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Abstract

Leadership education has been integral to the undergraduate curriculum since the early 1990’s. Today, more than 1,000 colleges and universities in the United States offer undergraduate courses in leadership studies and many offer academic credit in the form of a bachelor’s degree, academic minor, or certificate. Yet, little is known about those who teach leadership studies courses to undergraduates, the instructional strategies they employ, or the learning goals they set. The purpose of this study was to identify the instructional strategies that are most frequently used by instructors when they teach academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses, identify signature pedagogies within the leadership discipline, and assess the learning goals instructors believe are of the greatest importance in their courses. Schulman’s framework of Signature Pedagogies provided the framework for the portion of this study which identified the instructional strategies used most frequently. An exploratory factor analysis was performed to identify patterns of instructional strategies most often used. Fink’s Model of Significant Learning and Integrated Course Design provided the framework for the portion of this study that assessed the learning goals instructors believe are of the greatest importance in their courses.

Results of a unique web-based survey of 303 instructors that taught academic credit-bearing undergraduate leaderships studies courses between 2008 and 2010 were analyzed using quantitative methods to identify the
instructional strategies used most frequently by instructors within the leadership discipline and assess the learning goals instructors believe are of the greatest importance. Participants were solicited through the membership of the International leadership Association, National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, and NASPA Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education. Data from 303 survey participants were analyzed and results indicated that instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses prefer discussion-based pedagogies (such as class discussion) and instructional strategies that prioritize conceptual understanding and personal growth far more than traditional teaching and learning strategies like quizzes, exams, and lecture or skill-building activities such as role play, simulation, or games. Findings from this study suggest that class discussion—whether in the form of true class discussion or a variation of interactive lecture and discussion—is the signature pedagogy for undergraduate leadership education. While group and individual projects and presentations, self-assessments and instruments, and reflective journaling were also used frequently, overall, discussion-based pedagogies were used most frequently. Survey results also indicated that instructors place the greatest importance on learning goals that emphasize application, integration, and the human dimensions of significant learning more so than the learning goals of promoting foundational knowledge, caring, and metacognition (learning how to learn). These findings offer attributes that a variety of leadership educators have shared as effective for teaching and learning within the discipline and may facilitate the
development of new leadership programming policies, provide direction for future research, and contribute to the existing body of literature.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Background

Leadership Education has been an integral component of the undergraduate curriculum since the early 1990’s. During this time undergraduate leadership education (ULE) has experienced expansive growth where today there are more than 1,000 leadership programs at U.S.-based colleges and universities (Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006; Carry, 2003; Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003; Sorenson, 2002). These programs include curricular- and co-curricular based undergraduate leadership programs offering academic credit in the form of a bachelor’s degree, academic minor, or certificate as well as student affairs programming in the form of retreats, training, or other workshops. It would follow then that ULE instructors would subscribe to myriad pedagogies. Yet, unlike many academic disciplines, empirical data shows that ULE is offered in a format typically more experiential and activity based versus lecture and reading based (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Eich, 2008; Moore, Boyd, & Dooley, 2010). Yet, little is known about the emergence of specific pedagogies in ULE.

ULE courses also possess several unique characteristics. They consist of multi- and cross-disciplinary course content (Rost, 1993; Yukl, 2006); incorporate student-centered experiential learning experiences designed to help students
develop as leaders (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Eich, 2008; Moore, Boyd, & Dooley, 2010); emphasize personal growth, conceptual understanding, feedback, and skill building (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Conger, 1992); focus on leaders and followers, individuals and groups (DuBrin, 2010; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Northouse, 2010); and draw upon many theories, business practices, and alternative perspectives (DuBrin, 2010; Komives et al., 2007; Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 2006;). These unique characteristics provide many challenges to ULE instructors.

To address these challenges, ULE instructors potentially can employ a wide range of instructional approaches. Yet, research has shown that more often than not, ULE instructors use and emphasize experiential and active learning approaches (Eich, 2008; Moore, Boyd, & Dooley, 2010). Luckmann (1996) defines experiential learning as “a process through which a learner constructs knowledge, skill, and value from direct experience” (p. 6). According to Bonwell and Eison (1991), active learning means involving students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing. “Doing” refers to activities such as debates, simulations, guided design, group problem solving, and case studies. Thinking refers to reflections about the meaning of what students learn or about the learning process itself (Fink, 2003). Fink incorporates these methods into course design and instruction (teaching and learning) in a model of Integrated Course Design that emphasizes a “significant learning” or learning-centered approach where faculty decide first what students can and should learn in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated.
Uniquely, the research in ULE leads us to believe that it was built on this foundation. Yet, only a few very limited efforts have identified the profile of pedagogical content knowledge of ULE through instructor experiences.

One method growing to identify pedagogical content knowledge in the disciplines is through identifying “signature pedagogies.” Shulman (2005) defines signature pedagogies as the types of teaching that organize the fundamental ways in which future practitioners are educated for their new professions. According to Shulman, the easiest way to recognize signature pedagogies is to find out what pedagogies first come to our minds when asked about the preparation of a particular profession. Yet, nobody has investigated this query in the ULE discipline. What are these instructional strategies and how do leadership instructors utilize them effectively?

While there are potentially countless variations of instructional strategies for specific ULE courses—and while they may be grounded in active or experiential learning—there also may be several common observable patterns. For that reason, the present study first will empirically explore the pedagogical content knowledge commonly used to teach ULE courses. Then, this study will identify the possible existence of signature pedagogies in the ULE discipline. Finally, it will empirically explore the types of learning goals instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses establish for students in their courses.
Research Problem

Since 1990, only a few studies have reviewed or identified instructional strategies utilized in ULE (see for example: Allen & Hartman, 2009; Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1990; Conger, 1992; Day, 2000; Eich 2008; London, 2002; Yukl, 2002). While these studies have addressed various stakeholders’ perceptions of leadership development programming (and student perceptions in depth), only a handful collected data from leadership practitioners (not identified specifically as university instructors). For example, in a grounded theory study of “high quality” leadership programs, Eich (2008) interviewed 62 stakeholders in leadership programs that ranged in type from an academic course, to a week retreat, to a co-curricular program, to a service leadership program. Yet, only 17 of the stakeholders were practitioners (instructors). Despite the interest in student leadership development programming, the sparse few studies that have investigated ULE instructors who teach academic credit-bearing courses have been limited to an insufficient number of participants. To address this overlooked question, this study specifically investigated ULE instructors that teach academic credit-bearing courses through a national survey.

Despite the rapid growth in academic credit-bearing leadership studies course, instructors who teach these courses have not been profiled in the literature. In a recent study Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, and Arensdorf (2006) reviewed undergraduate leadership degree programs in the U.S. And while this study profiled the major, type of degree, credit requirements, delivery options, student population, and major description, they profiled only the number
of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty and academic host department of each program. Thus, the web-based questionnaire addressed the following questions of interest to the researcher:

1. Who teaches leadership studies courses?
2. What are their academic credentials?
3. What are their roles at their institution?
4. What types of institutions employ them (basic demographics)?
5. What types of leadership training or experiences have they had?
6. Through what academic area or department are the leadership course(s) they teach offered?
7. What degree(s) do their departments offer in leadership (if any)?

In fact, nearly no research exists in regard to leadership educators. Indeed, only in the last two years has information profiling ULE programs been central and available (e.g., International Leadership Association Directory of Leadership Education Programs; National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs). These resources identify only the existence of ULE programs and their academic profile (curricular or co-curricular), while profiles of instructors still need exploration.

Also, in previous studies of instructional strategies utilized in ULE, the literature has discussed pedagogy chiefly from students’ points of view. These studies have not addressed specifically the pedagogical methods used by leadership instructors from the instructor’s point of view. To address this
problem, a quantitative survey of most commonly utilized instructional strategies is needed.

Finally, while numerous studies have assessed teaching and learning, almost none have addressed the instructional goals associated with teaching and learning. Fink (2003) posits that to address these goals, teachers should take a learning-centered approach to designing courses. According to Fink (2005), “the heart of this approach is to decide first what students can and should learn in relation to this subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated” (p. 1). While application of this approach to specific courses and disciplines has been well documented in the literature (e.g., Allen & Tanner, 2007; Magnussen, 2008; Rose & Torosyan, 2009), no studies have addressed this approach in ULE. As well, no studies have approached learning goals empirically. Levine, Fallahi, Nicoll-Senft, Tessier, Watson, and Wood (2008) came close in their study, Creating Significant Learning Experiences Across Disciplines, where each author employed Fink’s (2003) approach to course redesign. This study assessed college students’ learning in six courses from different disciplines over one semester in the following areas identified by Fink (2003) as “learning goals”: (a) foundational knowledge, (b) learning how to learn, (c) application, (d) integration, (e) human dimension, and (e) learning how to learn. Similarly, Nicoll-Senft (2009) employed a pre- and post-assessment model to gauge improvement in student learning in a single Special Education course. While significant improvement in student learning was reported in both studies, they addressed learning goals in only six and one courses respectively. This study addressed
these gaps in the literature by collecting empirical data about the learning goals ULE instructors establish for their students in many courses across the leadership discipline through a national survey.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to identify the instructional strategies that are most frequently used by instructors when they teach courses in the ULE discipline, identify potential signature pedagogies for the ULE discipline, inform ULE practitioners about alternative instructional strategies used to teach ULE courses, and assess the learning goals ULE instructors establish for their students. A quantitative research design was used. A national web-based survey was used to identify the instructional strategies most frequently used by ULE instructors and assess the learning goals instructors place the greatest importance.

**Research Questions**

1. What are the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?
2. Are there identifiable signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline?
3. What learning goals are most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?

**Definitions of Terms**

The following definitions of terms are presented to clarify language used in this study.
Active Learning. Any instructional approach that “involves students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing” (Bonwell & Eison, 1991, p. 2).

Experiential Learning. A process through which a learner constructs knowledge, skill, and value from experience (Luckmann, 1996, p. 6).

Instructional Strategies. Learning or instructional strategies determine the approach for achieving learning objectives and are included in the pre-instructional activities, information presentation, learner activities, testing, and follow-through. The strategies are usually tied to the needs and interests of students to enhance learning and are based on many types of learning styles (Ekwensi, Moranski, & Townsend-Sweet, 2006). As used in this study, instructional strategies are interchangeable/synonymous with instructional methods, assignments, and classroom activities; they can be anything an instructor has built into a course for students to do or complete.

Leadership Education. Learning activities and educational environments that are intended to enhance and foster leadership abilities (Brungardt, 1996).

Learner-centered Approach. An approach to course design where teachers decide first what students can and should learn in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated (Fink, 2005).

Pedagogy. The act and discourse of teaching (variously described as a science, a craft and an art) (Mortimore, 1999).

Signature Pedagogies. These are the forms of instruction that leap to mind when we first think about the preparation of members of particular
professions. They implicitly define what counts as knowledge in a field and how things become known (Shulman, 2005).

**Delimitations**

First, the study used the population of ULE instructors identified from databases, listservs, and directories provided by the following professional associations, organizations, or groups: 1) International Leadership Association (ILA), 2) NASPA Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education Student Leadership Programs Group, and 3) the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP). Although some of these databases and listservs have international faculty members, this study included only the faculty members employed by U.S.-based institutions of higher education (the directories have U.S. institutions only). There are three reasons for this selection:

1. The number of faculty members located in foreign countries is relatively small when compared to those located in the U.S.

2. Not all international faculty members (e.g. from The Netherlands, Japan, or France) have English as their first language. Thus, to reduce potential language problems with survey items, this study will only include faculty members at U.S.-Based institutions.

3. The discipline of Leadership remains loosely defined, even more so globally. To reduce interpretation, increase reliability of survey items and results, and amplify the usefulness of the study to U.S.-Based practitioners, this study will only include faculty members at U.S.-based institutions.
Second, this study looked only at ULE instructors who teach academic credit-bearing courses in the discipline. Third, this study looked at ULE instructors who teach in-class, face-to-face courses only. Fourth, this study focused on Shulman’s (2005) framework of signature pedagogy. Fifth, this study measured learning goals based on definitions Fink’s (2003) taxonomy of significant learning. Sixth, no agreed upon definition for leadership or leadership studies exists within the discipline (Eich, 2007). These concepts and debates will be expanded on in the literature review.

Limitations

A quantitative exploratory study design with a survey method to study such phenomena is prone to several limitations:

1. Although the design targeted ULE instructors at U.S.-based institutions, the quantitative data might not be able to fully capture rich and detailed information on instructional strategies used in the ULE discipline.

2. It is important to note that not all ULE instructors are part of the professional organizations and associations included in this study. Likewise, not all ULE instructors’ university departments are included in the database provided by the International Leadership Association. Nor do all departments include instructor information on their department’s website. Generalization of the results to ULE instructors that are not part of the aforementioned organizations or whose departments are not included in the ILA database would not be appropriate thereby limiting the study’s external (population) validity.
3. The data obtained in 2010 will create a profile at a specific point of time.

4. Instrumentation and measurement errors pose the greatest potential threats to the validity of the present study; steps taken to reduce these threats are described in Chapter 3.

5. The use of a web-based survey sent to ULE instructors from the aforementioned sources will not ensure the quality of the results obtained if the response rate is unacceptably low.

In order to anticipate these limitations, the researcher has analyzed and assessed the confidence level of the findings. Because it is impossible to assess the representativeness precisely, the researcher will compare selected characteristics of the responding participants to the larger population of ULE instructors. And, although the listservs, databases, and directories identified above represent the researcher’s best attempt to identify the target population, it is possible that the survey will be distributed to non-ULE instructors.

**Significance of the Study**

In the ULE discipline, relatively few studies have focused on the teaching methods, instructional approaches, or leadership studies curriculum design and content while a greater number have focused on ULE programs (e.g., Allen & Hartman, 2009; Eich, 2008; Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack & Wagner, 2006; Ritch & Mengel, 2009; Roberts, 2007). Yet, today, more than 1,000 ULE programs exist (Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006). This study is the first of its kind to collect data regarding instructional methods and established learning goals in academic credit-bearing ULE courses through a
national survey. Thus, research that identifies specific and effective instructional strategies in the ULE discipline will serve as both a resource and guide for ULE instructors, student affairs programmers and academic administrators. Information regarding the learning goals ULE instructors establish for their students will help to inform decisions instructors make about instructional strategies.

As well, despite the increased interest in ULE, the literature has only sparsely reviewed specific leadership pedagogies as a group. In the 1992 work *Learning to Lead*, Jay A. Conger explored five innovative leadership training programs outside universities and joined them as a participant and observer (p. xiii). Following his documented experiences in these, Conger and his research team reported no “one best” program for leadership training. Instead, they found that instructional methods each had distinct strengths and drawbacks and the researchers categorized leadership training into four key approaches: 1) personal growth, 2) conceptual, 3) feedback, and 4) skill-building (p. 155). Sixteen years later (in 2008 and 2009), Allen and Hartman built upon Conger’s work and published three articles in peer-reviewed journals that identified 40 commonly used “sources of learning for leader development” (2008a, 2009b, & 2009). As a result, Allen and Hartman created one of the first comprehensive lists of leadership development teaching methods found in the literature (see also Avolio, 1999; Day, 2000; London, 2002; Yukl, 2002). Yet, through their research on students in ULE courses, no distinguishable leadership pedagogy emerged. Instead, they had a collection of sorts, identifying 40 sources of learning
commonly used in leadership development programming for collegians. This study builds upon the work of Conger (1992) and Allen and Hartman (2008a, 2008b, & 2009). Through a national survey investigating instructional strategy use in ULE this study will address these gaps in the literature and identify distinguishable or signature pedagogies within the discipline.

To date, no research exists that applies Fink’s model to leadership studies. However, several researchers and practitioners have applied Fink’s model in courses in other disciplines such as biology, computer science, engineering education, and gerontology. Yet, a review of the literature indicates that, of these studies, a sparse few have collected quantitative data to measure instructor utilization of significant learning. Instead, they are mostly collections of scholarly advice and implications for practice grounded in instructional experiences rather than research data.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

The dissertation reports research on instructional strategies and signature pedagogies in the ULE discipline over five chapters. Chapter one introduces the background of the research, the research problem, purpose, research questions, definition of terms, delimitations, limitations, and significance of the study. Chapter two reviews the relevant literature including the foundational concepts in this study. These include an overview of the ULE discipline and an examination of the instructional strategies utilized in the ULE discipline as well as a review of similar studies and other theories that guided the present study. Chapter three represents the methodological framework for the study, including an expanded
description of the survey instrument, population and sample, variables, and data
collection and analyses. Chapter four will detail the statistical analysis of data for
the research questions. Chapter five will restate the purpose of the study, a
review of the research questions, and present conclusions and recommendations
for further research. The appendix includes the survey instrument, invitation to
participate in the survey and other pertinent documents referred to throughout
the dissertation.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature

Introduction

The leadership discipline is burgeoning in higher education. Until recently, leadership studies was almost exclusively restricted to the business and student affairs disciplines (Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Today, the leadership discipline has transcended to an essential tenet of higher education that should be an element of all curriculums (Wren, Riggio, & Genovese, 2009). Yet, little research exists to identify or explain the instructional strategies or pedagogical techniques required to teach these valuable skills. Thus, further research is needed to explore these areas and shed some light on the current state of leadership studies pedagogy.

This chapter presents a literature review pertinent to the study. The chapter organization follows a logical order: the first half presents the principal theories and instructional strategies that informed this study and the second half reviews the ULE discipline and frequently used pedagogies. The chapter will explore: (1) the concept of signature pedagogies and its application in a variety of disciplines, (2) the concepts of significant learning and integrated course design and their application in a variety of disciplines, (3) a review of the instructional strategies central to this study, (4) an overview of the leadership discipline, (5) an
analysis of commonly used pedagogies in ULE, and (6) a summary of the philosophical foundation of this study.

**Signature Pedagogies**

Shulman (2005) defines signature pedagogies as the forms of instruction that leap to mind when we first think about the preparation of members of particular professions. They implicitly define what counts as knowledge in a field and how things become known. They define how knowledge is analyzed, criticized, accepted, or discarded as well as inform students to *think*, to *perform*, and to *act with integrity*. Is there then, a signature pedagogy in leadership education? Are leadership studies educators/programs preparing members of particular professions? Many scholars argue that leadership studies transcend the disciplines and prepare students for all professions (e.g., Doh, 2003; Wren, Riggio, & Genovese, 2009; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Thus, the challenge of identifying signature pedagogies in leadership is an important one.

According to Shulman (2005), a signature pedagogy has three dimensions:

1. **Surface structure**: “concrete, operational acts of teaching and learning, of showing and demonstrating, of questioning and answering, of interacting and withholding, of approaching and withdrawing.” (p.54)

2. **Deep structure**: “a set of assumptions about how best to impart a certain body of knowledge and know-how.” (p.55)

3. **Implicit structure**: “a moral dimension that comprises a set of beliefs about professional attitudes, values, and dispositions.” (p.55)

Yet, these three dimensions have not received equal attention across the disciplines (Shulman, 2005). This constitutes what is missing from our
understanding of signature pedagogies. To address this void, Shulman recommends a comparative study of signature pedagogies across professions. Such an approach can help identify alternative practices for improvement across the disciplines that spill over into the professions.

Shulman (2005) explains that effective signature pedagogies are those that incorporate active student participation, make students feel deeply engaged, promote a learning environment where students feel visible (making it hard for students to disappear and become anonymous). Furthermore, signature pedagogies tend to be interactive, meaning students are not only accountable to their teacher, but also to fellow students. Ultimately, signature pedagogies breed accountability of performance and interaction, as well as simply removing the cloak of invisibility leading to a much higher affective level in class. Arguably, since leadership development workshops, classic teambuilding seminars, and other interactive activities represent the earliest forms of leadership education, leadership educators have consistently demonstrated these types of techniques.

To be effective, leadership must be taught through learner-centered pedagogies (Eich, 2008). Bonwell and Eison (1991) suggested active learning in the classroom that “[involves] students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing” (p. 2). “Doing” refers to activities such as debates, simulations, guided design, group problem solving, and case studies. Thinking refers to reflections about the meaning of what students learn or about the learning process itself (Fink, 2005). Schneider and Shoenberg (1998) recommend five key elements to create hands-on, inquiry-oriented strategies of
learning: (a) collaborative learning, (b) experiential learning, (c) service learning, (d) research or inquiry-based learning, and (e) integrative learning. Likewise, Eich (2008) suggests that high-quality leadership programs incorporate student-centered experiential learning experiences that include leadership practice, reflection activities, application in meetings, meaningful discussions, episodes of indifference, civic service, and discovery retreats (p. 180). Early leadership educators must have been cognizant of this trend since the conditions of an interactive and learner-centered classroom tend to be the commonplace in leadership studies courses. But, just because the instructor employs the right methods does not mean that significant learning is taking place (this concept will be defined in depth in the section following Table 1).

**Shulman in Other Disciplines**

To date, no literature exists discussing a signature pedagogy for the leadership discipline. Yet, scholars have applied Shulman’s model to other disciplines. Perhaps it is because ULE transcends academic disciplines and professions (Northouse, 2010; Rost, 1993; Yukl, 2006). Since 2005, a number of published books have examined educating specific professions such as clergy (Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2005), lawyers (Sullivan, Colby, Wegner, & Bond, 2007), nurses (Benner, Sutphen, Leonard, & Day, 2009), engineers (Sheppard, Macatangay, & Colby, 2009), and physicians (Cooke, Irby, O’Brien, & Shulman, 2010). Most recently, *Exploring Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind* (Gurung, Chick, & Haynie, 2009) provides a collection of discussions describing commonly employed pedagogies in the
disciplines of humanities (history and literary studies), fine arts (creative writing and arts), social sciences (geography, human development, and psychology), natural sciences (agriculture and biological sciences), and mathematics (computer science, mathematics, and physics). A summary of the signature pedagogies in the Gurung, et al. (2009) text are discussed in Table 1. According to Djajalaksana (2011), several themes in the Gurung et al. text emerge across different disciplines: (1) the emerging and proposed ways of teaching in the various disciplines described reveal increased use of active learning instructional strategies and more learner-centered approach to teaching the courses, and (2) these discipline-based explorations were drawn from each author’s personal observations and reflections, case studies, or literature reviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/ Subject &amp; Author(s)</th>
<th>Traditional Ways</th>
<th>Signature Pedagogies (Emerging/ Proposed Ways)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture (Wattiaux, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Traditional in-class instruction that includes problem solving, oral and written communication, leadership, and life-long learning skills.</td>
<td>Capstone experiences and experiential learning opportunities to involve students in real-world experiences. This may include structured independent studies, internships, service learning, study abroad, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts (Klebesadel &amp; Kornetsky, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>In both the studio arts (i.e., paintings, sculpture) and the performance arts (i.e., theater, music, dance), students' work are judged by their peers and teachers, and students also critique/ give formative feedbacks on their own work, their peers' work, and professionals work in the field.</td>
<td>Using critique while creating a community of learners where students express ideas and share their standpoints in an open, free, and non-threatening environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Science (Bauer-Dantoin, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Traditional in-class teaching and “Scientific teaching”; laboratory exercises that engage students in the scientific method of biology with experimental, rigorous, collaborative, and evidence-based instruction.</td>
<td>More active learning involving cognitive development through biology laboratory experiences, where students engage in the spirit of research/ inquiry and enjoy the experience as biologist researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Science (Christie, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Traditional lectures and students creating computer programs that are not connected to real, everyday life.</td>
<td>No one signature pedagogy for computer science at this time. However, the future will most likely involve more emphasis on student learning and engagement with digital media and social interaction. This includes various active and cooperative learning techniques such as Socratic questioning through personal response systems and collaborative programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Writing (Meachem, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>The “writing workshop” – students write stories, read, and reflect on their own writing, then give and receive “a stack of critiques” from their peers in a large group dialogue. This creates a tendency that students suppress their own view towards what is acceptable by the audience or the instructor.</td>
<td>Treating students as writers and ask them to analyze and reflect on their own writing patterns/ habits in a more comfortable environment where they can express their own view in the highest standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography (Komoto, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Students are taught “spatial information skills” such as recognizing locations and creating maps; engaged in “fieldwork” such as visiting locations/ field trips; taught “visualization skills” on physical and cultural geography; and taught “map use” to create and interpret maps.</td>
<td>“Training students to think like geographers”, to move students from being a geographer novice to expert. This includes teaching the traditional ways and adding cognitive skill development so that students can conduct multifaceted observations on geographical landscape while appreciating the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 (Continued)

**Summary of Signature Pedagogies Discussions in Gurung et al.’s (2009) Book**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject &amp; Author(s)</th>
<th>Traditional Ways</th>
<th>Signature Pedagogies (Emerging/Proposed Ways)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History (Sipress &amp; Voelker, 2009)</td>
<td>The “coverage model” – teaching content of history through textbooks. Lack of attention to cognitive acquisition and assessment of learning.</td>
<td>“Doing history”, involving students to create critical arguments on historical issues and documents (e.g. argumentative essays, debates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development (Bartell &amp; Vespia, 2009)</td>
<td>“Developmental approach” – students are introduced to a developmental perspective with integrative thinking in this interdisciplinary subject. Specific sequencing, team teaching, active learning and real-world problem solving wrapped in a specific context so that students acquire an integrated understanding of human development issues.</td>
<td>Students are taught the perspective of a developmentalist where they can integrate the interdisciplinary nature of their subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Studies (Chick, 2009)</td>
<td>The “professorial packing” – teaching literature by stuffing the instructors’ views and interpretations of the materials rather than having students uncover these themselves.</td>
<td>“Unpacking the conflicts, conversations, and questions”, engaging students in critical arguments of the literature through conversations, negotiations, contradictions, or conflicts to draw students’ own views and interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Ernie, LeDocq, Serros, &amp; Tong, 2009)</td>
<td>Traditional lecture where instructor writes facts and theorems on a chalkboard and presents solutions to the relevant practice problems. Students learn passively and by taking notes.</td>
<td>Using of real-world problems to teach multiple representations of mathematical models and ideas to solve the problems. This involves more active student participation and cooperative/collaborative learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (Don, Garvey, &amp; Sadeghpour, 2009)</td>
<td>Separation of music theory and music performance. In the music theory, students must learn the music theory (and grammar) and musicianship skills (study keyboard, sing melodies, and read notations). In the music performance, it is the series of “private lessons” where students meet individually to master a specific instrument, and then at the end of the semester they must perform in front of their peers and music faculty “jury” who evaluate their performance.</td>
<td>Connecting the two elements of music study (theory and performance) and focusing on the thinking processes and analysis to encourage students’ creativity rather than on meticulous coverage of the content areas. Teaching students “how to practice” in addition to “what to practice”. Implements “studio teaching” where students learn individually and in groups rather than only through “private lessons”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/ Subject &amp; Author(s)</td>
<td>Traditional Ways</td>
<td>Signature Pedagogies (Emerging/ Proposed Ways)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physics (Lattery, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Lecture and confirmation labs “in search of truth”. In the traditional lecture, instructor writes on the chalkboard and students take notes as the main goal is to “cover the material”.</td>
<td>Several emerging pedagogies such as a “modeling method” where students investigate the thinking process and write a scientific paper that incorporate critical thinking; “peer instruction” where students engage in peer-to-peer discussions; “interactive lecture demonstration” where students are actively involved in the classroom demonstration; “tutorials in introductory physics” that provides students the opportunity for concept reviews, questionings, and problem solving; and “real-time physics” that involve computer-based data collection analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music (Don, Garvey, &amp; Sadeghpour, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Separation of music theory and music performance. In the music theory, students must learn the music theory (and grammar) and musicianship skills (study keyboard, sing melodies, and read notations). In the music performance, it is the series of “private lessons” where students meet individually to master a specific instrument, and then at the end of the semester they must perform in front of their peers and music faculty “jury” who evaluate their performance.</td>
<td>Connecting the two elements of music study (theory and performance) and focusing on the thinking processes and analysis to encourage students’ creativity rather than on meticulous coverage of the content areas. Teaching students “how to practice” in addition to “what to practice”. Implements “studio teaching” where students learn individually and in groups rather than only through “private lessons”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physics (Lattery, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Lecture and confirmation labs “in search of truth”. In the traditional lecture, instructor writes on the chalkboard and students take notes as the main goal is to “cover the material”.</td>
<td>Several emerging pedagogies such as a “modeling method” where students investigate the thinking process and write a scientific paper that incorporate critical thinking; “peer instruction” where students engage in peer-to-peer discussions; “interactive lecture demonstration” where students are actively involved in the classroom demonstration; “tutorials in introductory physics” that provides students the opportunity for concept reviews, questionings, and problem solving; and “real-time physics” that involve computer-based data collection analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology (Peden &amp; VanVoorhis, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>Large lectures, laboratory instructions, informal conferences, quizzes, and written reviews. Also commonly mentioned in literature reviews are “activities and demonstrations”, and “writing and problem solving”.</td>
<td>No single signature pedagogy at this time. However, critical thinking would be a suggested infusion to the current approach for teaching psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relatively little is known about signature pedagogies in other disciplines. As well, signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline have not yet been explored or identified. To address the surface structure dimension, the present study will collect data on the frequency of instructional strategies used by ULE instructors through a national survey (initial quantitative phase). Future researchers might employ qualitative research methodologies to examine the deep and implicit dimensions of signature pedagogies used in teaching ULE courses.

Creating Significant Learning Experiences

While Shulman’s (2005) idea of signature pedagogies remains the central theoretical tenet of the present study, my thinking has also been informed by Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning and Model of Integrated Course Design. Significant learning experiences describe a process or taxonomy that includes students engaged in their learning in a high energy classroom. Following in the footsteps of Barr and Tagg’s (1995) shift from a teaching to a learning paradigm in undergraduate education, significant learning is a learning-
centered approach where faculty decides first what students can and should learn in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated (Fink, 2003). This taxonomy differs from Benjamin Bloom’s (1956) Taxonomy of Learning that classifies levels of intellectual behavior important in learning—knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation—in that it is more learner-centered than teaching-centered and it is more of an interconnected cycle than a hierarchical process or pyramid. Figure 1 below illustrates Fink’s taxonomy.


The results, impacts, and outcomes of significant learning experiences produce a significant and lasting change in the student where the learning that occurs has a high potential for being of value in their lives long after the course is over (even after graduation) by enhancing their individual lives, preparing them to
participate in multiple communities, or preparing them for the world of work. Moreover, these courses should enhance students’ individual lives, enable them to contribute to the many communities of which they are a part, and prepare them for the world of work. Could the signature pedagogy of leadership be a model for all other disciplines? Is it because the leadership discipline emerged so late, centuries beyond that of the sciences, mathematics, and liberal arts, that leadership educators thought to themselves, “we better get this one right?”
Fink (2003) describes “good” courses as those that:

1. Challenge students to significant kinds of learning.
2. Use active forms of learning.
3. Have teachers who care—about the subject, their students, and about teaching and learning [not just research].
4. Have teachers who interact well with students.
5. Have a good system of feedback, assessment, and grading.

This list above reflects that if someone’s teaching successfully meets the criteria listed above, its impact is going to be good, no matter what else is bad about it—even if a teacher is not a great lecturer or well organized. Conversely, if someone’s teaching does not meet these criteria, that teaching is poor, not matter what else is good about it (Fink, 2003). Similarly, Shulman (2005) describes effective teachers not as charismatic figures, but instead as ordinary teachers in challenging disciplines that feel a responsibility that their students learn. These teachers are not just meeting their students halfway; they are going all the way and bringing them along. That kind of teaching should be within the grasp of any faculty member—it is not magic—it is pedagogy. In summary, this taxonomy of significant learning is one that is not hierarchical, but rather, like postindustrial leadership, is relational and even interactive.

Significant learning suggests a learning-centered approach to designed courses where instructors decide first what student can and should learn in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated
To do so, Fink (2005) suggests the following model of Integrated Course Design (ICD) identified in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: A Model of Integrated Course Design](image)


The Model of ICG indicates that, to design any form of instruction, the teacher needs to:

1. Identify important **Situational Factors**
2. This information should be used to make three key sets of decisions:
   a. What do I want students to learn? (**Learning Goals**)
   b. How will students (and the teacher) know if these goals are being accomplished? (**Feedback and Assessment**)
   c. What will the teacher and students need to do in order for students to achieve the learning goals? (**Teaching/Learning Activities**).
3. Make certain that these key components are integrated (that is, that they support and reinforce each other) (Fink, 2005).
The following section will describe the four tenets of Fink’s model in order to convey its influence on the present study.

**Situational factors.** In course design, situational factors provide the backdrop against which important decisions about the course will be made. Fink (2005) suggests a number of potentially important situational factors that affect the design of a course, including:

1. **Specific context of the teaching/learning situation:** How many students are in the class? Is the course at the lower division, upper division, or graduate level? How long and frequent are the class meetings? Will the course be delivered live, online, in a laboratory, etc.? What physical elements of the learning environment will affect the class?

2. **General context of the learning situation:** What learning expectations are placed on this course by the university, the college, one or more of the institution’s curricula, one or more professions, and society in general?

3. **Nature of the subject:** Is this subject primarily theoretical, practical, or a combination? Is it primarily convergent or divergent? Are there important controversies or recent changes within the field?

4. **Characteristics of the learners:** What are the life situations of the learners (what percent work, have family responsibilities, have a specific professional goal, etc.)? What prior knowledge and experiences relevant to this subject have students had? What are their
goals and expectations of the course? What are their preferred learning styles?

5. **Characteristics of the teacher.** What beliefs and values does the teacher have about teaching and learning? What level of knowledge does she/he have about the subject? What are his/her teaching strengths and weaknesses?

In a recent study that applied Fink’s Model of ICD to English Language Arts, Fayne (2009) began the process by assessing situational factors. She took into account time allocation, class size, student characteristics, teacher characteristics, and external constraints. While most factors can be identified by the instructor, Fayne collected data regarding student characteristics by administering an online survey to her students. This could also be done through icebreakers or other first day activities.

In her study, Fayne (2009) stressed the importance of context in course design. Taking into account situational factors such as students’ backgrounds and expectations, requires the instructor to ask themselves: What are these students motivated to learn? How can I match my course with their needs? The answers to these questions shape both structure and content.

**Learning goals.** After collecting information in the situational analysis, the next step is to decide what students should get out of the course. Fink (2005) suggests instructors should move beyond the traditional content centered approach that focuses on the subjects or topics students should learn and instead focus on the impact the course will have on the students long after it is
over. In order to transcend the traditional (teaching-centered) approach and move toward significant learning (learning-centered) approach, Fink developed the Taxonomy of Significant Learning (Figure 1 above) to guide instructors through making decisions about learning goals. In order for instructors to determine the appropriateness and relevance of each of the six types of learning goals for a given course, Fink (2005) suggests answering the following key questions:

1. **Questions about Foundational Knowledge as a Goal**: What key information (facts, terms, formulae, concepts, principles, relationships, etc.) is/are important for students to understand and remember? What key ideas or perspectives are important in this course?

2. **Questions about Applications as a Goal**: What kinds of thinking (critical, creative, practical) are important for students to learn? What skills are required? Should students be expected to learn how to manage complex projects?

3. **Questions about Integration as a Goal**: What connections should students recognize and make among ideas within this course? Among information, ideas, and perspectives from this course and those in other courses or areas? Between material in this course and the students’ personal, social, and/or work life?

4. **Questions about Goals Related to Human Dimensions**: What should students learn about themselves? What should they learn about understanding others and/or interacting with others?
5. **Questions about the Appropriateness of Caring Goals**: What changes/values should students adopt? Should interests be affected? Feelings? Commitments?

6. **Questions about “Learning How to Learn” as a Goal**: What should students learn about how to be good students in a course like this? How to learn about this specific subject? How to become a self-directed learner (developing a learning agenda and a plan for meeting it)?

