

MENCARINI, STEVEN M., Ph.D. A Longitudinal Examination of Structural Environments Within U.S. College and University Leadership Development Programs. (2018)

Directed by Dr. Laura Gonzalez. 124 pp.

This study sought to examine the structural elements of leadership development programs (LDPs) within U.S. colleges and universities. Much research has been written describing individual student effects of LDPs, however there has been a dearth of literature related to institutional mission alignment, theories utilized, targeted populations, financial and human resources, assessment and evaluation, and institutionalization of such programs. Utilizing the 2009 and 2015 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership – Institutional Survey (MSL-IS), a quantitative analysis of the above and other elements was conducted on the two time points.

Results indicate that LDP institutionalization in 2015 had a positive significant relationship to an institution having a leadership center, programs primarily focused on leadership education, and programs incorporating mentoring relationships, and a negative significant relationship to programs primarily focused on individual skill building and development and level of LDP institutionalization in 2009. Leadership educators believe their LDPs to be more institutionalized in 2015 compared to 2009. In evaluating variables related to LDP institutional and programming changes from 2009 to 2015, the following conclusions were reached: (a) there was no difference in the number of institutions that incorporate student leadership development as an aspect of their institutional strategic plans; (b) more institutions have their primary co-curricular leadership program informed by a clear definition of leadership; (c) more LDPs are open

to all students rather than to students with leadership roles or specific populations; (d) a higher number of LDPs are concentrating on leadership training and leadership development than leadership education and individual skill building; (e) LDPs are focusing on mentoring relationships, socio-cultural conversations, and community service “to an extent” or greater; (f) greater funding, but no additional staff, is being allocated to LDPs; and (g) LDPs are incorporating more sophisticated assessment techniques (such as pre-/post-tests and rubrics). Implications for theory include the creation of a definition of institutionalization for LDPs and consequences for practice include aligning LDPs with high-impact practices and other published research.

A LONGITUDINAL EXAMINATION OF STRUCTURAL ENVIRONMENTS
WITHIN U.S. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LEADERSHIP
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

by

Steven M. Mencarini

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2018

Approved by

Committee Chair

To my brilliant, beautiful wife, Jennifer Gibert Mencarini, and my wonderful sons,
Sam and J.J. - This journey would not have been possible
without your unending love and support.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation, written by Steven M. Mencarini, has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Context for the Study	1
Institutional Context.....	3
Student Context.....	4
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Theoretical Conceptualization	7
Epistemological Frame of Study.....	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Significance of the Study	13
Definition of Terms.....	13
Research Questions.....	15
Assumptions.....	16
Conclusion	17
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	19
Overview of Leadership Development Programs.....	19
History of Leadership Development as a Functional Area.....	19
Leadership Theories for College Students.....	21
Evolution of Leadership Theories.....	21
Collegiate Leadership Development Theories.....	25
Leadership Identity Development Theory	28
An Examination of Collegiate Leadership Development from Various Perspectives.....	29
Institutional-level Analysis	29
Program-level Analysis.....	31
Student-outcome Level Analysis	33
Programmatic Themes that Affect Student Leadership Capacity Gains.....	34
High-Impact Learning Practices of Leadership Development Programs	35
Characteristics of Distinctive Leadership Developments	38

Additional Considerations for Leadership Development	
Programs	40
Research Related to CAS Standards for Student Leadership	
Programs (SLPs).....	43
Mission.....	44
Program.....	45
Collaboration.....	45
Learning outcomes.....	46
Intentionally designed programs.....	47
Financial and Human Resources.....	48
Assessment and Evaluation.....	50
Conclusion	52
III. METHODOLOGY	54
Introduction.....	54
Research Design.....	55
Sample.....	56
Instrumentation	57
Data Collection	58
Data Analysis Plan.....	60
Limitations	61
Conclusion	62
IV. RESULTS	64
Demographics of the Sample.....	64
Research Question 1	65
Research Question 2	67
Cross-sectional.....	67
Longitudinal.....	69
Research Question 3	71
Mission.....	71
Program.....	73
Financial Resources	81
Human Resources	83
Assessment and Strategic Planning	86
Conclusion	89
V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	90
Summary of the Study	90

Findings Related to the Literature.....	92
Institutionalization	93
Program Characteristics	94
Conclusions.....	99
Implications for Action.....	99
Recommendations for Further Research.....	102
Concluding Remarks.....	104
REFERENCES	105
APPENDIX A. LIST OF MSL-IS QUESTIONS UTILIZED IN THE STUDY	116
APPENDIX B. 2009 MSL-IS PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS	119
APPENDIX C. 2015 MSL-IS PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS	121
APPENDIX D. INSTITUTIONS THAT COMPLETED THE 2009 AND 2015 MSL-IS	123
APPENDIX E. UNCG IRB DOCUMENTATION	124

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1.	Comparison of Theories Utilized for Conceptual Framework.....	10
Table 2.1.	Comparison of Leadership Development Best Practices	40
Table 4.1.	Demographics of Sample Institutions	65
Table 4.2.	Correlation Analysis of Level of LDP Institutionalization with Various Variables	66
Table 4.3.	Number and Frequency of Reported Level of Institutionalization.....	68
Table 4.4.	Reported Level of Institutionalization by MSL-IS Respondents	68
Table 4.5.	Responses to “Does Your Campus Have a Leadership Center?”	69
Table 4.6.	Sample Size and Frequency of Reported Level of Institutionalization by 21 MSL-IS Respondents from 2009 and 2015	70
Table 4.7.	Reported Level of Institutionalization by 21 MSL-IS Respondents from 2009 and 2015	71
Table 4.8.	Responses to “Does Your Institutional Strategic Plan Mention/Include Student Leadership Development?”.....	72
Table 4.9.	Number and Percentage of Response for “To What Extent Do Institutional Policy-making Boards/Committees Recognize Student Leadership as an Essential Goal for the Campus?”	72
Table 4.10.	Descriptive Statistics for “To What Extent Do Institutional Policy- making Boards/Committees Recognize Student Leadership as an Essential Goal for the Campus?”	73
Table 4.11.	Frequency and Valid Percentage of “Program Informed by a Clear Definition” for 2009 Responses.....	74
Table 4.12.	Frequency and Valid Percentage of “Program Informed by a Clear Definition or Framework” for 2015 Responses	74

Table 4.13.	Descriptive Statistics for “Program Informed by a Clear Definition or Framework”	74
Table 4.14	Number and Percentage of LDPs that Utilize a Particular Leadership Theory or Model	75
Table 4.15.	2015 MSL-IS Frequency and Relative Percentage of Programs Intended for a Specific Population	77
Table 4.16.	2015 MSL-IS Frequency and Relative Percentage of Programs Primarily Emphasizing Leadership Training, Leadership Education, Leadership Development, and Individual Skill Building.....	78
Table 4.17.	2015 MSL-IS Frequency and Relative Percentage of Programs Primarily Focused on Mentoring Relationships, Socio-cultural Conversations, and Community Service	79
Table 4.18.	Number and Percentage of LDPs Which Collaborate with Different Departments or Functional Areas	80
Table 4.19.	Reported Amount of Annual Funding for Primary LDP, Excluding Salaries	82
Table 4.20.	Reported Amount of Annual Funding for Primary LDP, Excluding Salaries	82
Table 4.21.	Descriptive Statistics of Faculty/Staff Positions (Professional and Student) Solely Dedicated to Primary Leadership Development Program	83
Table 4.22.	Frequency and Valid Percentage of Faculty/Staff Positions (Professional and Student) Solely Dedicated to Primary Leadership Development Program	83
Table 4.23.	Number and Frequency of Perception of Leadership Educator Knowledge About the Field of Leadership Studies	84
Table 4.24.	Reported Level of Leadership Educator Knowledge About the Field of Leadership Studies.....	84
Table 4.25.	Number and Frequency of Highest Level of Education for 2015 MSL-IS Respondents.....	85

Table 4.26.	Number and Frequency of Significant Coursework in Leadership Theory or Development Post-Baccalaureate for 2015 MSL-IS Respondents	85
Table 4.27.	Responses to “Does Your Primary Co-curricular Leadership Program Have Stated Learning Objectives?”	86
Table 4.28.	Frequency and Percentage of LDPs Using Various Assessment Methods	87
Table 4.29.	Responses to “Does Your Co-curricular Leadership Program Have a Strategic Planning Process?”	88
Table 4.30.	Of Respondents Who Have a Strategic Planning Process, How Often is the Strategic Planning Process Engaged?	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context for the Study

Leadership development programs (LDPs) have proliferated at many U.S. colleges and universities since the mid-1970s (Roberts, 1997). There is a fundamental belief among leadership theorists and educators that leadership can be learned and developed through intentional education, training, and development (Astin, 1993; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education [CAS], 2015; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2013; Rost, 1991). The goal of these training programs is often to help college students develop their leadership skills, abilities, and capacities to lead on campus and beyond. These programs vary from co-curricular workshop-based initiatives and conferences to curricular classes that form majors and minors, such as leadership studies, adaptive leadership, or leading for social change (Haber, 2011).

The exact number of curricular and co-curricular programs or the number of students enrolled or participating is unknown. According to an International Leadership Association's (2018) online database of leadership majors or minors, there are 1,570 U.S. colleges and universities listed offering such programs; many of these campuses have multiple majors and minors within specific disciplines (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). Because this is a compilation of self-selected institutions that chose to be in the directory,

there are numerous other institutions that may have curricular leadership studies majors or minors but were not included in the database. It is not known how many campuses have co-curricular LDPs, although a study at the turn of the century found over 800 LDPs exist on U.S. college campuses (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). In terms of the numbers of students involved, Dugan and Haber (2007) found that 60% of college students sampled in a national study indicated some level of involvement in short-term leadership programs, 40% participated in moderate-term, and 20% partook in long-term programs.

Given the number of curricular and co-curricular programs and the potential number of students involved in various programs, one might think that there would be a sound literature base in understanding the outcomes and productivity of such initiatives. Despite an explosion of leadership development opportunities becoming available to college students, we know little about curricular and co-curricular leadership offerings and if this programming aligns with emerging scholarship on leadership (Lunsford & Brown, 2017; Owen, 2012).

This raises a plethora of questions related to collegiate LDPs. What do we know about these programs and how effective and efficient are they? How aligned are LDPs with best practices in the field? Which opportunities develop students' leadership capacities more than others and which program qualities should be hallmarks of exemplary programs? Which leadership theories are being utilized in the formation of leadership development opportunities? How have these collegiate LDPs matured programmatically over the years?

In this chapter, there will be an exploration of the institutional and student contexts related to LDPs. Next, the problem statement, theoretical framework, and epistemological framework will be discussed. This will lead to the purpose and significance of the study and the definition of important terms to the study. The research questions that frame this dissertation will then be outlined. The chapter will conclude with three assumptions made within the study.

Institutional Context

Many scholars see the purpose of developing students' leadership capacities as aligning well with college and university mission statements (Chunoo & Osteen, 2016; Meacham & Gaff, 2006). Leadership tenets associate often with three potential purposes of a college education: (a) economic development and career readiness; (b) critical thinking; and (c) a liberal education, citizenship, and an engaged democracy (Chunoo & Osteen, 2016). Research has shown that LDPs can better prepare future employees and provide sought after skills by employers (National Association of Colleges and Employers [NACE], 2018). Critical thinking skills and positive social change attributes are also often advanced through leadership development opportunities (Dugan et al., 2011; Pigza, 2015; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999).

Furthermore, significant financial and human resources are often given to LDPs. Almost two-thirds of leadership centers on college campuses had budgets of over \$100,000, inclusive of salaries (Lunsford & Brown, 2017). In another study, the mean programmatic budget was almost \$44,000, exclusive of salaries (Owen, 2012). As for faculty and staff members working within leadership development centers, Lunsford and

Brown (2017) found that the median number was three, while Owen (2012) found the mean number of faculty and staff devoted to leadership programs to be 8.26.

There is an impression that many universities and colleges have robust LDPs; however, the situation is that many campuses find themselves in the early stages of “building critical mass” defined as “several leadership programs exist on campus, may or may not be coordinated” (Owen, 2012, p. 10). In an analysis of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership – Institutional Survey (MSL-IS) and how LDPs clustered related to finances, productivity, and intentionality, Owen (2008) determined that there were three different groupings: (a) “highly resourced, highly productive, highly intentional” programs ($n = 13$); (b) “limited resources, moderately productive, moderately intentional” programs ($n = 13$); and (c) “moderately resourced, moderately productive, less intentional” programs ($n = 19$) (p. 110). There was a fourth outlier cluster ($n = 7$) that did not have any clear responses that placed it into one of the other three clusters. This shows there is a difference in how U.S. colleges and universities structure and fund leadership programs and how the typology of each program may affect its programmatic offerings.

