadership and service roles (Select all the options that apply):
   ○ Andrews University Student Association (AUSA) Officer or Senator
   ○ Residence Hall Resident Assistant
   ○ Campus Ministries Leader
   ○ Clubs and Organizations
   ○ Class Officer
   ○ Ambassador
   ○ First Year Family Group Leader
   ○ None
   ○ Other

30. What is your major?
   ○ Art
   ○ Biology
   ○ Chemistry
   ○ Biochemistry
   ○ Communication
   ○ Elementary Music Education
   ○ English
   ○ French
   ○ German
   ○ History
   ○ Journalism and Mass Media
   ○ Language for International Trade
   ○ Mathematics
   ○ Music
   ○ Physics
   ○ Public Relations
   ○ Psychology
   ○ Sociology
   ○ Spanish
   ○ Religion
   ○ Agribusiness
   ○ Agriculture
   ○ Animal Science
   ○ Automotive Management
   ○ Automotive Technology
   ○ Aviation Technology
   ○ Computing
   ○ Digital Multimedia Technology
   ○ Engineering
   ○ Graphic Imaging Technology
   ○ Horticulture
   ○ Photographic Imaging
   ○ Architectural Studies
   ○ Architecture (5-year professional degree)
   ○ Business Economics
   ○ Economics
   ○ Finance
   ○ Information Systems
   ○ Language and Intl. Business (French)
   ○ Language and Intl. Business (Spanish)
   ○ Management
   ○ Marketing
   ○ Elementary Education
   ○ Secondary Education
   ○ Other

31. Your cumulative GPA at Andrews is: ________
From: Frances Faehner  
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 2:12 PM  
To: Andrews University Undergraduate Students

Dear Andrews Student,

Andrews University is exploring the idea of creating an undergraduate leadership-development program. A leader may not necessarily hold a formal position. Leadership is a relational process of people working together for change. Therefore all students are capable of learning to be effective leaders.

Traditionally, education focuses on acquiring knowledge. However, in a world of rapid change and complex problems an effective education should also prepare students to use their knowledge to influence and change the world.

As a doctoral student in the School of Education Leadership Program and as an Andrews University administrator responsible to assist student in their total developing I have a deep interest in leadership development. If you were to participate in a leadership-development program, you would likely be involved in a process of self discovery, mentoring, experiential learning, service learning, and formal recognition upon graduation.

By clicking on web site that follows: [http://www.zoomerang.com/survey?p=WEB2255F6PF68A](http://www.zoomerang.com/survey?p=WEB2255F6PF68A) and completing the on line survey (which can be done in 8-10 minutes) you have an opportunity to share your ideas about how leadership-development might be implemented at Andrews University.

Informed Consent Form

Purpose of Study
I understand that the purpose of this study is to learn about the interest and challenges in developing and leadership development program at Andrews University. A leadership development program can build upon the content of my field of study and help me know better how to use my knowledge to influence and change the world. The title: is “A case study to determine the interest and challenges of implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University.”

Inclusion Criteria:
In order to participate, I recognize that I must be an adult of 18 years of age (or older) and of a sound mind, and must have been enrolled as a student of Andrews University during the 05-06 school year.

Risks and Discomforts: I have been informed that there are no physical or emotional risks
to my participation in this study and that anonymity will be preserved at all times. As a participant my responses will not in any way effect my relationship with Andrews University.

**Benefits/Results**
I accept that I will receive no remuneration for my participation. My response will help the researcher arrive at a better understanding of the interests of undergraduate students in leadership-development at Andrews University.

**Voluntary Participation:** I understand that my involvement in this survey is voluntary and that I may withdraw my participation at any time without any pressure or negative impact on me. By clicking on the website, and entering the Zoomerang site, I understand that I am consenting to participate in the leadership-development study.

**Participation in drawing for special gift:**
I understand that if I desire to participate in a drawing for a respondent to receive a free gift, that I will need to voluntary give my email contact information, so that I may be contacted should I be selected.