**Feedback and assessment.** In keeping with the learning-centered approach emphasized in the Model of ICD, Fink (2005) suggests a set of feedback and assessment procedures collectively known as “educative assessment.” At the heart of this procedure is “Forward-Looking Assessment” which incorporates exercises, questions, and/or problems that create a real-life context for a given issue, problem, or decision. To construct this kind of question or problem, the instructor has to “look forward,” beyond the time when the course is over, and ask: “In what kind of situation do I expect students to need, or be able to use, this knowledge?” Fink (2005) posits that, “answering this question makes it easier to create a question or problem that replicates a real-life context. The problem should be relatively open-ended, not totally pre-structured. If necessary, certain assumptions or constraints can be given.”

**Teaching/Learning activities.** According to Fink (2005), creating a complete set of learning activities capable of fostering significant learning
requires a comprehensive view of teaching/learning activities. This view is illustrated in Figure 3.


Fink advocates following two general principles when selecting learning activities:

1. They should include information and ideas, experience, and reflective dialogue.

2. They should rely on direct rather than indirect learning activities.

Thinking back to the learning goals, Fink (2005) posits that learning activities should reflect the instructor's judgment of how effectively they address these goals. According to Fink:

Those [teaching/learning activities] that promote growth on several goals are considered “rich.” In-class examples include debates, role-playing, and simulations. Out-of-class examples include service learning, situational observations, and authentic projects.
Learning is enhanced and made more permanent when students reflect on the learning experience and its meaning to them. This can be done individually (journals; diaries) or with others (discussions with teacher or in small groups). When students reflect on what they are learning, how they are learning, its value, and what else they need to know, they are more inclined to both ‘own’ and appreciate their learning. (p.5)

Similarly, Andrews, Garrison, and Magnusson (1996), Svinicki (2004), and others advocate for a deep or meaningful approach to teaching and learning rather than a surface or reproducing approach. Accordingly, excellent professors tend to engage in instructional processes that are congruent with their preferred approach and have values and beliefs, and characteristics (for example, honesty, integrity, genuineness and respect for self, students, material and the process of teaching) that are considered foundational to a meaningful approach to teaching (Andrews et al., 1996). Some instructors exhibit a “deep approach to learning” while others use a “surface approach.” In the former, students seek a personal, meaningful understanding of the material being studied while the latter are content to simply reproduce the information presented during the course (Marton, Hounsell, & Entwhistle, 1997). Interestingly, Andrews et al. (1997) found many cases where there was incongruence between the professor’s approach to teaching and their students’ approaches to learning and that while the developmental level of
students, the context of the learning situation, assessment (grading) practices, and workload appear to be influential variables, the precise reasons for adopting different approaches remains speculative at best. Research is needed in to address these incongruences in both college teaching and general and leadership education specifically.

Through a national survey, the present study will identify the frequency of use of ULE instructors’ teaching and learning activities as well as feedback and assessment in their courses. As well, the survey will identify the learning goals instructors place the greatest importance. Information from this literature review combined with demographic questions from the survey instrument will identify the Situational Factors.

**Fink in Other Disciplines**

To date, no research exists that applies Fink’s model to leadership studies. However, several researchers and practitioners have applied Fink’s model in courses in other disciplines such as biology, computer science, engineering education, and gerontology. Yet, a review of the literature indicates that, of these studies, a sparse few have collected quantitative data to measure instructor utilization of significant learning. Instead, they are mostly collections of scholarly advice and implications for practice grounded in instructional experiences rather than research data. However, one recent study by Levine, Fallahi, Nicoll-Senft, Tessier, Watson, and Wood (2008) employed a comparative analysis of significant learning experiences across disciplines in their respective fields. In each case, the instructor used the course design methodology proposed by Fink (2003) to meet specific objectives inspired by the taxonomy.
Students in each course were given pre- and post- semester assessments using paired $t$ tests. For all six courses, significant improvement in learning occurred in the following areas: foundational learning, application, human dimension, and learning how to learn. More detailed information regarding the Levine et al. (2008) study as well as similar studies that apply Fink’s Model of ICG are listed in Table 2.

While some studies summarized specific learning goals in a few words or phrases, most organized their learning goals by focusing on the six major learning goals from Figure 1: 1) Foundational Knowledge (FK), 2) Learning How to Learn (LHL), 3) Application (A), 4) Integration (I), 5) Human Dimension (HD), and 6) Caring (C) (e.g., Kolar, Sabatini, & Muraleetharan, 2009; Miners & Nantz, 2009). In order to address each of the six goals, authors identified specific teaching/learning activities as well as specific methods of feedback and assessment for each one. Thus, Table 2 is organized according to the Model of Integrated Course Design in Figure 2. The “Discipline/Subject” column represents a very broad depiction of the situational factors while the “Learning Goals,” “Teaching/Learning Activities,” and “Feedback & Assessment” columns are more detailed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines/Subject &amp; Author(s)</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Physiology (Watson, 2008)*</td>
<td>Develop skills in students that they would take beyond their final exams and into their real lives. Increase student retention of the material by impressing on them how essential anatomy and physiology are in their daily lives.</td>
<td>Learning units where students were instructed to pick up a cup from a table and to build their understanding by explaining what was happening as they did so, involving first bones, then muscles, then muscle attachments, then nerves.</td>
<td>Multiple choice and essay exam questions.</td>
<td>Increases in FK, A, HD, and LHL. There were also significant gains in A since Watson emphasized case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History (Torosyan, 2009)</td>
<td>Students will: FK: remember the chronology of medieval art, major monuments in terms of significance and context, and art historical vocabulary, A: be able to take their art history learning and apply it to the outside world I: relate medieval art, history, and society HD: become more aware of how people from various cultures, places, and times create different kinds of aesthetic environments C: be more interested in attending museums; be interested in how different people create and decorate their built environments; be excited to travel; be curious about visiting different religions’ sacred structures and observing the relationship of religion to art LHL: have a clear sense of what they would like to learn next about art and art history; learn about their own learning styles and how different types of activities relate.</td>
<td>Visit to Greek Orthodox church. Cohesive medieval art exhibition: student teams selected works of art from varied times/places drew a gallery plan explaining placement and relationships of the artworks, composed a letter to the university president explaining why the exhibit deserved support, and brainstormed educational outreach events for fellow students and community members. Middle Ages: Students chose a modern pilgrimage site and researched and wrote papers comparing the modern site to a medieval one. Another assignment had students using art historical vocabulary to compare a religious building in their home town to a religious building in medieval times.</td>
<td>Reduced number of site visits and quizzes. Focus on writing up activity results and reflections.</td>
<td>Students connected goals relevant to contemporary living. They became inventive in undertaking generative activities as they made the big questions meaningful and applied course content to real-world observations. Significantly more energy in the classroom. Students clearly spent more time on their projects than on the previous research paper assignment. Although creativity had not been a learning objective, there were wonderful examples of it as students produced educational pamphlets for their exhibitions and wrote some papers from a medieval pilgrim’s viewpoint. Instead of passively absorbing information from a podium, students were learning from one another. By sharing their work, they learned different ways to synthesize the material, which helped in their LHL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 (Continued)

Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Passive to active learning environment. Use FK for stepping up to higher-level learning. Teach students how to learn and apply knowledge by using problems that use real data and mimic the workplace. Integrate solutions that account for multiple concerns. Emphasize engineering as a “people-serving profession.” Appreciation of society and self-worth.</td>
<td>Team-based learning, complex design problems beyond those found at the end of each chapter in the textbook, Sooner City project, and collaborative learning.</td>
<td>Multiple-choice quizzes used to measure student preparation. The authors also used formative and summative evaluations and project-specific diagnosis tools.</td>
<td>Students had a better understanding of the design process, experienced the interconnectedness and complexity of real world design projects, and were better able to handle ambiguity and assess multiple alternatives. There was a positive correlation between retention and the number of Sooner City credits taken. Internship students (students who earn credit for working at local engineering firms) reported that the Sooner City curriculum was excellent preparation for actual design work and gave them confidence to tackle complex designs with many competing factors. Faculty noted increased design capabilities. Faculty felt strongly that the project promoted design and cross-course integration in a flexible manner with minimal disruption to the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts in Biology</td>
<td>Help students see the daily importance of biology to their lives.</td>
<td>Peer teaching, linking concept to current events in biology.</td>
<td>Two-page news article reports (which assessed all of Fink’s taxonomy of significant learning) and had students do in-class reviews of news articles with each unit covered.</td>
<td>The redesign led to significant improvement during the semester in FK, I, HD, C and LL, but not in A. Peer-teaching in groups helped students learn. Other students specifically mentioned that the in-class news and news reports, case studies, and fact-based questions helped them learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/ Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Economics &amp; Intermediate Economics (Miners &amp; Nantz, 2009)</td>
<td>Introduction to Economics: FK: Memorization/use of economic terminology; recall of important functions gov’t performs in a market economy; A: use economic models to understand/explain events; set up/use Excel to analyze data; I: identify social &amp; political consequences of economic events; explain relationships among individuals, firms, and gov’t HD: give examples of one’s views of economic programs; perceive self as a valuable contributor to a team; C: have economic opinions; interest in studying the impact of economic programs; LHL: use of available information to construct knowledge; and awareness of one’s learning style. Intermediate Economics: FK: build repertoire of and use economic terms/concepts appropriately; understand/use algebra/calculus; A: calculate solutions to problems; analyze implications of gov’t policies; solve problems in alternative markets; I: identify interactions in economic models; form opinions about world economies based on economic theory; HD: build skill set; explain concepts to peers; C: identify usefulness of economic reasoning in personal decision making; ply economic theory to current events; LHL: reflect on progress as an economist; and create a learning plan</td>
<td>Students design brochures on policy issues to combine integration with caring. Students designed posters focusing on a current economic problem and presented issues as if they were in a town meeting. Reflective assignments where students wrote about what they had learned and how their thinking had changed.</td>
<td>Immediate Feedback Assessment Techniques to incorporate human dimension and real-world application learning; in-class quizzes.</td>
<td>The combination of developing more authentic assignments and asking students to reflect on their learning resulted in greater student learning and ownership of the material. Students experienced change fundamental to Fink’s paradigm of learning. They were not necessarily changing to be like the teacher, but were aware that their own ideas and thought processes were evolving in fundamental ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (Continued)

**Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Arts</strong> <em>(Fayne, 2009)</em></td>
<td>FK: Students should enhance their knowledge of English/language arts standards and standards-based instruction. A: Students should try out standards based instruction in their own classrooms. I: Students should link personal and professional literacy skills. HD: In order to promote positive interdependence, students should share teaching strategies and resources. C: Students should have opportunities to talk about classroom highs and lows. LHL: Student should be able to locate and evaluate web-based resources that can enhance their teaching practices.</td>
<td>Teaching-learning routines. Student Learning Communities that required group postings in an online environment with assigned roles: recorder, materials manager, discussion forum moderator, and timekeeper. Collaborative learning. Mini-lessons modeling best practices. Classroom discussion. Writing a teaching autobiography and keeping a reading log.</td>
<td>Formative (educative feedback) techniques. Peer review, interactive logs with instructor responses, exit slips, one-minute papers, end-of-term survey, and individual reading/writing conferences.</td>
<td>Students as well as the teacher could be authorities in the course. Students indicated that not only had they acquired knowledge of powerful teaching strategies but also had been motivated to try them out in their own classrooms. Students reported having to think independently and creatively, and concluded they had learned a great deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Planning for Students with Exceptionalities</strong> <em>(Nicoll-Senft, 2008)</em></td>
<td>Improve students’ ability to be self-directed learners.</td>
<td>Problem-based learning (PBL) with three instructor developed scenarios based on challenges she faced as a teacher, administrator, and educational consultant.</td>
<td>Multiple choice questions, vocabulary, case studies, essay responses to articles, written reflections and a Likert scale to rate students’ ability to develop flexible lesson plans based on their interests and learning styles.</td>
<td>Students were no longer passive learners and instead became active problem solvers. The redesign of this course using PBL resulted in significant improvements in student learning in four areas—A, I, HD, and LL—but not in FK or C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifespan Development (Fallahi, 2008)*</td>
<td>Move learning goals beyond foundational knowledge, achieve more application and integration, and move beyond lecturing to include more active learning. Learning about the human condition and caring about others.</td>
<td>Students followed cases studies throughout the semester and as they were introduced to new concepts, they applied that knowledge to the case studies.</td>
<td>Multiple choice questions, essays on case studies designed to examine students' abilities to apply concepts, and Likert scale assessments of students' level of caring/interest in course, knowledge about themselves, and comfort with research tools.</td>
<td>Increases in FK, A, HD, and LHL. Redesign created an atmosphere where the success of the group was dependent on both the students and the instructor. Understanding of childhood issues and available interventions for those children had grown immensely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifespan Development (Wood, 2008)*</td>
<td>Promote integration and application of the wide array of topics presented during the course, inspire caring about the material, and help students learn how to learn.</td>
<td>“Design a Toy” project: students designed an age-appropriate toy based on child development and completed a literature review. “Simulated Aging” exercise: Students were fitted with simulated aging disabilities and asked to perform everyday activities. Students wrote papers about their experiences and how their ideas about the challenges elderly people face changed as a result of the activity.</td>
<td>Multiple choice, essay, and Likert scale questions.</td>
<td>Significant increase in FK.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musical Forms and Analysis (Kelley, 2009)</td>
<td>FK: Be able to model the main musical forms and have a working knowledge of the terms used in describing musical form. Understand the concepts and terminology of advanced analytical techniques, such as those used in Schenkerian, feminist, and semiotic analysis. A: Be able to make informed, logical decisions about the formal structure of pieces they are conducting or performing. Be able to analyze music in a variety of ways to solve practical problems (for example, score errors) and develop a deeper understanding of the intricacies of the music they are working with. Be able to use their understanding of form to improve their composition skills. I: Be able to understand the significance of formal structures in the pieces they are conducting or performing. Be able to see how the study of musical form is linked to other fields. HD: See themselves as experts in examining formal processes in music, and develop the confidence to use the skills and techniques they have attained in this class to improve their own musical performances and compositions. Develop confidence in their ability to read and understand professional literature in their field. C: Value the tremendously varied intricacies inherent in musical form and see that music can have multiple meanings. Students will learn to examine music from several different points of view and take time to understand the form of pieces they are conducting or performing. Be more attentive to how music is used by society to promote cultural codes. LHL: Be able to read and understand complex articles dealing with musical analysis. Identify some of the more significant resources in the area of musical analysis and learn how to ask useful questions about music they do not understand.</td>
<td>“Pretty Polly” project where students combined written analysis with a musical arrangement and eventually perform it. Reading assignments. In-class analysis of music. Think-pair-share. Class discussion. Short essay.</td>
<td>Short quizzes graded by students in class.</td>
<td>Students thought more deeply about the special relationship of music, text, and performance in ways that encouraged significant learning. A better hands-on understanding of the course material… “The inclusion of the group project enabled us to put theory into application, which was very helpful.” Students went far beyond foundational knowledge and made significant strides towards achieving other learning goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (Rose &amp; Torosyan, 2009)</td>
<td>FK: Learn fundamental questions, principles, generalizations, and theories, including the use of scientific reason, the enlightenment revolution, and postmodernism. Understand twelve big philosophical questions about (1) the ethics of right and wrong, (2) our epistemologies of truth and knowledge, and (3) the metaphysics of reality and being. A: Learn to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view; question assumptions (yours and others). Develop communication skills such as writing clearly and briefly. I: Integrate philosophical frameworks that underlie subjects and cross areas of life. HD: Develop a clear understanding of, and commitment to, your own philosophy and values. Develop confidence in your strengths and ability to reason on your own. Increase your sense of responsibility for serving others. C: Pursue interest in your own big philosophical questions; write for thinking and for fun; increase your sense of responsibility for making the world fairer. LHL: Learn from mistakes, take action, and change behavior to reach goals.</td>
<td>Real-world time use, local site visits, and life decisions. Students were assigned groups to summarize and “peer teach” readings that required a metaphor, haiku, visual scribble, or skit. Timeline: students kept a 24 hour time line of their personal activities to evaluate improvement. Students wrote a letter to a philosophical novice.</td>
<td>Focused on quality vs. quantity in reading assignments. Exhibit pamphlet and concept pinwheel.</td>
<td>Students seemed to find our new goals relevant to contemporary living. They became inventive in undertaking generative activities as they made the big questions meaningful and applied course content to real-world observations. In fact, a new energy became palpable in our classrooms. energized and engaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Early Childhood (Levine, 2008)*</td>
<td>Promote students’ ability to learn how to learn and use scientifically based sources of information to make evaluations.</td>
<td>Active learning technique where students observed, interacted, and worked with groups of young children to help them create their own observational assignments concerning questions of interest to them including topics of interest to help them develop ways in which to observe children and come to a better understanding of their development.</td>
<td>Likert scale to rate students’ ability to find professional resources. Demonstrated use of knowledge and resources available to help children find articles related to specific questions.</td>
<td>Increases in FK, A, HD, and LHL. Significant gains in LHL since Levine emphasized focused on student directing their own learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Language (Davis, 2009)</td>
<td>FK: Make introductions and carry on a conversation in Spanish use vocabulary relating to school items to describe items in backpack; use present-tense verbs in conversation A: Use verb tenses to write a Spanish essay; introduce self to a native speaker; order in Spanish at an ethnic restaurant I: Present an independent study project on Hispanic culture to class HD: Describe challenges Hispanic students face; attend a campus meeting of the Latin Student Association C: Plan a trip to a Latin destination; LHL: Make a plan for continued language learning beyond course; apply learning skills gained to learning in other areas.</td>
<td>Translations presented to class from student chosen selections. Pronunciation: students would read aloud in Spanish from a humorous short story during every class helped the students overcome this hesitation and become more comfortable in speaking Spanish. Students would lead class chapters. Capstone project: written essay in Spanish on a topic of the student’s choice and an oral presentation or demonstration given to the class</td>
<td>Students checked homework assignments, short weekly quizzes in grammar, verb worksheets, and translation pieces. A two-part essay exam at the end of the semester provided a more formal evaluation of integration and application. Half of this exam consisted of a paragraph for the students to translate from Spanish into English. The second half was a two-page essay in Spanish. From the planning stages through to the final course evaluation, the instructor asked for feedback concerning goals, methods, materials, and activities.</td>
<td>Student enthusiasm for this course was strong from the beginning. Students reported finding practical ways to use their growing language skills in conversing with native Spanish speakers at their jobs and in the community. Students commented on how much his or her translation skills had increased and how much his or her comprehension of both spoken and written Spanish had improved. The course had brought their Spanish alive. The resulting change in student attitudes toward the value of their peers as learning partners was perhaps the biggest success of all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Special Education (Nicoll-Senft, 2009)    | FK: Identify the components and stages of the individualized education plans (IEP) process, including demonstrating the ability to write standards-based, measureable IEP goals, and objectives  
A: Demonstrate the ability to development appropriate accommodations or modifications in order to ensure appropriate access to the general education curriculum.  
I: Develop a universally designed teaching unit consisting of five lesson plans that are aligned with national, state, and local curricula standards.  
HD: Demonstrate an understanding of their own strengths and challenges and learning style as well as those of the students they teach.  
C: Demonstrate an interest in learning about current educational trends and issues and their impact on students with exceptionalities.  
LHL: Reflect on one’s teaching to improve instruction and guide professional growth.                                                                                           | Develop or rewrite an appropriate IEP including goals and objectives.  
Student learning profile.  
Lesson plan.  
PBL reflection papers  
Student logs.  
Reflection paper.  
Group project.                                                                                       | Quizzes with multiple choice and essay questions.  
PBL feedback forms.                                                                                              | Learning how to organize their work, distribute the workload evenly, and communicate with their group members outside class.  
student groups became more efficient in their individual and group efforts as the problems presented to them grew in complexity  
Student were no longer passive learners but instead became active problem solvers.                                                                                           |
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**Applications of Fink’s Model of ICD across Disciplines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/ Subject</th>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Activities</th>
<th>Feedback &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reported Evidence of Enhanced Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virology (Mester, 2009)</td>
<td>FK: Acquire in-depth knowledge of key concepts; familiarity with research journals. A: Apply course knowledge creatively and critically to solve current medical problems; demonstrate teamwork in a complex project. I: Understand various levels of virus-host interactions; assess the contributions of virology to advances in science and medicine. HD: Gain historical and human perspective of key advances in virology; value group learning environments. C: Understand impact of viral diseases. LHL: Gain long-term interest in virology; gain appreciation of the benefits of virology research; learn to think like a scientist.</td>
<td>Independent reading and literature research, multimedia in-class presentations, attendance at scientific seminars, participation in scientific poster sessions, student collaboration, preparation of current events, student-derived lecture material, group project, and class discussion.</td>
<td>Exams, written assignments, individual presentations, group projects, and follow-up with individual class members after completion of course.</td>
<td>Enhanced performance on exams/assignments. Greater depth in exam responses and in individual group projects. Highly creative application of established procedures during problem-solving assignments. Class discussions showed students were connecting course knowledge to other courses, their undergraduate research projects, jobs, and lives. Student-led scientific discussions always included “human perspective.” Discussions in/out of class gave evidence of reflective thinking. Students stopped by instructor’s office to relay information about virology long after class ended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor perceptions of Fink’s model.** Perhaps one of the most interesting and consistent results from the studies summarized in Table 2 was the enhanced learning reported by the instructors. In almost every study, instructors expounded the impact Fink’s model had had on their teaching. The following excerpts from studies in Table 2 explicate this impact:
• Expanding my learning goals into the human dimension and caring with capstone projects added depth to the course and extended student learning beyond the classroom. (Davis, 2009, p. 22)

• The innovations inspired by our collaboration with Dee Fink have transformed the educational experience of our students from a passive, dull learning environment that actually turns many students off to engineering to an active, dynamic learning environment that inspires students … While faculty effort is required to make this transition, this is offset by improved student learning and enthusiasm and the fact that teaching is much more fun. (Kolar, Sabatini, & Muraleetharan, 2009, p. 94)

• Using Fink’s taxonomy in the development of course goals and assessments, and ultimately in my teaching, strengthened my course and resulted in a much deeper learning experience for students. The breadth of the goals developed for this course using the taxonomy opened new doors to course assessments and approaches to teaching that I had not previously considered. My students also appreciated the clarity and readability of course goals and their explicit alignment with course assessments … My role as a teacher shifted from covering course content to that of being a facilitator of student learning. (Nicoll-Senft, 2009, p. 86-87)
• Being transparent about our teaching goals and making clear connections between those goals and our activities and assignments increased student buy-in to what we were trying to do. When students understood why we were doing particular sorts of exercises and activities, they responded by engaging in them more actively. Because students have different learning styles, it is important to provide them with a variety of ways to connect to course material that is new, technical, and abstract. They appreciated our interest in their learning and our attempts to engage them in different ways and at different levels in conversations about their learning. (Miners & Nantz, 2009, p. 32)

• Innovations included reading less but more deeply, using personalized questions to apply learning to life, and designing exhibitions and other visual products organized around student-chosen themes. Evidence showed that learners gained interest, internalized knowledge creatively, and found relevance in subjects that can often alienate the uninitiated. Furthermore, we realized ways to winnow objectives and specify guidelines and models for student work, while continuing to renew our own engagement with the teaching. (Rose & Torosyan, 2009, p. 70)

What faculty emphasize drives student learning (Levine, Fallahi, Nicoll-Senft, Tessier, Watson, & Wood, 2008). In a reflective article written four years after their original course redesign began, Levine, Fallahi, Nicoll-Senft, Tessier,
Watson, and Wood (2009) report always beginning course design by asking three questions: (a) “What do we want students to retain from this course?” (b) “How can we make this learning personal for the student?” and (c) “How can we make this a human experience that will make them care about the material?” This is a very different approach from asking: “How can I cover the textbook material in one semester?” They conclude their reflective article with the following sentence: “We have shown that our students learned and grew in many ways—and at the same time, so did we.” Clearly, course design has a major impact on what students learn.

**Instructional Strategies**

This section will provide a brief description of each instructional method presented within the web-based survey instrument to be employed in the present study. The comprehensive list of 24 instructional strategies in Table 3 was derived largely from previously published articles and one dissertation (Allen & Hartman, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Avolio, 1999; Conger, 1992; Day, 2000; Djajaslanka, 2011; Eich, 2008; London, 2002; and Yukl, 2002;). The listing was then subject to clarification, simplification, and revision by a research team consisting of myself, my major professor, and a panel of experts (see Appendix B).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Instructional Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Students examine written or oral stories or vignettes that highlight a case of effective or ineffective leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>Instructor facilitates sustained conversation and/or question and answer segment with the entire class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Students complete tests or exams that last the majority of the class period intended to assess subject matter mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>Students engage in interactions in a prescribed setting and are constrained by a set of rules and procedures. (e.g., Jeopardy, Who Wants to be a Millionaire, Family Feud, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Group Projects/Presentations</td>
<td>Students work on a prescribed project or presentation in a small group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Guest Speaker</td>
<td>Students listen to a guest speaker/lecturer discuss their personal leadership experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Icebreakers</td>
<td>Students engage in a series of relationship-building activities to get to know one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>In-Class Short Writing</td>
<td>Students complete ungraded writing activities designed to enhance learning of course content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Individual Leadership Development Plans</td>
<td>Students develop specific goals and vision statements for individual leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Interactive Lecture/Discussion</td>
<td>Instructor presents information in 10-20 minute time blocks with period of structured interaction/discussion in-between mini-lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td>Students observe or interview an individual leading others effectively or ineffectively and report their findings to the instructor/class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Students listen to instructor presentations lasting most of the class session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Instructional Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>Students learn about leadership theory/topics through film, television, or other media clips (e.g., YouTube, Hulu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>Students complete short graded quizzes intended to assess subject matter mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>Students develop written reflections on their experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Research Project/Presentation</td>
<td>Students actively research a leadership theory or topic and present findings in oral or written format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Role Play Activities</td>
<td>Students engage in an activity where they act out a set of defined role behaviors or positions with a view to acquire desired experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Self-Assessments &amp; Instruments</td>
<td>Students complete questionnaires or other instruments designed to enhance their self-awareness in a variety of areas (e.g., learning style, personality type, leadership style, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>Students participate in a service learning or philanthropic project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Students engage in an activity that simulates complex problems or issues and requires decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Small Group Discussions</td>
<td>Students take part in small group discussions on the topic of leadership or some aspect of group dynamics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Story or Storytelling</td>
<td>Students listen to a story highlighting some aspect of leadership; often given by an individual with a novel experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Student Peer Teaching</td>
<td>Students, in pairs or groups, teach designated course content or skills to fellow students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
<td>Students engage in group activities that emphasize working together in a spirit of cooperation (e.g., setting team goals/priorities, delegating work, examining group relationships/dynamics, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Factors that Relate to Instructional Strategies Use

Many different reasons underlie faculty members’ selection of specific instructional strategies. For example, some instructional strategies are better suited for small courses, while others can be equally effective in large courses. Likewise, some instructional strategies may be better suited for introductory courses, while others strategies might be used more pragmatically to teach advanced undergraduate courses. According to Allen & Hartman (2009), all sources of learning have benefits and drawbacks (depending on the context), and each has its time and place in a leadership development initiative. At times, sources of learning are mixed and matched while at other times, institutions use a single source of learning as the mechanism for leadership development. As well, although research has been conducted to identify leadership preferences of undergraduates (e.g., Dulin, 2008), little is known about how leadership is taught to undergraduates. The present study will identify instructional strategies of leadership instructors through a national survey.

Teaching in the Leadership Discipline

Leadership education is defined narrowly as the learning activities and educational environments that are intended to enhance and foster leadership abilities (Brungardt, 1996). Courses, retreats, and co-curricular programs are typical leadership education program curriculum delivery methods (Eich, 2007). Holistically, these instructional techniques are much different than those found in most academic disciplines. Thus, it is important to describe some of the unique characteristics of the leadership discipline prior to exploring and identifying the instructional strategies commonly used in the discipline. However, since
undergraduate leadership programs and curriculum are not the focus of the present study, this literature review will not discuss prior research in these areas.

**What are Leadership Studies?**

There was a time when leadership scholars and educators were often queried about the nature of their work and its place in the academy. Critics of leadership studies argue that there is no comprehensive central perspective that clarifies the field of leadership studies when, in fact, there is increasing consistency as to what theories comprise the evolution of leadership studies (Northouse, 2010; DuBrin, 2010; Yukl, 2006). Much of the complexity around leadership as a field of study can be traced to confusion about the inter- and multi-disciplinary nature of the undertaking (Rost, 1993; Yukl, 2006). Moreover, even the term leadership can be confusing. Burns (1978) describes leadership as one of the most observed and least understood phenomena, and proposes that one of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership. Eich (2007), describes leadership as a socially constructed term that means different things to different people and thus there is no clear consensus as to what exactly leadership is. After reviewing over 300 definitions, Rost defined leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (1993, p. 99). Within the context of leadership for college students, Komives, Lucas, & McMahon (2007) define leadership as a “relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change.”
Definitional differences aside, books used to teach leadership to college students conceptualize leadership in common terms as a process in which all individuals have the capability of developing and engaging in whether they hold a formal position or not (e.g., Higher Education Research Institute, 1996; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2009; Komives et al., 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2007 & 2008; Northouse, 2010; Wren, 1995). Eich (2007) and others argue that the postindustrial leadership paradigm, as Rost (1993) identifies it, is and should be the paradigm of leadership generally taught in leadership education programs. In general, descriptors such as collaborative, participative, shared, relational, non-hierarchical, authentic, transformative, ethical, process oriented, and authentic are often used to describe this postindustrial paradigm of leadership taught in campus leadership programs (Eich, 2007). According to Rost and Barker (2000), the industrial view of leadership is inadequate for educational purposes because it does not address the nature of the complex social relationships among people who practice leadership, nor does it accurately accommodate their purposes, motives, and intentions. Conversely, in the postindustrial paradigm, leadership potential exists in every student, and colleges and universities can develop this potential through leadership programs and activities (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999).

Growth and variation across the discipline. In a study to benchmark the state of leadership education, Howe and Freeman (1997) found growth in leadership programs and increased legitimacy in the academy, particularly in single course offerings or in programs offered through the student affairs division.
More recently, undergraduate leadership education is experiencing expansive
growth on campus, though most offerings are co-curricular in nature (Carry,
2003). From the development of the first majors offered in leadership studies in
the early 1990’s, there has been a burgeoning of academic leadership programs
so that more than 1000 such programs exist today (Brungardt, Greenleaf,
Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006; Sorenson, 2002). Student taking advantage of
these programs may participate in a single leadership development workshop or
pursue one of the thousands of academic degree programs. These include
academic certificates and minors as well as baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral
degrees.

Brungardt et al. (2006) employed a qualitative study to compare and
contrast the leadership major in identified programs from public and private
universities in the United States (undergraduate enrollment at these institutions
ranged from 700 to over 69,000). Specifically, the research team looked at
school profiles, program profiles, mission and purpose (including theory and
application), and curriculum (as well as pedagogy). Notable differences included
varied school sizes, host departments, and credit hour requirements. Other
inconsistencies included the focus of the program, the major scholars evident
within the curricula, and the disparity between theory versus skill development.
Notable findings from their study include:

1. Leadership programs are not limited to a particular type or size of
institution.
2. Most programs are located in professional and adult studies program, followed by colleges of arts, and colleges of business and leadership.

3. All programs in the study were created between 1993 and 2003.

4. Careers of graduating students varied greatly, showing occupations in government, social service, religion, business, and industry.

5. An overwhelming majority focusing on both theory and application as well as civic and/or organizational objectives.

6. Several universities focused their learning objectives on cognitive theories while others focused on the development of skills and behaviors (with only a few schools focusing on service-learning as pedagogy).

Yet, leadership studies has a rich discipline. In fact, there are more than thirteen peer-reviewed journals connected to leadership studies including, among others, the *Journal of Leadership Education*, *Leadership Quarterly*, the *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, the *International Journal of Servant Leadership*, and the *International Journal of Leadership Studies*. Numerous organizations and associations support the work of leadership educators across the world including the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, the International Leadership Association, the Association of Leadership Educators, the Center for Creative Leadership, and the Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership to name a few. When faced with questions such as is leadership a field of scholarly inquiry? Is it a teachable discipline? Does learning leadership benefit students and society? There is mounting evidence that the answers are
yes, yes, and yes (Norum, 2006). It should follow then, that leadership pedagogy ought to follow suit and establish its place in the discipline.

**Leadership pedagogy.** Leadership is a social process and like other social sciences, there are comprehensible processes that can be studied, understood, and applied in a variety of contexts. It is the work of the leadership educator to help students identify the core knowledge and practices of leadership, and to make meaning of it in their own lives and the world around them (Owen, Dugan, Berwager, & Lott, 2006). Indeed, leadership has been studied extensively from scholars in multiple disciplines using both quantitative and qualitative methodology. Collectively, the research findings on leadership provide a far more sophisticated and complex view of this phenomenon than most of the simplistic views presented in the popular press and pop culture about leadership, and provide a sound empirical basis for further study (Northouse, 2004). Bass (1990) cites over 7,500 research studies on leadership and describes the mounting theory, method, and evidence about leadership as “an antidote for the arguments of those continuing to bemoan the supposed unknowable, elusive, mysterious nature of leadership.” Yet, in reality, leadership is not as untouchable as previously conceived. In fact, as leadership educators, we can work to successfully enlighten our students by effectively teaching leadership theories and behaviors, therefore solving the preconceived “leadership mystery.”

The art of teaching leadership happens through programs which typically take the form of courses, retreats, degree programs, or student affairs programs.
In a theoretical analysis of leadership education, Billsberry (2009) posited that leadership is socially constructed and thus, there is a multitude of ways of viewing it. He suggests that teaching the postindustrial leadership paradigm of leadership theory may be more art than science. As previously stated, leadership programs typically employ more experiential and activity based instructional strategies versus lecture or reading.

Likewise, leadership instructors institute different ways of teaching leadership theories and content to students, but some larger elements may be present across many programs (Eich, 2008). In order to help students learn the substance of leadership programs, the following components are common: curriculum revision/development; community based leadership opportunities (community service); mentoring; student, faculty, or administrative leadership development; individual leadership development improvement plans; and collaborative leadership activities (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Bass (1990) adds that the most popular methods of delivering leadership education include: lectures and discussion, role playing, simulation, case studies, behavioral modeling, sensitivity (lab) training, and mentoring.

Yet, as leadership researchers struggle to define leadership and specifically *effective* leadership training, many pedagogical differences emerge. For example, Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005) suggest that postindustrial leadership and more recently, a relational leadership model (RLM), best represent the context through which college students are best informed. Moreover, understanding the process of creating a leadership identity
might be central to designing leadership programs and teaching leadership. The Leadership Identity Development Model represents a postindustrial values-centered approach to leadership development, specifically, how leadership identity is formed. The grounded theory model was constructed from a constant comparative analysis along five categories including essential developmental influences, developing self, group influence, changing view of self with others, and broadening view of leadership. The theory emerged as the relationships between the concepts combined into an integral framework that explained the phenomenon of leadership identity. The categories interact to create a leadership identity as the central category that develops over the six identity stages in the figure below:
Komives et al. (2006) noted that students held hierarchical views of leadership when they came to college. These perceptions were more consistent with traditional leadership approaches as trait, behavioral, and situational theories where “leadership” and “leader” are interchangeable concepts. However, once they started to view themselves as interdependent with others, they shifted their view of leadership to something many in a group do and as a process among people, which is more consistent with the post-industrial view of leadership (p. 412). Thus, effective student leadership development is an
intersection of student development and relational leadership. Once students begin to understand their roles as leaders as part of a relational process, they have achieved the final stage: Integration/Synthesis.

Another major theme that emerged from the postindustrial leadership development literature was the concept of recognition. When students received recognition of their potential, they were encouraged students to think more about what leadership was and to recognize the leaders around them (Komives et al., 2006). A signature pedagogy should explain how to promote recognition in the classroom.