Student Context

The previous section outlined various institutional contexts to better understand issues related to LDPs. This section briefly examines the student contexts and outcomes from LDPs.

Students who participate in LDPs see many positive outcomes through their involvement. Research has shown that students perceive improvements in civic, social,

and political awareness; commitment to service and volunteerism; communication skills; and personal and social responsibility, among many other attributes (Dugan et al., 2011; Dugan & Komives, 2006, 2007; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999).

There also seems to be an advantage for non-participants at institutions that have formal LDPs. In an analysis of data from 10 institutions, all students (participants and non-participants) at institutions who had an LDP scored significantly higher than those that did not have a formal leadership program (Cress et al., 2001). The authors called this a “halo effect,” suggesting that students who participated in formal LDPs not only increased specific leadership skills (such as ability to set goals, make decisions, etc.) but also “increased their commitment to developing leadership in others” (Cress et al., 2001, p. 25).

Students who are preparing to enter the workforce are often advantaged by having leadership qualities and skills for a variety of public and private opportunities. When employers were surveyed about what they might be influenced by as they are reviewing new hires, holding a leadership position and academic major were weighted the same (NACE, 2018). Additionally, nearly 75% of businesses and many professional associations use leadership competencies for training and evaluation (Seemiller, 2013).

In summation, there are numerous collegiate leadership development curricular and co-curricular programs with countless students involved in these environments. Institutions are spending copious amounts of resources on these programs. Research shows that students and institutions benefit from such programs, but there is a lack of information about the programs themselves.

Statement of the Problem

Leadership is something that all organizations care about. But what most interests them is not which leadership theory or model is “right” (which may never be settled definitively), but how to develop leaders and leadership as effectively and efficiently as possible. As such, this is an important area of scholarly research and application with myriad unanswered (and even undiscovered) questions to pursue. (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014, p. 79)

Although the above quotation is not specifically related to collegiate environments, it is wholly applicable to higher education settings. In the creation and implementation of LDPs, research has been lacking on their effectiveness and efficiency until recently (Dugan & Komives, 2006). In the early 2000s, an effort to more robustly measure the leadership capacities of U.S. college students commenced with the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) (Dugan & Komives, 2006). A companion survey, the MSL-IS, was added to the 2006 and 2009 MSL iterations to help measure the institutional environments related to leadership development. Numerous research articles have since been written that have utilized the data from the MSL and MSL-IS (Dugan, Bohle, Woelker, & Cooney, 2014; Dugan & Haber, 2007; Dugan, Kodama, Correia, & Associates, 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2007, 2010; Owen & Komives, 2006).

This study intends to build on limited prior research on U.S. collegiate LDPs (Lunsford & Brown, 2017; Owen, 2012) and utilize data from the 2015 MSL-IS to provide an updated snapshot of current programmatic structures of LDPs and to analyze if, and how, leadership development environments have evolved since the 2009 MSL-IS administration.

Theoretical Conceptualization

This study sought to explore key aspects of leadership development environments. Therefore, it is imperative to understand theories that help to support this study; this section investigates these theories.

Research has shown that environments have an effect on human behavior (Strange & Banning, 2015). In understanding human environments, Strange and Banning (2015) identify four key components:

- physical condition, design, and layout [physical environments]
- collective characteristics of the people who inhabit them [aggregate environments]
- organizational structures related to their purpose and goals [organizational environments]
- collective perceptions or social constructions of the context and culture of the setting [socially constructed environments] (p. 5)

Each of these types of environments shapes the student experience daily on college campuses. Moreover, each of these types of environments can be utilized to analyze LDPs and leadership development centers.

Probably the most visually obvious of the four types of environments, the physical environment, relates to the buildings, sidewalks, accessibility, cleanliness, layout, and use of space. Aggregate environments involve the collective characteristics of the human inhabitants of the environment—the general demographic and typology (e.g., personality, learning style) of the student body, faculty, and staff. Organizational environments are concerned with the formal and informal ways the campus is structured to understand how decisions are made, what rules are used, what is accomplished, and

how and what achievements are celebrated. Finally, socially constructed environments highlight the subjective experiences within collegiate settings such as what meanings are given to symbols and ceremonies, social climates, and general satisfaction and attraction to a particular environment.

One can analyze leadership development environments through each of these four environments. Having a leadership development center associates both with the physical environment—an actual place where LDPs are coordinated and held, and the socially constructed environment—what it means symbolically to have a leadership development center on campus. Aggregate environments represent the types of students who partake in leadership development programming. Examples of organizational environments include an emphasis on leadership within the institutional mission statement and how leadership is practiced on a campus by its institutional leaders.

With a background understanding of human environments, comprehending leadership development environments will now be explored. Haber (2011) developed the Formal Leadership Program Model with three different dimensions: students, structure, and strategies. The student dimension addresses the intended audience of the programs. Haber (2011) created poles for targeted vs. non-targeted programs (meaning how targeted the programs are to a particular group of students) and positional vs. non-positional (how directed the programs are for positional leadership roles). The structure dimension examined the (a) program foundation (mission, values, leadership theories utilized, etc.); (b) staff and resources; and (c) program components (requirements, credentials, etc.). Finally, the strategies dimension included the learning experiences and activities with

which students engage in the leadership program. The Formal Leadership Program Model is helpful to leadership educators who want to “facilitate an integrative learning experience for student participants in leadership programs” (Haber, 2011, p. 234) and will be the primary theoretical frame for this dissertation.

The MSL-IS is the first wide-scale initiative to attempt to measure and understand complexities within college leadership development environments or the “structure” component to which Haber (2011) theorized. The types of collegiate LDPs are numerous: duration (one-off, short-term, long-term); setting (academic classes, co-curricular); access of leadership programs (selective, targeted, open-to-all); for different social identities (women’s, men’s, first-year’s, upperclass, different racial groups); theoretical grounding (Social Change Model, servant leadership, transformational leadership); and focus of development (leadership skills, traits, competencies).

The 2006, 2009, and 2015 MSL-IS utilized a framework from the CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs to examine how institutions of higher education are designing and delivering leadership education programs. These standards include 12 component parts, each designed to examine a different aspect of leadership programs and services (CAS, 2015). These components are (a) mission; (b) program; (c) organization and leadership; (d) human resources; (e) ethics, law, policy, and governance; (f) diversity, equity, and access; (g) organization and management; (h) campus and external relations; (i) financial resources; (j) technology; (k) facilities and equipment; and (l) assessment and evaluation. Specific research associated with five of the CAS general standards shown in

Table 1.1 are shared in Chapter II; portions of Chapters IV and V will be organized utilizing these five CAS general standards.

Table 1.1 shows how the CAS Standards (2015) align well and overlap with Strange and Banning's (2015) exploration of human environments and Haber's (2011) framework for formal LDPs. Strange and Banning's organizational environments correspond to Haber's structure component and almost all of the general CAS Standards. Furthermore, Haber's student component relates to Strange and Banning's aggregate environments. Haber's program attribute component lines up with the CAS program general standards. Because this study's focus was related to the leadership development practice, in general, and specifically the programmatic efforts, this study concentrated on Haber's framework and the CAS Standards, but it is important to understand Strange and Banning's theory as well.

Table 1.1

Comparison of Theories Utilized for Conceptual Framework

CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs (2015)	Haber's (2011) Formal Leadership Program Model	Strange and Banning's (2015) four components of human environments
Mission	Structure	Organizational
Program	Students; Strategies; Structure	Organizational/Aggregate
Human Resources	Structure	Aggregate
Financial Resources	Structure	Organizational
Assessment & Evaluation	Structure	Organizational

Epistemological Frame of Study

It is not only important to understand the theoretical framework for this study, but also the epistemological frame. This section explores the experiences the author has had which help to inform the understanding of leadership and leadership development.

As an undergraduate student at the College of William and Mary, I was thoroughly involved in several student organizations and departmental programs. If I could have majored in co-curricular activities, I would have. I was editor-in-chief of the student newspaper, admissions intern supervising the tour guide program, intern within the sports information office in the athletic department, orientation leader, and member of a service organization working with middle school youths. Despite all of that involvement, I was not aware of any formal leadership development program. I called myself a campus leader, yet still I had no idea what leadership was or how I could improve my leadership experiences.

It was not until my graduate school experience that I learned anything about the concepts of “leadership” and “leadership development.” At the University of Maryland, I was “bitten by the leadership bug.” It was very difficult to not be bitten, given one of the gurus of collegiate leadership development was a faculty member in the program. During my 2 years as a graduate student, I learned from Dr. Susan Komives and audited her leadership theory class since I could not fit it in my schedule, as I ran out of credits. After graduating, I continued to work at Maryland as a full-time professional for 3 years, where I met people like Dr. Craig Slack, Dr. John Dugan, and Dr. Julie Owen. As a professional, Dr. Slack provided me and several other graduate students the opportunity

to co-teach a leadership course during one winter term through which I saw firsthand the impact teaching leadership studies has on undergraduates.

After leaving Maryland, I have always worked in some capacity to develop college students' leadership capacities. Whether it be through student activities, residence life, or specifically within leadership development programs, I have had the honor to have intentional conversations with college students around leadership. More recently, I spent 6 years as the Director of the Center for Leadership at Elon University, working to institutionalize leadership and leadership development within the curriculum, co-curriculum, and fabric of campus. In my current role at Guilford College, I am working with a group of faculty and staff to create initiatives with the goal of helping the institution become known for exemplary leadership development at a liberal arts institution. These experiences are shared so that one can see how I view leadership and leadership development through my personal and professional growth.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to build upon the 2009 MSL-IS report written by Owen (2012), which utilized a national sample to examine LDPs and leadership development centers at colleges and universities. In 2015, the MSL-IS was administered a third time; however, the dataset had not been analyzed. This study employed statistical analyses to examine variables related to institutionalization of LDPs and compared the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS dataset to examine differences in the structural environments of LDPs. The MSL-IS questions utilized in this analysis are included in Appendix A. This

quantitative investigation allowed for statistical comparison and the findings may be transferable and applicable to other contexts.

Significance of the Study

There were numerous important findings included in the 2009 MSL-IS report (Owen, 2012). For example, results showed that programs saw themselves more in “building critical mass” than enhancing quality or sustained institutionalization (Owen, 2012). Given this snapshot of data helped to understand where the leadership development functional area stood at that time and specific recommendations could be made based upon this data. With the additional iteration of the 2015 MSL-IS, another snapshot can provide a more holistic picture of the field. By comparing the 2009 MSL-IS findings with the results from 2015, changes in the programmatic efforts within the leadership development landscape are illuminated. Furthermore, the results of this study allow student affairs practitioners to more effectively assess and enhance their own program designs and delivery by recognizing distinguished structural factors that could affect student leadership development.

Definition of Terms

As this study explores a variety of trainings related to leadership development for college students, it is important to classify the differences between the concepts of leader development, leadership development, and leadership education.

Leader development focuses on developing individual leaders (intrapersonal), whereas leadership development focuses on a process of development that involves multiple individuals (interpersonal) (Day et al., 2014). The nature of leadership

development is multi-level and longitudinal (Day, 2011). To understand a person's demonstrated leadership, one must understand not only the personal qualities of the individual, but also how this individual interacts with others and the context of the actions taken (Day, 2011). Furthermore, one must also understand that leadership development occurs over time, well before any action taken to develop one's leadership capabilities happens and well after the intervention is complete (Day, 2011).

For the purposes of this study, the concept of **leadership** is informed by the Social Change Model of Leadership Development and defined as "a values-based process in which people work collaboratively toward the purpose of creating positive social change" (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 6).

Leader development is defined as "activities designed to develop an individual's ability to perform practical skills that facilitate effective leadership" (Allen & Roberts, 2011, p. 66).

Leadership development is defined as "a continuous, systemic process designed to expand the capacities and awareness of individuals, groups, and organizations in an effort to meet shared goals and objectives" (Allen & Roberts, 2011, p. 67).

Leadership education is defined as "a series of training interventions designed to enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities of individuals interested in engaging in leadership" (Allen & Roberts, 2011, p. 66).

A **leadership development program (LDP)** is defined as "any program or activity intentionally designed with the purpose of enhancing the leadership skills, knowledge, or abilities of college students" (Haber, 2006, p. 29) and relates to

environments on U.S. college and university campuses, unless specifically outlined in another research article.

Finally, this study focused on the **institutionalization** of LDPs. There is no formal definition of institutionalization for LDPs; however, there is literature from the service learning functional area about institutionalization. Furco and Holland (2004) define service learning program institutionalization as occurring when the program “becomes an ongoing, expected, valued, and legitimate part of the institution’s intellectual core and organizational culture” (p. 24). Klentzin and Wierzbowski-Kwiatkowiak (2013) determined eight common elements found in successful service learning program institutionalization: (a) inclusion of service learning language in the institutional mission statement; (b) a centralized service learning office; (c) a dedicated staff; (d) internal hard funding and supplied physical resources, including space; (e) training/development opportunities, including active organizational membership; (f) faculty rewards, including release time; (g) program assessment; and (h) a service learning advisory board comprised of multiple stakeholders.