**Contact Information:**
If I have any questions or concerns with regard to my participation in this study, I understand that I may contact the researcher, Frances Faehner at frances@andrews.edu or her advisor, Jim Tucker, adjunct professor in the School of Education, Leadership program, at jatuck@mac.com

Thank you for your interest and participation,

Frances Faehner
Vice President for Student Life
Graduate Student, School of Education
APPENDIX D

Michael Wright
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Andrews University

Subject: Request from Frances Faehner to approve online survey

Dear Michael,

This letter is to request approval from the Institutional Review Board to administer the enclosed survey to the undergraduate students of Andrews University. The survey was developed as part of a mixed methods research plan to collect data related to undergraduate leadership-development on the campus of Andrews University.

I am interested in collecting this data as part of my study as a doctoral student in the Leadership Program of the School of Education, Andrews University. My dissertation topic is, "A Case study to determine the interest and challenges of implementing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University". I have worked closely with my dissertation committee members, Jim Tucker, Duane Covrig, and Karen Stockton-Chilson in the development of my research questions, methodology, and this survey.

Additionally, in my administrative role, I am part of an informal exploration team considering the possibility and potential of developing an undergraduate leadership-development program at Andrews University. The findings from my study could also be shared with this task force, upon request, should the explorations move to a formal stage of program development.

I intend to use the services of an online survey. My sample will include all current undergraduate Andrews University students that are 18 or more years of age. Although the survey does not contain sensitive content areas, I will maintain the confidentiality of the participants of the survey. My major interest is in the aggregate nature of the data to be able answer my research questions and if appropriate to develop new initiatives to enhance leadership-development at Andrews University.

Please let me know if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

Frances Faehner
Vice President Student Services
Doctoral Student, School of Education

c: Jim Tucker
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Ms. Frances Faehner
Student Services
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0300

Ms. Faehner,

RE: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

IRB Protocol #: 06-054 Application Type: Original
Dept: Education (Leadership)

Review Category: Exempt Action Taken: Approved Advisor: Jim Tucker

Protocol Title: A Case Study to Determine the Interest and Challenges of Implementing an Undergraduate Leadership-development Program at Andrews University

This letter is to advise you that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved your proposal for research. You have been given clearance to proceed with your research plans.

All changes made to the study design and/or consent form, after initiation of the project, require prior approval from the IRB before such changes can be implemented. Feel free to contact our office if you have any questions. The duration of the present approval is for one year. If your research is going to take more than one year, you must apply for an extension of your approval in order to be authorized to continue with this project.

Some proposal and research design designs may be of such a nature that participation in the project may involve certain risks to human subjects. If your project is one of this nature and in the implementation of your project an incidence occurs which results in a research-related adverse reaction and/or physical injury, such an occurrence must be reported immediately in writing to the Institutional Review Board. Any project-related physical injury must also be reported immediately to the University physician, Dr. Loren Hamel, by calling (269) 473-2222.

We wish you success as you implement the research project as outlined in the approved protocol.

Sincerely,

Samuel Millen
Graduate Assistant
Institutional Review Board
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Frances Mae Faehner
Born in Cortland, New York, USA

EDUCATION
Andrews University  Ph.D. Candidate  Leadership  August, 2007
LaSierra University  M.A.  Counselor Education  1984
Andrews University  B.A.  Social Work  1976

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE
Andrews University  Vice President for Student Life  Berrien Springs  Michigan  October 2003-
Andrews University  Dean of Students  Berrien Springs  Michigan  2001-2003
Andrews University  Dean of Women  Berrien Springs  Michigan  1985-2001
LaSierra University  Dean of Women  Riverside  California  1983-1985
LaSierra University  Associate Dean of Women  Riverside  California  1981-1983
Shenandoah Valley Academy  Dean of Girls  New Market  Virginia  1978-1981
Bass Memorial Academy  Dean of Girls  Lumberton  Mississippi  1976-1978

OTHER EXPERIENCES
President  Adventist Student Personnel Association  1989-1990
Excellence in Administration Award  Adventist Student Personnel Association  1990