Some administrators and academics believe that leadership lives within a classroom setting and through academic growth, but their programs lack the broad-based framework that is needed to meet the needs of all students (Roberts & Ullom, 1989). Others believe in internships and real-world experiential training as the path. Some gently push students into the co-curricular world filled with multiple opportunities for practical growth. Student development relies on a holistic experience that includes all of these pathways and more (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). Nonetheless, student development and leadership development must include a dynamic environment of strategic events with a heavy reliance on theoretical application of leadership knowledge with appropriate reflection (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2006; Komives, 1996).

Wisniewski (2010) came to a similar conclusion. Through empirical research of 66 undergraduate students attending a private comprehensive
university in the Midwest, Wisniewski found that traditional approaches to teaching leadership education would most likely be met with resistance. According to Wisniewski:

The role of the leadership educator is not to deliver or transmit information, but rather to actively engage the learners in constructing personal theories and philosophies of leadership by creating a learning environment that builds upon learners’ existing knowledge and experiential base. (p. 65)

To illustrate this role, Wisniewski developed a leadership education model for Millennials that details the purpose and content, along with strategies for teaching and learning (see Table 4).
Table 4

The Role of the Leadership Educator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Purposes of a Leadership Education Model</th>
<th>The Content of a Leadership Education Model</th>
<th>The Teaching and Learning Process in a Leadership Education Model</th>
<th>The Role of the Educator in a Leadership Education Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help learners to identify their core values and beliefs, and examine the relationships between their espoused values and their actions.</td>
<td>Effective Communication (speaking and writing); Face-to-face; Electronic; With persons of the opposite gender, with persons from other backgrounds and cultures.</td>
<td>Stimulating student-led discussions based on current events or case studies.</td>
<td>To actively engage the learners in constructing personal theories and philosophies of leadership by creating a learning environment that builds upon learners’ existing knowledge and experiential base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help them construct a conceptual and theoretical knowledge base related to leadership that they can apply in real world settings.</td>
<td>Effective Listening: Being open to others’ ideas; Valuing the input of others.</td>
<td>Hands-on, active learning experiences such as in-basket exercises, simulations, and role playing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration: Working effectively with others from diverse groups; Managing others; Motivating others; Building trust.</td>
<td>Collaborative group work both with classmates and with others around the world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technological competence.</td>
<td>Digital technology-assisted teaching and learning (online blogs and discussions, interactive whiteboard activities, Internet research and WebQuests, student response systems, podcasts, and more)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical thinking and analysis.</td>
<td>Self-assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting and self-motivation.</td>
<td>Authentic assessments that challenge students to demonstrate skills that are relevant and directly applicable to the workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time management.</td>
<td>Engagement in the community through service learning, clinical experiences, apprenticeships, internships, and/or job shadowing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership theories, styles, and techniques.</td>
<td>The visioning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic thinking and Planning.</td>
<td>Coaching and mentoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet, critics continue to question whether leadership is, in fact, teachable. Gardner (1990) suggests that leaders are not born with innate skills or characteristics that predestine them to be leaders. Because the tasks and processes of leadership can be described, they can also be learned. In the preface to Harvard’s Sharon Daloz Parks’ book, *Leadership Can Be Taught*, leadership scholar Warren Bennis states “any person who has studied leadership has found it is not a predetermined affair. Many of the most significant shapers of history were themselves shaped gradually…Leadership can (and often must) be learned by those who would hope to practice it” (Parks, 2006). Thus, if we are to teach students to practice leadership effectively, leadership pedagogy should focus on teaching the tasks and processes of leadership.

In a recent study, Eich (2008) investigated tasks and processes of leadership education in both academic and non-curricular programs. Through a grounded theory analysis, he identified the attributes of leadership programs that contributed significantly to undergraduate student leadership development. His data analysis of four successful leadership programs for college students in the United States included a four year comprehensive program at a large public university, a six-semester service and leadership program at a small private university, an academic credit bearing interdisciplinary leadership course at a large public university, and a week-long summer retreat leadership development program. Through an analysis of more than 60 semi-structured interviews, Eich revealed a grounded theory that included 16 attributes of high quality leadership programs organized into three clusters: (a) participants engaged in building and
sustaining a learning community, (b) student-centered experiential learning experiences, and (c) research-grounded continuous program development. Figure 5 illustrates this model.

![Grounded Theory Model of High Quality Leadership Programs](image)


This study was particularly beneficial to the literature on student leadership development as a result of leadership development programs in the undergraduate classroom because of the specific analysis of these three clusters on the effects on students. For the present study, it is important to discuss Cluster II above. According to Eich (2008), “Cluster II: Student Centered
“Experiential Learning Experiences” yielded the following effects on undergraduates (p. 182-184):

Cluster II: Student-Centered Experiential Learning Experiences:

1. **Leadership Practice**: finding their voice, gaining self-efficacy, seeing leadership as something that they and others are capable of experiencing firsthand, thinking about who leaders are and what leadership is in broader and inclusive ways, gaining a greater understanding of organizations, group dynamics, and developing a team through motivating others, and learning balance, time management, and problem solving from the demands and imperfection of their projects.

2. **Reflection Activities**: learning more about themselves, develop future visions and goals, become more purposeful with being themselves and making congruent decision and develop a meaningful leadership philosophy, model, or framework to analyze their own thoughts and actions to ultimately integrate improvements in their life and leadership (p. 183).

3. **Application in Class Meetings**: identifying personality, leadership style, strengths, and opportunities for improvement through self-analysis and developing self-confidence, preparation, and specific skills (and gain rapid experience through simulations).
4. **Meaningful Discussions**: improving listening and speaking communication skills through listening to others and telling their own thoughts.

5. **Episodes of Difference**: gaining eye-opening new perspectives they were unaware of through sharing experiences with peers, learning different ways of leading through witnessing different leadership styles, and becoming more open-minded and less judging while reconciling their worldview.

6. **Civic Service**: clarifying their passions, interests, and strengths, expanding social awareness, empathy, gratitude, and respect for others, and understanding how they can serve to make a difference through servant leadership and social causes.

7. **Discovery Retreats**: renewing, gaining motivation, and reorganizing self at a higher level of leadership by exploring inward.

Clearly, decisions made at the programming level had significant effects on student development and learning in leadership. These effects range from experienced practitioners teaching research-backed content and programming, student-centered experiential learning activities in and out of the classroom, and flexibility and sustainability of a leadership community from both student and practitioner alike. According to Eich (2008) high-quality programs actually practice the kind of inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical, and process-oriented leadership for positive change that they advocate to their students. It is a “lived leadership” that is reflected throughout the teaching and pedagogy of
these programs. Thus, students learn, develop, and understanding leadership best when they are able to experience it firsthand as modeled by experienced practitioners.

The key factors that facilitate effective student learning include the participatory students themselves, the environment in which they learn, and the activities they do. To create this effective environment in the classroom practitioners must integrate and enact the 16 effects discussed above. Through this model, students can learn leadership as a result of program educational intervention rather than leaving leadership development to change through life experiences. Thus, Eich provides enlightened optimism of the opportunity and effectiveness of undergraduate student leadership development in the classroom. What is needed then is a thorough and complete analysis of the instructional strategies currently employed in ULE.

**Instructional Strategies in the Leadership Discipline**

This section will review previous research studies that address the application, implementation, and effectiveness of instructional strategies in the ULE discipline. It will begin by summarizing a key research study that organized and synthesized the major leadership pedagogies described in this section. Next, specific instructional strategies in ULE will be reviewed.

Despite the increased interest in ULE, the literature has only sparsely reviewed specific leadership pedagogies as a group. Finally, in preparation for a survey instrument that would survey undergraduate’ experiences and preferences of instructional strategies in undergraduate leadership education,
Allen and Hartman identified 40 commonly used “sources of learning for leader
development” (2008a, 2009b, & 2009). As a result, Allen and Hartman created
one of the first comprehensive lists of leadership development teaching methods
found in the literature (see also Avolio, 1999; Day, 2000; London, 2002; Yukl,
2002). Their research study, surveyed 171 undergraduate business students in
the “would prefer to experience” sample and 522 undergraduate attendees of a
student leadership conference in the “did prefer experiencing” sample. Their
results confirmed the utilization of a variety of learning interventions will not only
offer individual learners varied experiences but also will cut across a number of
learning styles. Furthermore, they recommended that leadership educators
concentrate on offering programs that meet their goals while considering student
preferences and use of sources of learning from all four quadrants in Conger’s
(1992) model that suggests four primary approaches to leadership development:
(a) skill building, (b) personal growth, (c) feedback, and (d) conceptual
understanding (Figure 6). Allen and Hartman (2009) also organized the identified
sources of leader development along with Conger’s approaches as illustrated in
Figure 6. Yet, no distinguishable leadership pedagogy emerged. Instead, they
had a collection of sorts, identifying 40 sources of learning commonly used in
leadership development programming for collegians. The present study aims to
identify distinguishable or signature pedagogies within the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Growth</th>
<th>Conceptual Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs that induce participants to reflect on their behaviors (such as their orientation toward risk or personal intimacy), values, and desires.</td>
<td>Programs that foster a conceptual understanding of leadership... theory oriented by nature... focused on the issue of leadership development through a cognitive understanding of the phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Skill Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs where feedback constitutes a large portion of the time and emphasis is placed on measuring the participant's skill in a wide range of leader behaviors.</td>
<td>Program designers identify what they perceive to be the key leadership skills that can be taught. These are formulated into modules and introduced to participants who practice or model specific behaviors. Participant performance is critiqued, and feedback directly them to strengths and weaknesses. Participants then practice and refine their skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The figure above is consistent organizationally with the sources of leadership pedagogy that emerged from the review of relevant literature. As well, the instructional strategies reviewed here will also be included in the web-based questionnaire used in the present national study. Therefore, my literature review of the approaches to leadership pedagogy will be organized based on the same four categories: (a) Personal Growth, (b) Conceptual understanding, (c) Feedback, and (d) Skill Building. As well, the researcher uncovered some new sources of leadership pedagogy in the literature not reviewed by Allen and Hartman. Nonetheless, these sources can be organized based on Conger’s model.

**Personal growth.** Much of the literature on leadership development as well as leadership pedagogy in ULE supports the relationship between these concepts and personal growth (e.g., Avolio 2005; Cacioppe, 1998; Popper & Lipshitz, 1993). According to Conger (1992), personal growth programs are "based, generally, on the assumption that leaders are individuals who are deeply in touch with their personal dreams and talents and who will act to fulfill them." Essentially, the purpose of these programs is to increase self-awareness and emphasize self-exploration (Allen & Hartman, 2008b). Avolio and Gibbons (1989) suggest that that, "After getting their own personal shops in order, charismatic/transformational leaders are free to look outward and beyond the time period in which they operate to solve significant problems." The relationship with leader development is that the more self-aware leader will be better prepared to lead others. And since these activities focus specifically on
improving students’ personal leadership skills, it should not be surprising that they preferred those programs with an individual or personal focus (Allen & Hartman, 2009). The major personal growth activities found in the literature include reflection, service learning, and self-development. Although it could be argued that some of these activities or techniques might warrant a separate categorical designation, the researcher feels that these categories effectively blanket these concepts.

**Reflection.** The use of reflection in classroom activities and assignments appears to have a strong effect on the development of leadership skills. Reflection comes in many forms within the leadership classroom and curriculum from written reflection activities in the form of journals, essays about readings, to verbal reflection in reaction to class discussions, questions posed, and current events to programs that formally engage students in completing vision and goal-setting activities and other projects to personalize the concepts to the individual (Eich, 2008). Eich found that there are two student learning and leadership development outcomes from students who engage in reflection activities:

1. Students learn more about themselves develop future visions and goals and become more purposeful with being themselves and making congruent decisions.
2. Students develop a meaningful leadership philosophy, model, or framework to analyze their own thoughts and actions to ultimately integrate improvements in their life and leadership
Likewise, Conger (1992) explains that these techniques are, “based, generally, on the assumption that leaders are individuals who are deeply in touch with their personal dreams and talents and who will act to fulfill them,” as well as, “induce reflection on behaviors, personal values, and desires” (p.45-46). Reflective opportunities that guide the meaning making process also assist in the growth of students’ identity, cognitive and moral development (Jones & Abes, 2004; Strain, 2005; Wang & Rodgers, 2006). It might be the personalized aspect of reflective activities then that makes this approach so effective.

*Individual reflection.* According to Allen and Hartman (2008b), “individual reflection occurs through activities such as journaling and challenges participants to focus on topics such as goals, personal mission, and experiences. Individual reflection may focus on past experience or future aspirations.” Densten and Gray (2001) advocate “critical reflection,” which involves “a commitment to questioning assumptions and taken-for-granteds embodied in both theory and professional practice” (see also Reynolds, 1999). The capacity to reflect relates directly to how effectively individuals can learn from their personal experiences (Boud et al., 1985). Through extensive research on gender and Full Range Leadership, Burbach, Matkin, and Fritz (2004) found reflective journal writing to improve critical thinking as well as growth in self-awareness and self-actualization, the development of new knowledge, increase student learning, and promote meaningful personal insights more than lecture and reading assignments alone. Thus, reflection provides a meaningful way for leaders to gain genuine understanding.
In leadership education, deep reflective learning requires students to consider the underlying dynamics of power and to question basic assumptions and practices. For example, students could be required to question the power they use in leadership situations to achieve the results they want. But, experience is more than just the events themselves. It also involves the perceptions of these events. Leaders actively shape and construct their experiences by selectively attending to particular situations. These perceptual sets are affected by feelings, needs, prior experience, and expectations (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1999). Often leaders are unaware of their perceptual sets and biases. Thus, an important function of leadership education is to provide opportunities for student reflection so that students gain understanding of how they perceive and interpret their observations. Further, reflection is important for leadership development as it can provide leaders with a variety of insights into how to frame problems differently, to look at situations from multiple perspectives or to better understand followers (Densten & Gray, 2001).

Reflection can also be utilized when teaching leadership theories. A common challenge when discussing leadership theories is connecting these theories to students in a way that is relevant to their lives. Underpinning theories may only make sense through practice, but practice makes sense only through reflection as enhanced by theory (Raelin, 1997). Consequently, the teaching of leadership is conducive to student-driven learning where contemporary theory is linked to actual experience (Densten & Gray, 2001). Thus, the use of critical
reflection enables students to enhance their leadership ability through evaluating the significance of their experiences from a leadership perspective.

*Group reflection.* Group reflection is defined as the source of learning that often occurs after an activity or event within the context of a learning activity. The purpose is to help participants make connections and capture learning (Allen & Hartman, 2008b). It is difficult for the researcher to separate group reflection as a single pedagogy since the interactive activities central to ULE almost always include a follow-up session of discussion questions and reflection.

*Service learning.* Service learning is defined as “a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community need together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5). Astin (1993) and Pascarella & Terenzini (1991) among other scholars suggest that extracurricular involvement, interaction with diverse peers, and student involvement promote leadership development. Yet, little research exists specifically addressing conjoined undergraduate leadership development activities outside the classroom. Several studies suggested that service learning, peer evaluations, and group projects were effective. For example, Burbach, Matkin, and Fritz (2004) found service-learning with an accompanied journal provided students with real-life, community-based experiences related to course content. These experiences created an opportunity to cognitively consider theories covered in the classroom. Chung (2001) found that students report perceiving a positive impact of service learning on their understanding of
leadership concepts. Pascarella, Palmer, Moye, and Pierson (2001) found that college students involved in "diversity experiences" had significant gains in critical thinking skills. Thus, student leadership development may transcend the classroom and still supplement the curriculum.

The following prior research studies demonstrate effective service learning pedagogy in ULE. The studies are organized by those that promote service learning only through personal growth and those that connect service learning with other outcomes such as leadership theory.

In service learning, the emphasis and value of service learning is felt and experienced by both the learner and the recipient of the activity. It is a pedagogy designed to transform students by combining social activism with academics and is commonly evaluated as a model pedagogy for leadership development in university students (Scharff, 2009). The service learning experiences build upon existing knowledge of community members and the young person (Webster, Bruce, & Hoover, 2006). "Service-learning joins two complex concepts: community action, the 'service,' and efforts to learn from that action and connect what is learned to existing knowledge, the 'learning'" (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). The combined approach attempts to solve genuine human problems while providing directed educational growth. The result is dynamic curriculum and programming that has the potential to radically change lives (Scharff, 2009).

In a recent empirical study, Webster, Bruce, and Hoover (2006) found that students who engage in service learning activities have significant gains in academic, social, and personal growth. Service learning purports that
participants gain social skills, participate in less risky behaviors, show an increase in academic achievement, have a greater sense of civic engagement and political affiliation, gain greater respect for peers and teachers, and develop a deeper understanding of self, greater empathy for others, increased cognitive complexity, a realistic perception of careers, and a more developed sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy (e.g., Billig, 2000; Furco, 2002).

In a similar study that utilized a grounded theory methodology, Stenta (2001) found that students in a service-based undergraduate leadership program personalized nearly every aspect of their experiences. Specifically, students internalized and personalized their learning by connecting leadership with others, tending to the common good, understanding difference, realizing the relationship of interconnectedness of complexly issues, and by understanding social change movements.

Scharff (2009) suggests that service learning is an excellent pedagogy to consider for those attempting to develop leadership skills in undergraduates. By combining both service and academics and casting participants as both teacher and learner, service learning provides a dynamic field for learning while also allowing students to work constructively to solve real-world problems. The volunteer aspect of service learning develops empathy. The academic focus grounds experience in theory and creates room for reflection. Further, transformational leadership skills can be fostered by providing students opportunities to connect with and inspire others to reach for higher potentials. Students can act on their passions while learning to provide services in a way
that minimizes paternalism. Participants can learn to act morally and thoughtfully, bringing out the best in themselves and others. In short, service learning can augment classroom offerings by giving students room to put their ideas into action (Scharff, 2009).

The service learning pedagogy develops linkages between theory and service and connects the participant with the community in a structured and direct manner (Hoover & Webster, 2004). Through these experiences participants develop an understanding of how to specifically help communities and enhance their own theoretical learning (Webster, Bruce, & Hoover, 2006). For instance, Seemiller (2006) asserts that participation in The Social Change Project (a service learning project) encourages students to recognize the need for leadership in creating effective social change which supports active utilization of these same leadership concepts in the future.

Service learning pedagogy has also been effective in outcomes that reach beyond social activism and personal growth. In a recent study Sessa, Matos, and Hopkins (2009) emphasized service-learning pedagogy and leadership theories in an experimental undergraduate course. Students in the study found situational leadership theories, team leadership theories, and leadership principles most relevant to their experiences. According to the researchers, the students learned about themselves personally as individuals, leaders, team members, and community members. Civically, students learned how to apply leadership theories, work in teams, and about the community as a system. In terms of depth of learning, based on Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy, students were
able to identify, describe, and apply concepts and to some extent analyze and synthesize them. These findings suggest that using service learning to help students learn about both the theory and practice of leadership is a viable alternative (Sessa et al., 2009).

**Self-Development.** Self-development, often integrated into the ULE curriculum as Personal Development Plans are defined as a process through which the student pre prepares a vision or development plan and takes personal responsibility (Taylor & Edge, 1997). In a qualitative investigation to explore how leadership was most effectively taught, Murry (1992) found that leadership development is primarily dependent on self-development. Undergraduate and graduate students participating in Murry’s study responded to the question “can leadership be taught?” by explaining that becoming an effective leader was the result of a combination of educational experiences, personality characteristics, and personal choice. Interviews with 24 of the 114 respondents also revealed that empowering and/or transformational learning at both the undergraduate and graduate level is highly emotional. Murry summarized these responses from the interview transcripts as self-development.

Allen and Hartman (2008b) report that this pedagogy, while popular in practice, lacks an extensive literature base. While they are easy to implement, they often fall victim to poor implementation and a lack of follow-through. Allen and Hartman suggest that unless they are linked to organizational systems rarely found in ULE, return on investment is unlikely. Allen and Hartman’s (2009) study of undergraduates surveyed what 171 business students would prefer to
experience and what 522 attendees of student leadership conference did prefer experiencing in ULE. In regards to self-development, Allen and Hartman (2009) suggest the following:

Students interested in developing their leadership abilities need help evaluating how their interests and motivation toward development may benefit or be hindered through self-development opportunities. Benefits include participating in activities matching the student’s learning style and level of preparation. Students are also much more likely to be engaged in self-selected activities. This engagement should lead to higher participant motivation and satisfaction. This should also yield better self-efficacy and leadership efficacy. However, disadvantages of self-directed development likely include setting learning goals that are less challenging than those set by an authority figure. Students may engage in confirmation bias when making these selections, and their participation may give them satisfaction and overconfidence in their improved leadership skill. Plus, students selecting only comfortable and preferred learning environments may not obtain broad coverage of concepts and experiences, which limits or slows leadership skill development. For example, avoiding role-playing and journal reflection activities could allow students to forget developmental activities that entail both uncomfortable emotional and cognitively complex ways to view leadership. In role playing it
can be advantageous for a student to take the position of disagreeing to better understand a method of thinking and behaving, but it is unclear if students would be willing to select these activities without some coercion. Therefore, individual differences and environmental factors may still be critical in predicting which students would seek a range of challenging developmental activities. Goal and vision statements were moderately popular in both samples, and these activities may enhance student development for those with a lower need for achievement or structured aspirations. (p. 14)

**Teambuilding.** According to Moorhead and Griffin (2010), teambuilding emphasizes members working together in a spirit of cooperation and generally has one or more of the following goals:

1. To set team goals and priorities.
2. To analyze and allocate the way work is performed.
3. To examine how a group is working—that is, to examine processes such as norms, decision making, and communication.
4. To examine relationships among people doing the work.

Effective teambuilding activities require participants to reflect on these experiences as a guide to becoming a leader in a collaborative environment. Like a low ropes course, teambuilding is cost effective and easy to implement. However, determining the return on investment may be difficult, and without a
skilled facilitator, learning opportunities may be missed. The approach is often used when a group is in its beginning stages (Allen & Hartman, 2008b).

**Conceptual understanding.** Leadership development through conceptual understanding “focuses on improving the individual’s knowledge through exposure to the topic of leadership” (Conger, 1992, p. 48). This form of development often centers on various theories of leadership (transformational leadership, situational leadership, emotional intelligence) and is confined to a classroom or e-learning module. Conceptual understanding activities usually offer broad coverage of leadership topics to better improve participants' understanding and much of the content is chosen by the instructor or speaker to meet specific learning goals (Allen & Hartman, 2009). Yet, these activities are much more observer-oriented; while the other sources of learning dimensions involve more individual activity and inclusion in learning. Allen and Hartman (2009) found that, in the conceptual learning dimension, students reported favoring lectures on the topic of leadership, observing effective leaders, watching films about leadership and listening to stories about leadership.

**Research leadership.** Research leadership is defined as a learning activity where students actively research a leadership theory or topic and present findings in oral or written format (Allen & Hartman, 2009). Jones and Kilburn (2005) proposed a framework for research leadership that included searching the literature from the perspective of primary concerns or recurring themes addressed by leadership scholars. They argue that their framework provides an overarching perspective and a logical schema for understanding the recurring
themes found in the leadership literature: the choice to become a leader; the activities in the leadership process; and the appropriate behaviors for interacting with followers. In order to organize and explain this information, Jones and Kilburn converted the themes of their framework into three major components:

1. Philosophy of leadership: the approaches a person may choose from when leading, including considerations of when and where to lead
2. Process of leadership: what activities or functions leaders perform, and
3. Psychology of leadership: how leaders interacted with followers

Jones and Kilburn were able to classify the numerous concepts and theories of leadership as being elements of one of these components. This classification schema recognized that specific concepts or theories provide responses to the concerns that are raised within the major components of the framework. The components of the framework are integrated by conceiving the process of leadership as enveloped within philosophies and psychologies of leadership. Further, the framework conceived the components as interacting dynamics of the leadership concept: (1) The choice to lead, which involves developing a philosophy of leadership; (2) The process of leadership, which incorporates four major functions of leadership and the activities within those functions; and (3) The choice of leadership behaviors, which requires understanding the psychology of leadership. Thus, this framework provides a basis, through research for students to leadership themes, make leadership decisions, and select appropriate behaviors for interacting with followers.
**Critical thinking.** ULE, unlike many other disciplines, emphasize building skills such as critical thinking through student-centered experiential learning (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Eich, 2008; Moore, Boyd, & Dooley, 2010). This type of learning is central to helping students develop as leaders and bridges thinking with action (Jenkins & Cutchens, 2010). According to Burbach, Matkin, and Fritz (2004), the underlying philosophy of leadership education is to enhance students’ interpersonal skills for leadership in an environment that fosters increased self-awareness, increased understanding of others, and learning from life experiences. Thus, leadership education is inherently designed to improve critical thinking by cultivating self-regulatory judgment through the interpretation, analysis, evaluation and inference of a leader's own decisions and actions. Similarly, other scholars have alluded to practicing critical reflection, a behavior that integrates personal experiences with new learning and understanding to engage and mobilize students to act on new ideas and to challenge conventional thinking in both theory and practice (Jones, Simonetti, & Vielhaber-Hermon, 2000; Reynolds, 1999). In leadership education, deep reflective learning requires students to consider the underlying dynamics of power and to question basic assumptions and practices. For example, students could be required to reassess the power they use in leadership situations to achieve their desired results (Jenkins & Cutchens, 2010).

Yet, engaging in critical reflection can create student discomfort and dissonance (Brookfield, 1994; Dewey, 1933; Reynolds, 1999). Nonetheless, as Fink (2003) and others assert, discomfort often means students are really
thinking and consequently really learning. Moreover, where reflection is absent, there is the constant risk of making poor decisions and bad judgments (Brookfield, 1995). For example, without reflection, leaders may be convinced by past successes of their invincibility and fail to consider other viewpoints, with possibly disastrous consequences (Densten & Gray, 2001). Similarly, leaders may avoid reflecting on a course of action because such reflection might challenge their favorable perceptions of themselves (Conger, 1992). Likewise, Jenkins and Cutchens (2010) advocate “leading critically,” the act of applying critical thinking skills to make decisions about leadership actions. Students can apply this concept to variety of situations by utilizing reflection of life experiences and taking actions to think.

**Feedback.** Along with those experiences that foster personal growth and conceptual understanding, Conger (1992) suggests that “through effective feedback processes, we can learn about our strengths and weaknesses in a number of leadership skills” (p. 50). Feedback may take many forms. Day (2001) summarized selected practices in leadership development through 360-degree feedback and executive coaching, mentoring and networking, and job assignments and action learning. Yet, these specific practices have not been altered, applied, or assessed in the undergraduate context. Nonetheless, these ideas may lead the way to future research.

For instance, mentors or coaches are common sources of feedback for individuals. The Center for Creative Leadership incorporates feedback-intensive experiences in its programming that are concerned with helping a person to see
more clearly significant patterns of behavior, to understand more clearly the attitudes and motivations underlying these patterns, to reassess what makes the person more or less effective relative to the goals he or she wants to attain, and to evaluate alternative ways of meeting these goals (McCauley, Moxley, & Van Velsor, 1998).

**Practice/Feedback.** Experiencing practice and subsequent feedback in the classroom has shown to produce leadership development in undergraduates. For example, Hess (2007) suggests the “classroom practicum approach” to develop leadership skills. In this approach, student learning is enhanced by integrating a greater emphasis on the transfer phase of the learning process. By engaging students in opportunities for extended practice and informed feedback, this approach improves student learning regardless of the class size. Unfortunately, in most academic settings, the opportunity for students to practice skills and receive feedback on their performance tends to be limited to involvement in brief role plays or simulations, and to whatever applications students might attempt outside the classroom. This lack of opportunity for significant class-based practice and feedback suggests a potential “next step” for leadership educators. Specifically, further enhancing course-based leadership skill building exercised through an increased emphasis on learning transfer, that is, by including opportunities for meaningful practice and feedback in the course design and curriculum.

Yet, there are many challenges inherent in ensuring meaningful practice and feedback (Hess, 2007). These include providing feedback to all students
and allowing all students to practice skills for a duration and complexity efficient to elicit a substantial skill set. Rubin (2006) concluded that to be effective, feedback should be concrete, specific, descriptive, balanced, nonthreatening, and constructive. Any course design seeking to achieve enhanced skills development through greater emphasis on learning transfer, then, must ensure quality in terms of both the practice opportunity and the feedback provided.

Holmer (2001) recommends having students prepare for leading in-class teams, has students review rules for giving feedback, and then has them practice framing feedback statements. McEnrue (2002) engages students in role plays and other exercises, each targeting a specific skill area. Students then receive highly structured peer feedback on their performance.

To combat this, Hess (2007) transcended Fleming's (1992) “Classroom Practicum Approach.” This approach is designed to develop team leadership skills in students. In this model, the classroom becomes the setting for each student’s experience. Each student is provided a significant opportunity to lead a 2-week-long team project and to receive detailed feedback on his or her effectiveness in that role. The practice opportunity is of complexity and duration sufficient to require the exercise of a broad range of leadership skills, from providing direction and support to managing conflict and achieving consensus. At the same time, the conditions required for competent feedback are also met in that feedback is received within a few days of practice, and all team members are trained specifically to provide feedback that is concrete, specific, descriptive,
balanced, nonthreatening, and constructive. A summary of this approach is illustrated in Table 5 below.

Table 5

**Summary of Classroom Practicum Approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Phase</th>
<th>Practicum Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begins with readings and discussion of issues in leadership (emotional intelligence, motivation, leadership styles, etc.).</td>
<td>Class is divided in four-person project teams. Each team member is the team leader for one project. For each project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the same time, the class is divided into teams, with each team responsible for preparation presentation/modeling and class discussions of one of the following skill sets: Providing direction Coordinating efforts Encouraging participation Facilitating group decisions Managing conflict</td>
<td>Team leaders Receive briefings on the project requirements/goals Prepare project plans with sub-goals and time frames for each team meeting (and minutes for each completed meeting) Lead team meetings Meet with the instructor and other team leaders after each team meeting for debriefing and behavioral goal setting Prepare and present the team project report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor leads training in providing written performance feedback</td>
<td>Team members Participate in team meetings Prepare and submit feedback reports on team leader performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Using students as the primary source of developmental feedback is consistent with Rubin (2006), who cited Falchikov and Goldfinch (2000) and Macpherson (1999) in concluding, “In general, the preponderance of evidence seems to suggest that with sufficient practice and clear methodology, students can provide peer feedback that is highly congruent with faculty member feedback.” The classroom practicum model described here attempts to enhance students' leadership skills development by integrating into the course design a
greater emphasis on the transfer phase of the learning process. By engaging students in opportunities for focused practice over several sessions and for informed peer feedback on their performance, this approach seeks to better achieve the conditions known to result in improved learning.

*Peer evaluations.* Another valuable feedback-based pedagogical tool is the use of peer evaluations. Buschlen (2009) found that:

Often times, group projects may be viewed by students as just another ‘group project’ but, if the task is accomplished by an explanation of how this project can also be an exercise in leadership, more productive outcomes await. Students must realize that the lessons of leadership transcend the final grade and will actually develop the student into a well-rounded citizen. Thus, faculty must push for more peer evaluations as this adds a level of sophistication to grading and forces students to confront each other during projects. This measure of accountability should enhance a student’s leadership and interpersonal skills. This expectation develops the skill of delegation, the skill of conflict negotiation, the skill of evaluation, and the realization of accountability. These were the lessons that transcend the classroom and make an impact in the community as students work and flourish. (p. 151)

*Self-assessments and instruments.* Assessments and instruments in this environment are an instructional method where students complete questionnaires designed to enhance their own self-awareness in a variety of
areas (e.g. leadership style, learning style, personality type) (Allen & Hartman, 2009). Popular in practice, ULE instructors have often used this pedagogical tool (Allen & Hartman, 2008b). Such assessments are useful and pragmatic because they provide an interactive learning tool, connect the material to the learner, and open the floor for introspective discussion. Examples include student or professional versions of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (www.myersbriggs.org) as well as other self-assessments to measure Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995), locus of control, and personality traits or dimensions.

The benchmark self-assessment may be Kouzes and Posner’s (1998) Student Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). While this instrument has been used by leadership researchers to assess leadership development in undergraduates, ULE instructors have also utilized this popular assessment in the classroom. The student LPI is based on Kouzes and Posner’s classic work The Leadership Challenge (1998) and more recently, The Student Leadership Challenge (2008). Through a plethora of resources including facilitator’s guides, student workbooks, and suggested interactive activities, ULE instructors should have no problem facilitating the student LPI in their classrooms (www.leadershipchallenge.com).

Also, in a recent study designed to answer the question: “Can leaders be trained?” Buschlen (2009) found that effective leadership education must focus more time and energy on a structured format for the understanding of self. His study of undergraduates in a 16 week for-credit academic leadership course based on the Social Change Model of Leadership (SCM) included community
service, theoretical, and application based projects. His research suggests that structured self-assessment surveys such as the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) or Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) would enhance self-image and will ultimately have a positive impact on the group values and the community values portion of that student’s development. Thus, the uses of assessments and instruments have many benefits in ULE.

**Skill-building.** Skill-building activities represent opportunities to practice leadership in a context where there is less pressure and a lower cost of failure (e.g., they are truly developmental in nature). Further inherent in these activities are participant critique and immediate feedback directed toward students’ strengths and weaknesses (Allen & Hartman, 2008b). According to Allen and Hartman (2009), students gravitated toward these types of activities because they allow them to practice and refine their skills in an interactive environment.

A number of scholars discuss the concept of skill or competency building (e.g., Cacioppe, 1998; Yukl, 2002). Skill building “demands that leadership abilities be broken down into actual mechanical processes that you and I can perform” (Conger, 1992, p. 176). Conger asserts that certain aspects of skills, such as communication and motivation, can be taught. London (2002) suggests that leadership skills should include such elements as “envisioning the future, establishing goals, communicating, rallying support for the vision, planning for its implementation, and putting the plans in place” (p. 22).

**Active & experiential learning.** Active learning is any instructional approach that “involves student doing things and thinking about the things they
are doing” (Bonwell & Eison, 1991, p. 2). Experiential learning is any pedagogical process through which a learner constructs knowledge, skill, and value from experience (Luckmann, 1996). Kolb’s (1994) experiential learning theory defines learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience.” The utilization of active and experiential learning techniques to promote leadership development in the classroom has proved effective through many techniques (e.g., Baltes & Staudenger, 2000; Moore, Boyd, & Dooley, 2010; Schneider & Shoenberg, 1998).

Bonwell and Eison (1991) assert that although activities such as role-playing, simulation, debate, and cases studies are teaching activities rather than more general teaching strategies, together they offer students an experience that has significant psychological and social as well as intellectual dimensions. In any case they provide a clear alternative to teaching as “dispensing information.” For example, in one ULE course, Burbach, Matkin, and Fritz (2004) found that student engagement in active learning techniques appeared to increase critical thinking. For the purposes of their students, critical thinking was defined as a purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation and inference as well as explanation of the evidential conceptual methodological, criteriological, or contextual considerations upon which that judgment was based (Facione, 1990).” Such active learning strategies include an out of class service project along with instructor-mediated reaction journals, group projects involving contextual scenarios, case studies (Case teaching
whether through case studies or short videos has been shown to involve students and enhance their learning experience), role-plays, Socratic questioning, and student presentations.

Buschlen (2009) stressed the importance for leadership instructors to develop lessons that impact a student's ability to see and experience leadership. He suggests that often times, group projects may be viewed by students as just another "group project" but, if the task is accomplished by an explanation of how this project can also be an exercise in leadership, more productive outcomes await. Students must realize that the lessons of leadership transcend the final grade and will actually develop the student into a well-rounded citizen.

Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2006) argue that students must be trained in the art of using multiple perspectives to solve real world, complex issues. Yet, this art is not easily understood and therefore formal training through the use of simulations and other active learning strategies are needed. Thus, instructors can enhance student leadership development through by incorporating experiential active learning strategies in their courses to help bridge the gap between the real world and the classroom.

Class discussion. Class discussion, for better or for worse, is the most common pedagogical method in use today and through the ages (Cross, 2002). Yet, while only a few studies have explored class discussion (or discussion pedagogy) as a stand-alone pedagogy (e.g. Cross, 2002; Dallimore, Hertenstein, & Platt, 2008), nothing of consequence appears in the leadership pedagogy literature. For example, Teaching Leadership (Pillai & Stites-Doe, 2003) merely
mentions class discussion several times throughout the text, while no substantial
discussion is included. As well, Wisniewski (2010) posits that the role of the
leadership educator in the teaching and learning process in a leadership
education model includes stimulating student-led discussion based on current
events or case studies.

Cross (2002) alludes to the growing criticism of the traditional
lecture/discussion format in college teaching. And while it remains the
overwhelming method of choice, there is nothing really wrong with it if it is used
with the conscious and express purpose of promoting learning. The purpose is
the key. Cross contends:

Class discussion covers a wide range of learning sins and virtues.
Some teachers use class discussion to promote learning; others
use it to fill class time. Some discussion is carefully planned; some
occurs by default. Some challenges and engages students; some
bores. Some is task-oriented; some lacks any focus. Some is
learner-centered; most is teacher-centered. And some discussion
consists largely of questions and answers with a call for ‘right
answers,’ while some is more like a conversation, challenging
analysis and higher-level thinking skills. (p. 8-9)

Similarly, C. Roland Christensen, professor emeritus of the Harvard
Business School and widely considered a master of the teaching by discussion
method asserts:
Class discussion is especially effective when educational objectives focus on qualities of mind (curiosity, judgment, wisdom), qualities of person (character, sensitivity, integrity, responsibility, (and the ability to apply general concepts and knowledge to specific situations). Discussion puts students in an active learning mode, challenges them to accept substantial responsibility for their own education, and gives them first-hand appreciation of, and experience with, the application of knowledge to practice. (1987, p. 3).

Class discussion has been advocated for a variety of reasons, including its inherently democratic nature (Redfield, 2000), its emphasis on active learning (Cross, 2002), and its impact on the development of problem solving (Gilmore & Schall, 1996) and critical thinking skills (Robinson & Schaible, 1993). Instructional developers suggest that compared to the traditional lecture method, discussion elicits higher-level reflective thinking and problem solving and that information learned through discussion is generally retained better than information learned through lecture (Ewens, 2000). However, equally important is the role that student participation during discussion might play in leadership development.

Case-in-point approach. The case-in-point approach, described in detail in Parks’ Leadership Can Be Taught (2005), offers a “bold approach to learning and teaching leadership, created and practiced in a manner that is responsive to the hungers for a new story about what leadership means and asks—and ways
of learning it” (p. 6). Parks asks the key questions required to develop a pedagogical model for leadership: Can leadership be learned? If it can be learned, can it be taught? And if so, what methods or approaches will work? Is teaching an act of leadership? If leading involves risk, what are the risks involved in teaching leadership? Can new insight move beyond conceptual awaking and actually change leadership behavior at the level of default settings—habitual ways of responding, especially in crisis and under stress?

According to Parks (2005), Heifetz, author of *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (1994) and his colleagues’ “Case-in-Point” approach to teaching answers all of these questions by employing several well-established learning traditions and methods: seminar, simulation, presentation of ideas and perspectives (through lecture, reading, and film), discussion and dialogue, clinical-therapeutic practice, coaching, the laboratory, the art studio, writing as a form of disciplined reflection, and the case study method. Parks particularly stresses the case study method as a powerful pedagogical tool that gives students multiple situations, concepts, and images to work with as they think about experiences that they haven’t yet had (Garvin, 2003; Parks, 2005;). This experiential framework, borrowed from John Dewey, draws on practical experience, but is usually somewhat removed from the actual, immediate experience on the student. According to Parks (2005), in the quest of a methodology that can teach further below the neck—to the default settings that people act from in a crisis—case-in-point teaching and learning seeks to make optimal use of the student’s own past and immediate experience:
In case-in-point teaching, what goes on in the classroom itself is an occasion for learning and practicing leadership within a social group. The class is recognized as a social system inevitably made up of a number of different factions and acted on by multiple forces. The class also has a clear and challenging purpose—to make progress in understanding and practicing leadership. The teacher has a set of ideas and frameworks to offer. But instead of presenting a lecture, or starting with a written case from another context that may not be relevant to the learning of the people in the class, the teacher waits for a case to appear in the process of the class itself. Every group generates its own set of issues, shaped, in part, by what is set in motion by the context and content provided by the teacher-presenter and the events of the day. The challenge is to make use of both the explicit and underlying issues that surface in the group by connecting those issues to the course content. The teacher, therefore, must reflect in the class as it is happening, asking, ‘is there any way I can use what is happening right here and now to illustrate the content I want the class to learn today?’ In other words, the teacher imagines that what went on in the class for the last ten minutes was a case. Then the teacher works to use it to illustrate the themes, concept or skill that he or she is trying to present. The work is to create a live encounter between the experience of the learner and the idea. (p. 7-8)
To explain this approach with a metaphor of the dance floor and the balcony where the dance floor is where the action is and the balcony is where the students can read the larger pattern of what is going on and figure out how to intervene in ways that will help the group make progress. In this approach the teacher remains the authority, but is also practicing leadership—skillfully allowing enough disequilibrium to help the group move from unexamined assumptions about leadership to see understanding, and acting in tune with what the art and practice of leadership may actually require (Parks, 2005).

Parks addresses the issue of transferability of this approach in chapter 8 of her book. She echoes the sentiments of Shulman (2005) and Fink (2003) that educators from a variety of backgrounds can employ this method, not only because they each bring a different style and set of talents to the work, but because they share the following: (a) a curiosity about how to practice a quality of leadership education that can more adequately address change on behalf of the common good, (b) an informed respect for the process of human growth and development, and (b) a willingness to take on a mode of working that challenges both their own and others’ assumptions about how teaching and learning take place (p. 170).

Role-play. Role play is a learning activity in which participants act out a set of defined role behaviors or position with a view to acquiring desired experiences. A role-playing scenario could be mimicking, demonstrative or illustrative of specific concepts, problems or situations (Sogurno, 2003). Sogurno
conducted a meta-analysis of the use of role play in leadership training programs and leadership education. She concluded that:

Because role-playing is less concerned with memorization or teacher-centered pedagogical approaches, but more concerned with active participation and sensitization of learners to new roles and behaviors it opens up more possibilities of associating enacted roles and behaviors to real-life situations thereby making sense of learning. In an epistemological sense, role-playing facilitates retention of information and enhances, new and a more permanent learning. (p. 355-356)

Wisniewski (2010) suggests that role-play is an effective active learning process that challenges students to modify their personal theories of leadership. It is though this cognitive process that learning and change occur. In Millennials, role-play has been found to Students engage in a learning activity where they act out a set of defined role behaviors or positions with a view to acquire desired experiences.

Simulations. Simulations are an activity that simulates the complex problems or issues and requires decision-making. Following the activity, students reflect on the process, results, and learning (Yukl, 2002). These activities challenge students to demonstrate a skill when it is not feasible to use a real-world setting (Palomba & Banta, 1999) and they can provide valuable evidence of student attainment that is both direct and authentic (Ewell, 2002b). Proponents of simulations assert that they stimulate interest and motivation.
Most simulations are experiential in nature (Curry & Moutinho, 1992; Drew & Davidson, 1993; Faria & Dickinson, 1994; Fripp, 1997; Keys & Wolfe, 1990; McCune, 1998) and provide the participant with rapid feedback about performance which has the power to draw in players (Drew & Davidson, 1993; Faria & Dickinson, 1994; Keys & Wolfe, 1990). In addition, some suggest that competition (Curry & Moutinho, 1992) and teamwork (Faria & Dickinson, 1994; Fripp, 1997) are the most engaging aspects of a simulation. At times simulations provide realistic representations of real world situations and provide participants with a more global view of their organization (Faria & Dickinson, 1994; Keys & Wolfe, 1990; Van Velsor, Ruderman, & Phillips, 1989).

In a recent article, Allen (2008) described 25 anonymous undergraduate student responses to StarPower, a simulation often used in leadership courses to teach students about ethical behavior. Allen concluded that:

Simulations are an important source of learning. Rather than passively learning about terms such as ethical relativism and ethical universalism, students had an opportunity to witness these dynamics unfold firsthand among their classmates. This notion is exemplified by a student’s comment that ‘it brings individuals in touch with their true ethical values and beliefs. It is easy to say you believe one thing, but actually behaving that way is altogether another issue. (p. 146)

**Games.** Games are activities that engage students in interactions in a prescribed setting and are constrained by a set of rules and procedures (e.g.,
Jeopardy, Who Wants to be a Millionaire, Family Feud, etc.) (Hsu, 1989). In an article summarizing his experiences using the *Prisoner's Dilemma* to teach ethics, Gibson (2003) found games and specifically game theory an important tool which students find to be challenging and enjoyable. Further, Gibson suggests that games are pedagogically useful because they raise awareness, spark challenges, have normative implications, and are descriptive.

**Traditional Assessment through Quizzes and Exams**

When it comes to instructional strategies, quizzes and exams are clearly more of an assessment tool than a learning activity. Yet, as stated in chapter one of this dissertation, as used in this study, instructional strategies are interchangeable/synonymous with instructional methods, assignments, and classroom activities; they can be anything they can be anything an instructor has built into a course for students to do or complete. While the literature on quizzes and exams in general is considerable (e.g. Clegg & Chasin, 1986; Chasin, 1987; Ewell, 1993, 2002a; and Holt & Eison, 1989) and the literature on assessment in leadership education is growing (e.g., Goertzen, 2009; Lindsay, Foster, Jackson, & Hassan, 2009; Rosch & Schwartz, 2009) very little exists addressing the specific use of quizzes and exams in leadership education.

Lindsay, Foster, Jackson, and Hassan (2009) reviewed leadership education and assessment approaches in the United States Air Force Academy. The results of their study suggest that developmental roadblocks often occur in leadership education and assessment recommendations can only be made once educators look at which attributes to assess:
To summarize, individuals often view themselves more favorably than other people view them, and individuals will interpret information to protect these positive self-perceptions. In fact, individuals might be particularly prone to positive illusions in the leadership domain for a few reasons. First, leadership is difficult to measure. Information about one’s leadership ability is often ambiguous and developing leaders can interpret such ambiguous information in a self-enhancing manner. Second, leadership is often important to one’s self-concept. Many people want to be great or at least decent leaders. Thus, when individuals receive negative information pertaining to their leadership, it can be more threatening than it would be for characteristics that are more peripheral to the self-concept. Third, leadership ability is a relatively global characteristic. Leadership essentially entails understanding and motivating other people. Because this is a relatively omnipresent endeavor, individuals might be particularly defensive about their abilities, as opposed to a more narrow skill. Fourth, by virtue of their leadership positions, leaders may receive consistently inaccurate feedback about their effectiveness (Church, 2000). Together, these issues clarify why many developing and existing leaders may have limited true awareness of their own leadership abilities. (Lindsay et al., 2009, p. 166)
To reiterate, Lindsay et al. (2009) suggest addressing these roadblocks by first looking at which attributes should be assessed. The first involves the outcomes to be measured. Is the focus of interest student learning, individual development, individual performance, or organizational impact? Each of these outcomes will influence the assessment strategy and the strategy must align itself with outcomes. For example, if one is solely interested in knowledge retention of the individual, then one could use a test of some sort to examine the knowledge that was learned and subsequently retained (e.g., quiz or exam). If one is looking at examining actual behavioral change, then a different assessment strategy is necessary (p. 167).

Goertzen (2009) looked at a variety of assessment methods in academic based leadership education programs. His analysis suggests that direct assessment techniques such as standardized exams provide valuable success measures for academic leadership programs, since they permit benchmark comparisons across other leadership programs. He warns however that standardized exams commonly rely upon forced-choice examinations that primarily measure the cognitive domain of learning, are often expensive, and are only as useful as their alignment with the expressed learning goals and objectives of the particular academic program.

Issues, Challenges, and Criticisms in Undergraduate Leadership Education

The quest for collective leadership pedagogy entails many challenges within the discipline. Such challenges include disparity in the theoretical framework, curriculum, influences, and assessment in leadership education (Middlebrooks & Allen, 2008). Indeed, because learning leadership and
developing leadership skills may be different than learning other content in a traditional classroom setting, leadership education may need different strategies for facilitating learning (Eich, 2003; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998; and Wren, 1995). Accordingly, leadership education requires its own examination to determine how effective teaching and learning of leadership is done. Attributes of the pedagogical attributes that enhance student learning and leadership development are at the center of determining excellence in leadership education (Eich, 2007). Thus, leadership educators should utilize the foundation we have built thus far and invest time and research in developing effective pedagogy.

Middlebrooks and Allen (2008) recognize two key pedagogical issues in leadership education. The first is a lack of connection and involvement in community/issues. This challenge entails how leadership educators can help students become leaders in their communities or engaged in a specific issue. The second, referred to as “Connecting the Dots: Activity and Insight,” describes a pedagogy that only provides the “in class” portion of leadership education. This challenge entails how we might get students to be able to practice what has been learned in real time where leadership is messy, consuming, and lack clear solutions. Specifically, how do we better connect the dots between experiences and activities, and theory and models? Eich (2008) echoes these findings in his research on high quality leadership programs. Specifically, he identifies 16 attributes organized into three clusters: (a) participants engaged in building and sustaining a learning community; (b) student-centered experiential learning experiences; and (c) research grounded continuous program development.
Through the program attributes, students learn about leadership and themselves in the course of engaging in the leadership process while reflecting on and applying their new learning and skills in collaborative action with others. Thus, effective leadership pedagogy will guide leadership educators how to create the in class conditions to allow students to defeat these challenges.

Similarly, Allen and Hartman (2009) argue that even if the classroom does offer opportunities to practice aspects of leadership, it is not the same as truly being in the thick of a difficult leadership challenge. Likewise, leadership development needs clear cut objectives, a sound learning methodology, and a powerful learning environment for the participants. As a result, program architects struggle to define clear and realistic learning objectives and as a result do not choose learning interventions (sources of learning) that fit the objectives for development.

Brungardt (1996) suggested leadership development activities are not well documented, and researchers often do not explain or understand the impact the activity has on students. He also indicated leader development and education could be more deliberately implemented if research moved from descriptive studies into those that prescribe specific models of intervention. In addition, several leadership studies have discussed the value of classroom and direct experience as a means for leader development, but this research is often distant from practitioners or is too polarized in its viewpoint to be practically relevant.

Yet, a main theme that emerged from their study was that no cohesive framework exists across leadership majors (Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, &
Arensdorf, 2006). They suggested working together to agree on a common ground in teaching students historical, theoretical, and practical foundations and applications of leadership in order to gain credibility or make the case for leadership as a credible major. In an indirect response to this need, a Learning Lab held at the 2006 International Leadership Association (ILA) conference focused on the broad topic areas (sections) that should be addressed by guidelines and the questions essential (guiding questions) to the development of leadership education programs at postsecondary institutions. This work lead to a request to become a formal ILA learning community in 2007. Since 2007, thirty-eight members of the International Leadership Association began working together on an online Wiki to develop these guidelines. The guidelines included clearly identifying a conceptual framework for leadership programs as well as teaching and learning, context, content, and outcomes and assessments (Guidelines for Leadership Education Learning Community). A review of these guidelines presents important questions for future research and collaboration.

**Group versus personalized settings.** According to Allen and Hartman (2009), some sources of learning are clearly designed to be delivered in a group setting while others are more individualized in their delivery and design. In addition, some sources of learning ask the participant(s) to actively engage in the learning activity in a context directly relevant to leadership, while other sources of learning are observation oriented and can occur in settings vastly different from actual leadership scenarios. Allen and Hartman suggest future research to determine which activities best fit the situation. Just as factors might dictate
which instructional strategies are chosen by ULE instructors, no single source of learning is always appropriate; variables such as time, money, skill level of the facilitators, learning objectives, and participant development level should be taken into consideration.

Current State of Research in the Discipline

Serious leadership pedagogy research is quite young. In fact, only one major peer-reviewed journal, the Journal of Leadership Education (JOLE), focuses (almost exclusively) on leadership education. Since its inaugural issue in the Summer of 2002, JOLE, an official publication of the Association of Leadership Educators, has focused on testing the hypothesis that “leadership education is possible … [and while] other journals with leadership in the title focus primarily on defining and describing leadership … journals concerning education seldom address the subject of leadership.” According to their website, “[JOLE] sits at the nexus of education theory and practice and leadership theory and practice, and from this divide, this mountain pass; there is a need to look ‘both ways.’ Whether or not leadership education is a discipline of its own is unclear, at least at present. If nothing else, by looking both ways this journal hopes to provide a passageway between two disciplines, enriching both in the process” (http://www.fhsu.edu/jole_website/about.html).

Summary and Conclusion

With the current state and growth of leadership studies, the need for research exploring the various strategies for teaching and learning in the discipline has never been greater. While there are several bodies of relevant literature that inform the present study such as research on signature
pedagogies, significant learning and Integrated Course Design, and different types of instructional strategies, studies investigating the profile of instructional strategies used across the disciplines are still very limited. As well, while a few studies have looked at student preferences of leadership development sources of learning (e.g. Allen & Hartman, 2009) or the quality of specific instructional strategies individually (e.g. Allen, 2009; Moorhead & Griffin, 2010; Sogurno, 2003), the literature is sparse of exploration into the preferences of leadership educators. Gaining an understanding of leadership instructors’ preferences at the most basic level is the critical first step to further inquiry within the discipline.

In order to provide relevant leadership education, it is important to carefully assess stakeholders responsible for delivering knowledge within the discipline. Allen and Hartman’s (2008a, 2008b, 2009) conceptualization of Conger’s (1992) framework of sources of learning in leadership development was used as the conceptual framework giving meaning and direction to the instructional strategy inquiry in this study. Further, this study was informed by Schulman’s framework of signature pedagogies as well as Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning. These frameworks place the research within its intended context of collegiate teaching and learning within the leadership discipline, which begins with the exploration of the target population in order to identify and explore their teaching and learning goal preferences.

Still, there is a growing but underdeveloped body of literature focused primarily on instructional strategies in leadership education, resulting in a gap in the literature related to best practices within the discipline. Further, the literature
offered just a mix of research on various teaching and assessment strategies in leadership education. There is clearly a lack of research that specifically addresses this literature gap in the field of leadership education.

An examination of the literature related to signature pedagogies was also performed. The literature included a fair number of studies that investigated or identified signature pedagogies in other disciplines such as physics, history, and psychology. Yet, no studies looked at the emergence of signature pedagogies within the leadership discipline. The absence of research studies assessing signature pedagogies within the leadership discipline renders the current study vital for identifying them.

As well, an examination of the literature related to the application of Fink's model of Integrated Course Design and the integration the Taxonomy of Significant Learning was performed. The review of the literature demonstrated a hodgepodge of efforts to apply Fink's model of integrated course design across the disciplines. For example, studies looked at biology, economics, and philosophy. Yet, not a single one had performed research on these frameworks within the leadership discipline. The lack of research studies assessing the application and integration of Fink's frameworks in the leadership discipline adds additional impetus for this study.

In all, this literature has an extensive base of applications and inquiries into the two major frameworks, Fink and Shulman, used here. Yet, such an inquiry is lacking as there is an absence of empirically grounded studies in leadership education. Further, only Conger (1992) and Allen and Hartman's
(2008a, 2008b, 2009) have empirically researched instructional strategies in leadership education at any length. Clearly, there is a need for further inquiry addressing these areas in the leadership discipline. This study will address this need.
Chapter 3

Method

Introduction

This study explored the instructional strategies used in the leadership disciplines at U.S.-based institutions of higher education. The primary data collection targeted a national audience of undergraduate leadership studies instructors through a web-based survey. The participants for this study were derived from membership directories and listservs of several professional associations and organizations in the leadership discipline. These sources will be described in greater detail later in this chapter.

This study employed an exploratory quantitative research design to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?

2. Are there identifiable signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline?

3. What learning goals are most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?

A brief pilot study preceded the comprehensive data collection by means of a web-based survey. Following the pilot study, the web-based survey questionnaire was reviewed for content validity, clarification, simplification, and
revision by a panel of experts. The quantitative analysis procedures include descriptive statistics and a factor analysis of the instructional strategies.

**Research Design**

Quantitative research is a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. These variables, in turn, can be measured and analyzed using statistical procedures (Creswell, 2008). Like qualitative research, quantitative inquiry has assumptions about testing theories deductively, building in protections against bias, controlling for alternative explanations, and being able to generalize and replicate the findings (Creswell, 2009).

Specifically, this study employed an exploratory quantitative design with a survey research strategy of inquiry. According to Creswell (2009) a survey research strategy of inquiry provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. It includes cross-sectional and longitudinal studies using questionnaires or structure interviews for data collection, with the intent of generalizing from a sample to a population (Babbie, 1990). This study utilized a survey research strategy of inquiry to provide a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions of ULE instructors.

**Research Method**

The flowchart in Figure 7 summarizes the master plan of the research method of this study:

1. The research began early in 2009 with the identification of the research interest (i.e., the instructional strategies, possible signature pedagogies
used in the leadership discipline, and Fink’s taxonomy of significant learning).

2. Following a comprehensive literature review and extensive reading on research methodologies, the next steps included identifying the research problem, articulating the study’s purpose, generating the research questions, and identifying the delimitations, limitations, and significance of the study.

3. After completing these steps, two additional action steps were taken:
   a. Constructing the survey instrument following the steps recommended by DeVellis (1991).
   b. Determining the data collection methods, which included identifying the target population, obtaining permission from moderators in the identified professional leadership associations and organizations to distribute and/or contact their members through their listservs or through organizational databases, compiling e-mail addresses for potential participants, obtaining permission for the inclusion of certain survey items, and formulating the data collection procedures.

4. Prior to the formal proposal defense, a pilot investigation was employed to revise and refine the online survey instrument. As well, this study sought additional experts to assist in ensuring content validity, clarification, simplification, and revision of the online survey instrument.
5. The quantitative data collection used the final form of the instrument.

6. Afterwards, the collected primary data was analyzed.

7. At the final stage, the survey findings were analyzed and interpreted.

This information was used to identify implications and make recommendations for future action and research.

**FIGURE 8.** Research Method Flowchart.
FIGURE 8. (Continued) Research Method Flowchart.

Survey Population

The primary data collection targeted a national audience of undergraduate leadership studies instructors through two primary sources. The first source was the organizational memberships and/or databases of the following professional associations/organizations or their respective member interest groups: the International Leadership Association (ILA), NASPA (Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education) Student Leadership Programs group), and/or the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP). The researcher was granted explicit permission by these organizations to contact their members via e-mail to solicit participation in the survey. The second source will be a random sample of
instructors identified through the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs, a searchable directory of leadership programs available to all ILA members. Each group will be described in detail in the following section.

ILA. Based at the University of Maryland’s School of Public Policy, the ILA is the global network for all those who practice, study, and teach leadership (http://www.ila-net.org/about/index.htm). This study will target ULE instructors in this organization by contacting the 2,271 members (as of October 10, 2010) of the ILA through the ILA Member Exchange listserv as well as the 77 members (as of October 10, 2010) of the ILA Leadership Education Member Interest Group (MIG). The MIG is comprised of ILA members committed to the development of leadership capacity at educational institutions and organizations. This group facilitates the sharing of leadership ideas, methods of teaching and learning, programs, and curricula (http://www.ilaspace.org/group/leadershipeducationmemberinterestgroup).

The ILA is also home to the premier directory of national leadership programs: The International Leadership Association Directory of Leadership Education Programs (it will be expanded to an international directory at the end of 2010). The current directory is comprised of more than 1,100 degree-granting leadership programs based at U.S. colleges and universities (http://www.ila-net.org/Resources/LPD/index.htm). Over 200 of these programs offer a bachelor’s degree or minor.

NCLP. Based at the University of Maryland, the NCLP, through the development of cutting edge resources, information sharing, and symposia,
supports leadership development in college students by serving as a central source of professional development for leadership educators (261 members as of October 10, 2010). The NCLP also works to connect leadership educators to one another and support those developing leadership programs in their communities (http://www.nclp.umd.edu/).

**NASPA.** Based out of Washington, D.C., NASPA is the leading voice for student affairs administration, policy, and practice, and affirms the commitment of the student affairs profession to educating the whole student and integrating student life and learning. With over 11,000 members at 1,400 campuses, and representing 29 countries, NASPA is the foremost professional association for student affairs administrators, faculty, and graduate and undergraduate students (www.naspa.org). This study will target ULE instructors through the membership of the NASPA Knowledge Community: Student Leadership Programs (SLPKC) (2,003 members as of October 10, 2010). The mission of the SLPKC is to serve as a resource for higher education professionals who have a professional interest in young-adult (i.e., college students) leadership training, education, and development. The SLPKC shares best practices, provide critical evaluation of the field, examine standards for leadership programs, support national and regional efforts to develop student leadership programs, make contributions to the literature, recognize exemplary programs, and cultivate a forum for the presentation of new ideas (http://www.naspa.org/kc/kcslp/default.cfm).

**Sampling.** The intent of sampling individuals is to choose individuals that are representative of a population so that the survey results can be generalized
to a population. As well, this study aimed to reduce the sampling error (difference between the sample estimate and the true population score) by attempting to use a large sample size. In order to obtain the largest possible sample, the researcher contacted potential participants through two methods:

1. Professional Association/Organization: listserv or organizational database
2. Program Directory: random sample (through a Random Digits table) of no more than three ULE instructors from each program to equal 181 potential participants.

Unfortunately, there is no way to truly identify the population of ULE instructors. Nonetheless, the organizational listservs and databases listed above represent a large sample of the target population and are derived from the major professional organizations of undergraduate leadership educators in the U.S. The use of these listservs and databases reduced the need to contact a large number of individual institutions and leadership programs for permission to obtain faculty e-mail addresses. Even so, there might have been overlap as invitations via e-mail may have reached the same participant multiple times.

The ILA Directory of Leadership Programs lists over 1,400 leadership degree granting, minors, or certificate programs based at colleges and universities. Through a simple search feature, the directory can be utilized to narrow results to institutions that grant undergraduate baccalaureate, minors, or certificate programs. Thus, instructors listed on the websites for the institutions in this group are likely more representative than the organizational listservs and
databases described above. Yet, the benefit of using this directory to complement the organizational listservs and databases described above is that many undergraduate leadership instructors are not members of professional organizations just as faculty within any discipline may not have membership in all professional organizations within their area. Nonetheless, the directory source is not all-inclusive as approximately one-third of the department websites do not list their instructors. Thus, the survey was only sent to instructors listed on their department website. There is no reason to anticipate that the leadership studies programs that did not list their individual instructors by name on their website are not representative of the population as whole (for example it could simply be the character of the program).

The unit of analysis in this study is the individual instructor responding to the survey. For example, individual instructors will report the number of different instructional strategies they use in their classes. Additional discussion regarding sample size is included in the Quantitative Analysis section of this chapter.

**Participant Demographics**

Demographic information was collected about each survey participant through specific survey items (see appendix A). The survey also included questions designed to collect information about each participant’s college or university as well as their level of prior educational attainment, teaching experience, and role at their institution. This information was used to describe the participants in the research findings.
Four thousand eight hundred and sixty one potential participants were identified through four key sources: (a) the membership of The International Leadership Association (ILA), (b) the membership of The National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP), (c) the Student Leadership Programs Knowledge Community (SLPKC) of NASPA Student Affairs Professional in Higher Education, and (d) undergraduate leadership educators identified through the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs, a searchable directory of leadership programs available to all ILA members. The membership of the ILA was contacted through the ILA Discussion listserv and by the e-mail addresses members listed in their member profiles, the membership of the NCLP was contacted through their member listserv, and the membership of the SLPKC of NASPA was contacted through their member listserv. Undergraduate leadership educators identified through the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs were found by using the search function illustrated in Figure 9.
Yet, while the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs boasts “There are currently more than 1400 programs listed…” only 112 institutions met the criteria of this study (ILA Directory of Leadership Programs). Namely, the institution’s
undergraduate leadership program must offer academic credit-bearing leadership courses and include at least one leadership instructor’s e-mail address on their department website. Of the 112 institutions that met the criteria, 43 listed only one useable e-mail address, while the remaining 69 had at least two. Thus, 181 e-mail addresses of leadership instructors identified on department websites were contacted. This group turned out to have the best return rate of the four sources: 52.49%. Further, while the return rate drops significantly from the total number of responses to the eligible responses (56.1%), the difference between the analyzed and eligible responses is only 15.6%. Return rates from all four sources are illustrated in Table 6 and the response periods are illustrated in Table 7.

Table 6

Return Rate of Web-based Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
<th>Eligible Responses</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
<th>Analyzed Responses</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILA</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>18.78%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLP</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.39%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILA Directory of Leadership Programs</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>71.27%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60.22%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>52.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4861</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>13.17%</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>6.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Response Periods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Period</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/25/10 - 10/31/10</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/10 - 11/7/10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/10 - 11/14/10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/10 - 11/21/10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/10 - 12/1/10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-response Bias**

To ensure accurate interpretation of research findings, researchers should report details about their research design, data collection method, response rates and the potential biasing effects of nonresponse when presenting findings from survey research (Kano, Franke, Afifi, & Bourque, 2008). According to Kano et al., nonresponse may affect the validity of the findings, especially their external validity, or the extent to which they can be generalized to the population of interest. While nonresponse can be either random or nonrandom, both kinds can affect the internal and external validity of study findings (but nonrandom nonresponse is of greater concern). The bias created by nonresponse is a function of both the level of nonresponse and the extent to which non-respondents are different from respondents. Interestingly, increasing response rates in survey research may not necessarily reduce bias or produce vastly different study results (Curtin, Presser, & Singer, 2000; Groves, 2006; Groves, Presser, & Dipko, 2004; Keeter, Miller, Kohut, Groves, & Presser, 2000; Teitler,
Reichman, & Sprachman, 2003). Accordingly, Kano et al. (2008), suggest four methods of assessing patterns of nonresponse:

1. **Univariate comparisons between respondents and non-respondents**: the assumption is that differences in independent variables are associated with differences in dependent variables.

2. **Multivariate regression analysis**: the results of this kind of analysis are used to develop data weights that will adjust for the differential probability of survey response. Additionally, regression models can be extended to include analysis of the predictors of both survey response and research-relevant response.

3. **Wave analysis**: the assumption here is that late respondents and respondents who required more follow-up effort (i.e. high-effort respondents) share characteristics with non-respondents, and to compare them with early or low-effort respondents on dependent variables (e.g. Curtin, et al., 2000)

4. **Random follow-up interviews**: a direct method of comparing respondents with non-respondents on substantive variables. However, this method only works if the survey is not completely anonymous.

In the present study, the researcher used a variation of univariate comparisons between respondent and non-respondents by comparing independent variables between early and late respondents (while keeping in mind the idea of wave analysis as it applies to dependent variables) (Kano et al., 2008). Specifically, the five response periods in Table 7 were grouped into three
response periods: (a) 10/25/10-10/31/10 ($N = 103$), (b) 11/1/10-11/14/10 ($N = 150$), and (c) 11/15/10-12/1/11 ($N = 50$). Twenty four one-way analyses of variance for each of the twenty four instructional strategies included in the survey and an additional six one-way analyses of variance for each of the six learning goals included in the survey were analyzed to assess the potential nonresponse bias in this study (see Appendix G). Analyses of variance of the 24 instructional strategies showed that the effect of the response periods were significant for only Stories $F(2, 300) = 5.57$, $p = .004$; Research Projects & Presentations $F(2, 300) = 3.92$, $p = .021$; and Quizzes $F(2, 300) = 3.55$, $p = .030$. Analyses of variance of the six learning goals showed that the effect of response periods were significant for only Application, $F(2, 300) = 3.78$, $p = .024$. Since only three of the twenty four instructional strategies and only one of the six learning goals from the study had significant mean differences and none had difference less than $p = .001$, the nonresponse in this study is likely no different than the reported findings.

**Description of Sample**

Participants were 359 undergraduate leadership studies instructors who completed a web-based questionnaire between October 25, 2010, and December 1, 2010. Participants self-reported having taught an in-class/face-to-face (not online) academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership course in the United States within the previous two years (this initial question determined the eligibility of participants). While 640 potential participants clicked on the hyperlink in the invitation e-mail to take part in the study, only 359 were eligible to participate. 56 participants did not complete the questions directly associated with the research questions of this study. As a result, these respondents were
removed from the analysis, resulting in a final sample of 303 instructors for this study.

Demographics of participants are described in detail in Table 8. In order to report these demographics more clearly, some considerations were made by the researcher that resulted in the re-characterization of participant responses or the creation of a new character attribute. For example, the Degree Area listed in Table 8 includes participant response to the following open-ended question: “For the degree indicated in Question 22, in what area or discipline was it awarded?” College Student Affairs, Development and Personnel were grouped together as were Organizational Studies and Organizational Leadership. For the characteristic “Principal Activity at my Institutions,” some participants reported combinations of teaching and research or students affairs. As a result, these are reported as separate characteristics in Table 8.

Table 8

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 303)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Multi-Racial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Attained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Studies</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Student Affairs, Development or Personnel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Miscellaneous</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/MBA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership or Leadership Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science, Public Policy, or Public Admin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity/Clergy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Teaching Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal Activity at Institution**

- Teaching: 140 (46.2%)
- Student Affairs (Student Services): 71 (23.4%)
- Administration: 59 (19.5%)
- Research: 10 (3.3%)
- Non-Academic: 9 (3.0%)
- Teaching & Administration: 4 (1.3%)
- Omitted: 4 (1.3%)
- Teaching & Research: 2 (0.7%)
- Teaching & Student Affairs: 2 (0.7%)
- Graduate Student: 2 (0.7%)

Additionally, participants' leadership experiences and participation in leadership training are reported in Table 9. Here, the “Type of Leadership Experience” refers to participants’ responses to the following question from the survey: “Please describe your formal leadership training experiences (check all that apply).” While *Non-Profit* and *Religious* (i.e. clergy, sisterhood or church group president) were not explicit choices on Question 16 of the survey, there were enough open-ended responses in these categories to report them separately in Table 9.
Table 9

*Leadership Experience and Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Leadership Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Student</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Leadership Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coursework</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Program or Workshop</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Coursework</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants reported the type and location of the institution where they worked (Table 10) as well as the academic college and department within their institutions that delivered the leadership courses they identified (Table 11). In Table 10, states are grouped together by region.
Table 10

*Institutional Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year Public University</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year Private College or University</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year Public or Community College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year Private College or University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic (FL, GA, MD, NC, SC, VA, WV, DC)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific (AK, CA, HI, OR, WA)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central (AL, AR, KY, MS, LA, OK, TN, TX</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic (DE, NJ, NY, or PA)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain West (AZ, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, UT, WY)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 describes the academic leadership program delivered by the participants’ institutions. In order to clearly report the characteristics of the academic colleges and departments delivering the undergraduate leadership courses, the open ended responses to question 9 on the survey were grouped together based on the most common responses.
### Table 11

*Leadership Program/Course Academic Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic College delivering Undergraduate Leadership Program/Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult or Professional Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Tech</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Academic Department delivering Undergraduate Leadership Program/Course** |    |     |
| Leadership                                                            | 58 | 19.1|
| Other                                                                | 50 | 16.5|
| Business, Management, & Organizational Studies                       | 49 | 16.2|
| Student Affairs (i.e. Leadership Center, Provost, President's office)| 45 | 14.9|
| Not indicated                                                        | 35 | 11.5|
| Interdisciplinary/Gen Studies                                       | 14 | 4.6 |
| Behavioral Sciences                                                 | 13 | 4.3 |
| Education                                                            | 12 | 4.0 |
| Political Science, Pub Policy, or Government                        | 11 | 3.6 |
| Communications                                                       | 8  | 2.6 |
| Adult or Professional Studies                                        | 4  | 1.3 |
| Honors                                                               | 2  | 0.7 |
| Humanities                                                           | 2  | 0.7 |
Question 10 of the survey asked participants to identify what academic leadership program (if any) students taking their course had the opportunity to apply the credits toward. The responses to this question are reported in Table 12.