Research Questions

The following research questions about collegiate leadership development environments which guided this study are:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between overall LDP institutionalization and various programmatic and institutional characteristics as measured by the 2015 MSL-IS survey?

Research Question 2: Is there a difference between level of institutionalization for LDPs from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS surveys?

Research Question 3: Is there a difference in LDP characteristics between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS survey related to five CAS Student Leadership Program (SLP) Standards (mission, program, financial resources, human resources, and assessment and strategic planning)?

Assumptions

There are three fundamental assumptions within this study. The first is that the concept of leadership can be taught and learned. Early theories of leadership concentrated on an individual's physical attributes or on their natural-born characteristics (Northouse, 2013). As the functional area of leadership studies has evolved, there is a more nuanced understanding of leadership that has been constructed—that leadership is a concept that involves a reciprocal relationship between a leader and other individuals (Northouse, 2013). Current theories related to leadership and leadership development are designed around experiential opportunities, trainings, and education as a way of building an individual's leadership abilities, skills, knowledge, and capacities (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Dugan et al., 2013).

The next assumption is that the structural environment of LDPs (such as mission and vision, theoretical framework, or knowledgeable administrators of programs) can affect the quality of the student outcomes. Dugan and Owen (2007) have argued that a clear theoretical framework, knowledge of the literature, and well-defined values and assumptions make for more effective leadership programs. Furthermore, Zimmerman-

Oster and Burkhardt (1999) suggest that the most successful leadership programs are characterized by a clear theoretical orientation in addition to the presence of a strong connection between the mission of the institution and the mission of the LDP or center.

The last assumption is that colleges and universities are places where leadership capacities can be developed. Students can develop an identity around leadership (Komives, Owen, Longersbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005), just as students develop cognitively, morally, and psychosocially during college. Leadership development is best applied in the context of other types of psychosocial development of an individual during college and is not solely dependent on the types of training and experience (Dugan, 2011). Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009) express the complex nature of leadership development within the domains of cognitive, moral, and identity development. This is especially important as higher order cognitive abilities are necessary and associated with leadership efficacy and social perspective taking, two important outcomes of leadership development (Dugan, 2011). Leadership development is more than simple maturation that needs to incorporate significant time and investment, and it is more than just a collection of workshops and training.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the student and institutional contexts related to U.S. collegiate LDPs to construct the background for this study. Subsequently, the statement of problem, theoretical framework, and epistemological framework was explored. The purpose and significance of the study was stated to help reader understand the importance of the study. Definitions of key terms were provided to provide clarity regarding key

study concepts. Finally, the study's research questions and assumptions were outlined to offer a springboard for the following chapters.

The next two chapters further illuminate key components of the study. Chapter II provides an overview of relevant research and literature associated with collegiate LDPs and synthesizes the past and current state of information. Chapter III follows with an outline of the intended methodology for the study. This study continues with Chapters IV and V describing the results and implications derived from the findings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview of Leadership Development Programs

The opening chapter provided a summary of leadership development programs (LDPs) and a framework from which this research was conducted. This chapter offers a more complex understanding of the current literature landscape for collegiate LDPs. The first portion explores the history of leadership development as a functional area in higher education and the overarching leadership theories and their applications within a higher education framework. The second section explores the types of institutional LDPs and literature linked to student leadership outcomes. To conclude the chapter, the last portion explores the Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) Standards and research related to five general practice standards that are utilized by the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership-Institutional Study (MSL-IS).

History of Leadership Development as a Functional Area

Beginning in the 1970s, several student affairs professional associations encouraged their members to centralize the importance of leadership education in higher education (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). The American College Personnel Association (ACPA) took the first step in creating a Task Force on Leadership Development in 1975 through Commission IV. Other professional organizations, such as the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) and the Association of College Unions

International (ACUI), were also having conversations about leadership training and development (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018).

In 1981, Dennis Roberts edited a volume through the ACPA Commission IV called *Student Leadership Programs in Higher Education*, which put “leadership on the national agenda of the higher education community” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018, p. 13). According to Guthrie and Jenkins (2018), the volume established the “how-to” of developing leadership programs and formalized procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of existing programs. Later in the decade the Association of American Colleges (now the AAC&U) formed a consortium of individuals, including some from ACPA and ACUI, for the Institute on the Study and Practice of Leadership. This group actively pursued developing a comprehensive model for academic and student affairs staff. In 1989, the National Clearinghouse of Leadership Programs (NCLP) was established at the University of Maryland College Park to help form LDPs nationally.

Over the past 25 years, LDPs have become more established within higher education settings and scholarship has expanded. The National Leadership Symposium, a collaboration between ACPA, NCLP, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), was created in 1990 with the goal of helping to inform leadership educators (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). The CAS Standards for LDPs were developed and published in 1996 (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018); these will be explored later in this chapter. Additionally, the Social Change Model for Leadership Development (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996) and relational leadership model (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998) were released for higher education audiences to

help provide leadership educators frameworks to structure their programs. These two models are also discussed in the next section.

Leadership Theories for College Students

There are a number of theories that have been conceived since the beginning of the 20th century to help understand the complex human behavior commonly known as “leadership,” such as trait, skill, style, situational, and reciprocal theories (Northouse, 2013). This portion of the chapter investigates the progression of leadership theories and how these theories have been utilized and adopted by a higher education setting.

Evolution of Leadership Theories

The concept of “leadership” has been explored through research and practice since the beginning of the 20th century. There are more than 1,500 definitions and 40 models of leadership that currently exist (Kellerman, 2012). Rost (1991) articulated two basic problems to studying leadership: the unnecessary focus on “what is peripheral to the nature of leadership” (p. 3) and the challenge by practitioners and scholars in “defining leadership with precision, accuracy, and conciseness so that people are able to label it correctly when they see it happening or when they engage in it” (p. 6). An influential scholar in leadership, James MacGregor Burns once quipped, “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on Earth” (Burns, 1978, p. 2).

The evolution of the concept of “leadership” and theories associated with leadership is quite extensive and is reviewed concisely and critiqued in this section of the chapter. In the early 20th century, definitions of “leadership” focused on power and control. Northouse (2013) cites a definition of “leadership” from a conference in 1927 as

“the ability to impress the will of the leader on those led and induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation” (p. 2).

One of the first attempts to study “leadership” focused on specific traits leaders needed to possess to be effective (Dugan, 2017; Northouse, 2013). This collection of theories became known as trait approaches, which concentrated on innate qualities and characteristics of great social, political, and military leaders and of general characteristics that are commonly found in leaders. After a half-century of research, Northouse (2013) boiled these traits down into five categories: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability. The span of time over which these theories emerged has covered several decades with initial trait theories, such as the Great Man from the 1800s, to current trait theories like the Leadership Challenge by Kouzes and Posner (2012), emotionally intelligent leadership (Shankman, Allen, & Haber-Curran, 2015), and strengths-based leadership (Rath, 2007). Trait theories are quite limited in that the list of traits can be numerous, neither take into consideration the context of a situation nor the involvement of others in the process of leadership, and they reinforce the dichotomy of leaders and followers as mutually exclusive (Dugan, 2017; Northouse, 2013).

Another general collection of leadership theories can be classified as skill-approach theories. Like trait-approach theories, skill-approach theories focus on the skills and abilities a leader uses, which can be learned and developed (Northouse, 2013). Skill approaches concentrate on technical, human, and conceptual skills and capabilities (both knowledge and skills) needed by effective leaders (Northouse, 2013). Katz’s (1974) “Three Skills Model” indicates that the basic administrative skills one needs to be

a leader are “technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills.” A more recent example of a skill-based approach is the model of leader problem-solving, which proposes combining specific knowledge of oneself, people, and the problem with skills such as understanding of the problem, communication, and garnering support (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Owen Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000). The challenge with skill-based leadership theories is that they are weak in predictive value of how effective the demonstrated leadership affects performance (Northouse, 2013).

A third subset of theories, style approaches, does not focus on skills or traits, but centers on what task and relationship behaviors a leader employs (Northouse, 2013). These theories promote the “one best way” approach to leading by explaining how leaders combine both task and relationship behaviors to influence subordinates in their efforts to reach a goal (Komives et al., 2013; Northouse, 2013). An example of a style approach would be the Managerial Grid, now called the Leadership Grid, with updates in 1978, 1991, and 1999 (Blake & Mouton, 1964). The Leadership Grid uses axes of concern for people and concern for production with types of leadership demonstrated, such as “accommodating/country club management” and “authority-compliance” (Blake & McCauley, 1991, pp. 29, 54). The challenge with style-based leadership theories is that there is no universal style of leadership that could be effective in almost every situation (Northouse, 2013).

Building from style approaches, situational models speak to the varied nature of situations that leaders face; these models say that leaders should vary their leadership depending on the situation (Komives et al., 2013). Depending on the competence and

commitment of individuals they are leading, leaders should vary their leadership style to match (Northouse, 2013). For example, Hersey and Blanchard's (1969) "Four Leadership Styles" model focuses on the leader's directive and supportive behaviors toward followers. This is quite different than trait, skill, and style approaches of leadership in that these types of theories recognize the role that followers play as leaders employ their leadership. However, situational theories have not been validated with research and have been described as ambiguous, which makes it difficult to formulate specific, testable propositions (Dugan, 2017; Komives & Dugan, 2011; Northouse, 2013). Furthermore, this model relies on a leader's perception of the followers, which leaves an opportunity for biased evaluations from the leader (Dugan, 2017).

The historic arc of the leadership theories above called industrial leadership theories, which evolved to become more complex and adaptive, build to a new reciprocal relationship and understanding between leaders and followers called post-industrial leadership theories (Rost, 1991). This new way of thinking (post-industrial) was first proposed by James MacGregor Burns in *Leadership* (Burns, 1978):

Leadership is the reciprocal process of mobilizing by person with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers. (p. 425)

From Burns's seminal book, a whole new line of leadership theories has been developed related to understanding the leader-follower dynamic. Two of the more popular reciprocal theories, relational leadership and the Social Change Model for Leadership Development, are commonly utilized within collegiate LDPs and are discussed next.

Other post-industrial theories include chaos theory and authentic leadership (Dugan, 2017).

The above chronological articulation of the developmental history of leadership theories has been critiqued by Dugan (2017) and called “the story most often told” (p. 59). Dugan (2017) suggests there is a more critical and integrative way to looking at the arc of leadership theories, which better accounts for the cumulative evolution of theories. Dugan (2017) utilizes “bookend” theories of implicit leadership theory—“how people perceive leaders should be and how they actually show up” (p. 72) and Ospina et al.’s (2012) framework for strategic social change to ground the model. To showcase the evolution of leadership theory, Dugan (2017) employs six overlapping clusters: (a) person-centered theories; (b) theories of production and effectiveness; (c) group-centered theories; (d) theories of transformation; (e) relationship-centered theories; and (f) vanguard theories.

In conclusion, understanding the nature of “leadership” has shifted from leaders having some sort of trait or style, imposing their wills on their followers, to more nuanced ways of viewing leadership as a shared process between leaders, followers, and the spaces between. The following section takes the above concepts about leadership and connects them to collegiate LDPs.

Collegiate Leadership Development Theories

Many of the previous leadership development theories discussed above stem from the business world, are derived from an industrial approach, and are hierarchical in nature. In the preface for the Social Change Model (HERI, 1996), there is a discussion of

the need for a new approach to leadership education and development as the century ended. The purpose of the Social Change Model is to “prepare a new generation of leaders who understand that they can act as leaders to effect change without necessarily being in traditional leadership positions of power and authority” (HERI, 1996, p. 12).

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development was developed by an ensemble of leadership educators for implementation with college students (HERI, 1996). This model encourages college students to think about leadership as an inclusive process rather than as a position, and is designed to enrich the development of leadership qualities in all, not just those in formal leadership roles (Mencarini, 2017). The model focuses on the seven “C” values for social change encapsulated in the three levels of development (individual, group, and society levels). The “C” individual values are (a) *consciousness of self* where one focuses on self-awareness, as shaped in part by the influence of others; (b) acting in *congruence* with one’s values; and (c) developing a *commitment* and sense of responsibility toward some effort (HERI, 1996). The “C” group values are: (a) *collaboration*, where individuals work together and thus multiply effort, while also gaining multiple perspectives; (b) *common purpose* of sharing one vision; and (c) *controversy with civility*, which is the purposeful conflict that ultimately promotes the group’s development and ability to achieve positive social change for all (HERI, 1996). There is a single “C” community value of *citizenship*, where leaders see themselves as part of a greater whole, engaged in community and aware of issues that affect the entire group (HERI, 1996). There is an implied “eighth C” of social change, which gives meaning and purpose to the above seven Cs (HERI, 1996).