Table 12

*Leadership Degree(s) Offered*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents had the option to select multiple degrees.

Lastly, participants provided the level, type, and size of the undergraduate leadership course identified for the survey. Table 13 includes the level of the course delivered by the participant as well as the course type. Question 2 of the survey asked participants to identify (in an open-ended response) one specific academic credit-bearing in-class/face-to-face (not line) undergraduate leadership course that they reach regularly. This question also included explicit language explaining that the participant should use this course as their reference point throughout the survey. In order to clearly report the different undergraduate leadership course types, the open-ended responses to Question 2 on the survey were grouped together based on the most common responses.
## Table 13

**Course Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate, advanced, or upper level</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory undergraduate course</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Leadership</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Leadership</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org/Group Theory</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone/Seminar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics/Values</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Topics in Leadership</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Specific Leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Global/Multicultural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship/Field Study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 29 students</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 14 students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 49 students</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 99 students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or more students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Variables of Interest

The primary variable of interest in this study was the frequency of use for each instructional strategy. The constitutive definition of this variable is the use of an instructional strategy by the instructor in their class sessions. The operational definition of this variable is the self-reported frequency of use of the instructional strategy in a course taught within one academic term, either quarter or semester.

The list of 24 instructional strategies will appeared in two sections of the web-based questionnaire. As some participants might not be familiar with every instructional strategy, a brief description used with permission from Allen and Hartman’s (2008a, 2008b, & 2009) research appears underneath each instructional strategy. The web-based environment made it possible to design the survey to show the list of instructional strategies titles on the questionnaire while also providing a hidden description that viewed by respondents as needed. As some participants might not be familiar with every instructional strategy, a brief description of each instructional strategy appeared when the participant placed their mouse pointer on the term “description…” (view survey in Appendix A).

For all 24 instructional strategies, the following six point frequency scale (i.e. 0 to 5) was used to measure the variable operationally:

- 0 - Never (0% of my class sessions)
- 1 - Rarely (Less than 10% of my class sessions)
- 2 - Occasionally (11-33% of my class sessions)
3 - Frequently (34-65% of my class sessions)

4 - Almost Always (66-90% of my class sessions)

5 - Always (91-100% of my class sessions)

Factor analysis was used to group participants’ responses based on similarities and allowing further analysis using component scores. To serve the requirement in the factor analysis method, responses on this variable were treated as a continuous variable.

A second variable of interest in this study is the frequency of establishment of each learning goal. The constitutive definition of this variable is the establishment of a learning goal for their students by a ULE instructor in their course. The operational definition of this variable is the self-reported frequency of establishment of a learning goal in a ULE instructor’s course within one academic term, either quarter or semester.

A list of six different learning goals appeared in one section of the web-based questionnaire. The learning goals were defined according to Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning. For all six learning goals, the following four point frequency scale (i.e. 0 to 3) was used to measure the variable operationally:

0 – Not at all important (0-25% of my course)

1 – Somewhat important (26-50% of my course)

2 – Important (51-75% of my course)

3 – Extremely Important (76-100% of my course)
Instrument Construction Process

According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), the best instruments are rigorously developed using good procedures of scale development. This study utilized a newly developed survey instrument containing items derived from previously available survey forms. The procedure below identifies the steps used in this instrument’s construction; these steps follow from DeVellis’s (1991) scale development procedure:

1. **Determine what you want to measure and ground yourself in theory and constructs to be addressed.**
2. **Generate an item pool, using short items, and appropriate reading level, and questions that ask a single question.**
3. **Determine the scale of measurement for the items and the physical construction of the instrument.**
4. **Have the item pool reviewed by experts.**
5. **Consider the inclusion of validated items from other scales or instruments.**
6. **Administer the instrument to a sample for validation.**
7. **Evaluate the items (e.g., item-scale correlations, item variance, and reliability).**
8. **Optimize scale length based on item performance and reliability checks.**
Step 1: Determine what you want to measure and ground yourself in theory and in the constructs to be addressed. The purpose of the survey instrument was to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies for teaching leadership courses, to identify possible signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline, and assess the learning goals instructors teaching these courses emphasize most. Based on Shulman’s (2005) description, signature pedagogies are those teaching methods that first come to a faculty member’s mind when he or she is asked to identify the most dominant instructional strategies used to teach a specific discipline. Based on Fink’s (2003) description, significant learning suggests a learning-centered approach to designed courses where instructors decide first what student can and should learn (learning goals) in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated.

Steps 2 & 3: Generate an item pool that uses short items at an appropriate reading level that ask a single question. Then, determine the scale of measurement for the items and the physical construction of the instrument. The variables of interest discussed previously formed the structural foundation for development of this instrument. The questionnaire contained five sections:

- **Section 1** classified participants for inclusion in the study by asking, “In the last two years, have you taught an in-class/faceto-face (not online) academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership course in the United States?” If the participant answers “No” they were directed to a “thank you” screen and their survey was complete.
• **Section 2** asked questions that aim at describing the undergraduate leadership course, instructor’s experience teaching said course, experience teaching undergraduate leadership courses in general, the size of their course, institutional profile, and the academic department where the leadership course was located including degrees offered.

• **Section 3** asked questions aimed at identifying the frequency of instructional strategies use, which was the variable of primary interest. In addition, responses to this section helped identify potential signature pedagogies to support the results obtained in Section 4. This section lists different types of instructional strategies. The list includes instructional strategies found in Allen and Hartman’s Sources of Learning in Collegiate Leadership Development Programs (2009). The list has undergone careful review with the dissertation advisor Dr. James A. Eison. The questionnaire contains 24 instructional strategies (view the list in chapter 2) and one field for “other.”

• **Section 4** aimed at identifying possible signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline by asking participants, “In your teaching of the course, what are the THREE (3) instructional strategies you use most frequently?” To make this item user-friendly and easier to analyze, this section listed all the instructional strategies identified previously in Section 3 of the questionnaire.

• **Section 5** asked questions aimed at identifying the learning goals ULE instructors establish for students in their courses. This section listed
six learning goals adapted from Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning. Specifically, participants are asked, “When deciding what you want your students to learn in the course you identified in Question 2, how important are each of the following learning goals?”

- **Section 6** asked questions aimed at describing the participant’s variables demographics including their occupation, professional memberships, education, gender, and race/ethnicity.

The order of the sections described above was based upon the following logic:

- Easy items will be the first questions posed to avoid participants bulking from answering the questions.
- Highly important questions appear early in the questionnaire. The demographic questions are crucial for identifying the participants, their institution, and course profiles.
- Familiarity of the terms. The web-based environment makes it possible to design the survey to show the list of instructional strategies titles on the questionnaire while also providing a hidden description that viewed by respondents as needed. As some participants might not be familiar with every instructional strategy, a brief description of each instructional strategy will appear when the participant places his or her mouse pointer on the term “description…” (view survey in Appendix A). The list of instructional strategies precedes the signature
pedagogies questions to help familiarize participants (Djajalaksana, 2011).

- Since the learning goals are the secondary variable of interest, this section follows the instructional strategies section.

**Step 4: Have the item pool reviewed by experts.** Survey items were reviewed using several strategies. The first strategy involved the author’s self-judgment, using his knowledge from the published literature and experiences from over three years of teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses, to evaluate the questionnaire’s content. Then, a small panel of experts, comprised of three types of experts: experts in instructional strategies, experts in the leadership discipline, and experts in measurement, were consulted. These experts were:
  - Dr. James A. Eison as the expert in instructional strategies and active learning.
  - Dr. Scott J. Allen as the expert in instructional methods in leadership education.
  - Dr. Jeffrey Kromrey as the expert in measurement and research.

More detailed information on the expert reviewers is available in Appendix B.

**Step 5: Consider the inclusion of validated items from other scales or instruments.** The design of the survey instrument used in this study was modeled after the approach used by Djajalaksana (2011). The survey instrument used in her study was designed to collect data identifying the most frequently
used instructional strategies for teaching Information Systems (IS) courses and to identify possible signature pedagogies found within the IS discipline. Here, the study was designed to collect data identifying the most frequently used instructional strategies for teaching leadership, to identify possible signature pedagogies found within the leadership discipline, and identify the learning goals most frequently established by ULE instructors for students in their courses. A detailed explanation of the rationale for creating each major section of the survey identified in Steps 2 & 3 appears after Steps 7 & 8 under the heading “Rationale and Selection of Survey Items.”

**Step 6: Administer the instrument to a sample for validation.** The focus of the pilot study was to identify potential difficulties participants might have in understanding survey items and get a sense of completion time for the entire instrument. For this purpose, the researcher requested the assistance of ULE instructors at the University of South Florida and the panel of experts. Along with completing the pilot study, these participants were asked the following questions:

1. How long did it take you to complete this survey?
2. Were there any missing instructional techniques that you feel are crucial to improving this study?
3. Are there any survey items that you would add that are not currently included? Would you remove any?
4. Are the survey items clear and concise?
5. Are the survey items relevant?
6. Any other feedback you would like to add?
Of the 22 recipients of invitation to participate in the pilot study, there were nine respondents. Only four of the respondents answered the questions above. Their feedback and suggestions as well as my reactions are summarized in the following discussion.

**Feedback from pilot study.** The survey, on average, took 10 minutes to complete. This was helpful for revision to the final survey invitation e-mail. Regarding the inclusion or inappropriateness of survey items in the instructional strategies in Section 3 of the survey, respondents suggested minor changes to wording. Also, a few respondents suggested some instructional strategies I had already made the conscious decision not to include such as a “historical tour” and “e-learning” (see chapter 2).

One respondent suggested adding “homework,” “answering questions at the end of the chapter,” as well as listing “bad ideas” too. For example, the same respondent suggested, “I don’t assign anything because leadership can’t really be learned in the classroom. I know a lot of educators truly believe this [sic].” As a result, the final survey will include an “other” field in Section 4. Results from the “other” field, if applicable, will be coded during the quantitative analysis.

Regarding the addition or removal of survey items in general, respondents had a variety of suggestions. One respondent remarked, “…something we struggle with is how to divide some of these sources of learning into different buckets – they are a combination of activities, techniques and mediums – is an exam an instructional technique? This could be a fun debate [sic].” After conferring with my dissertation committee chairman, we decided to modify the
definition of “instructional strategy” with the following clarification added: “As used in this study, instructional strategies are interchangeable/synonymous with instructional methods, assignments, and classroom activities; they can be anything an instructor has built into a course for students to do or complete.” This disclaimer appears in both the “Definitions of Terms” section of Chapter 1 as well as in Section 3 of the web-based questionnaire.

Another helpful suggestion from the pilot study was the following: “I’m sure most faculty do not teach their class online, but that’s a component for our campus. It may be interesting to ask about online courses. Some of the instructional strategies are not relevant to online class so I answered based on how I normally do a face-to-face course [sic].” Although it would certainly be interesting to look at online pedagogy in leadership studies, that is not a focus of this study. Accordingly, question 1 of the web-based questionnaire was modified as follows: “In the last two years, have you taught an in-class/face-to-face (not online) academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership course in the United States?” Since the aim of this study is to identify instructional strategies that occur in the classroom, this modification acts as an additional gatekeeper for ideal respondents.

Question 17 of the survey was designed to identify participants’ professional associations/organizations by asking: “Are you a member of any of the following professional associations/organizations?” However, the answer choices were limited to the three organizations that the sample was derived from (not including the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs): (a) ILA, (b) NCLP, and
(c) NASPA. This was done as a way to identify respondents within groups. Nonetheless, as suggested by one pilot study respondent, “...you may want to allow [participants] to fill in a response. For example, I would want to put the Academy of Management.” This is an interesting demographic question and could be helpful for future research. Accordingly both a “none” and an “other” field will be included in the final instrument.

Regarding the clearness or conciseness of survey questions, the feedback from the pilot study was positive. Suggestions here were limited to the order of items including moving the demographic information to the beginning or end for continuity. As a result, the final survey instrument includes information about the instructor’s course, teaching experiences, and academic department only in Section 2 and leaves instructor profiling and demographic questions until the end in Section 6.

Regarding the relevance of survey items, one respondent to the pilot study remarked that they have, “…always thought the personality characteristics or leadership efficacy of the instructor might predict the types of assignments/activities used. You may consider adding something like that. You teach what your comfortable participating in yourself [sic]?” This suggestion raised additional discussion during the dissertation proposal pre-defense in regards to identifying participants’ previous leadership experiences and whether or not they had attended formal leadership training or education themselves. As a result, two additional questions were added to Section 6 of the survey.
The first of these new items will ask participants whether they have held a formal/significant leadership position, for more than one year, in business, education, military, government, college (as a student leader), none, or other. The inclusion of the “college student leader” answer choice stems from the researcher’s experience as a student leader and its major impact on his career path in undergraduate leadership education. The researcher is curious whether his peers were also impacted by these experiences. The second new item asks participants to describe any formal leadership training experiences they might have had including undergraduate or graduate leadership coursework, participation in a formal leadership training program or leadership conferences, none, or other. Responses from both of these items are designed to assist the research in better describing participants as well as identify any commonalities between previous leadership experiences and the decision to teach leadership courses.

**Steps 7 & 8: Evaluate the items and optimize scale length based on item performance and reliability checks (e.g., item-scale correlations, item variance, and reliability).** At the end of the quantitative phase, there will again be an assessment on the reliability and validity of the survey items. For this purpose, this study used Cronbach’s alpha as a reliability measure.

**Rationale for selection and inclusion of survey items.** Discussion regarding section and inclusion of survey items was discussed previously in the section describing the pilot study results above. Additional discussion regarding researcher rationale is included below.
Section 1. As described above, Section 1 aimed at classifying the participant for inclusion in the study by asking, “In the last two years, have you taught an in-class/fce-to-face (not online) academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership course in the United States?” If the participant answers “No” they are directed to a “thank you” screen and the survey is complete. This question was designed to exclude participants that are either not ULE instructors or do not teach academic credit-bearing courses. As well, this question helps to differentiate between in-class and web-based instructors.

Section 2. As described above, Section 2 of the survey asked questions aimed at describing the characteristics of the participant’s undergraduate leadership course, the instructor’s experience teaching said course, experience teaching undergraduate leadership courses in general, the size of their course, institutional profile, and the academic department where the leadership course is located including degrees offered.

Sections 3 & 4. As described above, Sections 3 and 4 asked questions aimed at identifying the frequency of instructional strategies use, which was the primary variable of interest. The instructional strategies included in the survey instrument were identified by Allen and Hartman (2009) as specific sources of learning used in the leadership development institutes examined in their research that categorized approaches to leadership development that aligned with Conger’s (1992) four approaches: 1) Personal Growth, 2) Conceptual Understanding, 3) Feedback, and 4) Skill Building. Allen and Hartman’s (2009) study focused specifically on 20 sources of learning. However, they identify an
additional 20 sources of learning that might also be utilized within leadership development program, but may be more appropriate for an organizational context. As well, some of Allen and Hartman’s sources of learning such as “Degree Programs: Participants engage in formal education programs (e.g., certificate, minor, major, or master’s level) bound by a prescribed curriculum,” were either irrelevant, could not be identified as instructional strategies or were captured in other survey items. Also, “Historical Tour or Reenactment: Participants attend a tour or reenactment of historical significant (e.g., Gettysburg)” was omitted because it received the lowest overall mean scores in both the “would prefer” and “did prefer” areas in Allen and Hartman’s research. Thus, this study included 12 of the focused 20 sources of learning as well as 3 of the additional 20. Final selection (illustrated in Table 14) was based on a combination of recommendations from a panel of experts, a review of the literature, and the researcher’s expertise and experience.

As previously discussed, no prior studies have explored signature pedagogies with a quantitative research design. This study aimed to identify signature pedagogies in ULE by identifying the most frequently used instructional strategies by ULE instructors.
Table 14

*Instructional Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Instructional Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>*Case Studies</td>
<td>Students examine written or oral stories or vignettes that highlight a case of effective or ineffective leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>Instructor facilitates sustained conversation and/or question and answer segment with the entire class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Students complete tests or exams that last the majority of the class period intended to assess subject matter mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>*Games</td>
<td>Students engage in interactions in a prescribed setting and are constrained by a set of rules and procedures. (e.g., Jeopardy, Who Wants to be a Millionaire, Family Feud, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Group Projects/Presentations</strong></td>
<td>Students work on a prescribed project or presentation in a small group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Guest Speaker</strong></td>
<td>Students listen to a guest speaker/lecturer discuss their personal leadership experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>*Icebreakers</td>
<td>Students engage in a series of relationship-building activities to get to know one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>In-Class Short Writing</td>
<td>Students complete ungraded writing activities designed to enhance learning of course content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>*Individual Leadership Development Plans</td>
<td>Students develop specific goals and vision statements for individual leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Interactive Lecture/Discussion</td>
<td>Instructor presents information in 10-20 minute time blocks with period of structured interaction/discussion in-between mini-lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td>Students observe or interview an individual leading others effectively or ineffectively and report their findings to the instructor/class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>*Lecture</td>
<td>Students listen to instructor presentations lasting most of the class session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes one of Allen and Hartman’s (2009) 20 focused “sources of learning.”
*Denotes one of (or an adaption of one of) Allen and Hartman’s (2009) “other sources of learning.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Instructional Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>Students learn about leadership theory/topics through film, television, or other media clips (e.g., YouTube, Hulu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>Students complete short graded quizzes intended to assess subject matter mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>*Reflective Journals</td>
<td>Students develop written reflections on their experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>*Research Project/Presentation</td>
<td>Students actively research a leadership theory or topic and present findings in oral or written format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>*Role Play Activities</td>
<td>Students engage in an activity where they act out a set of defined role behaviors or positions with a view to acquire desired experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>*Self-Assessments &amp; Instruments</td>
<td>Students complete questionnaires or other instruments designed to enhance their self-awareness in a variety of areas (e.g., learning style, personality type, leadership style, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>*Service Learning</td>
<td>Students participate in a service learning or philanthropic project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>*Simulation</td>
<td>Students engage in an activity that simulates complex problems or issues and requires decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>*Small Group Discussions</td>
<td>Students take part in small group discussions on the topic of leadership or some aspect of group dynamics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>*Story or Storytelling</td>
<td>Students listen to a story highlighting some aspect of leadership; often given by an individual with a novel experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Student Peer Teaching</td>
<td>Students, in pairs or groups, teach designated course content or skills to fellow students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>**Teambuilding</td>
<td>Students engage in group activities that emphasize working together in a spirit of cooperation (e.g., setting team goals/priorities, delegating work, examining group relationships/dynamics, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes one of Allen and Hartman’s (2009) 20 focused “sources of learning.”
**Denotes one of (or an adaption of one of) Allen and Hartman’s (2009) “other sources of learning.”
**Section 5.** As described above, Section 5 of the survey aimed at identifying the learning goals ULE instructors establish for students in their courses, which is the secondary variable of interest. The learning goals included in the survey instrument were identified by Fink (2003) as part of a Taxonomy of Significant Learning integral to his model of Integrated Course Design. Fink identified the following six learning goals: (a) Foundational Knowledge, (b) Application, (c) Integration, (d) Human Dimension, (e) Caring, and (f) Learning How to Learn. Fink’s work focused on assessing the appropriateness and relevance of each of these six types of learning goals for a given course. Fink recommends asking key questions which are captured in the description of each learning goal as it appears in the survey as illustrated in Table 15. To date, learning goals from Fink’s taxonomy have not been empirically explored (see Chapter 2) in a discipline-wide survey. Accordingly, the present study will be the first of its kind to do so.
### Table 15.

*Learning Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>The understanding and remembering of foundational knowledge important to the course such as facts, terms, formulae, concepts, principles, relationships, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>The thinking (critical, creative, and practical) and other skills required to apply the foundational knowledge gained in the course outside of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>The recognition of the connections of information, ideas, and perspective from this course and those in other courses or areas as well as the students' personal, social, and/or work life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Human Dimension</td>
<td>The understanding of one’s self, others, and/or interacting with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>The appropriateness of decisions that affect one’s caring about changes, values, interests, feelings, and commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Learning How to Learn</td>
<td>The abilities to be a good student, learn a specific subject, and become a self-directed learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.** As described above, Section 6 asked questions that aimed at describing the participant’s variables demographics including their previous leadership experiences and training or education, occupation, professional memberships, education, gender, and race/ethnicity. Items profiling faculty were modeled from the 2010-11 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey ([http://www.heri.ucla.edu/researchers/instruments/FACULTY/2010FAC.PDF](http://www.heri.ucla.edu/researchers/instruments/FACULTY/2010FAC.PDF)).
Profiling leadership instructors is important to this research both as a source of statistical analysis as well as to fill a void in the research literature. To date, no studies have collected data on the profiles of leadership instructors in the U.S. Items profiling specific courses were borrowed (with permission) from Djajalaksana’s (2011) survey and modified for this study.

**Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis**

The following section will explain the data collection and analysis procedures for this study. Additionally, the subsections will clarify the format of the web-based questionnaire, treatment of missing data, and statistical analyses used in this study.

**Quantitative data collection procedure.** The invitation to participate in the study was sent via e-mail to the target population. Each e-mail contained instructions for providing informed consent and a hyperlink to the survey questionnaire. SurveyMonkey.com was selected to create the online survey because of its advanced functionality, simplicity of survey interface, features, and ease of use.

The steps below describe the questionnaire distribution procedure that was employed in the quantitative phase of this study:

1. On October 25, 2010, an e-mail requesting participation (see Appendix D), containing instructions for providing informed consent and the hyperlink to the web-based questionnaire were sent to potential participants through the organizational listservs and program directories identified.

2. Then, two reminder e-mails (see Appendix E) were sent using the following schedule:
a. November 1, 2010; one week after the initial e-mail.

b. November 15, 2010; two weeks after the first reminder e-mail.

The web-based SurveyMonkey.com software ensured that only the one unique response came from each specific IP (Internet Protocol) address. This feature assisted in avoiding duplicate responses from the same participant. Although there remains a possibility that a participant might have used a different IP address, the possibility to send a duplicate response is low as a result of the significant time and effort required to complete this survey.

**Instrument format.** Based on cost saving considerations and the review of prior similar studies, this study employed a web-based survey tool to distribute the questionnaire to the target participants. As a basis for this choice of data collection, the researcher reviewed Evans’ and Mathur’s (2005) study on the value of online surveys. Figure 10 depicts the major strengths and major potential weaknesses of online surveys.
As is evident in the diagram and discussed throughout this section, the advantages of online surveys far outweigh the disadvantages, particularly for the type of study conducted here. Moreover, as Evans and Mathur (2005) suggest in
the flowchart below, the weaknesses can be addressed and combated to increase response rates and diminish interference. This issue is covered in more depth in the section on response rates and sampling concerns.


As well, the way the questionnaire displays on the computer screen when using web-based survey format may have profound effect on the willingness of the participants to fill in the survey questionnaire completely (Dillman, Tortora, & Barker, 1999). Dillman, et al., suggest three basic criteria for a respondent-
friendly questionnaire. They suggest that a respondent-friendly questionnaire must consider the following:

1. “Respondent-friendly design that takes into account the inability of some respondents to receive and respond to web questionnaire with advanced programming features that cannot be received or easily responded to because of equipment, browser, and/or transmission limitations” (p.3).

2. “Respondent-friendly design takes into account both the logic of how computers operate and the logic of how people expect questionnaires to operate” (p.5).

3. “Web questionnaire should take into account the likelihood of their use in mixed-mode survey situation” (p.6). When the screen view is limited, participants may not be able to view the choices that are down in the list and hidden from the screen view before they scroll the screen. There will be a high chance that participants may miss those choices.

The questionnaire format of the web-based survey in this study implements as many principles from Evans and Mathur’s (2005) and Dillman et al. (1999) as possible (see Appendix A). As well, many questions were modeled from Djajalaksana’s (2011) survey instrument that employed many of the formatting guidelines suggested by Dillman et al. (1999). Specifically, the following principles are applied:

1. Sending the invitation e-mail through organizational listservs to avoid perception as junk mail.
2. Setting a motivational welcome screen in the beginning of the survey.

3. The first set of questions on the first screen is the easiest to answer to encourage the participants to proceed to the next questions.

4. Limit the question length in each page in order to maintain full view of the questions in the browser window.

5. Avoid as many “check-all-that-apply” questions.

6. Set none of the questions to have required answer.

7. The use of skip-logic procedure for specific question when possible as with the surveymonkey.com, there are several limitations that make it impossible to apply the skip logic procedure to all questions when needed (e.g. question 1 of the survey available in Appendix A).

**Treatment of missing data.** There will always be incomplete responses when conducting large-scale survey research. In this study, the following plan describes how incomplete survey responses will be handled:

- A participant’s responses will be eliminated if a participant leaves the section 2, 3, and 4 blank (i.e. does not complete the survey).
- A participant’s responses will be kept if he/she leaves blank any questions contained in Section 1 or Section 6 of the questionnaire, but he or she answers all of the items contained in Section 3, 4, and 5. In such instances the participant profile items will be recorded as “Omitted.”

**Quantitative data analysis procedures.** This study utilized PASW Statistics Release 18.0.0 version software (SPSS, Inc., 2009) as the primary
software for all statistical analyses. This software accommodated the moderate number of responses in this study and provided the necessary tools for each of the planned statistical analysis procedures. The following section describes the step-by-step plan used for data analysis to address the two research questions that comprised this study.

**Research Question 1: What are the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by faculty teaching Leadership Studies courses?**

**Identifying the most frequently used instructional strategies.** The first step to answer Research Question 1 involved creating a frequency tabulation and percentage of responses for each of the instructional strategies listed in Section 3 of the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the mean, median, and mode of the item responses indicating frequency of instructional strategies use. In chapter 4, histograms will be used to illustrate the responses in a visual manner. As well, the top 10 most frequently used instructional strategies are presented in the more visual manner to sharpen the analysis. As noted previously, the scale for measuring frequency of instructional strategy use will be a continuous scale. Therefore, additional analysis of the standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis of item responses to assess the normality of the distribution are included.

**Identifying patterns of responses through factor analysis.** Factor analysis is an analytic technique that permits the reduction of a large number of
interrelated variables to a smaller number of latent or hidden dimensions.

According to Tinsley and Tinsley (1987):

The goal of a factor analysis is to achieve parsimony by using the smallest number of explanatory concepts to explain the maximum amount of common variance in a correlation matrix. Factors, in essence are hypothetical constructs or theories that help interpret consistency in a data set. The value of factor analysis, therefore, is that it provides a meaningful organizational scheme that can be used to interpret the multitude of behaviors analyzed with the greatest parsimony of explanatory constructs. (p. 414)

Factor analysis is a multivariate covariance analysis commonly used by researchers to discover new constructs and help in theory development. The primary purpose of explanatory factor analysis (EFA) is to arrive at a more parsimonious conceptual understanding of a set of measured variables by determining the number and nature of common factors needed to account for the pattern. That is, EFA is used when a researcher wishes to identify a set of latent constructs underlying a battery of measured variables (Fabrigar, MacCallum, Wegener, & Strahan, 1999). Factor analysis may be used to study the structure of a set of variables or when the researcher wishes to reduce the common variance in a test to a smaller number of conceptually meaningful variables and to understand how each basic unit (i.e., tests or items) is structured (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987). Here, the factor analysis will be used to reduce the common variance amongst instructional strategies identified by participants to a smaller
number of conceptually meaningful instructional strategies. These data also helped in theory development.

Tinsley and Tinsley (1987) recommend that the research consider five attributes to assess whether a data matrix is appropriate for factor analysis: 1) an evaluation of the composition of the data matrix, 2) the sample size, 3) the measure of association, 4) the interdependence of the measures, and 5) the significance of the matrix. Researchers must also make four kinds of decisions when performing a factor analysis: 1) which communality estimate to use, 2) which method of factor extraction to use, 3) how many factors to rotate, and 4) what rotation procedure to use.

Since this study employed EFA, the researcher first estimated the proportion of common variance or communality estimate, which is the proportion of the total variance of a variable that is common variance. To better understand the EFA model, the following information from Fabrigar, MacCallum, Wegener, and Strahan (1999) is helpful:

This model postulates that each measured variable in a battery of measured variables is a linear function of one or more common factors and one unique factor. Common factors are unobservable latent variables that influence more than one measured variable in a battery and are presumed to account for the correlations (covariances) among the measured variables (i.e., two measured variables are assumed to be correlated, because they are influenced by one or more of the same common factors). Unique
factors are latent variables that influence only one measured variable in a battery and do not account for correlations among measured variables. Unique factors are assumed to have two components: a specific factor component (i.e., systematic latent factors that influence only one measured variable) and an error of measurement component (i.e., unreliability in a measured variable). The goal of the common factor model is to understand the structure of correlations among measured variables by estimating the pattern of relations between the common factor(s) and each of the measured variables (i.e., as indexed by factor loadings). (p. 275)

For an EFA, Tinsley and Tinsley (1987) recommend a squared multiple correlation (SMC) of the variables, calculated by using the variable as the criterion in a multiple regression in which the remaining variables serve as predictors. The method for SMC is the following:

1. The initial SMCs are selected and placed in the diagonal of the correlation matrix.
2. The matrix is factor analyzed and the resulting communalities are calculated from the factor loadings.
3. These communalities are compared with the initial estimates.
4. If any difference exceeds a specific criterion (e.g., .001), the calculated communalities are used as the initial estimates and the correlation matrix is factored again.
5. Steps 1-4 are repeated (iterated) until the calculated communality estimates correspond closely to those used as the initial estimates in the analysis.

The next step is to identify the method of factor extraction. Here, only exploratory descriptive methods were calculated since the research is intended to be exploratory. Moreover, this study advances no a priori hypothesis about the results. Thus, the procedure will be principal axis factoring (common factor) analysis, a procedure that uses an estimate of common variance among the original variables to generate the factor solution. It is important to note that in this procedure, the number of factors will always be less than the number of original variables (Thapalia, 1998).

To determine the number of factors to use, the researcher used Cattell’s “scree test,” based on the assumption that as a matrix becomes residual, succeeding factors extracted from that matrix will represent only error variance. The researcher then performed a scree test by plotting the eigenvalues. All factors to the left of the scree are judged to be real factors while all factors to the right are judge to be error factors (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987).

The final step required the researcher to rotate the factors since there are many factor solutions to the correlation matrix, not just one. This aided the researcher in determining which factor solution to report. Hence, rotation clarifies the factor structure by spreading variance across
the factors a bit more equitably. Further, rotation generally results in a more interpretable solution and one that is more likely to generalize to other samples from the same population (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987).

According to Tinsley and Tinsley (1987), factor rotation procedures can be classified as yielding orthogonal and oblique factor solutions. Orthogonal (uncorrelated) factor rotation procedures yield factors that are independent while oblique factor rotation procedures allow factors to be correlated after the rotation is completed. Since the factors were correlated, this study used an oblique promax rotation procedure.

This study employed an EFA to identify the patterns of instructional strategies most often used in the leadership discipline. Two bases were used for assessing which items belong to particular subgroups from Allen and Hartman’s (2008 and 2009) adaption of Conger’s (1992) four approaches to sources of learning in student leadership development: 1) concepts and theories based on the literature review, and 2) a common sense for the purpose of evaluating each item. The factor analysis grouped the responses based on their commonalities. The dimensions of instructional strategies as explained in the literature review were the minimum guidelines for labeling the groups.

With the assumption that the unit of analysis will be an individual, the process was the following:

1. Obtain the measures of central tendency (mean, median, mode, standard deviation) and assess the data normality (skewness and kurtosis).
2. Generate the factor solution through principal axis factoring (common factor) analysis.

3. Analyze the scree plots, review factors with eigenvalues greater than the average eigenvalue, and review extracted factors for interpretability of the factor results.

4. Choose the number of factors to use.

5. Since all factors were correlated, rotate the factors using an oblique promax procedure.

6. Assess the pattern and structure to evaluate whether the items in the factors had good factor loadings

7. Name/label the factors. Identify the factors with the highest average score.

8. Calculate the factor score estimates by averaging the items that load on the factors (component scores).

This analysis procedure identified patterns of the instructional strategies most frequently employed across leadership courses. The findings in chapter 4 are reported in the following manner: “instructors in the leadership discipline make greater/lesser use of ________ strategies than _________ when teaching leadership studies courses.”

Sample size in factor analysis. A review of the factor analysis literature indicates that much attention has been given to the issue of sample size (e.g., Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988; Hogarty, Hines, Kromrey, Ferron, & Mumford, 2005; MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). In short, the old adage that the
bigger the sample size, the variability in factor loadings across repeated samples will decrease (i.e. the loadings will have smaller standard errors). In fact, based on new research, samples smaller than generally recommended might be adequate in some applied factor analysis studies (MacCallum, et al., 1999); given a few additional factors.

This new theoretical framework presents the following hypotheses about the effects of sample size in factor analysis (MacCallum, et al., 1999):

1. As \( N \) increases, sampling error will be reduced and sample factor analysis solutions will be more stable and will more accurately recover the true population structure.

2. Quality of factor analysis solutions will improve as communalities increase. In addition, as communalities increase, the influence of sample size on quality of solutions will decline. When communalities are all high, sample size will have relatively little impact on quality of solutions, meaning that accurate recovery of population solutions may be obtained using a fairly small sample. However, when communalities are low, the role of sample size becomes much more important and will have a greater impact on quality of solutions.

3. Quality of factor analysis solutions will improve as overdetermination of factors improves. This effect will be reduced as communalities increase and may also interact with sample size. (p. 90-91)

In short, the minimum sample size needed to assure good recover of population factors is not consistent across studies but rather is dependent on
some aspects of the variables and design in a given study. Most important, level of communality plays a critical role. This is because the factor analysis model does not extract all the variance; it extracts only that proportion of variance, which is due to the common factors and shared by several items. The proportion of variance of a particular item is due to common factors (shared with other items) and is called communality. The proportion of variance unique to each item is then the respective item’s total variance minus the communality. Thus, when communalities are consistently high, (probably all greater than .6), then that aspect of sampling that has a detrimental effect on model fit and precision of parameter estimates receives a low weight, thus greatly reducing the impact of sample size and other aspects of design. (In fact, MacCallum et al. posit that the mean level of communality must be at least .7 for communalities not to vary over a wide range). Under such conditions, recovery of population factors can be very good under a range of levels of overdetermination and sample size. Good recovery of population factors can be achieved with samples that would traditionally be considered too small for factor analytic studies, even when $N$ is well below 100. Yet, MacCallum et al. (1999) stresses that Investigators must not take their findings to imply that high-quality factor analysis solutions can be obtained routinely using small samples. Rather, communalities must be high, factors must be well determined, and computations must converge to a proper solution (MacCallum et al., 1999, p. 96). Further, Hogarty et al. (2005) found that good factor recovery was only consistently found in conditions in which where are fewer factors and strong overdetermination factors.
MacCallum et al. (1999) also suggest that researchers should make efforts to reduce the number of variables and number of factors and to assure moderate to high levels of communality. This investigation used an instrument designed specifically for this study and the items in Section 3 were articulately selected from the leadership pedagogy literature, reviewed by a panel of experts, and revised after a pilot study. Yet, if results show a large number of factors and low communalities of variables, then the investigator can have little confidence that the resulting factors correspond closely to population factors unless sample size is extremely large (MacCallum et al., 1999). Moreover, results from the Hogarty et al. (2005) study clearly call for a reduced emphasis on sample size rules of thumb in favor of additional considerations such as a careful selection of variables to be included in the study, high communality of variables, and overdetermination of factors (p. 225). The researcher paid close attention to these results during analysis. Accordingly, since the web-based questionnaire yielded 303 eligible participants, the EFA was employed.

**Research Question 2: Are there identifiable signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline?**

Signature pedagogies are defined as the forms of instruction that leap to mind when we first think about the preparation of members of particular professions. They implicitly define what counts as knowledge in a field and how things become known (Shulman, 2005). Accordingly, this study aimed to identify signature pedagogies in the ULE discipline by measuring those instructional strategies most frequently utilized by ULE instructors.
To do so, the questionnaire included a question designed to identify possible signature pedagogies used in the Leadership discipline: “In your teaching of the course, what are the THREE (3) instructional strategies you use most frequently?” The 24 instructional strategies listed previously re-appeared in Section 4 as a short list. Participants were asked to select three instructional strategies from the list provided. The primary method for analyzing responses from Section 4 was frequency tabulation and a percentage analysis of responses obtained. Additionally, the most frequently reported instructional strategies are presented in a more visual manner to sharpen the analysis.

**Research Question 3: What are the most frequently reported learning goals of instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?**

Answering Research Question 3 involved creating a frequency tabulation and percentage of responses for each of the learning goals listed in Section 5 of the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the mean of the item responses indicating the learning goals established.

**Validity in Quantitative Research**

Validity serves the purpose of checking on the quality of the data and the results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). In quantitative research, validity means that the researcher can draw meaningful inferences from the results to a population; reliability mean that scores received from participants are consistent and stable over time. The standards are drawn from statistical procedures of external experts. There are two contexts in which to think about validity and reliability: (1) scores from past uses of the instruments and whether the scores
were valid/reliable, and (2) assessment of the validity/reliability of data collected in my study. This study will address this issue through content validity—how judges assess whether the items of questions are representative of possible items—by having the survey instrument reviewed by a panel of experts.

**Researcher’s Resources and Skills**

The researcher has completed coursework in advanced statistical methods at both the master’s and doctoral level. As well, the researcher completed a master’s thesis where a web-based questionnaire was utilized to collect data on the effects of diversity in student organizations on leadership development. The aforementioned study included multiple statistical analyses.

**Potential Ethical Issues**

In this study, there was absolutely no deception nor were any questions designed to pose a threat to the participants. Therefore, this study will be classified as posing minimal risk to the participants. As well, the researcher obtained IRB approval in this study as required by the University of South Florida (USF). Thus, there are several important items to include in this study:

- To address all ethical issues associated with the study, informed consent was obtained from all participants. Approval for conducting the study was obtained from USF IRB as well as the ILA, NASPA, and NCLP groups. The informed consent instruction was included as part of the e-mail message addressed to potential participants. There was also a statement to explain that participants express their voluntary consent by clicking the link to the survey posted in the e-mail.
• To increase the cooperation from research participants, a clear explanation on the purpose of the study was included in the e-mail communication (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

• To minimize the resistance from participation, there was a guarantee of anonymity stated in the consent form. The report of the findings is also anonymous and integrative.

• To provide the opportunity to withdraw from the study, there was a statement that, should participants have any concerns during the data collection or analysis stages, the participants may withdraw their responses from the study.

Finally, e-mail and phone contact information for the primary investigator was included on the consent form, the questionnaire, and all e-mail messages, to ensure that participants will be able to reach the primary investigator at any time should they have any concerns in regard to the research.

Summary

This study used an exploratory quantitative research design to gather and analyze the data. The quantitative survey research includes data from undergraduate leadership studies instructors gathered from a web-based survey.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

As noted in chapter 1, this study explored in detail the instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership courses and the learning goals instructors believe are of the greatest importance. The chapter is organized in terms of three specific research questions posed in chapter 1. It first reports the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses; it then discusses potentially identifiable signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline; and finally, it reports the learning goals most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses.

Research Question 1: What are the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?

The first research question examined the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership courses. Descriptive statistics for all instructional strategies appear in Table 16.

Question 2 of the web-based survey asked participants to identify one specific academic credit-bearing in-class undergraduate course that they regularly taught and to use that course as their frame of reference while
completing the survey of 24 instructional strategies in Table 16. Participants reported frequency of use of each strategy using the following rating scale:

- 0 - Never (0% of my class sessions)
- 1 - Rarely (Less than 10% of my class sessions)
- 2 - Occasionally (11-33% of my class sessions)
- 3 - Frequently (34-65% of my class sessions)
- 4 - Almost Always (66-90% of my class sessions)
- 5 - Always (91-100% of my class sessions)

Table 16 contains the means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of instructional strategies used based on the rating scale above and Figure 12 identifies the ten most frequently used instructional strategies. In table 17 the original five-point rating scale was condensed into three categories (0-33% of class sessions, 34-65% of class sessions, and 66-100% of class sessions) to sharpen the visual representation of the results.
Table 16

Mean Frequency of Use of Instructional Strategies with Confidence Intervals and Standard Deviations (N = 303)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Method</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>4.48 (0.79)</td>
<td>4.39 4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Lecture &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>3.84 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.71 3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>3.49 (1.19)</td>
<td>3.35 3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>3.31 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.17 3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Presentations</td>
<td>3.00 (1.61)</td>
<td>2.82 3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>2.80 (1.61)</td>
<td>2.62 2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessments/Instruments</td>
<td>2.80 (1.38)</td>
<td>2.64 2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>2.62 (1.31)</td>
<td>2.48 2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>2.61 (1.47)</td>
<td>2.45 2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>2.42 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.29 2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Leader Development Plans</td>
<td>2.32 (1.63)</td>
<td>2.14 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>2.28 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.12 2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Breakers</td>
<td>2.21 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.05 2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>2.03 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.89 2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>1.96 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.81 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Short Writing</td>
<td>1.93 (1.48)</td>
<td>1.77 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>1.91 (1.66)</td>
<td>1.72 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td>1.91 (1.47)</td>
<td>1.75 2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Teaching</td>
<td>1.87 (1.52)</td>
<td>1.70 2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>1.84 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.67 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>1.76 (1.61)</td>
<td>1.58 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>1.71 (1.30)</td>
<td>1.56 1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>1.69 (1.37)</td>
<td>1.53 1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>1.42 (1.44)</td>
<td>1.26 1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ULE instructors reported using *class discussion* $(M = 4.48, SD = 0.79)$, *interactive lecture/discussion* $(M = 3.84, SD = 1.15)$, and *small group discussion* $(M = 3.49, SD = 1.19)$ more frequently than any other instructional strategies, 95% CIs $[4.39, 4.56]$, $[3.71, 3.97]$, and $[3.35, 3.62]$ respectively. Conversely, instructors reported using *role play activities* $(M = 1.71, SD = 1.30)$, *simulation* $(M = 1.69, SD = 1.37)$, and *quizzes* $(M = 1.42, SD = 1.44)$ less frequently than any other instructional strategies, 95% CIs $[1.56, 1.86]$, $[1.53, 1.84]$, and $[1.26, 1.58]$ respectively. As well, 91.1% of ULE instructors use *class discussion* 66-100% of the time and 98% use it at least 34% of the time. At the same time, only 10.2% of instructors use *role play activities* 66-100% of the time.

**FIGURE 12.** Ten Most Frequently Used Instructional Strategies.
Table 17

Percentage of Instructors’ Instructional Strategies Use in Class Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Method</th>
<th>0-33% of class sessions</th>
<th>34-65% of class sessions</th>
<th>66-100% of class sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Lecture/Discussion</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussions</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects/Presentations</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project/Presentation</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessments &amp; Instruments</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Leadership Development Plans</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icebreakers</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class Short Writing</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story or Storytelling</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Peer Teaching</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speaker</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Play Activities</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4 of the web-based questionnaire asked participants to identify the three instructional strategies they used most frequently in their course. This question included the same 24 instructional strategies from Section 3 but also included an “other” field in which participants could add an additional instructional method. Three participants noted using Ronald Heifetz’s famed strategy, “Case-in-point” (Heifetz, 1994) while no “other” instructional strategy appeared more than once. Table 18 illustrates the instructional strategies participants reported in their “Top 3.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Lecture &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessments &amp; Instruments</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Leadership Development Plans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories or Storytelling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Breakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class Short Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, no fewer than 23.8% of ULE instructors included *class discussion, interactive lecture & discussion, group projects & presentations, self-assessments & instruments, or small group discussion* in their Top 3 most frequently used instructional strategies (see Figure 13). And, more than half (54.5%) reported using *class discussion* in their “Top 3.”

**FIGURE 13.** Six Most Frequently Reported “Top 3” Instructional Strategies.

Interestingly, four of the top five instructional strategies that appeared in the results from Section 3 of the survey that asked participants which instructional strategies they used most frequently—Class Discussion, Interactive Lecture & Discussion, Small Group Discussion, and Group Projects & Presentations—also appeared as the most frequently reported instructional strategies from Section 4 of the survey that asked participants to choose three
instructional methods they use most frequently. Research Projects & Presentations was the fifth most commonly used instructional strategy in Section 3, the ninth most reported in the “Top 3” most used strategies in Section 4, and 42.6% of instructors use this method 66-100% of the time.

**Research Question 2: Are there identifiable signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline?**

To examine the second research question, instructor responses from Sections 3 and 4 were analyzed. Additionally, a common factor analysis was performed to identify the patterns of instructional strategies most often used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership courses. This analysis indicated that instructors in the undergraduate leadership discipline make greater use of instructional strategies that emphasize class discussion and conceptual understanding than skill building or traditional assessment practices (i.e. exams and quizzes).

Another way to look at the results is to explore which of the 24 instructional strategies from Section 3 of the questionnaire relate most closely to one another. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) enables researchers to do this by examining which items from an instrument “cluster” together. The following section describes the procedures, statistical analyses, and results of an EFA applied in this study.

**Factor Analysis**

Initially, the factorability of the 24 items was examined. The data was screened for univariate outliers. The minimum amount of data for factor analysis was satisfied, with a final sample size of 303.
Several well-recognized criteria for the factorability of a correlation were used. Firstly, all 24 items correlated at least .3 with at least one other item, suggesting reasonable factorability. Secondly, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .856 (“great” according to Field, 2009; Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999), and all but two KMO values (.483 and .469) for individual items were > .525, above the acceptable limit of .5 (Field, 2009), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was also significant ($\chi^2 (276) = 2252.612, p < .000$). Finally, the communalities of 21 of the 24 items were above .3 and all were above .22 (see Table 21), further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all 24 items.

Principal axis factoring (PAF) was used because the primary purpose of the analysis was to identify patterns of instructional strategies most often used in the leadership discipline. Further, the analysis of the data structure in PAF focuses on shared variance and not on sources of error that are unique to individual measurements. The initial eigenvalues showed that the first factor explained 27.87% of the variance, the second factor 7.92% of the variance, the third factor 5.97% of the variance, the fourth factor explaining 5.32%, the fifth factor 4.84%, the sixth factor 4.46%, and a seventh explaining 4.21%. Four, five, six, and seven factor solutions were examined using varimax, promax, and oblimin rotations of the factor loading matrix. The seven factor solution, which explained 45.05% of the variance was preferred because of its theoretical support, the “leveling off” of eigenvalues on the scree plot after the seven factors,
and all had eigenvalues greater than the average eigenvalue. There was moderate difference between the promax and oblimin solutions, but little difference between the varimax and promax solutions, yet the promax solution had higher factor loadings. Thus, all solutions were examined in the subsequent analyses before deciding on an oblique promax rotation for the final solution. This is consistent with the study since the factors will be looked at as subscales on a survey instrument designed to measure a single concept. Thus, the subscales should have some relationship to each other since they are all supposed to measure the same overall concept.

A PAF of the 24 items using oblique promax rotations was conducted with items explaining 45.05% of the variance. A promax rotation provided the best defined factor structure. All items except for Case Studies had primary loadings over .33 (consistent with Jolliffe, 1972, 1986). The scree plot was slightly ambiguous and showed inflexions that would justify retaining both components 5 and 7 (see Figure 14).
The items that clustered on the same components were generally consistent with Allen and Hartman’s (2008 and 2009) adaption of Conger’s (1992) four approaches to sources of learning in student leadership development. This suggests that component 1 represents Skill Building, component 2 represents Personal Growth, component 3 represents Conceptual Understanding & Feedback, component 4 represents Traditional Assessment, component 5 represents Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding, component 6 represents Interactive Conceptual Understanding, and component 7 represents Class Discussion. The factor loading for this final solution is
presented in Table 19, initial communalities and communalities after extraction are presented in Table 21, and a summary table of the eigenvalues, percentages of total variance, and cumulative percentages for each factor appears in table 20.

Table 19

*Factor Loadings for Promax Oblique Seven-Factor Solution for the Items of the Web-Based Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Skill Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Role Play Activities.</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Simulation.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Games.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: Personal Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reflective Journals.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Service Learning.</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Icebreakers.</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Individual Leadership Development Plans.</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In-Class Short Writing.</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Conceptual Understanding &amp; Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interview of a Leader.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lecture.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Story or Storytelling.</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Individual Leadership Development Plans.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Media Clips.</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Research Project/Presentation.</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Self-Assessments &amp; Instruments.</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Traditional Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exams.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Quizzes.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5: Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group Projects/Presentations.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Research Project/Presentation.</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guest Speaker.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Factor 6: Interactive Conceptual Understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Small Group Discussions.</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Student Peer Teaching.</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teambuilding.</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor 7: Class Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Class Discussion.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interactive Lecture/Discussion.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 303 and α = .88*

**Table 20**

*Eigenvalues, Percentages of Variance, and Cumulative Percentages for Factors of the 24-Item Web-Based Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>31.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>35.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>38.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>43.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>45.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

*Communalities: Instructional Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Method</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Breakers</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Short Writing</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Leader Development Plans</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Lecture &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Presentations</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessments/Instruments</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labeling the factors. While the factor labels were generally consistent with Allen and Hartman’s (2008 and 2009) adaption of Conger’s (1992) four approaches to sources of learning in student leadership development, other similarities between the items that loaded on each factor are important to discuss. The following brief section will describe the researcher’s rationale for factor labeling and discuss the pedagogical likenesses among the items that loaded on each factor.

**Factor 1: Skill Building.** The first factor included the following three instructional strategies: *role play activities, simulation, and games*. These items all fell within Allen and Hartman’s (2009) categorization of “Skill Building.” These instructional strategies all emphasize active, experiential, classroom-based pedagogies that promote students doing and engaging in learning. Use of these pedagogies is often considered medium- to high-risk (the risks that students will not participate, use higher-order thinking, or learn sufficient content, that faculty members will feel a loss of control, lack necessary skills, or be criticized for teaching in unorthodox way) by college instructors (Bonwell & Eison, 1991).

**Factor 2: Personal Growth.** The second factor included the following five instructional strategies: *reflective journals, service learning, icebreakers, individual leadership development plans, and in-class short writing*. With the exception of *icebreakers* (which fell within Allen and Hartman’s “Skill Building” category) and in-class short writing (which was not one of the sources of learning contained in their model), all items fell within Allen and Hartman’s (2009) categorization of “Personal Growth.” In Allen and Hartman’s model, informal
networking appeared in this category and arguably, icebreakers are as much about breaking the ice as they are about networking in an informal environment. Further, in-class short writing is clearly an individual activity designed to stimulate the learner to think, write, and reflect. This group of instructional strategies emphasizes personal growth through some type of reflection, service, or articulating through writing a personal vision statement.

**Factor 3: Conceptual Understanding & Feedback.** The third factor included the following seven instructional strategies: *interview of a leader, lecture, story or storytelling, individual leadership development plans, media clips, research project/presentation, and self-assessments & instruments.* Allen and Hartman’s (2009) model included the following congruent sources of learning: Film and TV clips, Lecture, Listen to a story, Observation, Articles or books, and Research Leadership. Further, their model categorized individual leadership development plans as “Personal Growth” and self-assessments & instruments were categorized separately in a single category they called “Feedback.”

Arguably, the instructional strategies that loaded on factor three all emphasize learning that includes conceptual understanding and feedback. For example, interviewing a leader, listening to a lecture or story, and watching media clips all focus on connecting leadership concepts to real world applications. Research projects and presentations similarly allow the learner to focus on books, articles, events, current and former leaders to bridge concepts with concrete ideas and illustrative examples. Further, self-assessments and
instruments allow the learner to connect leadership concepts with their own personal attributes. In summary, this group of instructional strategies focuses on the understanding of abstract leadership concepts by creating connections with real world application.

**Factor 4: Traditional Assessment.** The fourth factor included the following two instructional strategies: *exams* and *quizzes*. While no theoretical model of leadership education explicitly included these instructional strategies, exams, quizzes, tests, and other forms of written assessment are ubiquitous across undergraduate coursework. These instructional strategies represent very similar instructional strategies used to assess student learning and assign students grades.

**Factor 5: Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding.** The fifth factor included the following three instructional strategies: *group project/presentation*, *research project/presentation*, and *guest speaker*. All three items fell within Allen and Hartman’s (2009) categorization of “Conceptual Understanding.” Arguably, the instructional strategies that loaded on factor five include strategies that emphasize presenting leadership research and observing peers or guest speakers. Both group projects/presentations and research projects/presentation require students to research a topic, perhaps even collect data, and present their findings to their classmates. As well, all three of these instructional strategies suggest some type of observation whether in the form of watching one’s peers present their group or individual project or presentation or listening to a presentation made be a guest speaker.
Factor 6: Interactive Conceptual Understanding. The sixth factor included the following three instructional strategies: small group discussions, student peer teaching, and teambuilding. Allen and Hartman (2009) did not include these particular instructional strategies in their model. However, small group discussions and teambuilding are similar to the small group reflection (under the category “Personal Growth”) and low ropes or team course (under the category “Skill Building”) sources of learning, respectively, described in their model. In this study, the term “interactive” was used to describe the active, group-oriented, and relational aspects of these three instructional strategies. The third use of “Conceptual Understanding” was retained to describe the learning outcomes of these instructional strategies. All three instructional strategies are group activities designed to promote the interaction of students and deeper understanding of course concepts.

Factor 7: Class Discussion. The seventh factor included the following two instructional strategies: class discussion and interactive lecture/discussion. Though, these items were not present in any of the theoretical frameworks that guided this study, class discussion and interactive lecture/discussion were the most frequently used instructional strategies in ULE. These instructional strategies emphasize the relational and informal environment in leadership education. Both suggest a pedagogy where the student and instructor are co-contributors and students are explicitly empowered to participate in the teaching and learning process.
Reliability. As noted above, the factor labels were generally consistent with categories offered by Allen and Hartman’s (2008 and 2009) in their adaption of Conger’s (1992) four approaches to sources of learning in student leadership development. Thus, the extracted factors were retained. The Skill Building (three items), Personal Growth (five items), Conceptual Understanding & Feedback (seven items), Traditional Assessment (two items), Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding (three items), Interactive Conceptual Understanding (three items), and Class Discussion (two items) subscales of the instructional strategies all had acceptable reliabilities; all Cronbach’s $\alpha > .59$. No substantial increases in alpha for any of the scales could have been achieved by eliminating additional items.

Composite scores. Composite scores were created for each of the seven factors, based on the mean of the items which had their primary loadings on each factor. Higher scores indicated greater use of the instructional strategies. Means ranged from 4.16 for Class Discussion to 1.59 for Traditional Assessment. Class Discussion was the instructional strategy leadership instructors reported using most, with a negatively skewed distribution (-1.40) and a prominent kurtosis statistic of 4.29. Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding was considerably less, with a very slight positively skewed distribution, followed closely by Interactive Conceptual Understanding and Conceptual Understanding & Feedback, both with very small positively skewed distributions. Personal Growth was used moderately less than the prior three with a slight positively skewed distribution with Skill Building and Traditional
Assessment far behind, both with small positively skewed distributions.

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 22. Except for Class Discussion, the skewness and kurtosis were well within a tolerable range (-1 to +1) for assuming a normal distribution.

Table 22

*Mean, Standard Deviation, and Cronbach’s Alpha: Factor Component Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/Label</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16 (0.82)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.78 (1.09)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Conceptual Understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.66 (1.08)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Understanding &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.40 (0.95)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.24 (1.01)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59 (1.32)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 contains the correlation coefficients between factors.

Correlations ranged from $r = .27$ to $r = .58$ and all but two of the seven factors were statistically significant for a two-tailed Power of t test of $r = 0$ at $p > .05$ (Cohen, 1988). According to Cohen, correlations with an effect size greater than .113 for a sample of 300 are significant at the $p > .05$ level. For this sample, only factors 2 (Personal Growth) and 7 (Class Discussion) were insignificant. And while these two factors do have an insignificant relationship, it is only slightly at $r = .109$.  


Table 23

*Factor Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/Label</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Skill Building</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Personal Growth</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Conceptual Understanding &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Traditional Assessment</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Interactive Conceptual Understanding</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Class Discussion</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td><em>0.11</em></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Insignificant at p < .05

Overall, these analyses indicated that seven distinct factor were underlying leadership instructors’ responses to the web-based questionnaire and that factors were internally consistent. An approximately normal distribution was evident for the composite score data in the current study, thus the data were well suited for parametric statistical analyses.

**Research Question 3: What learning goals are most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?**

The third research question concerned the learning goals most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership courses. The analysis of the data on this question revealed that when instructors set out to decide what they want students to learn in their undergraduate leadership courses, they emphasize learning goals that stress application far more than learning goals that stress learning how to learn. Participants reported the relative importance of alternative learning goals through the following rating scale:
• 0 – Not at all important (0-25% of my course)
• 1 – Somewhat important (26-50% of my course)
• 2 – Important (51-75% of my course)
• 3 – Extremely Important (76-100% of my course)

Higher scores indicated greater relative importance of specific learning goals. ULE instructors reported emphasizing application \((M = 2.51, SD = 0.69)\), integration \((M = 2.43, SD = 0.68)\), and human dimension \((M = 2.30, SD = 0.80)\) more frequently than the remaining learning goals, 95% CIs \([2.43, 2.59], [2.35, 2.50], \) and \([2.21, 2.39]\) respectively. Conversely, instructors reported emphasizing learning how to learn \((M = 1.73, SD = 0.98)\), caring \((M = 1.83, SD = 1.01)\), and foundational knowledge \((M = 2.03, SD = 0.90)\) as being less important to them than the other learning goals, 95% CIs \([1.62, 1.84], [1.72, 1.95], \) and \([1.92, 2.13]\) respectively. Interestingly, 91.7% of instructors reported application as important or extremely important when setting learning goals for their courses while only 60.5% reported the same for learning how to learn. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 24. Table 25 illustrates the breakdown of learning goals by each level of the rating scale.
Table 24

*Means with Confidence Intervals (CIs) and Standard Deviations of Learning Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
<th>$M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>2.51 (0.69)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>2.43 (0.68)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Dimension</td>
<td>2.30 (0.80)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>2.03 (0.90)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1.83 (1.01)</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning How to Learn</td>
<td>1.73 (0.98)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

*Percentage of Importance Participants Placed on Learning Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
<th>Not at all important (0-25%)</th>
<th>Somewhat important (26-50%)</th>
<th>Important (51-75%)</th>
<th>Extremely Important (76-100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Dimension</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning How to Learn</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This study explored the frequency of use of 24 instructional strategies by instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses. In addition, the relative importance of six learning goals was also assessed. The reliability and construct validity of each of the four dimensions identified by Allen and Hartman (2008 & 2009) were analyzed and found acceptable. Cumulative variance explained from the Promax factor analysis was 45.05% and the resulting coefficient alphas ranged from 0.59 to 0.77 indicating acceptable levels of internal reliability.

Results indicated that instructors teaching undergraduate leadership courses differ in their preferences and use of alternative instructional strategies. Further, when deciding what students should learn in their classes, instructors place the highest importance on learning goals that emphasize application, integration, and the human dimension far more than they do foundational knowledge, caring, and learning how to learn.
Chapter 5
Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

This study explored the instructional strategies used by instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses as well as the learning goals instructors believe are of the greatest importance. In particular, it focused upon the following research questions:

1. What are the most frequently employed instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?
2. Are there identifiable signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline?
3. What learning goals are most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses?

This chapter summarizes the study and presents important conclusions drawn from the data presented in chapter 4. Further, it examines potential implications for action and offers recommendations for further research.

Study Frameworks

This study was guided by three distinct frameworks. First, Allen and Hartman's (2008a, 2008b, & 2009) conceptual model of Conger's (1992) "Four Approaches to Leadership Development" provided the framework that guided the
exploration of the most frequently used instructional strategies used by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses. This study utilized each of the four approaches in the model—“Personal Growth,” “Conceptual Understanding,” “Feedback,” and “Skill Building”—to organize and identify the instructional strategies that were explored.

Second, Shulman’s (2005) framework of signature pedagogies was used to conceptualize what counts as knowledge and how things become known in undergraduate leadership education. According to Shulman (2005), signature pedagogies are the forms of instruction that leap to mind when we first think about the preparation of members of particular professions. They implicitly define what counts as knowledge in a field, how things become known, how knowledge is analyzed, criticized, accepted, or discarded as well as how it informs students to think, to perform, and to act with integrity. One of the unique characteristics of leadership studies is that it transcends the disciplines and prepares students for all professions (Doh, 2003; Wren, Riggio, & Genovese, 2009; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). To identify signature pedagogies, Schulman recommends investigating the surface structure of pedagogies in a discipline by measuring the concrete, operational acts of teaching and learning, of showing and demonstrating, of questioning and answering, of interacting and withholding, and of approaching and withdrawing. The frequency of instructors’ use of the 24 different instructional strategies in this study represents these surface structure measurements.
Third, Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning and Model of Integrated Course Design guided the framework for exploring the learning goals instructors believe are of the greatest importance in their leadership studies courses. This study utilized the six learning goals in Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning—“Foundational Knowledge,” “Application,” “Integration,” “Human Dimension,” “Caring,” and “Learning How To Learn”—to measure the learning goals most important to instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses. The instructional strategies used and learning goals emphasized by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses were explored using a web-based questionnaire designed by the researcher in order to identify signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline and assess the most emphasized learning goals.

**Overview of the Problem**

Until now, studies that reviewed or identified instructional strategies used in ULE were limited to the perceptions of students and leadership practitioners who were not identified specifically as university instructors (e.g., Allen & Hartman, 2009; Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1990; Conger, 1992; Day, 2000; Eich 2008; London, 2002; Yukl, 2002). In addition, despite the rapid growth in academic credit-bearing ULE, instructors who teach these courses had not been studied at any length. And, while the application of Fink’s (2003) Model of Integrated Course Design in different disciplines has been profiled in the literature (e.g., Allen & Tanner, 2007; Magnussen, 2008; Rose & Torosyan, 2009), no studies addressed this approach in ULE. This study addressed these gaps in the literature by collecting empirical data about the instructional strategies used and
learning goals established by instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses through a national web-based survey.

**Review of the Methods**

This section includes a brief summary of the methods used in this study including the participants’ demographics, type of research data, data collections procedures, and data analysis techniques.

**Participant demographics.** The final sample of 303 participants that teach academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses to undergraduates is the largest reported study of ULE instructors to date. The majority of participants were white (83.8%) and female (54.8%). Also, the majority of participants reported having earned a graduate degree—doctorate (58.4%) or master’s (38.6%)—as their highest degree attained. Further, 60.2% reported having more than five years of teaching experience. Perhaps surprisingly, only 7.9% of the participants earned their advanced degree in leadership or leadership studies. Instead, degrees in organizational studies (13.9%), higher education (12.9%), college student affairs, development, or personnel (12.2%), and miscellaneous education-related degrees (11.6%) were more prominent. Participants’ primary activity at their institutions was teaching (46.2%), student affairs (23.4%), or administration (19.5%)

Additionally, 95% of participants taught at a four-year public or private university or college. At these institutions, the academic college delivering the undergraduate leadership courses taught by the participants was usually Business (13.9%), Arts and Sciences (12.2%), or Education (11.6%). The specific academic department offering these courses was Leadership (19.1%),
Business, Management, or Organizational Studies (16.2%), or Student Affairs (14.9%). More than half of all participants reported having personally experienced undergraduate leadership experiences while in college (50.2%) and 74.3% reported taking graduate coursework in leadership.

**Type of research data.** The analyzed data was collected using a web-based questionnaire that was modeled after the approach used by Djajalaksana (2011) to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies for teaching Information Systems (IS) courses and to identify possible signature pedagogies found within the IS discipline. In the present study, the survey instrument was used to collect: (a) demographic information about the participants, (b) identify the most frequently used instructional strategies for teaching leadership courses, (c) to identify possible signature pedagogies in the leadership discipline, and (d) to assess the learning goals instructors teaching these courses emphasize most. Based on Shulman’s (2005) description, signature pedagogies are those teaching methods that first come to a faculty member’s mind when he or she is asked to identify the most dominant instructional strategies used to teach a specific discipline. The 24 instructional strategies included in the survey were derived chiefly from Allen and Hartman’s Sources of Learning in Collegiate Leadership Development Programs (2009) and subsequently reviewed by a panel of experts. Based on Fink’s (2003) description, significant learning suggests a *learning-centered approach* to designed courses where instructors decide first what student can and should learn (learning goals) in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated. The six learning
goals included in the web-based questionnaire were derived from Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning.

**Data collections procedures.** The primary data collection targeted a national audience of undergraduate leadership studies instructors through two primary sources from October 25, 2010, through December 1, 2010. The first source was the organizational memberships and/or databases of the following professional associations/organizations or their respective member interest groups: the International Leadership Association (ILA), NASPA (Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education) Student Leadership Programs group), and/or the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP). The researcher was granted written permission by these organizations to contact their members via e-mail to solicit participation in the study. The second source of respondents was a random sample of instructors drawn from the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs, a searchable directory of leadership programs available to all ILA members.

**Data analysis techniques.** Exploring Research Question One involved creating a frequency tabulation and percentage of responses for the items on the survey that looked at instructional strategy use. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the mean and confidence intervals of the item responses indicating frequency of instructional strategies use.

Examining Research Question Two involved an explanatory factor analysis—specifically principal axis factoring (common factor analysis)—to identify the patterns of instructional strategies most often used in the leadership
discipline. Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess reliability. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the composite scores of each subgroup.

Analyzing Research Question Three involved creating a frequency tabulation and percentage of responses for each of the items on the survey that looked at the learning goals instructors deemed most important. The most important learning goals were identified by an analysis of the mean scores from the responses.

**Major Findings**

To organize the data and present a framework for discussion, the major findings of the data related to research questions one and two will be discussed together. The discussion of research question three will then be presented independently.

**Research Questions One and Two: Instructional Strategy Use and Signature Pedagogies in Undergraduate Leadership Education**

To answer research question one, frequency tabulations and percentage of responses for each of the 24 instructional strategies in Section 3 and Section 4 of the survey were analyzed. Overall, instructors teaching undergraduate leadership studies courses use varying forms of class discussion more so than any other instructional strategy. Specifically, *class discussion, interactive lecture/discussion* and *small group discussion* had the highest means scores and were used more frequently (i.e., in 66-100% of class sessions) than each of the other instructional strategies surveyed. Conversely, undergraduate leadership instructors use skill-building instructional strategies such as *simulations, games,* and *role play activities* far less often. Specifically, two out of three instructors
surveyed used *class discussion* or *interactive lecture/discussion* in 66-100% of their class sessions and 88.5% use them at least one third of the time. Further, 54.5% of instructors listed *class discussion* and 47.2% listed *interactive lecture/discussion* in their “Top 3” most used instructional strategies. At the same time, only 10.2% of instructors use *role play activities, games, or simulation* 66-100% of the time with only 20.1% using them at least 34% of the time. Also of note, only 11.2% of instructors use *quizzes or exams* 66-100% of the time with only 19.8% using them at least 34% of the time. Likewise, only 4.3%, 3.0%, and 2.6% of instructors, respectively, listed *simulation, games, and role play activities* in their “Top 3.” Additionally, only 4.3% of instructors listed *exams* in their “Top 3” and only 2.6% listed *quizzes*.

To answer research question two, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to identify how the 24 instructional strategies contained in the survey related most closely to one another. Then, the groups or “factors” from this statistical procedure were analyzed to see which groups emerged as those used most frequently. It was anticipated that these instructional strategies would group together in a manner similar to the “Four Approach” models of leadership development posited by Conger (1992) and Allen and Hartman (2009). The four approaches in these models were: (a) Personal Growth, (b) Conceptual Understanding, (c) Feedback, and (d) Skill Building. While Personal Growth and Skill Building were apparent in the EFA, Conceptual Understanding was observed to be subdivided into three separate dimensions: *research/observation*
conceptual understanding, interactive conceptual understanding, and conceptual understanding & feedback.

Of greatest interest to the researcher was the emergence of two approaches not included in the original models posited by Conger (1992) and Allen and Hartman (2009). These dimensions are Class Discussion and Traditional Assessment. While Traditional Assessment (exams and quizzes) proved to be the least frequently used group of instructional strategies, Class Discussion was used more often than any other group. The Class Discussion group includes traditional class discussion where the instructor facilitates sustained conversation and/or question and answer segment with the entire class as well as interactive lecture/discussion where the instructor presents information in 10-20 minute time blocks with period of structured interaction/discussion in-between mini-lectures. In summary, the following seven groups of instructional strategies emerged from the EFA:

1. Skill Building: role play activities, simulation, and games
2. Personal Growth: reflective journals, service learning, icebreakers, individual leadership development plans, and in-class short writing
3. Conceptual Understanding & Feedback: interview of a leader, lecture, story or storytelling, individual leadership development plans, media clips, research project/presentation, and self-assessments & instruments
4. Traditional Assessment: exams and quizzes.
5. Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding: *group project/presentation, research project/presentation, and guest speaker.*

6. Interactive Conceptual Understanding: *small group discussions, student peer teaching, and teambuilding*

7. Class Discussion: *class discussion and interactive lecture/discussion*

The analysis of the composite scores based on the mean of the items in each group resulted in findings similar to those from the initial frequency tabulations. Specifically, Class Discussion was group of instructional strategies instructors reporting using most ($M = 4.16/5.00$), while Skill Building ($M = 1.79$) and Traditional Assessment ($M = 1.59$) were the strategies instructors reported using least frequently. The means of Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding ($M = 2.78$), Interactive Conceptual Understanding ($M = 2.40$), and Conceptual Understanding & Feedback ($M = 2.24$) were separated by only .38. Personal Growth ($M = 2.24$) was used slightly less than the three Conceptual Understanding groups and more so than Skill Building and Traditional Assessment.

**Signature pedagogies in undergraduate leadership education.** Until now, no one has applied the concept of signature pedagogies to leadership education. This question prompted the researcher in this study to ask: “What are the signature pedagogies used to prepare future leaders?” According to the findings of this study, class discussion—whether in the form of true class discussion or interactive lecture and discussion—is used more frequently in ULE courses. Perhaps, discussion-based pedagogies are *the* signature pedagogy for
undergraduate leadership education. Yet, the results of this study also indicate that other instructional strategies including group and individual projects and presentations as well as self-assessments and instruments, and reflective journaling are also used frequently. A detailed examination of these findings and related literature follows after the section summarizing research question three.