Included in the model are the reciprocal interactions between the three levels of development. Influenced by relational leadership models, such as those illustrated by Burns (1978) and Rost (1991), the Social Change Model of Leadership Development views leadership as a process between people rather than held by a single person or because of a title one holds (HERI, 1996). The intent of the leadership process is to benefit others and alter and improve the status quo (Skendall, 2017). Since its creation, it has been widely adopted by college and university leadership educators in helping to ground LDPs with a theoretical framework and data-backed research (Mencarini, 2017). A critique of the Social Change Model is that it neither explicitly include values associated with cultural competence, nor does it clearly explore the context within which one is demonstrating leadership (Komives & Dugan, 2011).

Another leadership development model developed specifically for college students is the Relational Leadership Model (RLM) (Komives et al., 2013). Leadership has much to do with relationships, and a theory that addresses this dynamic is relational leadership, which has been defined as “a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change” (Komives et al., 2013, p. 95). The RLM concentrates on five primary components: (a) being purposeful in one’s leadership; (b) including diverse points of view; (c) empowering others; (d) being ethical in nature; and (e) accomplishing goals by being process-orientated (Komives et al., 2013). Limitations of the RLM include that it may not resonate with students who view leadership from a positional lens and that the interconnections between the five components are not often explored (Komives & Dugan, 2011). Relationship-centered theories call attention to

potential inequalities within the leadership process (for example, the component of inclusion in the RLM), but fail to offer help or guidance about how leaders can navigate this practice (Dugan, 2017).

As highlighted by Komives et al. (2013), the leadership process calls for those engaged in it to be knowledgeable (knowing), to be aware of self and others (being), and to act (doing). This model, knowing-being-doing, is a holistic approach as the components are interrelated and cyclical (Komives et al., 2013). One way this model is implemented in collegiate LDPs is through student leadership competencies (Seemiller, 2013). By providing an intentional and measurable way of developing students as leaders, leadership competencies can create a mechanism for behavioral benchmarking (Seemiller, 2016).

Leadership Identity Development Theory

In addition to understanding the above collegiate leadership development theories, there is a significant collegiate leadership identity development theory (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Rather than focusing on the process of leadership exemplified by students at higher education institutions, the Leadership Identity Development (LID) theory centers on how college students develop a sense of themselves as leaders and demonstrate leadership. The LID model, based on the LID theory, is grounded in stage-development theory where college students can move through various levels to more complexity in understanding their leadership identity (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006). The model's six stages are (a) awareness—students become aware that leadership is happening around them; (b)

exploration/engagement—students experience groups for the first time and start their involvement; (c) leader identified—students begin to see themselves as leaders and take on responsibility; (d) leader differentiated—students recognize the role of others in the process; (d) generativity—students work to develop the leadership capacities of others; and (f) integration/synthesis—students see leadership as a life-long process (Komives et al., 2006). Understanding the LID model can help leadership educators think more critically about their programs and how to be more effective in delivering opportunities for students to practice their leadership capacities.

The previous section explored the history of leadership theories, college-specific leadership theories, and a leadership development identity model. The next sections pivot to understanding the research related to collegiate leadership development from an institutional, programmatic, and individual student level.

An Examination of Collegiate Leadership Development from Various Perspectives

The macro-meso-micro frame analysis is a useful way of studying the concept of leadership development from multiple perspectives. In this instance, leadership development in higher education will be explored from an institutional level, program level, and student-outcome level perspective; this section analyzes the literature from each level.

Institutional-level Analysis

The purpose of colleges and universities is multi-faceted. Higher education institutions not only help students to develop “prepared minds” on an individual level (Bok, 2013, p. 31), but on a societal level—“[colleges and universities] supply the

knowledge and ideas that create new industries, protect us from disease, preserve and enrich our culture, and inform us about our history, our environment, our society, and ourselves” (Bok, 2013, p. 1).

Chunoo and Osteen (2016) articulated a unique purpose for leadership education within higher education. They write,

The powerful alignment of leadership education to higher education’s mission lies in the fact that across three guiding purposes of higher education (economic development and career readiness, critical thinking, and a liberal education, citizenship and an engaged democracy), leadership education is ever-present as relevant and necessary. (p. 11)

Situated with why colleges and universities exist in U.S. society, the above quote makes a compelling argument that leadership education is central to higher education’s purpose.

Guthrie and Osteen (2016) challenged higher education to reclaim its role in development of student leadership capacities. As higher education has evolved over the years in the types of students attending, how and what classes are taught, what opportunities exist on campuses, and what the purpose of postsecondary education is, leadership and leadership development theories have also changed (Guthrie & Osteen, 2016). Guthrie and Osteen write, “The development of students’ identities and capacities to lead in their professional, personal, and communal lives has been, and currently remains, a higher education imperative and is the responsibility of all who work toward the betterment of our students” (p. 6).

Higher education institutions should link their mission statements and the presence of leadership education programs on campus (Chunoo & Osteen, 2016).

Furthermore, the literature is replete with suggestions that LDP mission statements should be associated with institutional mission statements (Chunoo & Osteen, 2016; Kezar, 2006). This alignment is discussed later in this chapter.

Researchers suggest it is the student experience during college, rather than institutional type, that develops leadership capacities. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) characterize most of the post-1990s research of institutional effects on leadership skills as follows:

Most studies find few, if any, independent effects on freshmen- to senior-year changes linked to institutional type, control, or size after adjusting for students' pre-college traits (usually including their initial evaluations of their leadership talents) and experiences during college. . . . Most of these studies suggest that various aspects of a campus's climate or the experiences students have while enrolled are more powerful predictors of leadership development than an institution's structural or organizational characteristics. (p. 236)

Students develop leadership skills through such disparate aspects of the co-curriculum as informal interaction with faculty, participation in clubs and organizations, time spent utilizing campus resources, and peer interactions (Astin, 1993; Kuh, 2008). Moreover, a variety of studies show that intentional participation in leadership curricular and co-curricular opportunities also develop a student's leadership capacities (Dugan, 2011; Dugan et al., 2011, 2013).

Program-level Analysis

This section examines the different types of LDPs at U.S. colleges and universities and how these different types may affect students' leadership development capacities.

In their research about the effectiveness of leadership programs, Dugan and Haber (2007) outlined three different types of co-curricular LDPs (short-term, moderate-term, and long-term). Short-term experiences were opportunities such as one-off workshops, conferences, or retreats. Moderate-term experiences were a single, semester-long course or a series of workshops or trainings. Multi-semester workshops, leadership certificate programs, or an emerging leaders program were classified as long-term experiences. In an analysis of the 2005 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL), all three types of experiences resulted in significantly higher socially responsible leadership scores for participants compared to non-participants (Dugan & Haber, 2007). Interestingly, short-term programs had a stronger impact than moderate- or long-term programs.

From the initial administration of the MSL, it was determined that only 2.5% of the 50,000 respondents said they had been in a curricular or co-curricular certificate program, 0.8% participated in a leadership minor program, and 0.8% received a leadership major (Owen & Komives, 2006). When expanded to taking a single leadership course, 18.8% had taken at least one leadership class.

According to Haber (2011), institutions should move beyond comprehensive leadership programs to integrative programs. Comprehensive programs can be described as having a wide scope or size (Haber, 2011). Differing from comprehensive programs, integrative leadership programs “weave together many different experiences, areas of content, and opportunities to create a more complete whole that facilitates leadership learning” (Haber, 2011, p. 233).

Student-outcome Level Analysis

In Owen and Komives's (2006) analysis, students who completed at least one leadership course scored significantly lower on socially responsible leadership scales than those who did not take any similar course. This result is somewhat surprising; one would expect students to have a higher level of demonstrated leadership. However, Owen and Komives (2006) surmised that

student self-perceptions of their ability to evidence certain leadership outcomes may be reduced when they are made aware of the complex history and theoretical underpinnings of the field of leadership. That is, the more theories they are exposed to, the more they are aware of what they do not know. (p. 5)

Therefore, students are more critical and score themselves lower now that they have been exposed to a more nuanced understanding of leadership. This may also be an explanation for why short-term LDPs produce greater gains in socially responsible leadership than moderate- or long-term initiatives (Dugan & Haber, 2007).

In another study, this time using the 2009 MSL, Dugan et al. (2011) determined a number of leadership development opportunities or programs had an effect on demonstrating socially responsible leadership. A majority of these programs were short term in length rather than mid- or long-term programs, which supports the findings of Owen and Komives (2006) and Dugan and Haber (2007). The findings included:

- Attending a conference or lecture/workshop series was a significant, positive predictor of all four socially responsible leadership domains (individual, group, society, and change).

- Participation in a single academic course or capstone leadership experience was a significant, positive predictor of three of four domains.
- Participation in a leadership living-learning community or outdoor leadership program was a significant, negative predictor on three of four domains.
- Being a part of a peer leadership team was a significant, positive predictor of individual and societal domains.
- Positional leadership training or service immersions was a significant, positive predictor of group and societal domains.
- Participation in a multicultural leadership program was a significant, positive predictor of societal and change domains.

As one can observe from these results, depending on the type of participation a particular student has within an LDP, there is typically a positive association with socially responsible leadership domains (with the sole exception of leadership living-learning community or outdoor leadership program).

The above portion of this chapter examined the macro-, meso-, and micro-level research related to LDPs. The next section delves deeper into the high-impact practices and distinctive aspects that lead to greater student gains in advancing leadership capacities.

Programmatic Themes that Affect Student Leadership Capacity Gains

How leadership is taught is “indefinitely more important in leveraging student leadership development than the platform of delivery” (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 6). Recent research has started to highlight “best practices” associated with student leadership

development (Dugan et al., 2013). This portion of the chapter explores these programmatic themes.

High-Impact Learning Practices of Leadership Development Programs

The idea of high-impact educational practices comes from George Kuh's (2008) writing for AAC&U. Using information from the National Survey for Student Engagement, Kuh (2008) identified 10 programmatic efforts that are impactful for student learning. High-impact learning pedagogies empirically shown to make a difference in leadership development should be integrated into educational interventions (Dugan, 2011; Dugan et al., 2011; Priest & Clegorne, 2015), such as efficacy-building experiences, interactions across and about difference, mentoring relationships, and experiential learning, based on research utilizing data from the 2012 iteration of the MSL (Dugan et al., 2013). Each of these four high-impact learning practices is discussed next.

Leadership self-efficacy is a key predictor of gains in leadership capacity as well as a factor in whether or not students actually enact leadership behaviors (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2010). Based on the work of Bandura (2007), leadership self-efficacy is defined as "one's internal belief in the likelihood that they will be successful when engaging in leadership" (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 6). In their research with the 2007 MSL, Dugan and Komives (2010) ran multiple hierarchical regressions to analyze the data. Dugan and Komives (2010) concluded that students' levels of self-efficacy for socially responsible leadership explained substantive amounts of variance across the Social Change Model constructs. This is important because self-efficacy can be supported with intentional interventions such as (a) mastery experiences that build skills,

which can be generalized to other contexts; (b) vicarious experiences, where one observes others successfully completing challenging tasks; (c) verbal persuasion, which encourages the student to face a difficult challenge; and (d) assessment of physiological and affective states, which recognizes stress and acts to reduce anxiety (Bandura, 2007).

Socio-cultural conversations with peers are the single strongest predictor of socially responsible leadership (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2010). These types of conversations are defined as “formal and informal dialogues with peers about differences . . . as well as interactions across difference. . . . Topics include, but are not limited to, race/ethnicity, lifestyle and customs, social issues, political values, and religious beliefs” (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 9). This may impact leadership development because it requires students to (a) clarify their own perspectives; (b) seek a better understanding of others’ world views; (c) comprehend how personal values fit into larger societal structures and perspectives; and (d) discern how to work with different communities to initiate positive change (Dugan et al., 2013). Research has shown that social-perspective taking, which can be enacted through socio-cultural conversations, has a strong direct effect on group-level socially responsible leadership values and an indirect effect on societal leadership values (Dugan et al., 2014). Leadership educators should be trained (and also should provide in-depth training for students) to facilitate leadership education on multicultural perspectives and how to facilitate dialogue around challenging socio-cultural issues (Dugan et al., 2013).

Mentorship has also shown to be a high-impact pedagogical practice for leadership development (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2010). The MSL

defines a mentor as “a person who intentionally assisted the student’s growth or connects the student to opportunities for career or personal development” (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 12). Students may be mentored by faculty, staff, employers, family members, community members, and/or peers. It probably is not shocking that meaningful, developmental relationships make a significant difference in students’ leadership capacity. However, creating an atmosphere for mentorship to happen can be difficult, as mentor-mentee relationships do not just happen by matching two people together. LDPs can train mentors on how to engage in developmentally appropriate conversations with their mentees, and also share with mentees the benefits of mentorship and how to utilize and leverage their mentor experience to enhance their leadership capacities (Dugan et al., 2013).

Experiential learning opportunities, such as service learning and participation in off-campus activities, have been determined to help students develop their socially responsible leadership (Dugan et al., 2013). With community service, students have the ability to enhance group-related capacities, deepen their personal commitments, work together to create change, and investigate systems that cause inequities in our society (Dugan et al., 2013). Not only should students participate in community service, but educators must create an opportunity for students to reflect on the leadership constructs being taught (Dugan et al., 2013). Wagner and Pigza (2016) warn, however, of five common tensions among community service learning opportunities and leadership development, including (a) intentionality behind the service work; (b) role of failure in the projects; (c) participation of the off-campus group in the design of projects; (d) the

need to learn about the communities that are being served, which they call “pre-requisites of agency” (p. 12); and (e) the emotional risk needed by both sides as learning across cultures presents itself.

Participation in off-campus activities has also been shown to aid in the enhancement of socially responsible leadership (Dugan et al., 2013). Off-campus activities have been defined as “engaged membership in community-based or work organizations unaffiliated with colleges and universities” (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 17). Perhaps more importantly, off-campus organizational memberships emerged as particularly influential for students of color (Dugan et al., 2013).

Characteristics of Distinctive Leadership Developments

Eich (2008) determined 16 programmatic attributes in three clusters which determined high-quality leadership programs through a grounded study with 63 interviews of leadership educators. Those three clusters are (a) participants engaged in building and sustaining a learning community; (b) student-centered experiential learning experiences; and (c) research-grounded continuous program development (Eich, 2008). The first cluster focuses on the humans who compose the programs and how they relate to each other. Considerations include who the students are, who the leadership educators are, and how they are all supported through the program (Eich, 2008). The second cluster relates to what was structured into the LDPs to help students build their leadership capacities, such as how students practice concepts together and individually (in meetings, retreats, reflections, etc.; Eich, 2008). The last cluster encompasses three attributes that include flexible program design to accommodate student interests, content anchored in

modeled leadership values, and systems thinking applied for constant program improvement (Eich, 2008).

Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) further developed Eich's work with five characteristics of distinctive curricular and co-curricular programs: (a) intentionally designed programs; (b) authentic leadership learning environments; (c) application of knowledge, skills, and values; (d) meaning making through reflection; and (e) continuous program improvement. The focus of these characteristics included learning outcomes for programs and connecting these outcomes with specific pedagogies, the role of instructors and the "supportive yet challenging" environment needed for leadership development to occur, and opportunities for application of leadership concepts in real-world environments (classrooms, student organizations, and service learning) with intentional reflection questions built into the process.

There are similarities and differences between Dugan et al.'s (2013) high-impact practices, Eich's (2008) high-quality LDP characteristics, and Guthrie and Jenkins's (2018) attributes (Table 2.1). First, Guthrie and Jenkins's (2018) attributes are not grounded in peer-reviewed research protocols but gathered through an "extensive literature review" (p. 95). No additional information is given related to how Guthrie and Jenkins's list was created or what process was utilized in producing their characteristics. Each programmatic theme compilation included service learning pedagogies and reflection as integral to the distinctiveness of LDPs. Eich's (2008) list of characteristics included specific attributes related to the individuals involved (for example, social identities), whereas Dugan et al.'s (2013) and Guthrie and Jenkins's (2018)

characteristics integrated the role of the instructors and importance of mentorship in the leadership development process.

Table 2.1

Comparison of Leadership Development Best Practices

	Developed by ...	Interactions with diverse others	Programs' opportunities open to all students	Experiential learning?	Reflection as an aspect of program?	Continuous program development
Dugan et al.'s (2013) high impact practices	Using the 2012 MSL survey data	Yes; through socio-cultural conversations	Yes	Yes; such as community service and memberships in off-campus organizations	Yes; to "interrogate their personal values and challenge normative assumptions"	Not highlighted
Eich's (2008) high-quality LDP attributes	Qualitative study of 62 interviews with leadership educators	Yes; students encounter "episodes of difference"	No; selected "diverse and engaged" students	Yes; individually and collectively; through various service to community, campus, program	Yes; connecting leadership theory, their experiences, and themselves	Yes; use of systems thinking, modeled on student outcomes
Guthrie and Jenkins's (2018) characteristics of distinctive curricular and co-curricular programs	Review of existing literature	Not highlighted	Not highlighted	Yes; finding environments for application of knowledge, skills, and values	Yes; make explicit connections between experiences and learning outcomes	Yes; assessment is important when making improvements

Additional Considerations for Leadership Development Programs

Collegiate leadership programs should also be grounded in post-industrial, relational leadership theories. The three widely used theories in higher education leadership programs are the Social Change Model (HERI, 1996), the Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2013), and the Leadership Challenge (Kouzes &

Posner, 2012; Rosch & Anthony, 2012). According to the 2009 MSL-IS, 64% of leadership programs reported utilizing such leadership theories to help inform their programmatic efforts (Owen, 2012). Eighty-two percent of programs employed the Social Change Model (HERI, 1996) often or very often, with relational theories (56%) and servant leadership (51%) applied the most next frequently (Greenleaf, 1977; Komives et al., 2013). Despite the use of these post-industrial, relational theories, programs that are developed for non-positional leaders are still grounded in personal development using self-awareness tools (such as Covey's *7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Myers-Briggs's Type Inventory, or Rath's StrengthsQuest) instead of theoretical or conceptual models of leadership (Dugan, 2011; Owen, 2012).

LDPs should be offered when students are developmentally ready (Dugan et al., 2013; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). The LID model can help leadership educators determine which programs may be ideal for students (Komives et al., 2005). For example, leadership educators should not be creating workshops about how to leave their legacy and develop other leaders in their organization (something from the generativity stage of the LID model) when students are in the exploration/engagement stage of just identifying themselves as having the capacity to lead. As evidenced in this study and the research, social-perspective taking, which can be enhanced through socio-cultural conversations, requires higher level cognitive skills (Dugan et al., 2014). Leadership educators should be cognizant about who their audience is and what their identity and psychosocial development level may be when providing lectures, trainings, workshops, etc.

Based on Dugan's (2011) "heretical," but realistic assertion that not just anyone can be a leader, leadership educators and programs should take into consideration that the process of learning leadership can be unsafe for some students, given privilege and oppression within socially constructed systems. Increased attention to dimensions of social identity and systematic oppression are necessary for LDPs and has a multitude of outcomes. Not only should leadership educators be aware of what social identities are participating in their programs (Eich, 2008), but educators should also be mindful of what social identities are not participating (and why). Furthermore, leadership programs should take into account the varying nature of how leadership capacities are developed and how leadership is expressed within different individual social identities (Rosch, Collier, & Thompson, 2015). Finally, an individual's privileged identities also need to be challenged to understand minoritized identities. Recognizing how different people may view a situation through different lenses could affect how a particular leader demonstrates leadership. This skill, however, requires students to be developmentally ready, not just in their leadership identity but also psychosocially, cognitively, and morally.

The previous section explored what many consider to be "best practices" within college and university LDPs. Utilizing the MSL dataset, Dugan et al. (2013) developed a set of four high-impact practices for leadership development. Eich (2008) and Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) created their own distinctive LDP characteristics, which overlap but also differ from Dugan et al.'s (2013) attributes. Moreover, additional researchers added other themes to consider, such as grounding programs in post-industrial leadership

models (Dugan, 2011; Owen, 2008) and acknowledging how social identities may impact how students engage in LDPs (Dugan, 2011; Rosch et al., 2015). The next section investigates the research behind the CAS Standards which helps to frame the MSL-IS and methodology, answering Research Question 3.

Research Related to CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs (SLPs)

The general CAS (2015) Standards include 12 common characteristics to all higher education functional areas. The mission of the CAS Standards “is to promote the improvement of programs and services to enhance the quality of student learning and development” and are “designed to provide suggestions and illustrations that can assist in establishing programs and services that more fully address the needs of students than those mandated by a standard” (CAS, 2015, n.p.). The 12 general standards are mission; program; organization and leadership; human resources; ethics; law, policy, and governance; diversity, equity, and access; institutional and external relations; financial resources; technology; facilities and equipment; and assessment and evaluation.

Developed in 1996 and revised in 2002 and 2009, the CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs (SLPs) provide guidance for establishing and maintaining high-quality leadership programs (CAS, 2015). Leadership educators can utilize the standards to evaluate programs, as they are designed to apply broadly across institutional types and sizes (CAS, 2015).

Utilizing the frame of the CAS Standards, the variables investigated for this study from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS focus mostly on five general standards: mission, program, human resources, financial resources, and assessment and evaluation general

standards. The research pertaining to these general standards is explored in this section of the chapter.

Mission

According to the CAS Standards for SLPs, “Student leadership development must be an integral part of the institution’s educational mission” (CAS, 2015, p. 5). The notion of developing students as leaders is embedded in many college mission statements, and this reflects the importance of graduating future leaders who can positively contribute to society (Troyer, 2004). However, the question has been raised in higher education regarding the alignment of institutional missions, visions, and strategic plans with the development, implementation, and operations of collegiate LDPs (Chunoo & Osteen, 2016).

In an investigation of 312 college and university mission statements about the learning goals for undergraduate students, researchers determined that approximately 100 mission statements mentioned leadership skills (Meacham & Gaff, 2006). In the same study, Meacham and Gaff (2006) found that many significant student learning goals were “widely discussed and valued among faculty, students, parents, employers, and the general public appear in the mission statement of fewer than 15 percent of these ‘best’ American college and universities” (p. 9). They recognized that student leadership development skills were limited to divisions of student affairs, but they nevertheless contended the importance attached to the leadership learning goal among the university leaderships necessitated its inclusion in most universities’ mission statements.

Ozdem (2011) analyzed the mission and vision statements on the strategic plans of higher education institutions and found that the most common phrases in the mission statements were about providing services for the education of a qualified workforce and research. He argued that the success of a strategic plan depends on the correct identification and formulation of the vision and mission statements, which reflects the organization's culture.

In the exploration of leadership center program mission statements, almost 85% of leadership development centers emphasized leaders and most of the centers had leader behaviors in their mission statements; however, fewer leadership center mission statements included followers (30%) or environmental contexts (20%) (Lunsford & Brown, 2017). The authors highlighted this as a disconnect between leadership theory and practice (Lunsford & Brown, 2017).

Program

The CAS Standards for SLPs articulate the need for LDPs to (a) collaborate across the academy; (b) establish learning outcomes related to knowledge acquisition, cognitive complexity, intrapersonal development, interpersonal competence, humanitarianism and civic engagement, and practical competence; and (c) be intentionally designed programs delivered through multiple avenues (e.g., workshops, classes, retreats, conferences) and grounded within leadership development theories (CAS, 2015).

Collaboration. The interdisciplinary nature of leadership in general is highlighted within the CAS Standards for SLPs (CAS, 2015). As leadership draws from

multiple contexts, such as political science, management, history, psychology, sociology, anthropology, biology, education, philosophy, and public administration, integrated learning associated with leadership is necessary (Haber, 2011; Sorenson, 2007). Dugan (2017) highlighted that interdisciplinary approaches to leadership development are integrative and synergistic, as opposed to multidisciplinary approaches which are additive in nature. This integrated learning cannot happen without collaborations across the institution.

The decentralization of leadership programs on many campuses has led to content silos and the loss of integrated, collaborative efforts (Allen, Shankman, & Haber-Curran, 2016; Guthrie & Osteen, 2016; Owen, 2012). Owen (2012) highlighted that many of the collaboration partners for LDPs exist within student activities (83% of 2009 MSL-IS respondents answered “often” or “very often”) and other student affairs functional areas, but not with academic departments (only 42%). Creating true collaboration is difficult and challenging on a college campus; rather than thinking of collaborations as good or bad, Allen et al. (2016) suggest viewing collaborations as a “spectrum of choices to be constantly made and assessed around alignment and integration” (pp. 87–88).

Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes describe “what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce based on their learning histories” (Maki, 2004, p. 88). High-quality learning outcomes are critical in curricular and co-curricular planning for LDPs (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). The CAS SLP categories related to learning outcomes include foundations of leadership, personal development, interpersonal development, and the development of groups, organizations, and systems (CAS, 2015).

Eighty percent of LDPs have specified leadership outcomes, although the assessment and evaluation of the outcomes is generally lacking or immature (Owen, 2012). More information about assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes is discussed later in this chapter, as assessment is one of the CAS general standards.