**Research Question Three: The Learning Goals Instructors Believe are of the Greatest Importance in their Courses**

To answer research question three, frequency tabulations and percentage of responses for each of the six learning goals from Section 5 of the questionnaire were analyzed. This question asked instructors to think about the learning goals they choose when deciding what they want students in their courses to learn. Overall, instructors teaching leadership education to undergraduates emphasized learning goals that focused more on *application*, *integration*, and the *human dimension* than on *foundational knowledge*, *caring*, and *learning how to learn*. Specifically, instructors reported *application* (61.5%), *integration* (52.6%), and *human dimension* (49.5%) as extremely important (76-100% of their course) while *foundational knowledge* (35.4%), *caring* (32.3%), and *learning how to learn* (26.1%) were reported far less. Additionally, 91.7% of instructors reported *application* as important or extremely important (51-100% of their course) while only 60.5% reported the same for *learning how to learn*. In fact, only 7.5% of instructors indicated *integration*, *application* (8.3%), or *human dimension* (14.5%) as somewhat important or not important at all (0-50% of their course) versus *foundational knowledge* (26.8%), *caring* (35.4%), and *learning how to learn* (39.5%).
Findings Related to the Literature

This section will discuss how the present findings relate to the previously published literature about leadership education. First, instructional strategy use will be discussed with a brief section related to each of the seven groups that emerged from the explanatory factor analysis. Second, signature pedagogies will be reviewed with suggestions for signature pedagogies within the leadership discipline. Third, the establishment of learning goals in ULE will be addressed with analysis addressing the relationship between the results of this study and leadership development in undergraduates.

**Instructional strategy use.** The findings from this study indicate that instructors prefer instructional strategies that emphasize inclusive processes such as class discussion and group activities more so than traditional assessment practices, lecture, and skill-building. As mentioned previously, the 24 instructional strategies that appeared in the survey were derived initially from Allen and Hartman’s Sources of Learning in Collegiate Leadership Development Programs (2009). However, no distinguishable pedagogy emerged from their research. Instead, they had a collection of 40 sources of learning commonly used in leadership development programming for collegians. Recently, Wisniewski (2010) explored a variety of pedagogies used in leadership education. Her model of leadership education emphasizes effective communication, collaboration, goal and vision setting, stimulating student-led discussion, critical thinking and analysis, self-assessments, and engagement in the community. In the present study, discussion-based pedagogies—included in
the survey as a result of the researcher’s experience and intuition—emerged as the primary instructional strategies employed in ULE classes.

Until now, a comprehensive list of instructional strategies framed in the leadership education literature has been employed by the researcher. Further, no prior study empirically explored instructional strategies with a large national sample of leadership educators. While few studies conducted since 1990 have addressed in depth various stakeholders’ perceptions of leadership development programming and/or student perceptions (e.g. Allen & Hartman, 2009; Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1990; Conger, 1992; Day, 2000; Eich 2008; London, 2002; Yukl, 2002), only a handful collected data from leadership practitioners (not identified specifically as leadership educators). In comparison, this study surveyed 303 instructors who currently teach academic credit-bearing classroom-based undergraduate leadership studies courses. For example, Eich (2008) interviewed 62 stakeholders in leadership programs for his grounded theory of “high quality” leadership programs; only 17 of the 62 stakeholders were instructors (not specifically identified as teaching academic credit-bearing courses). Thus, this study breaks new ground in the leadership education literature by exploring empirically instructional strategy use by a large sample of leadership educators teaching academic credit-breaking undergraduate leadership studies courses.

While no studies compared the relative frequency of use of various instructional strategies in ULE, the literature does contain a few studies specifically addressing each of the following categories of instructional strategies...

Allen and Hartman (2008) is the obvious exception where they surveyed members of the International Leadership Association (ILA) who had some responsibility for creating or conducting leadership development in their organization. While their exploratory study produced only 42 useable surveys, the results are worth mentioning here. Participants in Allen and Hartman’s study were asked to rate the likelihood they would select particular sources of learning. Participants in the present study were far less likely to use simulation or individual leadership development plans than in Allen and Hartman’s study. And while assessments and instruments and reflection were popular instructional strategies in both studies, instructors teaching undergraduate leadership courses do not use them as frequently as practitioners from the ILA (Allen & Hartman, 2008). Allen and Hartman stress that choosing sources of learning is contextual. For example, in the present study, the findings were obtained from instructors teaching classroom-based undergraduate leadership studies courses while in
Allen and Hartman’s study survey respondents provided leadership training in various types of organizations.

And, although research has been conducted to identify leadership preferences of undergraduates (e.g., Allen & Hartman, 2009; Dulin, 2008), little is known about how leadership is actually taught to undergraduates. Findings from this study indicate that instructors teaching academic leadership studies courses to undergraduates employ varying forms of class discussion and reflection far more frequently than simulation and games. In fact, less than one third of instructors in this study used simulation or games in 34-100% of their class sessions. Conversely, Allen and Hartman (2009) found that undergraduate business students preferred participating in a simulation or game (where one was asked to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and abilities) more than any other leadership development activity. However, undergraduates that attended a student leadership development conference (a second sample from the same study) rated participation in role-playing activities second to last.

In the present study, more than 80% of instructors reported using small group discussion at least a third of the time in their class sessions. Both the undergraduate business students and the undergraduate student leadership development conference attendees in Allen and Hartman’s (2009) study also reported preferring openly discussing leadership concepts in a small group. However, in this study, more than half of the instructors reported using reflective journals at least a third of the time in their class sessions, while undergraduate
business students from Allen and Hartman’s study reported writing in a journal to reflect on their experiences as their least preferred source of learning.

The literature on the use of reflection as an instructional strategy suggests that this disconnect might be caused by the discomfort and dissonance it causes students (Brookfield, 1994; Dewey, 1933; Reynolds, 1999). Student preferences aside, as Fink (2003) and others assert, discomfort often means students are really thinking and consequently really learning. Moreover, the frequency of use of reflection as an instructional strategy in this study is consistent with the literature and suggests that undergraduates in leadership studies courses are being challenged by their instructors to exhibit a “deep approach to learning” while other instructors use a “surface approach.” In the former, students seek a personal, meaningful understanding of the material being studied while the latter are content to simply reproduce the information presented during the course (Marton, Hounsell, & Entwhistle, 1997).

Findings from this study are consistent with the “deep approach to teaching” described by Andrews, Garrison, and Magnusson (1997). Andrews et al. describe this deep approach to teaching as a meaningful one versus the reproducing or “surface” approach. Further, instructors employing a deep approach to teaching appear to engage in instructional processes that are congruent with their preferred approach and have values and beliefs, and characteristics (for example, honesty, integrity, genuineness and respect for self, students, material and the process of teaching). Perhaps it is because of the inclusive nature of leadership itself that inclusive, interactive, and relational
instructional strategies emerged as those used most frequently. In practice, effective leaders make followers feel valued in their organization—that they are a part of the vision—that they are included in the decisions that affect its progress. It should be no surprise then that instructional strategies that emphasize an inclusive process such as class discussion prepare future leaders across the disciplines.

The role of the leadership educator is to “actively engage learners in constructing personal theories and philosophies of leadership by creating a learning environment that builds upon learners’ existing knowledge and experiential base” (Wisniewski, 2010). Likewise, Guthrie and Thompson (2010) advocate that leadership education should be facilitated in intentional environments comprised of education, experience, and reflection. These findings are consistent with the literature on postindustrial and relational leadership theories most emphasized in undergraduate leadership education and appear to echo and perhaps even model active, experiential, and inclusive pedagogies.

**Class discussion.** In this study, discussion-based pedagogies were used more frequently than any other group. The instructional strategies included in this group are class discussion, interactive lecture/discussion, and small group discussion. Notably, class discussion and interactive lecture/discussion were the first and second most frequently used instructional strategies. The literature on discussion-based pedagogies describes the use of these strategies in a very general sense (e.g. Cross, 2002; Dallimore, Hertenstein, & Platt, 2008) and no studies discuss describe specifically the use of discussion-based teaching in
leadership education specifically. While Bass’s (1990) research was not framed in leadership education, he stresses the importance of group discussion in managerial applications. Relatedly, the review of applications of Fink’s Model of Integrated Course Design (ICD) across the disciplines that appears in Table 2 in Chapter 2 includes frequent mention of class discussion techniques once courses were given the ICD makeover (e.g., Fayne, 2009; Kelley, 2009; and Mester, 2009). “Interactive lecture demonstration”—where students are actively involved in the classroom demonstration—also was described as a signature pedagogy in Physics education (Lattery, 2009).

Connecting discussion pedagogy to undergraduate leadership education. Within the context of leadership for college students, leadership is a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). This model of leadership, called the Relational Leadership Model, reflects how an organization influences the components of being inclusive, empowering, and ethical through a defined process. According to the popular leadership theorist Ken Blanchard, “Leadership isn’t something you do to people. It’s something you do with them” (Jackson, 2006). Arguably, discussion-based pedagogies occur in a purposeful environment that emphasizes inclusiveness, empowerment, and ethics through a defined process.

In her paper, The Role of Class Discussion in the Learning-Centered Classroom, K. Patricia Cross (2002) likened the environment of learning-centered discussion to that of a winning basketball team. The metaphor aims to
contain the seven conditions reported by Chickering and Gamson (1987) under which learning is most likely to take place—a) encourages student-faculty contact, b) encourages cooperation among students, c) encourages active learning, d) gives prompt feedback, e) emphasizes time on task, f) communication high expectations, and g) respects diverse talents and ways of learning—through six powering forces in education:

1. Activity
2. Cooperation
3. Diversity
4. Expectations
5. Interaction
6. Responsibility

Accordingly, a winning coach goes into a game expecting to win. Likewise, the coach is going to hold high expectations for performance, foster active engagement in the game with cooperation and interaction among team members. Moreover, the coach will cultivate diversity by nurturing and capitalizing on the distinctive talents of each member of the team while demanding that all team members assume responsibility for staying in shape, showing up for practice, and doing the personal best in each game. Thus, the only way for players to develop and improve their skills is to get in there and practice the winning moves themselves (Cross, 2002, p. 9). How is this any different from cultivating effective discussion pedagogy in the undergraduate leadership classroom to prepare leaders to use these skills in a global society?
Relational leadership and discussion pedagogy. A class discussion has three dimensions: (a) Content (what the class is about), (b) Process (how the class is functioning), and (c) People (who is involved in the process) (Kasulis, 1982). If we again compare this to the Relational Leadership Model (RLM), additional similarities arise. The content is the purpose of the class. According to Komives et al. (2007), how a purpose is achieved (the process) is just as important as the outcome. How goals are accomplished and how others are involved in the process matters greatly in the leadership process. Or in this case, how the class is functioning during a discussion is just as important as the teaching and learning goals established by the instructor.

Being purposeful means having a commitment to a goal or activity (Komives et al., 2007). When an instructor commits to specific teaching and learning goals he or she is also being purposeful. Instructors can further model this approach by understanding the people in the process, valuing and actively engaging diversity in views, approaches, styles, and aspects of individuality, such as sex or culture, that add multiple perspectives to a group’s activity is what being inclusive is all about. How we talk about people in the organization, how we refer to them (colleagues versus subordinates or participants versus followers), and how the organization is structured are indicators of inclusive environments (Hesselbein, 2002). Using discussion pedagogy to model inclusive behaviors (Cross, 2002) is consistent with the inclusivity suggested by Komives et al. (2007) in the RLM:
[Inclusiveness] means understanding how different groups or individuals might approach issues from different perspectives or frames, maintaining the attitudes that respect differences, and valuing equity and involvement. It means thinking of networks and webs of connection instead of seeing issues and problems as isolated and discrete. Being inclusive embraces having the skills to develop the talent of members so they can be readily involved. Listening with empathy and communicating with civility are communication skills that facilitate the inclusion of others. Inclusiveness breeds new leadership and creates a positive cycle that sustains the quality of an organization over time. (p. 85-86)

Discussion pedagogy also emphasizes the use of empowerment in the classroom (Cross, 2002). According to Komives et al. (2007), “empowering environments are learning climates.” Accordingly, empowerment has two dimensions: (a) the sense of self that claims ownership, claims a place in the process, and expects to be involved, and (b) a set of environmental conditions (in the group or organization) that promote the full involvement of participants by reducing the barriers that block the development of individual talent and involvement. Komives et al. (2007), contend:

Empowerment is claimed (“I have a legitimate right to be here and say what I feel and think”) as well as shared with others (“You should be involved in this; you have a right to be here too; tell us what you think and feel”). Being empowering means mitigating
aspects of the environmental climate that can block meaningful involvement for others. Empowering environments are learning climates [emphasis added] in which people expect successes yet know they can learn from failures or mistakes. It is important to establish organizational environments that empower others to do and to be their best. (p. 94-95)

Likewise, effective positional leaders know that their power and ability to be effective comes from the members of their group—their participants (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). Similarly, ULE instructors empower students to become an active contributor in their classrooms, adding their perspective and insight to the teaching and learning process. In the same way, hoarding power in leadership (or in the classroom) risks negative responses from others that would contradict the positive goals and objectives of the group. According to Bolman and Deal (2003), “the key gift that leaders can offer is power.” Arguably, in the ULE classroom, discussion-based pedagogies create an atmosphere where students are more likely to feel they matter.

Murrell (1985) describes six methods through which someone might become empowered: educating, leading, structuring, providing, mentoring, and actualizing. He describes educating as discovering/sharing information and knowledge and leading as inspiring, rewarding, and directing. Together, discussion-based pedagogies in the ULE classroom are meant to empower students and instructors to discover and share information and knowledge
relationally. The instructor directs the process, modeling it for the students; aiming to inspire and rewarding students with new ideas about leadership.

*Case-in-point pedagogy.* As noted in Chapter 4, a few survey respondents added “case-in-point” pedagogy as an optional open-ended response in Section 4 of the survey which asked participants to indicate the three instructional strategies they used most often. Effective discussion pedagogy is similar in practice to the famed “case-in-point” method (Heifetz, 1994). For example:

In case-in-point teaching, what goes on in the classroom itself is an occasion for learning and practicing leadership within a social group. The class is recognized as a social system inevitably made up of a number of different factions and acted on by multiple forces. The class also has a clear and challenging purpose—to make progress in understanding and practicing leadership. The teacher has a set of ideas and frameworks to offer. But instead of presenting a lecture, or starting with a written case from another context that may not be relevant to the learning of the people in the class, the teacher waits for a case to appear in the process of the class itself. (Parks, 2005, p. 7-8)

Yet, Parks also stresses that this approach is an amalgam of instructional strategies including seminar, simulation, presentation of ideas and perspectives (through lecture, reading, and film), discussion and dialogue, clinical-therapeutic practice, coaching, the laboratory, the art studio, reflective writing, and case
study. However, the dance floor and balcony metaphor often associated with the case-in-point approach might help to better explain this method in the classroom. Specifically, the dance floor is where the action is and the balcony is where the students can read the larger pattern of what is going on and figure out how to intervene in ways that will help the group make progress. In this approach the teacher remains the authority, but is also practicing leadership—skillfully allowing enough disequilibrium to help the group move from unexamined assumptions about leadership to see understanding, and acting in tune with what the art and practice of leadership may actually require.

As noted in Chapter 2, Shulman (2005) and Fink (2003) describe effective teachers not as charismatic figures, but instead as ordinary teachers in challenging disciplines that feel a responsibility that their students learn. Similarly, Parks (2005) asserts that instructors from a variety of backgrounds can employ the case-in-point method, not only because they each bring a different style and set of talents to the work, but because they share the following: (1) a curiosity about how to practice a quality of leadership education that can more adequately address change on behalf of the common good, (2) an informed respect for the process of human growth and development, and (3) a willingness to take on a mode of working that challenges both their own and others’ assumptions about how teaching and learning take place.

**Conceptual understanding.** The findings from this study indicate that instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses use instructional strategies that emphasize conceptual understanding
more so than any other group of instructional strategies except for discussion-based pedagogies. In leadership education, conceptual understanding focuses on improving the learner’s knowledge through exposure to the topic of leadership and is much more observer-oriented (Conger, 1992); while the other instructional strategies individual activity and inclusion (Allen & Hartman, 2009). In this study, conceptual understanding as described by Allen and Hartman (2009) emerged as three distinct groups in the explanatory factor analysis: “Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding,” “Interactive Conceptual Understanding,” and Conceptual Understanding & Feedback.” The following section will describe these findings as they relate to previous literature.

*Research/Observation conceptual understanding.* The first conceptual understanding group was “Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding” which included the following instructional strategies: *group project/presentation*, *research project/presentation*, and *guest speaker*. These instructional strategies emphasize students presenting leadership research and/or observing peers or guest speakers. Group projects/presentations and research project/presentations had the fourth and fifth highest mean scores in terms of their frequency of use, respectively, of all instructional strategies surveyed. Further, three-fifths of instructors use group projects/presentations or research projects/presentations in 34-100% of their class sessions. Jones and Kilburn (2005) suggest that leadership research provides a basis for students to explore leadership themes in the literature, make leadership decisions, and select appropriate behaviors for interacting with followers. While the findings from the
present study do not support or negate their substance, instructors use projects and presentations quite frequently. Conversely, presentations from guest speakers were not reported as frequently versus projects and presentations. Perhaps instructors find the necessity of scheduling guest speakers in every class session as a bit unnecessary.

*Interactive conceptual understanding.* The second conceptual understanding group was “Interactive Conceptual Understanding” which included the following instructional strategies: *small group discussions, student peer teaching, and teambuilding.* Only “Class Discussion” and “Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding” were used more frequently. In this study, the term “interactive” was used to describe the active, group-oriented, and relational aspects of these concept-focused instructional strategies. Small group discussion had the third highest mean score behind only class discussion and interactive lecture/discussion and four out of five instructors reporting using this instructional strategy in 34-100% of their class sessions. Team building had the ninth highest mean score, while *student peer teaching* was nineteenth. Further, while one out of two instructors use *teambuilding* in 34-100% of their class sessions, just under one-third of instructors use *student peer teaching*.

While the published literature has not explicitly discussed discussion in small groups or peer-teaching, its frequent use in leadership education has been suggested (Allen & Hartman, 2009; Bass, 1990). Teambuilding is discussed in the same literature as well as in more depth by others (e.g. Allen & Hartman, 2008b; Moorhead & Griffin, 2010). These studies suggest that teambuilding is
cost effective (in relation to the available resources of the average instructor) and easy to implement, yet determining the return on investment may be difficult, and without a skilled facilitator, valuable learning opportunities may be missed.

*Conceptual understanding & feedback.* The third conceptual understanding group was “Conceptual Understanding & Feedback” which included the following instructional strategies: *interview of a leader, lecture, story or storytelling, individual leadership development plans, media clips, research project/presentation, and self-assessments & instruments.* Only, “Class Discussion,” “Research/Observation Conceptual Understanding,” and “Interactive Conceptual Understanding” were used more frequently. This group focuses on the understanding of leadership concepts through a variety of instructional strategies designed to invoke and connect with the pragmatic and also provide useful feedback. Yet, while lecture, stories, interviewing leaders, individual leadership development or vision plans, and media clips are only briefly mentioned in the literature, there is an extensive literature base on the use of assessments and instruments in leadership education (*research project/presentations* were discussed in a previous section).

On the one hand, in this study, only two out of five instructors reported using *lecture* in 34-100% of their class sessions. Likewise, only 6.6% of instructors listed *lecture* in their “Top 3.” Wisneiwski (2010) suggests that traditional approaches to teaching leadership would most likely be met with student resistance. Instructors appear to have caught on.
On the other hand, *self-assessments and instruments* had the seventh highest mean score in this study. Further, more than half of instructors reported using self-assessments and instruments in at least one-third of their class sessions. Findings from this study support the literature that this instructional strategy is popular practice (Allen & Hartman, 2008b).

**Personal growth.** In this study, *reflective journals, service learning, icebreakers, individual leadership development plans, and in-class short writing* were grouped together and categorized as instructional strategies related to “Personal Growth.” While together this group was only the fifth (out of seven) most frequently used collection of instructional strategies, *reflective journals* and *individual leadership development plans* were in the top 11 (out of 24). Additionally, more than half of instructors reported using reflective journals at least one-third of the time in their class sessions and one in five listed it in their “Top 3.”

Leadership is widely considered to be a socially constructed phenomenon that means different things to different people (Billsberry, 2009; Eich, 2007). Thus, it makes sense that instructional strategies that emphasize the individual would group together in the explanatory factor analysis (EFA). Consistent with Conger (1992) and Allen and Hartman (2009), instructional strategies that induce participants to reflect on their own behaviors and values emerged from the EFA. Accordingly, the literature review included studies focused on reflection, service learning, and self-development in general. The following subsections will discuss
the findings related to the literature that address reflection and self-development as a group and service learning separately.

Reflection and self-development. In fact, the literature on reflection in leadership education is ample (e.g. Burbach, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004; Densten & Gray, 2001; Eich, 2008; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1999; Raelin, 1997). Conversely, while popular in practice, literature on self-development is rather scarce (Allen & Hartman, 2009). Overall, these studies show that reflection provides a meaningful way for leaders to gain genuine understanding of themselves, their perceptions of experiences and events, and their feelings, needs, expectations, and values. Further, reflection is important for leadership development as it can provide leaders with a variety of insights into how to frame problems differently, to look at situations from multiple perspectives or to better understand followers (Densten & Gray, 2001). In addition, reflection can be utilized when teaching leadership theories (Raelin, 1997). In the same way, Allen and Hartman (2009) warn that avoiding self-development and reflection could allow students to forget developmental activities that entail both uncomfortable emotional and cognitively complex ways to view leadership. The frequency of use of reflection pedagogies in this study is consistent with the broad use suggested in the leadership education literature.

Service learning. Service learning is a major sub-discipline within leadership education. As well, there is an extensive literature base describing its use and effectiveness within the leadership discipline (e.g. Burbach, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004; Chung, 2001; Scharff, 2009; Sessa, Matos, & Hopkins, 2009; Stenta,
Its importance within the discipline goes hand-in-hand with leadership development as represented in the titles of several departments at major universities such as the Center for Leadership and Service Learning at California State Polytechnic University and the University of Pittsburgh. Other student affairs departments pair leadership and service or civic engagement such as the Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement at the University of South Florida or the Center for Leadership and Civic Education at The Florida State University. Similarly, Burbach, Matkin, and Fritz (2004) paired service learning with reflective journals to connect community based experiences related to course content. Additionally, almost one in four participants in this study reported teaching a service learning course and two out of three instructors reported using service learning pedagogy in at least one-third of their class sessions. The findings from this study support the growth of this relationship as well as the grouping of service learning with personal growth pedagogies such as reflection and self-development.

**Skill building.** The findings from this study indicate that only “Traditional Assessment” (exams and quizzes) is used less frequently than “Skill Building” (role play activities, simulations, and games). Even individually, games, role play activities, and simulation were fifteenth, twenty second, and twenty third (out of 24) respectively. Further, only one out of five instructors reported using role play activities in at least one-third of their class sessions with simulation (23.4%) and games (29.4%) not far behind. Yet, a review of the leadership literature suggests common use of these instructional strategies in leadership education (e.g. Allen,
According to Bonwell and Eison (1991), active learning means involving students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing. “Doing” refers to activities such as debates, simulations, guided design, group problem solving, and case studies. Accordingly, instructional strategies that emphasize considerable “doing” from this study include the following that were grouped together and labeled “Skill Building”: role play activities, simulation, and games. Allen and Hartman (2009) also grouped these instructional strategies together in their framework in a category with the same name.

Yet, the present findings do not support the assertions in the literature. Clearly, active skill building instructional strategies such as games, role play, and simulation are used far less than previously thought. But, are they not being used because instructors find them unimportant or is it because they are afraid to use them (or cannot use them skillfully)? Equally, the literature praises the use of active learning strategies such as role-playing, games, simulation, debate, and case studies both in the leadership education literature (e.g. Allen, 2008; Gibson, 2003; Sogurmo, 2003) and in the college teaching literature in general (e.g. Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Fink, 2003; Svinicki, 2004) as offering students learning experiences that have significant psychological and social as well as intellectual dimensions.

**Traditional assessment.** In this study, “Traditional Assessment” (exams and quizzes) emerged as the least frequently used instructional strategy amongst
instructors teaching undergraduate academic credit-bearing leadership studies courses. Three out of four instructors use exams less than a third of the time in their class sessions; while one in five use quizzes. As well, less than five percent of the sample listed exams or quizzes in their “Top 3” instructional strategies. Further, the mean scores of quizzes (last) and exams (20th) ranked in the bottom four.

Thus, while assessment practices in leadership education in general have only recently been explored (e.g. Goertzen, 2009; Lindsay, Foster, Jackson, & Hassan, 2009; Rosch & Schwartz, 2009), results of this study may explain why the literature reveals very little about the use of traditional assessment such as exams and quizzes within the discipline. Like the use of lecture in its most traditional format, written assessment in the forms of exams and quizzes represents the most ancient forms of teaching. And, like lecture, these are the traditional approaches to teaching leadership education students most likely meet with resistance (Wisniewski, 2010). Yet, this study suggests that leadership educators are fully aware of these trends since traditional assessment was the least frequently reported dimension of instructional strategies and lecture was not far behind. While the infrequent of use of these instructional strategies might stem from the fact that it would be very uncommon to have a quiz or exam in each and every class, the findings from this study seem to support the literature base.

**Signature pedagogies.** The results of this study indicate that, more often than any other instructional strategy, instructors teaching leadership to
undergraduates are using discussion pedagogy as well as a collection of other pedagogies including projects and presentations, self-assessments and instruments, and critical reflection. Holistically, these pedagogies all emphasize and model inclusive, relational, and interactive processes. Equally, Eich (2008) stresses that “high-quality” leadership programs should practice the kind of inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical, and process-oriented leadership for positive change that they advocate to their students. Not surprisingly, leadership within the context of college students is widely considered a “relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change” (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). In leadership education, the change is learning and accomplishing that change means the enhancement of one’s leadership ability. Yet, as the definition states, this learning occurs in a relational process. One that is as inclusive as it is ethical.

Effective signature pedagogies are those that incorporate active student participation, make students feel deeply engaged, and promote a learning environment where students feel visible (making it hard for students to disappear and become anonymous) (Shulman, 2005). Furthermore, signature pedagogies tend to be interactive, meaning students are not only accountable to their teacher, but also to fellow students. Ultimately, signature pedagogies breed accountability of performance and interaction, as well as simply removing the cloak of invisibility leading to a much higher affective level in class. Arguably, since leadership development workshops, classic teambuilding seminars, and other interactive activities represent the earliest forms of leadership education,
leadership educators have consistently demonstrated these types of techniques. This discussion resonates with a reoccurring theme of this study: Could the signature pedagogy of leadership be a model for all other disciplines? Fink (2003) describes “good” courses as those that:

1. Challenge students to significant kinds of learning.
2. Use active forms of learning.
3. Have teachers who care—about the subject, their students, and about teaching and learning [not just research].
4. Have teachers who interact well with students.
5. Have a good system of feedback, assessment, and grading.

This list above reflects that if someone’s teaching successfully meets the criteria listed above, its impact is going to be good, no matter what else is bad about it—even if a teacher is not a great lecturer or well organized (Fink, 2003). Similarly, Shulman (2005) describes effective teachers not as charismatic figures, but instead as ordinary teachers in challenging disciplines that feel a responsibility that their students learn. These teachers are not just meeting their students halfway; they are going all the way and bringing them along. Fink suggests: “That kind of teaching should be within the grasp of any faculty member—it is not magic—it is pedagogy.” In the same way, instructors teaching leadership education are modeling the very behaviors society recognize as leadership. And if leadership educators are doing this effectively, then what are they doing?
The literature on signature pedagogies in general is a hodgepodge of commonly employed instructional strategies across the disciplines drawn from the author's personal observations and reflections, case studies, or literature reviews (e.g., Benner, Sutphen, Leonard, & Day, 2009; Cooke, Irby, O'Brien, & Shulman, 2010; Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2005; Gurung, Chick, & Haynie, 2009; Sheppard, Macatangay, & Colby, 2009; Sullivan, Colby, Wegner, & Bond, 2007). Collectively, these studies demonstrate increased use of active learning instructional strategies and more learner-centered approaches. Correspondingly, to be effective, leadership must be taught through learner-centered pedagogies (Eich, 2008). Eich suggests that high-quality leadership programs incorporate student-centered experiential learning experiences that include leadership practice, reflection activities, application in meetings, meaningful discussions, episodes of indifference, civic service, and discovery retreats (p. 180).

In this study, the surface structure of signature pedagogies, defined as the concrete operational acts of teaching and learning, of showing and demonstrating, of questioning and answering, of interacting and withholding, and of approaching and withdrawing were explored. The results of this study indicate that in leadership studies, teaching and learning occur through a relational process that utilized active and experiential instructional strategies such as class discussion and interactive lecture and discussion. Moreover, leadership is shown and demonstrated through the modeling of inclusiveness by effective leadership instructors. Class discussion explicitly accentuates questioning and
answering, interacting and withholding, and approaching and withdrawing.

Assignments and class activities that supplement the discussion include projects and presentations, self-assessments and instruments, and critical reflection.

**Learning goals.** This study explored the learning goals instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses placed the highest importance. Nine out of ten instructors in this study placed the highest importance (important or extremely important) on learning goals that emphasize application and integration. Comparably, only six out of ten instructors focused on learning goals that emphasize caring and learning how to learn with the same high levels of importance. While the literature is void of any studies specifically addressing learning goals in leadership education, the researcher did find some interesting similarities within the leadership development and college teaching and learning literature.

An instructor’s ability to meet established learning goals—for example, those explicitly stated in the syllabus—is just one important way that leadership is modeled in the classroom. Fink (2003) echoes this idea, suggesting that a teacher is generally seen by both the students and the university as being the person in charge of a given course. Thus, the teacher should think about the course as an opportunity to be a leader and to exert leadership skills. Chapter 3 cites several studies where pedagogy is used to teach transformational leadership (e.g., Allen & Hartman, 2009; Gibbons, 1989; Murry, 1992; Scharff, 2009). Fink used the example of transformational leadership developed by James MacGregor Burns (1987) and Bernard Bass (1984, 1994, 1998). In this
model, there are four components of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual situational and individualized consideration. Thus, if a teacher is having difficulties in relationships with students, they might use these concepts to identify ways to relate to the students differently (Fink, 2003, p. 250).

**Taxonomies of learning and leadership development in undergraduates.** In the literature review, Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning is discussed in great detail. One of the key variations between Fink’s and Bloom’s (1956) Taxonomies was the addition of three new categories: (a) Human Dimension, (b) Caring, and (c) Learning How to Learn. Fink contends that individuals and organizations involved in higher education are expressing a need for important kinds of learning that do not emerge easily from the Bloom taxonomy, for example: learning how to learn, leadership and interpersonal skills, ethics, communication skills, character, tolerance, and the ability to adapt to change. Further, Fink defines his model in terms of change. He explains that, “…for learning to occur, there has to be some kind of change in the learner. No change, no learning. And significant learning requires that there be some kind of lasting change that is important in the terms of the learner’s life” (2003, p. 30). Likewise, the relational leadership model strongly considered the context in which leadership is taught to college students emphasizes a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change (Komives, Lucas, & MacMahon, 2007).
While both models include six levels of learning, Fink’s taxonomy suggests a human element not present in Bloom’s model. This element emphasizes the learner-centered focus of significant learning versus the traditional teaching-centered model. Similarly, the Leadership Identity Development (LID) model discussed in chapter 3 is leader-centered and focuses on how relational leadership develops in college students.

According to Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005), leadership identity is strongly correlated to leadership development. Thus, the processes through which undergraduates understand, learn, and develop their leadership traits, skills, and self-efficacy is an important concept to consider and discuss. The researcher found the relationship between these process and learning goals thought-provoking. In particular, the similarities in the literature focusing on development in Bloom’s original “Taxonomy of Learning” (1956), the more contemporary Taxonomy of Significant Learning (Fink, 2003), and the Leadership Identity Development (LID) model (Komives et al., 2005) (see Table 25). Bloom describes learning as a developmental process or levels of learning beginning with knowledge of the subject and moving to comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and finally evaluation. Fink (2003) describes significant learning as a learning-centered approach where faculty decides first what students can and should learn in relation to the subject and then figure out how such learning can be facilitated. The LID model describes a process where leadership identity in college students is informed by the interaction of developing self through group influences that changed one’s view of self with others and
broadened the view of leadership in the context of the supports of the
developmental influences (Komives, et al., 2005). Table 25 below illustrates the
relationship between the two taxonomies and the LID model.
### Integrated Model of Bloom’s Taxonomy, Fink’s Taxonomy, & the LID Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning</th>
<th>Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning</th>
<th>Leadership Identity Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terminology</td>
<td>Understanding and remembering:</td>
<td>Recognition that leaders exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specific facts</td>
<td>Information Ideas</td>
<td>Viewing leadership as external to the self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>No personal identification of leadership or differentiations of group roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trends and sequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classifications and categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>criteria methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Exploration/Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Intentional involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Thinking—critical, creative, and practical thinking</td>
<td>Experiencing groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrapolation</td>
<td>Managing projects</td>
<td>Taking on responsibilities, but not generally in positional leadership roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking to learn anything they could from participation in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Leader Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executing</td>
<td>Connecting: Ideas</td>
<td>Comprehension that groups are comprised of leaders and followers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementing</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Belief that leaders did leadership and were responsible for group outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realms of life</td>
<td>Belief that one is the leader only if they hold a leadership position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Become intentional about and/or intentionally choose group roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active engagement, but still look to the leader as the person in charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning</td>
<td>Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning</td>
<td>Leadership Identity Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Human Dimension</td>
<td>Leadership Differentiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning about:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation of leadership beyond the role of positional leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition that anyone in the group can do leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness that leadership is also a process between and among people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness that people in organizations are highly interdependent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership is happening all around us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to engage in ways the invite participation in shared responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View positional leadership roles as facilitators, community builders, and shaper’s of group culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of own influence and responsibility of each member to engage in leadership collectively to support group goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Generativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production of a unique communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production of a plan, or proposed set of operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derivation of a set of abstract relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing new:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active commitment to larger purposes and to the groups and individuals who sustained them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sought to articulate personal passion for actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connected personal passions to the important beliefs and values in their lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further exploration of interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance of responsibility for developing others and for regenerating or sustaining organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Integrated Model of Bloom’s Taxonomy, Fink’s Taxonomy, & the LID Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning</th>
<th>Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning</th>
<th>Leadership Identity Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Learning how to learn</td>
<td>Integration/Synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Evaluation in terms of internal evidence. Judgments in terms of external criteria.*

*Continual, active engagement with leadership as a part of self-identity.*

*Increase of internal confidence and striving for congruence and integrity.*

*Confidence to work effectively with other people in diverse contexts as both positional leader and member.*

*Comprehension of organizational complexity.*

*Practice of systemic thinking.*

When applied to ULE, the first stage of each framework (Bloom’s Taxonomy, Fink’s Taxonomy, and the LID model) represents a basic knowledge of the discipline, but without any personal identification beyond ideas, terminology, and trends. Here, undergraduates know that leaders exist, but have not developed the personal identification needed to progress to the next cycle.

This second stage represents comprehension and practical application of leadership skills. At this point, undergraduates have taken the imitative to become involved in leadership activities. They are immersing themselves in a breadth of group experiences, but might not have undertaken positional leadership roles. Nonetheless, they are seeking to learn from these experiences.

The third stage represents the execution and implementation of leadership skills. Now, undergraduates are connecting the ideas from their leadership courses,
interactions in groups, and experiences with real life. They also understand that groups are comprised of leaders and followers and recognize their influences. However, they might believe that only positional leaders have true power and may choose their leadership roles accordingly. The fourth stage represents the analysis of the elements of leadership and their influence and interaction within organizations. Here, undergraduates are learning about themselves and others. They understand leadership transcends positional leadership roles. Moreover, there is awareness that leadership is an interdependent and shared process that occurs between and among people. The fifth stage represents the creation, development and elements of communication, relationships, feelings, interests, and values. At this point, undergraduates have actively committed themselves to purposeful leadership (usually to a cause of personal passion). Moreover, they have come to realize the inherent responsibility of regenerating and sustaining their organizations for future members and leaders. The sixth and final stage represents thorough comprehension of leadership. In this stage undergraduates understand and evaluate leadership from internal and external lenses. Moreover undergraduates assume leadership roles with both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation (yet both are not required) since they may lead from any position in the organization. At this juncture, undergraduates are motivated by personal growth, constructive criticism and self-direction. They understand the intricacies of how organizations work and how to fix problems that arise from all levels.