Intentionally designed programs. Both Eich (2008) and Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) describe intentionally designed programs as a characteristic of high-achieving LDPs. Recent research highlights a disconnect between what leadership development centers and programs are doing and what the literature recommends for the leadership programs (Lunsford & Brown, 2017; Owen, 2012). As discussed earlier in Chapter I, there is a significant difference between leader development and leadership development (Day, 2011; Day et al., 2014). Lunsford and Brown (2017) found about half of their sample used leader-centric views (focusing on leader competencies and skills) rather than follower, context, or process-focused theories. Owen (2012) similarly determined almost two-thirds of respondents relied on personality inventories as major portions of their programmatic efforts. This research sought to take another snapshot to determine if LDPs are more aligned with leadership development than leader development.

Moreover, research has indicated that a best practice for leadership development is the incorporation of mentoring opportunities for leaders, both being mentored by others and for mentoring peers (Dugan et al., 2013; Komives et al., 2006; Solansky, 2010). Lunsford and Brown (2017) determined that less than half of their sample of leadership development centers utilized mentoring or coaching practices as an aspect of their programmatic efforts.

Financial and Human Resources

Although the CAS Standards for SLPs have separate general standards for human resources and financial resources, the research tends to incorporate both together.

Therefore, the next section will examine the two jointly.

For leadership programs to be successful, institutions need to provide enough financial and human resources to execute their programs. An analysis of the MSL-IS and the MSL datasets produced interesting conclusions about collegiate leadership development environments (Owen, 2008). Using a cluster analysis, Owen was able to compute three distinct sets of institution types when it came to leadership development: (a) “highly resourced, highly productive, highly intentional” programs ($n = 13$); (b) “limited resources, moderately productive, moderately intentional” programs ($n = 13$); and (c) “moderately resourced, moderately productive, less intentional” programs ($n = 19$) (p. 110). There was a fourth outlier cluster ($n = 7$) that had no clear responses to be placed into one of the other three clusters. It seemed that the difference between Cluster 2 and 3 was the emphasis on staff positions for Cluster 2. This can probably account for the “moderate” level of intentionality rather than the “less” intentionality of Cluster 3.

Owen (2008) conducted further analysis of the clusters. For Cluster 1, the institutions are more likely to be at further advanced stages of “enhancing quality” or “sustained institutionalization” of leadership programs, have a higher likelihood of having a leadership center on campus, and maintain high numbers of staff dedicated solely to and affiliated with leadership programming. Every institution in Cluster 1 uses

the Social Change Model as its theoretical frame and they have the highest amounts of programming, regardless of audience (Owen, 2008).

Differences between Cluster 2 and 3 are more blurred. Although they have similar average numbers of staff affiliated with leadership programs, programs in Cluster 2 have a higher average number of full-time staff devoted to programs (Owen, 2008). This may indicate that while institutions in Cluster 3 fund their programs at higher levels, institutions in Cluster 2 devote a greater percentage of resources to funding staff positions, a figure that was not considered in the expenditures question (Owen, 2008). While both clusters of institutions offer a similar average number of programs, institutions in Cluster 2 offer higher numbers of programs for positional leaders, while institutions in Cluster 3 have higher mean numbers of open programs or programs targeted at specific leadership subgroups (Owen, 2008).

In addition to the analysis above, there were several other supportive findings for the 2009 MLS-IS (Owen, 2012). There is an impression that many universities and colleges have robust LDPs; however, the realization is that many campuses find themselves in the early stages of “building critical mass” (Owen, 2012). And in the process of “building critical mass,” many institutions are operating as a siloed program rather than incorporating important stakeholders from other departments (Owen, 2012).

Leadership educators must be knowledgeable about leadership theory and leadership development. Educators must be appropriately trained in leadership theory, as well as the integration and facilitation of learning pedagogies known to leverage leadership development (Dugan, 2011). According to Owen (2012), leadership educator

preparedness varies greatly. Out of 82 respondents to the MSL-IS, 46 (52%) reported little to no coursework in leadership studies. In the same study, Owen (2012) also found a need for ongoing education of leadership educators. Dugan (2011) highlights that the lack of training among educators creates an increased likelihood that leadership program content falls back to being positional leadership training rather than true leadership development.

Assessment and Evaluation

Leadership programs should also be assessed on a regular basis (CAS, 2015), and 80% of leadership educators actually assess student learning (Owen, 2012). Yet Owen (2012) found that much of the assessment consisted of usage data (99%), satisfaction assessment (92%), and self-report assessment (67%). The research showed that leadership educators are regularly assessing their programs, but have a difficult time making full use of the data. If better student learning assessment was conducted, Owen suggests that data could be used for program advocacy.

Assessing the concept of “leadership” is no easy task (Owen, 2011). There are numerous ways to define “leadership” and theories to describe it; thus, it is difficult to clarify skills, attitudes, and behaviors associated with the idea that one wants to measure. Additionally, many of the assessments related to leadership are self-reported, which may not truly capture an accurate picture (Owen, 2011). Furthermore, there are various levels of leadership to observe (individual, group, or society levels), so assessing just one area may not represent the entirety. Leadership educators also face a balance of the amount of time, energy, and resources it takes to gather assessment data with how to utilize the data.

Despite these challenges, LDPs should be assessed regularly with thorough and comprehensive assessments with findings that enhance these offerings.

According to Owen (2012), 50% of leadership programs had a strategic planning process and yet only 14% of the total number engaged so on a yearly basis. Owen (2012) suggests that leadership educators need to commit to a strategic planning process each year and to do more to involve a variety of stakeholders (students, other administrators, potentially community members) in the process. Incorporating strategic planning into the design and delivery of collegiate LDPs is important (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Specifically, they called for programs to include (a) process, outcome, and impact objectives that are clearly stated and measurable; (b) a clearly stated evaluation plan that includes dissemination of results to all stakeholders and the use of results in planning and decision-making; and (c) a process for strategic planning and visioning that goes beyond 3-5 years (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999).

The previous section of this chapter discussed ways that leadership educators can create strong LDPs through alignment for five of the general standards from the CAS (2015) Standards: (a) mission statements that are connected with institutional statements; (b) programs that collaborate, have learning outcomes, and are intentionally designed with developmental theories in mind; (c) enough financial and human resources to accomplish its mission and goals; and (d) assessing and strategic planning built into the fabric of leadership programs.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the current literature related to LDPs within U.S. colleges and universities. The chapter started with an exploration of how leadership development became a functional area within higher education. The history of the concept of “leadership” and leadership theories, and non-collegiate-based and collegiate-based theories was examined. A closer look at the literature associated with LDPs was surveyed related to institutional, programmatic, and student-levels. High-impact practices and distinctive characteristics of LDPs were investigated to assess which programmatic aspects have the greatest positive effect on student leadership gains. Finally, research connected with five specific CAS Standards of SLPs were assessed as the MSL-IS variables for this study are framed by the standards.

As discussed in this chapter, there is a plethora of literature about LDPs; however, there is a dearth of information related to if and how the functional areas of leadership development have matured over the years. There is a good snapshot from the 2009 MSL-IS of where the structures of LDPs stood at that time. This study provides another snapshot to gain a better sense of the advancement or regression of LDPs.

Additionally, there is a general understanding of high-impact practices and distinctive characteristics of successful leadership programs (Dugan et al., 2013; Eich, 2008; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). Nevertheless, it is not known how many institutions are utilizing recommended standards to improve their LDPs. Another expectation of this study is to further the research on the theory-to-practice connection within the field. As

LDPs mature within colleges and universities, they should continue to evolve and utilize such hallmarks to become more effective in their missions.

The next chapter delves deeper into the research methodology of the study, including more information about the research design, sample and sampling procedure, the instrument (MSL-IS), data collection procedures, data analysis, and potential limitations.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The previous two chapters outlined the context for this study of leadership development programs (LDP) as well as what is known in regard to the latest literature and research. Again, the purpose of this study was to determine what types of relationships exist between overall LDP institutionalization and structural components of LDPs and to understand how the structural components of LDPs may have changed over a 6-year timespan. The research questions are:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between overall LDP institutionalization and various programmatic and institutional characteristics as measured by the 2015 MSL-IS survey?

Research Question 2: Is there a difference between level of institutionalization for LDPs from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS surveys?

Research Question 3: Is there a difference in LDP characteristics between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS survey related to five CAS Student Leadership Program (SLP) Standards (mission, program, financial resources, human resources, and assessment and strategic planning)?

This chapter provides for an in-depth understanding of the methodology for this study. In the first section, the research design is discussed. Then the sample of

institutions that completed the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership – Institutional Study (MSL-IS) in 2009 and 2015 is explained. A further exploration of the MSL-IS instrument and how data were collected are articulated. The last portion of the chapter contains the data analysis that was conducted and limitations are considered.

Research Design

The research design utilized for this study aligns with the work of Owen (2008, 2012). A quantitative analysis of LDPs was employed to examine the structural components as it provides a way for the findings to be more generalizable for program application. The institutions for the study were chosen based on their participation in the 2009 and 2015 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (see Appendix B and C). The companion survey, MSL-IS, was employed to gather data related to leadership development elements at the programmatic and institutional level. Thus, a convenience sampling technique was applied. As discussed below, the MSL-IS was developed specifically to measure structural and programmatic components of leadership programs and is the first survey to intentionally measure institutional leadership development environments (Owen, 2008, 2012).

A correlation analysis determined the relationship between the institutionalization of LDPs and programmatic and institutional elements (Research Question 1). To answer Research Question 2, a *t*-test was run to determine if there was a difference in the reported level of institutionalization of LDPs between 2009 and 2015. Utilizing the results of the correlation analysis, *t*-tests and chi square analyses were run with both cross-sectional and longitudinal cohort designs to determine if there was any difference in

the programmatic and institutional characteristics related to institutionalization of LDPs. Finally, to determine general changes within the student leadership development field between the 2009 and 2015 iterations of the MSL-IS, a series of descriptive statistics, *t*-tests, and chi square analyses were utilized to understand the differences related to the study variables (Research Question 3).

Sample

The population for this study is U.S. higher education institutions with LDPs. A convenience sample of institutions that participated in the 2009 and 2015 MSL were encouraged to also participate in the MSL-IS administered in each of those years.

The 2009 MSL-IS survey was sent to 103 institutions that participated in the MSL that year. Of the 103 surveys, 96 were returned and 90 of them were deemed complete. Because the data analysis requires comparing two data sets, in order to keep the data sets independent the 21 institutions that completed both the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS were removed. This left 69 institutions in the 2009 data (Appendix B). For the 2015 MSL-IS survey, 98 representatives from institutions were asked to respond. Of those 98 institutions, five were institutions outside the U.S. and were eliminated from this study as this study only examined U.S. LDPs. From the remaining 93 institutions, eight institutions did not respond. A total of 85 institutions either completed ($n = 71$) or partially completed ($n = 14$) the survey. The partially completed surveys were not included in this study. The list of U.S. institutions for this study that fully completed the 2015 MSL-IS, and which were included in this study, can be found in Appendix C.

There were 21 institutions that completed the MSL-IS in both 2009 and 2015. Again, the partially completed surveys were not utilized in this study. The final list of those institutions incorporated into this study can be found in Appendix D.

Instrumentation

The MSL-IS was crafted by the MSL research team to gather programmatic and institutional data related to the leadership development initiatives at the participating campuses (Owen, 2008, 2012). According to Owen (2008),

Questions were theoretically derived by the research team from a thorough review of the leadership evaluation literature, comply with Berdie, Anderson, and Niebuhr's (1986) guidelines for designing a questionnaire, and were reduced according to Cronbach's (1982) divergent and convergent evaluation question process as outlined in Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003). (pp. 71–72)

In addition to the rigorous nature while developing the instrument, a pilot test was created at the University of Maryland, College Park, with two content experts in co-curricular leadership development providing feedback on question language, response options, and the organization of the survey (Owen, 2008).

The 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS were utilized to collect data for this study. The 2009 MSL-IS consisted of 74 items that asked for (a) basic demographic information about the institution; (b) descriptions of the leadership programs, including mission, programmatic elements (such as theoretical background, types of programs offered); (c) staffing levels; (d) financial resources; and (e) assessment and evaluation methods (Owen, 2012). Responses varied from categorical/multiple choice formats, open-ended responses, to 4-point Likert scales ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (4) *strongly agree* (Owen,

2012). The Cronbach alpha reliability estimates on the survey were listed as (a) program structure questions ($\alpha=.84$); (b) program method ($\alpha=.85$); (c) program administration ($\alpha=.87$); and (d) program consequence measures ($\alpha=.92$) (Owen, 2012).

There were a few changes in the questions and response options between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS iterations. The 2015 MSL-IS included additional questions about leadership educator preparedness, specifically around (a) coursework related to pedagogy, learning assessment, or curriculum development, and (b) coursework about facilitating multicultural or intercultural development (J. Owen, personal communication, March 26, 2018; MSL-IS, 2015). Also, there were slight tweaks to some questions with new or updated information (for example, response options of emotionally intelligent leadership and critical social theory were added to the 2015 MSL-IS question about theories or models used to inform their co-curricular LDPs). Seeing as the 2009 MSL-IS was only slightly modified for the 2015 iteration, Cronbach alphas can continue to be assumed to be accurate from 2009.

Data Collection

The 2009 MSL-IS, administered between January and April 2009, was sent digitally to all 103 institutions that participated in the 2009 MSL iteration (Owen, 2012). Because the listed name as the campus contact for the MSL may not have worked in the student leadership center, a request was made to forward the survey “to the person or persons most knowledgeable about co-curricular and curricular leadership programs on campus” (Owen, 2012, p. 9). It was suggested that institutions pull together a team of individuals familiar with the programs to complete the survey (Owen, 2012). “Anecdotal

information indicates that as many as half of participating institutions used this method to complete the MSL-IS instrument” (Owen, 2012, p. 9). Institutions were encouraged to complete the MSL-IS by their MSL study team contact and also asked to submit documents related to LDPs (J. Owen, personal communication, March 26, 2018).

The data collection for the 2015 MSL-IS was very similar to the 2009 version, although there were some slight differences. The 2015 MSL-IS, administered between January and April 2015, was also digitally distributed to all 98 institutions that participated in the 2015 MSL survey (J. Owen, personal communication, March 26, 2018). The same two special requests regarding the institutions that completed the survey in 2009 were also made—to forward the survey to the person most knowledgeable about the institution’s leadership programs and to gather a group together to complete the survey (J. Owen, personal communication, March 26, 2018). However, compared to the 2009 survey, the follow-up reminders about the MSL-IS were made through email requests rather than a more personal outreach from the MSL study team contact and no additional request for documents were made (J. Owen, personal communication, March 26, 2018).

The 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS administrations were both approved by the Loyola University Chicago Institutional Review Board (IRB). For this study, approval from the University of North Carolina Greensboro IRB was sought and was determined not to require IRB approval (Appendix E).

Data Analysis Plan

The initial step of the data analysis was to prepare the data. Since the data were already collected, the institutional responses were reviewed for completeness. Eighty-eight and 71 responses were deemed acceptable for the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS, respectively. A further check of the data did not reveal any apparent outliers or clearly falsified data.

For Research Question 1, a correlation analysis was completed to determine the relationship between level of institutionalization and various programmatic and institutional variables. The variables selected to be utilized in the correlation analysis were based on research about LDPs. The variables employed were (a) institution strategic plan incorporates leadership development; (b) program open to all students; (c) program open to those with leadership positions; (d) programs focused on leadership education; (e) programs focused on leadership development; (f) programs focused on skill building; (g) institution has a leadership center; (h) program has a strategic planning process; (i) program has mentoring relationships; (j) program incorporates socio-cultural conversations; (k) program includes service opportunities; and (l) institutionalization of LDP in 2009.

A *t*-test was run to compare the level of institutionalization reported, based on a four-point Likert scale question, in the full 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS datasets to find if there was a difference between the reported levels in the intervening six years (Research Question 2). Because there was a significant difference found between the two samples, the results of Research Question 1 were utilized to determine if there was a difference

between the variables that were found to correlate to level of institutionalization. Chi square analyses and *t*-tests were run, if possible, to determine differences in those variables. Furthermore, a cohort of 21 institutions completed both the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS; a matched pair-sample *t*-test was run to determine if there was a difference in level of institutionalization for that cohort of 21 institutions. Where appropriate, effect sizes of significant results were calculated.

Finally, for Research Question 3, a series of descriptive statistics, *t*-tests, and chi square analyses were completed to determine if there was a difference in the institutional responses from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS related to the five CAS SLP standards (mission, program, financial resources, human resources, and assessment and strategic planning).

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The first limitation is that there is some uncertainty about who filled out the survey. As indicated earlier in this chapter, the MSL-IS was sent to the institutional contact for the administration of the survey. This person may or may not have the most accurate information about LDPs on a particular campus. Although it was requested that the person who complete the MSL-IS be knowledgeable about curricular and co-curricular initiatives, the survey could have been filled out by someone else. This limitation was attempted to be addressed by a request made to pull together a team of individuals familiar with campus LDPs to complete the survey. Furthermore, the first question of both the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS attempted to

address this concern by asking the respondent to indicate their “personal knowledge about all existing student leadership development opportunities on your campus.”

Another limitation is that there could be dependency in the data, as this study examines leadership programs which are nested together with institutional characteristics. The study did not utilize more advanced statistical analyses, such as multi-level or hierarchical models, to probe deeper into the relationships given the limited sample size to the number of variables in the study. Therefore, it is prudent to use caution in any assumptions and conclusions made from the results.

The third and final limitation is related to the convenience sampling method utilized in the study. Only institutions that participated in the MSL were invited to complete the MSL-IS. This could mean that the MSL-IS study population is less representative of the full institutional population with LDPs due to self-selection. Institutions that know about the MSL and know how to use the MSL data for effective assessment purposes may have had a different type of LDPs than what a random sample might have produced.

Conclusion

This current chapter examined the methodology of the study and the intended data analyses. The researcher determined that a quantitative analysis of the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS datasets would best address the research questions. The MSL-IS is an instrument developed specifically to measure programmatic and institutional structural elements for LDPs. Sixty-nine responses were utilized from institutions in 2009 and 71 institutional answers were used from the 2015 MSL-IS. A combination of *t*-tests, chi

square, and correlation analyses were conducted to answer the three research questions.

The subsequent chapters will report the results, conclusions, and implications of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

One purpose of this study was to utilize the 2009 and 2015 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership – Institutional Survey (MSL-IS) iterations to determine if there have been changes in the structural environments of participating U.S. higher education leadership development programs (LDPs) over the intervening 6 years. This chapter provides the demographic information of the institutional participants and the statistical analyses that answered the research questions to describe any shifts in LDP institutionalization and LDP programmatic and institutional characteristics. All analyses were carried out using the statistical software SPSS, version 24.0.

Demographics of the Sample

Using the IPEDS institutional identifier, institutional characteristics were obtained from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education website (n.d.), which were last updated in 2015. Table 4.1 provides a summary of institutional classifications. The final sample size of the 2009 MSL-IS iteration was 69. Of those, over half were private not-for-profit 4-year institutions ($n = 37$) with public 4-year schools slightly behind with 31. There was slightly more Masters schools ($n = 31$) than Doctoral campuses ($n = 25$). The 2015 MSL-IS sample consisted of 71 institutions. In this sample, there were less private not-for-profit 4-year institutions than in 2009 ($n_{2015} = 27$ vs. $n_{2009} = 37$). The size of institutions in 2015 were distributed small ($n = 11, 15.5\%$),

medium ($n = 20$, 28.2%), and large ($n = 40$, 56.3%). As with the 2009 sample, Masters ($n = 28$) and Doctoral ($n = 34$) institutions were most prevalent in the sample.

Table 4.1

Demographics of Sample Institutions

	2009	2015
Total sample	69	71
Sector of institutions		
Public 4 year	31	41
Private not-for-profit 4 year	37	27
Public 2 year	1	3
Size of institution		
Small	17	11
Medium	22	20
Large	30	40
Carnegie classification		
Associate	1	3
Baccalaureate	12	6
Masters	31	28
Doctoral	25	34

Research Question 1

What relationship is there between overall LDP institutionalization and various programmatic and institutional characteristics as measured by the 2015 MSL-IS survey?

To answer Research Question 1, a correlation analysis was run to determine which variables may be related to institutionalization of LDPs in 2015. The results show

that institutionalization of LDPs in 2015 had a positive significant relationship to (a) an institution having a leadership center ($r = .46, p < .001$); (b) programs primarily focused on leadership education ($r = .29, p = .016$); and (c) programs incorporating mentoring relationships ($r = .44, p < .001$). Level of institutionalization was negatively related to (a) programs primarily focused on individual skill building and development ($r = -.29, p = .016$); and (b) institutionalization of LDPs in 2009 ($r = -.30, p = .011$). A full correlation analysis table can be found in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Correlation Analysis of Level of LDP Institutionalization with Various Variables

	Institutionalization of LDP in 2015		Institutionalization of LDP in 2015
Institution strategic plan incorporates leadership development	-.05	Institution has a leadership center	.46**
Program open to all students	.04	Program has a strategic planning process	-.23
Program open to those with leadership positions	-.22	Program has mentoring relationships	.44**
Programs focused on leadership education	.29*	Program incorporates socio- cultural conversations	.20
Programs focused on leadership development	.22	Program includes service opportunities	.10
Programs focused on skill building	-.29*	Institutionalization of LDP in 2009	-.30*

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

Research Question 2

Is there a difference between level of institutionalization for LDPs from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS surveys?

There were two different types of analyses conducted to answer this research question. The first set of analyses was completed with an independent *t*-test of the full data from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS. The second set of analyses was done with a cohort of 21 institutions who responded to both the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS instruments.

Cross-sectional

Based on the results of the correlation analysis, the following survey questions were examined via 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS results: (a) At which stage would you characterize the overall student leadership development efforts on your campus?; and (b) Does your campus have a leadership center?

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 shows the frequency and the mean scores from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS responses for level of LDP institutionalization. The results show that there is a significant difference between the 2009 and 2015 samples related to institutionalization of LDPs ($t = 2.73, df = 138, p = .007$). The Cohen's *d* calculated was .47 which indicates a medium effect. Respondents indicated that their LDPs were more institutionalized in 2015 ($M = 2.68, SD = .81$) than in 2009 ($M = 2.32, SD = .74$). Eight programs in 2009 rated themselves as brand new/emerging, whereas only one did so in 2015. The same approximate percentage of programs evaluated themselves as building critical mass in 2009 and 2015; however, the percentage of institutions who rated themselves as sustained institutionalization quadrupled from 2009 to 2015.

Table 4.3

Number and Frequency of Reported Level of Institutionalization

	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>n</i>	Valid %
Brand new/emerging	8	11.6	1	1.4
Building critical mass	34	49.3	35	49.3
Enhancing quality	24	34.8	21	29.6
Sustained institutionalization	3	4.3	14	19.7

Table 4.4

Reported Level of Institutionalization by MSL-IS Respondents

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2009	69	2.32	.74
2015	71	2.68	.81

Table 4.5 showcases the difference in frequency of leadership centers on college campuses between 2009 and 2015. Although there is a higher percentage of institutions that have leadership development centers in 2015 (53.5%) than in 2009 (42.0%), a chi-square analysis shows that there is not a significant difference in the percentages ($\chi^2 = 1.85$, $df = 1$, $p = .174$). Additionally, the ratio of “yes” to “no” responses in 2009 was 0.73, whereas in 2015 it was 1.15.

Table 4.5

Responses to “Does Your Campus Have a Leadership Center?”

	Yes	No	Total
2009	29	40	69
2015	38	33	71
Total	67	73	140

There were three additional significant findings in the correlation analysis from Research Question 1 relating to institutionalization of LDPs: (a) programs primarily focused on leadership education (positive relationship); (b) programs primarily focused on individual skill building and development (negative relationship); and (c) programs offering mentoring relationships (positive relationship). Unfortunately, the 2009 MSL-IS instrument asked the number of programs focused on leadership education or individual skill building, whereas the 2015 MSL-IS asked for the percentage of programs. Given this information, it is not possible to compare the two datasets in the cross-sectional analysis. Furthermore, there was no question on the 2009 MSL-IS about incorporating mentoring relationships into LDPs; therefore, no data analysis was completed. Information about each of these variables and their descriptive statistics are discussed below in the program section of Research Question 3.

Longitudinal

There were 21 institution representatives who completed the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS. The same data analysis for the cross-sectional group was also performed for the

cohort group to determine if there is a significant difference between level of institutionalization of LDPs.

A paired-sample *t*-test was run to analyze the difference between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS for the LDP institutionalization level variable (Tables 4.6 and 4.7). The results show there is a significant difference between level of institutionalization between the 2009 and 2015 cohort samples ($t = 2.09$, $df = 40$, $p = .049$). The cohort respondents report a greater level of institutionalization of the LDPs in 2015 ($M_{2015} = 3.00$, $SD_{2015} = .84$) than in 2009 ($M_{2009} = 2.67$, $SD_{2009} = .73$). The Cohen's *d* calculated was .42, which would be classified as a medium effect size. Furthermore, the results showed that five additional cohort schools had leadership center locations in 2015 than in 2009 ($n = 17$ and $n = 12$, respectively).