Although no research specifically addressed the similarities between taxonomies of learning and leadership identity development, some leadership
scholars have recommended aligning outcomes in leadership education with Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy. For example, Lindsay, Foster, Jackson, and Hassan (2009) suggest developing an assessment strategy aligned with particular outcomes based on the categories of the taxonomy:

For example, if leadership education is part of an overall leader development program, diligence should be paid to how this education is assessed so that it fits into the broader organizational plan as opposed to an independent activity with independent outcomes. Therefore, leadership education could be used to provide the requisite knowledge that could then be coordinated with an experiential setting where the individual is required to apply that knowledge in particular scenarios. The combined influence of leadership education and leadership application would be identified through a unified assessment goal of individual development. Knowledge for knowledge sake does not necessarily benefit the individual or the organization, but knowledge and application could be enhanced when personal leader development is part of a broader developmental program that extends well beyond the classroom. Using Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy, one can develop assessment methods that link multiple learning outcomes. Aligning the education and application pieces provides the basis for creating a transformational effect on the individual. (Lindsay et al., 2009, p. 167)
Thus, while this study looked at learning goals in ULE, previous research suggests these techniques might be suitable for assessment as well. For example, levels of the LID model could be aligned with categories of Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning to define and measure learning goals and outcomes.

**Surprises from the Findings**

Two findings from this study were in direct contrast to the researcher’s experiences as well as the bulk of the leadership education literature (e.g. Bass, 1990). The first and most perplexing finding from this study was the infrequent use of highly active “Skill Building” instructional strategies such as role play, simulation, and games (only the “Traditional Assessment” group consisting of exams and quizzes was used less frequently). In fact, these findings indicate that three out of four instructors teaching undergraduate academic credit-bearing leadership studies courses use this group of instructional strategies in only one-third or fewer of their class sessions. As well, less than four percent of instructors listed this group in their “Top 3.”

The second most perplexing finding was the infrequent use of the instructional strategy *service learning*. This is puzzling since one in four instructors reported teaching service learning courses. Yet, two out of three instructors use service learning only 0-33% of the time in their class sessions.

**Implications for Action**

This study was undertaken with the vision that it could be pragmatically used by leadership educators and student affairs professionals. This exploratory
study of instructional strategies and learning goals within the leadership discipline has numerous implications for practice for a variety of individuals who seek to advance teaching and learning leadership. As well, the findings of this study have implications for leadership studies, leadership pedagogy, and the learning goals instructors establish for their courses. These findings can provide a foundation to develop workshops for leadership educators or enhance existing ones. Findings from this study may also catalyze ideas for innovations to the way leadership is taught or promote focused research on the use and best practices of the most frequently used instructional strategies. As well, these findings may offer a framework for leadership educators when deciding on the learning goals for their own courses. Further, these practices have the potential to spill over into areas such as leadership identity development and assessment.

**Instructional strategy use.** There ought to be workshops on best practices in leadership education. For example, while simulation, games and role play are used quite infrequently by the instructors surveyed in this study, perhaps they value it but do not know how to use it effectively. Workshops that emphasize best practices including the design of these activities, what high quality work looks like, and how to assess their effectiveness could prove extremely beneficial in the discipline.

Equally, if discussion-based pedagogies are the most frequently employed instructional strategy used by instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses, it is imperative that this strategy is utilized effectively. Yet, the research was scarce of any guides that help faculty
facilitate class discussion. Experts agree that leading a producing discussion is among the most challenging and demanding tasks of an instructor—and one of the most satisfying when things go well (Cross, 2002, p. 10). According to Davis (1993, p. 63):

A good give-and-take discussion can produce unmatched learning experiences as students articulate their ideas, respond to their classmates’ points, and develop skills in evaluating the evidence for their own and others’ positions. Initiating and sustaining a lively productive discussion are among the most challenging of activities for an instructor.

Cross (2002) stresses that participation is a necessary but hardly sufficient condition for learning. Further, like leadership, leading productive discussion takes planning. To return to the basketball metaphor from the section above, just as a basketball coach goes into the game with a strategy, one flexible enough to change if conditions demand it, but firm enough to reach the goal, a teacher must do likewise and have an eye on the objective. Likewise, the results from Research Question Three show that instructors emphasize Application more than any other learning goal. This is related to the leadership practice and application in meetings posited by Eich (2008). Meaningful discussions and episodes of difference might very well occur during class discussion; the most frequently reported instructional strategy from this study. However, what we do not know is whether leadership programs or their instructors are doing these things
effectively. How will student affairs professionals such as leadership program
directors or leadership studies faculty know they are being effective?

Resonating with the well-known research of Kouzes and Posner’s (2007)
“Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership,” leaders must inspire a shared vision.
Likewise, instructors teaching leadership to undergraduates must have a vision
for the class discussion. Where will it go? What, specifically, do they want
students to learn from each class meeting? Undergraduates in leadership
studies courses aptly enjoy these courses. In fact, the unique pedagogical
practices in undergraduate leadership courses are a magnet for many. Yet,
instructors must—must—be purposeful in their pedagogical processes.

**Learning goals.** This study was the first to explore learning goals
empirically within the framework of Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant
Learning and the first do to so in the leadership discipline. Fink offers several
suggestions for action that can be applied to ULE. By comparing the results of
this study with Fink’s suggestions, the following implications for higher education
administrators are important to address:

1. Support faculty efforts to learn about new ideas on teaching and
   learning by making professional development an integral part of faculty
   work and establishing centers that can help faculty learn new ideas
   about teaching and learning.

2. Evaluate teaching in a way that will foster a faculty perspective on
   teaching that is focused on student learning and on what they need to
do to further enhance the quality of their teaching
3. Develop mechanisms for educating students about what constitutes good teaching and learning, so they can cooperate with faculty who use new ideas.

The analysis of the findings in this study indicated that instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses found “Learning How to Learn” the least important learning goal. If leadership educators are not teaching students to learn how to learn, then why not? The collegiate teaching and learning literature stresses metacognition and deep levels of learning (e.g. Fink, 2003; Svinicki, 2004). Accordingly, leadership educators should incorporate activities, assignments, and projects that integrate these types of learning into their courses. Additionally, leading scholars in the discipline should look to alternative strategies for training instructors and furthering this area of inquiry.

Scholars might look to the growing interest in the Leadership Identity Development (LID) model. Arguably, from a pedagogical standpoint, the LID model informs college students how to develop from both application to metacognition and exploration to integration (see Table 18). In the same way, leadership education may in fact be more about self-development than foundational knowledge. Thus, bridging deep levels of learning and meticulously selected inclusive pedagogies with increasing levels of leader development is an important implication for instructors in the discipline and an equally significant area for further inquiry.
Limitations

There are some recognized limitations to this study. One limitation of this study is that the results may not be representative of the entire population of instructors teaching undergraduate academic credit-bearing leadership studies courses due to the low response rate from the International Leadership Association (ILA), National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP), and NASPA Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education groups, despite the adherence to many established survey design recommendations. However, invitations to members of these groups were sent through listservs and there was no evidence that a majority of these groups’ members met the predetermined eligibility requirements. In comparison, the alternative strategy for participant selection—through the ILA Directory of Leadership Programs—had a significantly higher response rate. Still, not all ULE instructors’ university departments are included in the database provided by the ILA. Nor do all departments include instructor information on their department’s website. Thus, replication, as in any survey-based methodology is a limitation.

A further limitation of this study is that it included only instructors who taught face-to-face/in-class (not online) leadership courses. Online delivery of leadership education might offer quite different data in the use of instructional strategies and learning goal importance. A couple participants in the pilot study indicated their ineligibility to participate because the undergraduate academic credit-bearing leadership courses they taught were web-based. As well, this study looked at undergraduate academic-credit bearing leadership courses only.
College instructors teaching graduate level or non-academic leadership courses may have reported different data. In addition, this study was limited to U.S.-based instructors. A few potential participants replied to the invitation e-mail indicating their ineligibility to participate due to their international status. An international study of instructor preferences in leadership education may have produced alternative findings.

An additional limitation of this study is that all possible instructional strategies were not included in the survey. Leadership educators, like educators in any discipline, use countless pedagogies and a multitude of assessments. The researcher in this study took great care in methodically selecting the instructional strategies found in the literature, a panel of experts in the field, and from his own experience to be most closely connected to the leadership discipline.

Another limitation in this study is that it measured perceived quantity of instructional strategies use only. While it measured it by several statistical methods, is frequency the true best method? Perhaps quality might better assess instructional strategy use. For example, in this study media clips were found to be a popular instructional strategy. Yet, this research reports nothing on the quality of this strategy. Are instructors showing short YouTube clips or intricately chosen selections from the greatest movies or speeches of all time? This research also reports little on the best practices within the discipline.

One more limitation of this study is that it the learning goals surveyed were framed within and defined by Fink’s (2003) Taxonomy of Significant Learning.
This taxonomy was of particular interest to the researcher because of its focus on the active and experiential learning most closely related to the types of instructional strategies found in the leadership education literature. While this study used Fink’s taxonomy, it could have measured learning goals in relation to Bloom’s (1956) Taxonomy or several others from the collegiate teaching and learning literature. Likewise, it could have measured learning goals in relation to the levels of the Leadership Identity Development Model suggested by Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005).

A further limitation of this study is that the data analyzed were obtained using a self-report survey, and therefore, contains all of the limitation inherent in this type of study design such as response/recall bias, question misunderstanding, questions structure, and/or inaccurate responses. Nonetheless, self-report via a web-based survey design has been shown to be a reliable and valid method for obtaining information, and given the resources available, this method was the best choice.

A final limitation of this study was that because participation was voluntary, leadership instructors who received an e-mail invitation to participate and chose not to may have demonstrated different self-reported rates of instructional strategy use or learning goal importance. It should be recognized that because every facet of life and practice is continuously changing, the results of this study will not remain relevant indefinitely. Likewise, there is still much to learn in relation to instructional strategies and learning goals in undergraduate leadership education.
Recommendations for Further Research

The use of instructional strategies and the importance of learning goals in collegiate leadership education are underdeveloped in the literature and thus a potentially rich area for further research. Moreover, the process of conducting this research and viewing the current state of the leadership teaching and learning literature, a number of opportunities and recommendations for future research have surface. Some areas for future inquiry represent limitations discussed in the previous section. Decisions were made as to the scope of this study and what to focus on. While all areas could not have been included, they remain interesting directions for future inquiry. The following themes represent suggestions for future investigation.

**Gender, ethnicity, and other demographic perspectives.** An analysis of the findings from this study suggest that instructors teaching academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership studies courses are slightly more likely to be female than male (55% versus 43% of the sample), but are far more likely to be white (84% of the sample) than any other race/ethnicity. Why is there such a predominant “whiteness” in leadership education? If leadership educators must also “Model the Way” in their classrooms, what does the lack of diversity at the head of the class coupled with the increasing diversity of students mean for leader modeling and development in undergraduates? Too, does the racial divide impact the types of instructional strategies instructors might select in their courses? What about the effectiveness of the instructional strategies they select? What about student participation and impact?
This study was limited to U.S.-based instructors teaching academic credit-bearing leadership studies courses to undergraduates. A few potential participants replied to the invitation e-mail indicating their ineligibility to participate due to their international status. Research is needed to explore instructional strategy use the global level. Further, future studies might look at graduate level or non-academic leadership courses. While this study was the first to explore instructional strategy use in leadership education empirically with such a large sample, research is needed to expound these findings.

**Assessment and effectiveness outcomes.** In this study, instructors self-reported their instructional strategy use and the importance they placed on specific learning goals. While this study measured frequency of instructional strategy use, future studies might delve into the *quality* of their impact, effectiveness, and student learning outcomes. Just because instructors are using this or that instructional strategy frequently does not mean they are using them effectively. Also, does the use of certain instructional strategies actually improve student learning? What about the importance instructors place on certain learning goals? How can we assess what instructors are doing and know if what they are doing is effective? Research is needed to assess strategies for instructors within the discipline in order to guide and inform teaching and learning.

**Course delivery.** This study collected data to help describe the participants in detail. Notably, the academic college and department where the academic credit-bearing leadership studies courses were delivered on each
campus was an important area of inquiry. At these institutions, the academic college delivering the undergraduate leadership courses was usually Business (13.9%), Arts and Sciences (12.2%), or Education (11.6%). The specific academic department delivering these courses was Leadership (19.1%), Business, Management, or Organizational Studies (16.2%), or Student Affairs (14.9%). An analysis of these data suggests that instructional strategy use varies somewhat depending on what academic area is delivering the leadership course. For example, instructors in business departments used exams, quizzes, research projects/presentation, case studies, and lecture far more frequently than instructors from student affairs. Equally, instructors from student affairs used peer teaching and reflective journals more often than their business counterparts. Research is needed to explore instructional strategy use within academic departments as well as identify best practices for each area.

Reasons non-participants cited for not participating (often due toeligibility) ranged from teaching graduate courses to teaching only online courses. In fact, several potential participants reported teaching online courses only and that this was the reason they were determined ineligible. Instructional strategies in distance learning course most certainly vary from in-class ones not only because of the method of delivery, but also due to the leadership discipline. The literature base reviewing online instructional strategies in the leadership discipline is less extensive than the current one. Yet, there is evidence that online course delivery of leadership education is growing as well. For example, the International Leadership Association Directory of Leadership Programs lists
more than 100 universities and colleges that offer online courses in leadership. Research is needed to explore the instructional strategy use in online programs and instructor preferences within online courses. Data from these inquiries will help to guide and inform current and future programs in the discipline.

**Instructors’ education and experience.** This study also collected data about participants’ education and prior leadership experiences. More than half of all participants reported having leadership experiences while in college (50.2%) and 74.3% reported taking graduate coursework in leadership. Yet, only 7.9% of the participants earned their advanced degree in leadership or leadership studies. Instead, degrees in organizational studies (13.9%), higher education (12.9%), college student affairs, development, or personnel (12.2%), and miscellaneous education-related degrees (11.6%) were more prominent. And, while the majority (60.2%) of participants in this study reported teaching more than five years, we know little about their pedagogical training or development. In this study, 82.5% of participants reported attending a leadership conference and 63.7% attended a leadership training program or workshop. Unfortunately, the wording of the survey did not specify whether these conferences, workshops, or trainings were specific to teaching leadership or leadership in general. Research is needed to assess the frequency of pedagogical training leadership educators have had. Comparing the results of pedagogical training with instructional strategy in instructors may prove interesting. Yet, overall, analyses of these data suggest that instructional strategy use varies somewhat depending on an instructor’s education and experience. Additional research is needed to
explore the effects of education and experience on instructional strategy use in leadership educators.

**Interesting comparisons that emerged from the data analysis.** This study looked at instructional strategies and learning goals in undergraduate leadership education independently from one another. Yet, further analysis and after-hours inquiry by the researcher uncovered interesting relationships between these data. For example, the use of skill building instructional strategies was significantly correlated with instructors who also placed a high importance on application. In addition, the use of instructional strategies that emphasized personal growth was significantly correlated with instructors that also placed a high importance on the human dimension and caring learning goals. Equally, but not surprisingly, the use of traditional assessment was significantly correlated with instructors that also placed a high importance on foundational knowledge.

Research is needed to explore these relationships. Further inquiry in this area connecting teaching and assessment strategies that connect to specific learning outcomes could prove very important and useful in the discipline. Additionally, this study collected data on different types of courses. Future inquiry might explore which instructional strategies fit best in each course type.

While this study did include an explanatory factor analysis (EFA), it was not designed with the intent of creating subscales for future assessment. Yet, the findings from the EFA in this study indicate specific groups of instructional strategies. Confirmatory factor analysis would further validate these findings by assessing both the number of factors and the factor loadings. Subscales or
instructional strategy inventories based on these groups would be helpful in assessing use across leadership programs, departments, and courses. Research is needed to further explore this potential.

**Signature pedagogies.** This study explored only one of the three dimensions of signature pedagogies according to Schulman (2005). Specifically, this study explored the “surface structure” dimension of signature pedagogies within the leadership discipline. According to Schulman, this dimension includes the “concrete, operational acts of teaching and learning, of showing and demonstrating, of questioning and answering, of interacting and withholding, of approaching and withdrawing.” The second dimension, deep structure (a set of assumptions about how best to impart a certain body of knowledge and know-how) and the third dimension, implicit structure (a moral dimension that comprises a set of beliefs about professional attitudes, values, and dispositions) would be explored best through qualitative research methods. Research is needed to evaluate the findings of this study with experienced leadership educators through in-depth interviews and observation. Qualitative methodologies such as direct observation might also uncover alternative findings versus the self-reported survey data in this study.

**Miscellaneous inquiry.** This study collected a variety of demographic data about the participant and the institution they worked at. Research is needed to explore whether the size, location, or degrees offered have any effect on the type of instructional strategies employed in their academic leadership programs.
Future studies might also look at instructors’ syllabi. For example, do instructors’ syllabi reflect the same instructional strategies and learning goals reported in this study? Research is needed to further explore these relationships and help guide educators in the discipline.

Further research will be needed to continue to explore the teaching, learning, and assessment strategies in leadership education. The leadership discipline growing rapidly and gaining an adequate understanding of the undergraduate leadership studies classroom will require rich and focused research. Leadership education, like any discipline, is an ongoing process of assessing knowledge, planning, organizing, and assessment; continued research will only enhance this process.

**Conclusion**

In closing, the findings from this study offer new knowledge into the instructional attributes—specifically from the instructor’s point of view—of undergraduate academic credit-bearing leadership studies courses. The purpose of this study was to identify the instructional strategies that are most frequently used by instructors when they teach courses in the leadership discipline, identify potential signature pedagogies within the discipline, inform practitioners about alternative instructional strategies used to teach leadership courses, and assess the learning goals instructors deem most important in their course. In the absence of any prior studies exploring instructional strategies from the educators’ perspective, signature pedagogies or learning goals in the leadership discipline or from an empirical perspective, the findings from this study provided insight in the current state of undergraduate leadership education and
identified the instructional strategies most currently utilized as well as the learning goals instructors placed the highest importance.

The most widely used instructional strategies in leadership education were at one time considered limited to approaches that emphasized personal growth, conceptual understanding, feedback, and skill building. Yet, instructors teaching leadership education may succumb to modeling behaviors as much as they also emphasize active and experiential learning strategies. The text that encompassed Fink’s (2003) taxonomy of significant learning and model of integrated course design was titled “Creating Significant Learning Experiences across the Disciplines.” Fink stressed the importance of his perspective and its ability to transcend the disciplines. In the same way, leadership education is uniquely positioned to prepare future leaders across the disciplines. Leadership education is defined as learning activities and educational environments that are intended to enhance and foster leadership abilities (Brungardt, 1996). Arguably, this definition is limited. Leadership education can and should do more than enhance and foster leadership abilities in a vacuum. More so, leadership education should be transcendental. Regardless of a student’s major or career path, leadership education compliments any academic track and helps prepare students across the disciplines to be leaders in a global society. And it does so in educational environments that both model inclusiveness and utilize inclusive pedagogies.

At the largest level the researcher hopes that institutions, academic departments, and leadership programs will be able to use these findings to
evaluate and plan leadership education in meaningful ways. Moreover, it is an
aim of this research that future scholars implement workshops, conference
sessions, and publications on best practices in instruction within the discipline.
At the more scalable level, the researcher hopes these findings will be able to
catalyze innovation in leadership education and stimulate new ideas in the
classroom. At the very least, these findings should offer attributes that a variety
of leadership educators have shared as effective for teaching and learning within
the discipline. In addition, the findings from this study may facilitate the
development of new leadership programming policies, provide direction for future
research, and contribute to the existing body of literature. Incorporating ideas for
the sake of quality and innovation in leadership education can offer opportunities
for further assessment and research that can contribute both nationally and
globally to instructor teaching and student learning.
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Appendices
# Appendix A. Survey Questionnaire

## 1. Eligibility

1. In the last two years, have you taught an in-class/face-to-face (not online) academic credit-bearing undergraduate leadership course in the United States?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
2. Course Information

2. Course Name
Please identify one specific academic credit-bearing in-class/face-to-face (not online) undergraduate leadership course that you teach regularly and type the course name in the space provided.
*Use this course as your reference point when completing the survey.

3. What is the level of the course identified in Question 2?
(Please check one answer below)
- Introductory undergraduate course
- Intermediate, advanced, or upper level undergraduate course

4. How many years experience do you have teaching the course identified in Question 2?
- Less than 1 year
- 1 – 2 years
- 2 – 3 years
- 3 – 5 years
- More than 5 years

5. How many years experience do you have teaching undergraduate academic credit-bearing leadership courses in general?
- Less than 1 year
- 1-2 years
- 2-3 years
- 3-5 years
- More than 5 years
3. Participant, Course, and Institutional Profile

6. What is the approximate class size of the course you identified in Question 2? (Please check one answer below)
   - 1 - 14 students
   - 15 - 29 students
   - 30 - 49 students
   - 50 - 99 students
   - 100 or more students

7. What is the institution type where you teach the course identified in Question 2? (Please check one answer below)
   - 2-year Public or Community College
   - 2-year Private College
   - 4-year Public University
   - 4-year Private University
   - Other (please specify)

8. In what U.S. state is the institution where you teach the course identified in Question 2 located?
   - State: ________
9. On your campus, where is the undergraduate leadership program through which the course you identified in Question 2 located?

Specific College (please describe)

Specific Department (please describe)

10. Students taking the course identified in Question 2 have the opportunity to have the credits earned apply toward what academic leadership program? (Check all that apply)

☐ Certificate

☐ Minor

☐ Baccalaureate

☐ None

☐ Other (please specify)
5. Frequency of Instructional Strategies Use

11. This research seeks to identify instructional strategies used by leadership faculty. As used in this survey, INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS are interchangeable with instructional strategies, assignments, and classroom activities; they can be anything an instructor has built into a course for students to do or complete. For the course you identified in Question 2, please read the list of INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS below and use the scale provided to describe your frequency of use (i.e., from Never to Always).

Never (0% of my class sessions)

Rarely (Less than 10% of my class sessions)

Occasionally (11-33% of my class sessions)

Frequently (34-55% of my class sessions)

Almost Always (66-90% of my class sessions)

Always (91-100% of my class sessions)

To view a brief description of each instructional method, simply place your mouse pointer over the term description...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Method</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects/Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icebreakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Short Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. (Continued) This research seeks to identify instructional strategies used by leadership faculty. As used in this survey, INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS are interchangeable with instructional strategies, assignments, and classroom activities; they can be anything an instructor has built into a course for students to do or complete. For the course you identified in Question 2, please read the list of INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS below and use the scale provided to describe your frequency of use (i.e., from Never to Always).

Never (0% of my class sessions)
Rarely (Less than 10% of my class sessions)
Occasionally (11.33% of my class sessions)
Frequently (34-65% of my class sessions)
Almost Always (66-90% of my class sessions)
Always (91-100% of my class sessions)

To view a brief description of each instructional method, simply place your mouse pointer over the term description...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Leadership Development Plans</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of a Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. (Continued) This research seeks to identify instructional strategies used by leadership faculty. As used in this survey, INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS are interchangeable with instructional strategies, assignments, and classroom activities; they can be anything an instructor has built into a course for students to do or complete. For the course you identified in Question 2, please read the list of INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS below and use the scale provided to describe your frequency of use (i.e., from Never to Always).

Never (0% of my class sessions)

Rarely (Less than 10% of my class sessions)

Occasionally (11.33% of my class sessions)

Frequently (34-65% of my class sessions)

Almost Always (66-90% of my class sessions)

Always (91-100% of my class sessions)

To view a brief description of each instructional method, simply place your mouse pointer over the term description...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Method</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Play Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessments &amp; Instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Peer Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Most often used instructional strategies

14. In your teaching of the course you selected in Question 4, what are the THREE (3) instructional strategies you use most frequently? (Please check THREE (3) instructional strategies from this list.)

- Case Studies
- Class Discussion
- Exams
- Games
- Group Projects/Presentations
- Guest Speaker
- Icebreakers
- In-Class Short Writing
- Individual Leadership Development Plans
- Interactive Lecture/Discussion
- Interview or a Leader
- Lecture
- Media Clips
- Quizzes
- Reflective Journals
- Research Project/Presentation
- Role Play Activities
- Self-Assessments & Instruments
- Service Learning
- Simulation
- Small Group Discussions
- Story or Storytelling
- Student Peer Teaching
- Teambuilding

Other (please specify)

[ ]
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9. Learning Goals

**Q15.** When deciding what you want your students to learn in the course you identified in Question 2, how important are each of the following learning goals?

- Not at all Important (0.25% of my course)
- Somewhat Important (26-50% of my course)
- Important (51-75% of my course)
- Extremely Important (76-100% of my course)

*To see the definition of each learning goal, simply place your mouse pointer over the term definition...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Knowledge</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning How to Learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Instructor Profile

16. Have you ever held a formal/significant leadership position for a year or more in any of the following areas? (please check all that apply)

☐ Business
☒ Education
☐ Military
☐ Government
☐ College student leadership (e.g., student government, graduate student council, fraternity/sorority president, etc.)
☐ None
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________

17. Please describe your formal leadership training experiences (check all that apply):

☐ Undergraduate leadership coursework
☐ Graduate leadership coursework
☐ Participation in a formal leadership training program
☐ Participation in leadership conferences
☐ None
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________

18. What is your principal activity in your current position at this institution?

☐ Administration
☐ Teaching
☐ Research
☐ Student Affairs (Student Services)
☐ My full-time professional career is outside academia
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________
19. Are you a member of any of the following professional associations/organizations? (Please check all that apply)
- Association of Leadership Educators (ALE)
- International Leadership Association (ILA)
- National Clearinghouse of Leadership Programs (NCLP)
- NASPA Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education
- None

20. What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

21. What is your race/ethnicity?
- White/Caucasian
- African American/Black
- Hispanic/Latino
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Other (please specify)

22. Highest Degree Attained: (please check one answer below)
- Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)
- Master's (M.A., M.S., M.F.A., M.B.A., etc.)
- Doctorate
- Other (please specify)

23. For the degree indicated in Question 12, in what area or discipline was it awarded? (Please indicate in the box provided)
11. Thank you

Thank you for your participation.
Appendix B. Panel of Experts
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Assistant Professor of Management
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Appendix C. E-mail Inviting Participation to Pilot Survey

Hello USF Leadership Education Faculty,

I am currently conducting research for my doctoral dissertation in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of South Florida. I am interested in collecting information about the instructional strategies used and the learning goals established by instructors in the Leadership discipline. Despite the increasing interests in the instructional strategies employed in the Leadership discipline, past studies only look at curriculum content and a number of teaching methods used to teach a number of Leadership courses. There has never been a national study to identify the instructional strategies used or learning goals established by instructors in various undergraduate Leadership courses. Thus, I am writing to ask if you would be willing to participate in a brief pilot study whose purpose is to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies and most frequently emphasized learning goals by Leadership instructors such as yourself.

As previously noted, this is a pilot study and your responses will be utilized to assist me in refining the survey for distribution in early November to faculty like yourself across the U.S. The survey should only take 10-15 minutes.

After you have completed the survey, please assist me in answering the following questions:

1) How long did it take you to complete this survey?

2) Were there any missing instructional techniques that you feel are crucial to improving this study?

3) Are there any survey items that you would add that are not currently included? Would you remove any?

4) Are the survey items clear and concise?

5) Are the survey items relevant?

6) Any other feedback you would like to add?
I appreciate your time and consideration of participating in this study as well as your anticipated participation in the final research survey in November.

By clicking the link below to go directly to the survey instrument, you are hereby granting consent to take part in this pilot research study.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/LeadershipInstructionalStrategies

Please e-mail me your response to the questions above by Friday, 9/10.

Thank you in advance,
Appendix D. E-mails Inviting Participation  
(ILA)

Dear Colleague,

Like you, I currently teach undergraduate leadership studies courses. I am also a member of the International Leadership Association (ILA) and the ILA Leadership Education Member Interest Group. I am contacting you with the permission of the ILA to ask if you would be willing to complete a brief survey for my doctoral research at the University of South Florida. The purpose of the study is to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies and most emphasized learning goals by leadership instructors such as you.

The potential benefits to you and others in our field will come from the synthesized results of survey participants that will be shared with interested participants and readers of an anticipated submission to the *Journal of Leadership Education*. Your input can provide a profile that will capture the present instructional strategies used within U.S. undergraduate leadership education.

If you are willing to participate in this voluntary study, you will be asked to complete a brief online survey consisting of 23 questions. Previous participants reported spending approximately 10 minutes.

This unfunded research is considered to be a minimal risk and regrettably no compensation is available to pay you for your participation. This research will be anonymous and the survey results will be reported in an integrative manner.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dan Jenkins either by phone at (813) 974-4503 or by email at djenkin2@mail.usf.edu. Additionally, if you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, please contact the Division of Research Integrity and Compliance of the University of South Florida at (813) 974-9343. The eIRB ID Number for this study, titled “Exploring Instructional Strategies and Learning Goals in Undergraduate Leadership Education” is Pro00002418.

I appreciate your time and consideration of participating in this study.

By clicking the link below to go directly to the survey instrument, you are hereby granting informed consent to participate in this research study.

Dear Colleague,

Like you, I currently teach undergraduate leadership studies courses. I am also a member of the NASPA Student Leadership Programs Group. I am contacting you with the permission of the NASPA Student Leadership Programs Group to ask if you would be willing to complete a brief survey for my doctoral research at the University of South Florida. The purpose of the study is to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies and most emphasized learning goals by leadership instructors such as you.

The potential benefits to you and others in our field will come from the synthesized results of survey participants that will be shared with interested participants and readers of an anticipated submission to the *Journal of Leadership Education*. Your input can provide a profile that will capture the present instructional strategies used within U.S. undergraduate leadership education.

If you are willing to participate in this voluntary study, you will be asked to complete a brief online survey consisting of 23 questions. Previous participants reported spending approximately 10 minutes.

This unfunded research is considered to be a minimal risk and regrettably no compensation is available to pay you for your participation. This research will be anonymous and the survey results will be reported in an integrative manner.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dan Jenkins either by phone at (813) 974-4503 or by email at djenkin2@mail.usf.edu. Additionally, if you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, please contact the Division of Research Integrity and Compliance of the University of South Florida at (813) 974-9343. The eIRB ID Number for this study, titled “Exploring Instructional Strategies and Learning Goals in Undergraduate Leadership Education” is Pro00002418.

I appreciate your time and consideration of participating in this study.

By clicking the link below to go directly to the survey instrument, you are hereby granting informed consent to participate in this research study.
Dear Colleague,

Like you, I currently teach undergraduate leadership studies courses. I am also a member the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP). I am contacting you with the permission of the NCLP to ask if you would be willing to complete a brief survey for my doctoral research at the University of South Florida. The purpose of the study is to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies and most emphasized learning goals by leadership instructors such as you.

The potential benefits to you and others in our field will come from the synthesized results of survey participants that will be shared with interested participants and readers of an anticipated submission to the *Journal of Leadership Education*. Your input can provide a profile that will capture the present instructional strategies used within U.S. undergraduate leadership education.

If you are willing to participate in this voluntary study, you will be asked to complete a brief online survey consisting of 23 questions. Previous participants reported spending approximately 10 minutes.

This unfunded research is considered to be a minimal risk and regrettably no compensation is available to pay you for your participation. This research will be anonymous and the survey results will be reported in an integrative manner.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dan Jenkins either by phone at (813) 974-4503 or by email at djenkin2@mail.usf.edu. Additionally, if you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, please contact the Division of Research Integrity and Compliance of the University of South Florida at (813) 974-9343. The eIRB ID Number for this study, titled “Exploring Instructional Strategies and Learning Goals in Undergraduate Leadership Education” is Pro00002418.

I appreciate your time and consideration of participating in this study.

By clicking the link below to go directly to the survey instrument, you are hereby granting informed consent to participate in this research study.

Dear Colleague,

Like you, I currently teach undergraduate leadership studies courses. I am also a member of the International Leadership Association (ILA). I found your academic department in the ILA Directory of Leadership Education Programs and am contacting you to ask if you would be willing to complete a brief survey for my doctoral research at the University of South Florida. The purpose of the study is to identify the most frequently used instructional strategies and most emphasized learning goals by leadership instructors such as you.

The potential benefits to you and others in our field will come from the synthesized results of survey participants that will be shared with interested participants and readers of an anticipated submission to the Journal of Leadership Education. Your input can provide a profile that will capture the present instructional strategies used within U.S. undergraduate leadership education.

If you are willing to participate in this voluntary study, you will be asked to complete a brief online survey consisting of 23 questions. Previous participants reported spending approximately 10 minutes.

This unfunded research is considered to be a minimal risk and regrettably no compensation is available to pay you for your participation. This research will be anonymous and the survey results will be reported in an integrative manner.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dan Jenkins either by phone at (813) 974-4503 or by email at djenkin2@mail.usf.edu. Additionally, if you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, please contact the Division of Research Integrity and Compliance of the University of South Florida at (813) 974-9343. The eIRB ID Number for this study, titled “Exploring Instructional Strategies and Learning Goals in Undergraduate Leadership Education” is Pro00002418.

I appreciate your time and consideration of participating in this study.

By clicking the link below to go directly to the survey instrument, you are hereby granting informed consent to participate in this research study.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/UndergraduateLeadershipEducation
Appendix E. Reminder E-mail

Dear Colleague,

Like you, I currently teach undergraduate leadership studies courses. Recently, you received a survey seeking information about instructional strategies and learning goals in the leadership discipline. This research is part of my doctoral research at the University of South Florida. If you have already completed the survey, your participation is greatly appreciated, and you may disregard my message. If you have not yet completed the survey, this is a friendly reminder to complete the survey.

If you are willing to participate in this voluntary study, you will be asked to complete a brief online survey consisting of 23 questions. Previous participants reported spending approximately 10 minutes.

This unfunded research is considered to be a minimal risk and regrettably no compensation is available to pay you for your participation. This research will be anonymous and the survey results will be reported in an integrative manner.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dan Jenkins either by phone at (813) 974-4503 or by email at djenkins2@mail.usf.edu. Additionally, if you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, please contact the Division of Research Integrity and Compliance of the University of South Florida at (813) 974-9343. The eIRB ID Number for this study, titled “Exploring Instructional Strategies and Learning Goals in Undergraduate Leadership Education” is Pro00002418.

I appreciate your time and consideration of participating in this study.

By clicking the link below to go directly to the survey instrument, you are hereby granting informed consent to participate in this research study.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/UndergraduateLeadershipEducation
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Appendix G. Non-response Bias ANOVA

Table A1

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analyses of Variance for the Effects of Three Response Periods on Instructors’ Use of Twenty Four Instructional Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategy</th>
<th>10/25-31 M</th>
<th>10/25-31 SD</th>
<th>11/1-14 M</th>
<th>11/1-14 SD</th>
<th>11/15-12/1 M</th>
<th>11/15-12/1 SD</th>
<th>F(2, 300)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Breakers</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Short Writing</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Leadership Development Plans</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Lecture &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Interviews</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Clips</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessments/Instruments</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Teaching</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analyses of Variance for the Effects of Three Response Periods on Importance Instructors Place on Six Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
<th>10/25-31 M</th>
<th>10/25-31 SD</th>
<th>11/1-14 M</th>
<th>11/1-14 SD</th>
<th>11/15-12/1 M</th>
<th>11/15-12/1 SD</th>
<th>F(2, 300)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Dimension</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to Learn</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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