Table 4.6

Sample Size and Frequency of Reported Level of Institutionalization by 21 MSL-IS Respondents from 2009 and 2015

	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>n</i>	Valid %
Brand new/emerging	0	0.0	0	0.0
Building critical mass	10	47.6	7	33.3
Enhancing quality	8	38.1	7	33.3
Sustained institutionalization	3	14.3	7	33.3

Table 4.7

Reported Level of Institutionalization by 21 MSL-IS Respondents from 2009 and 2015

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2009	21	2.67	.73
2015	21	3.00	.84

Research Question 3

Is there a difference in LDP characteristics between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS survey related to the five CAS SLP standards (mission, program, financial resources, human resources, and assessment and strategic planning)?

For this research question, the statistical analysis was run separately for the five different CAS SLP Standards for ease of understanding of the results.

Mission

The CAS SLP mission standard (CAS, 2015) incorporates aspects of the programmatic mission and institutional mission. There are no questions on the MSL-IS about programmatic mission. In the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS iterations, there is a question about leadership development being incorporated into the institutional strategic plan. In the 2015 MSL-IS, a question was added about the perception of the survey respondent related to the extent that institutional policy-making boards/committees recognize student leadership as an essential goal for the campus.

Table 4.8 displays the difference in frequency of institutions mentioning student leadership development in their strategic plans between 2009 and 2015, according to survey respondents. The percentage of respondents who indicated that the institution's

strategic plan included student leadership slightly increased from 56.9% to 57.1% in 2009 and 2015, respectively. A chi-square analysis showed there was not a significant difference in the percentages ($\chi^2 = .01, df = 1, p = .98$).

Table 4.8

Responses to “Does Your Institutional Strategic Plan Mention/Include Student Leadership Development?”

	Yes	No	Total
2009	33	25	58
2015	36	27	63
Total	69	52	121

Respondents from the 2015 MSL-IS commonly view that those who are a part of policy-making boards and committees do see a value of student leadership as an essential goal for the campus, with 39 respondents indicating “often” or “very often” versus 27 respondents who indicated “not at all” or “sometimes” (Tables 4.9 and 4.10).

Table 4.9

Number and Percentage of Responses for “To What Extent Do Institutional Policy-making Boards/Committees Recognize Student Leadership as an Essential Goal for the Campus?”

	Not at all	Sometimes	Often	Very often
<i>N</i>	4	23	19	20
Valid %	6.1%	34.8%	28.8%	30.3%

Table 4.10

Descriptive Statistics for “To What Extent Do Institutional Policy-making Boards/ Committees Recognize Student Leadership as an Essential Goal for the Campus?”

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2015	66	2.83	.94

Program

The second CAS SLP standard utilized in analyzing Research Question 3 is Program. Program criteria include contribution for student learning and development, design, and collaboration (CAS, 2015).

In 2009, MSL-IS respondents were asked, “To what extent is your primary co-curricular leadership program informed by a clear definition of leadership?” Answer choices were “not informed,” “somewhat informed,” “fairly informed,” and “highly informed” (Table 4.11). In 2015, the question was slightly modified to include “a clear definition or theoretical framework of leadership” and answer choices were adapted to “not informed,” “to some extent,” “fairly informed,” and “highly informed” (Table 4.12). Given the similarities in the questions and answer choices, a comparison statistical analysis was still performed. The results showed a significant difference in the 2009 and 2015 iterations ($t = -3.46$, $df = 138$, $p = .001$). The effect size was calculated to be medium-to-large in size (Cohen’s $d = .71$). Respondents from 2015 were much more likely to respond with “is informed” and “greatly informed” when compared to the 2009 survey respondents ($M_{2009} = 2.83$, $SD_{2009} = .66$; $M_{2015} = 3.34$, $SD_{2015} = .77$) (Table 4.13).

Table 4.11

Frequency and Valid Percentage of “Program Informed by a Clear Definition” for 2009 Responses

	Not informed	Somewhat informed	Fairly informed	Highly informed
2009	2	16	43	8
Valid %	2.9%	23.2%	62.3%	11.6%

Table 4.12

Frequency and Valid Percentage of “Program Informed by a Clear Definition or Framework” for 2015 Responses

	Not informed	To some extent	Is Informed	Greatly informed
2015	1	10	24	36
Valid %	1.4%	14.1%	33.8%	50.7%

Table 4.13

Descriptive Statistics for “Program Informed by a Clear Definition or Framework”

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2009	69	2.83	.66
2015	71	3.34	.77

Both MSL-IS iterations also asked about which types of leadership development theories or models were utilized for co-curricular LDPs. Table 4.14 provides the percentage of programs in 2009 and 2015 that utilize a particular theory or model. In 2009, respondents were asked how often certain theories or models were used (“never,”

“sometimes,” “often,” or “very often”); in 2015, respondents were asked first if they utilized a theory (“yes” or “no”) and then if the respondent answered “yes” would be asked for how often. The 2009 results were transformed into “yes/no” answers to compare with the 2015 results. Furthermore, there were three theories (authentic leadership, emotionally intelligent leadership, and critical social theory) which were asked in 2015 and not in 2009.

Table 4.14

Number and Percentage of LDPs that Utilize a Particular Leadership Theory or Model

Leadership Theory or Model	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>n</i>	Valid %
Great man/trait theories	26	38.2%	11	16.2%
Behavioral/situational theories	59	86.7%	57	83.8%
Influence/charisma theories	26	38.2%	17	25.0%
Transactional/transformational theories	52	75.4%	48	69.6%
Servant leadership	63	91.3%	62	89.9%
Social Change Model of Leadership Development	64	92.7%	69	100%
Relational Leadership Model	57	82.6%	51	75.0%
Leadership Identity Development model	51	73.9%	55	80.9%
Adaptive/chaos leadership theories	26	37.7%	24	35.3%
Organizational/systems theories	30	44.1%	23	33.8%
Management models	30	44.1%	17	25.0%
Personal development models and tools	63	92.6%	67	97.1%
Authentic leadership	N/A	N/A	45	68.2%
Emotionally intelligent leadership	N/A	N/A	51	75.0%
Critical social theory	N/A	N/A	17	25.0%

The results indicate that over 90% of LDPs in 2009 and 2015 employ the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996), personal development models (such as Myers-Briggs Type Inventory or Rath's StrengthsQuest), and servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977). In 2015, the use of specific personal development models and tools was asked (it was not inquired in 2009); the results showed that LDPs utilized MBTI (65.7%) and Rath's StrengthsFinder (87.0%) more than Covey's Seven Habits (27.9%) or the FISH philosophy (25.0%). Few LDPs employ Great Man/trait theories, influence/charisma theories, management theories, or critical social theory, which were all 25% or less in the 2015 MSL-IS dataset.

The next data analysis involved the intended audience of LDPs. In 2009, the MSL-IS gathered information about the intended audience by asking respondents how many programs were directed toward certain populations of students. Answers were given from 0 to 999 programs. In 2015, the MSL-IS posed a slightly different question and respondents were asked to give the percentage of LDPs directed toward specific populations. Given the different scales, it was not possible to compare the two datasets. A 2015 snapshot is provided in Table 4.15.

Forty-six of 71 respondents (64.8%) in 2015 said that at least half of their programs were open to all students, whereas the exact same number (46 of 71 respondents; 64.8%) answered that one-fourth or less of their LDPs are open to those within a special position. Eighty percent of respondents reported that less than one-fourth of LDPs are targets to a certain characteristic of student.

Table 4.15

2015 MSL-IS Frequency and Relative Percentage of Programs Intended for a Specific Population

	None	> 10%	10-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Programs open to all students	1	4	10	10	22	24
Relative %	1.4%	5.6%	14.1%	14.1%	31.0%	33.8%
Programs open to those with special positions	5	17	24	6	12	6
Relative %	7.0%	23.9%	33.8%	8.5%	16.9%	8.5%
Programs targeted to those with certain characteristics	6	17	26	11	9	1
Relative %	8.5%	23.9%	36.6%	15.5%	12.7%	1.4%

Depending on the type of LDP, the emphasis of the program may be on leadership training, leadership education, leadership development, or individual skill building.

Again, in the 2009 MSL-IS, respondents were asked to provide the number of programs, whereas in 2015, the respondents were requested to provide a percentage of programs.

Therefore, a comparison of the two datasets could not be completed. The results in Table 4.16 provide an assessment from the 2015 MSL-IS dataset related to the emphasis of the LDPs. The data show that institutions are stressing leadership training and leadership development over leadership education and individual skill building.

Research highlights the inclusion of mentoring relationships, socio-cultural conversations, and participation in community service as positive program attributes for

enhancing socially responsible student leadership development (Dugan et al., 2013). The 2009 MSL-IS iteration did not incorporate questions related to these three program attributes. Table 4.17 showcases the results from the 2015 MSL-IS. It seems that, in general, institutions are including mentoring relationships, socio-cultural conversations, and participation in community service as aspects of their LDPs. For mentoring relationships, 77.1% of respondents (54 out of 70) implied a focus “to some extent” or greater in this area. The results for socio-cultural conversations (81.7%) and involvement in community service (88.7%) were even more favorable.

Table 4.16

2015 MSL-IS Frequency and Relative Percentage of Programs Primarily Emphasizing Leadership Training, Leadership Education, Leadership Development, and Individual Skill Building

	None	> 10%	10-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Leadership training	0	5	14	15	25	12
Relative %	0.0%	7.0%	19.7%	21.1%	35.2%	16.9%
Leadership education	3	20	15	20	8	5
Relative %	4.2%	28.2%	21.1%	28.2%	11.3%	7.0%
Leadership development	1	3	12	18	21	16
Relative %	1.4%	4.2%	16.9%	25.4%	29.6%	22.5%
Individual skill building	2	11	18	23	12	4
Relative %	2.8%	15.5%	25.4%	32.4%	16.9%	5.6%

Table 4.17

2015 MSL-IS Frequency and Relative Percentage of Programs Primarily Focused on Mentoring Relationships, Socio-cultural Conversations, and Community Service

	Not at all	To a very small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	It is the primary focus
Mentoring relationships	0	16	32	21	1
Relative %	1.4%	22.5%	42.1%	29.6%	1.4%
Socio-cultural conversations	2	11	31	25	2
Relative %	2.8%	15.5%	43.7%	35.2%	2.8%
Community service	0	8	27	32	4
Relative %	0.0%	11.3%	38.0%	45.1%	5.6%

The final data analysis completed for the Program CAS Standard concerned with which functional areas and departments LDPs collaborated. Table 4.18 gives the percentage of programs in 2009 and 2015 that collaborated with a particular department or functional area. Similar to the theory question above, in 2009 respondents were asked how often certain departments were collaborated with (“never,” “sometimes,” “often,” or “very often”); in 2015, respondents were asked first if they collaborated with a particular department (“yes” or “no”) and if the respondent answered “yes,” they were asked for how often. The 2009 results were transformed into “yes/no” answers to allow for comparison with the 2015 data. Finally, the percentages represented are for those that said there was a certain functional area at a particular institution. For example, some institutions do not have women’s centers; the reported valid percentage is only for those institutions that have a women’s center.

Table 4.18

Number and Percentage of LDPs Which Collaborate with Different Departments or Functional Areas

Department or Functional Area	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>N</i>	Valid %
Academic departments	66	95.7%	59	88.1%
Academic advising	36	53.7%	33	47.1%
Alumni and alumni centers	57	82.6%	45	64.3%
Athletics	45	66.2%	49	70.0%
Campus recreation and intramurals	43	64.2%	49	70.0%
Career services	62	89.9%	54	77.1%
Chaplain's office	34	66.7%	20	28.6%
Community service/volunteer programs	53	100%	62	88.6%
Community businesses	41	61.2%	20	29.0%
Community non-profits and civic organizations	56	81.2%	38	55.1%
Community political and advocacy groups	35	50.7%	19	27.5%
Commuter/Off-campus student programs	26	52.0%	30	42.9%
Counseling center	41	59.4%	32	45.7%
Disability resources and services	33	49.3%	33	47.8%
Entrepreneurship centers	N/A	N/A	25	35.7%
Fraternity and sorority life	50	87.7%	47	68.1%
Health center	38	56.7%	19	27.5%
Institutional research	43	66.2%	46	64.8%
K-12 schools	34	50.7%	25	36.2%
Learning assistance services	30	46.9%	18	26.1%
Multicultural programs and services	65	95.6%	63	88.7%
Orientation	61	89.7%	53	76.8%

Table 4.18

Cont.

Department or Functional Area	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>N</i>	Valid %
Parent and family affairs	29	55.8%	31	44.3%
Other area colleges and universities	48	69.6%	38	55.1%
Residence life	62	91.2%	61	87.1%
Student activities/programming	65	95.6%	38	97.4%
Study abroad/international	39	56.5%	29	42.0%
Women's center	34	79.1%	33	48.5%

In general, respondents indicated greater collaboration in 2009 than in 2015.

Similar departments and functional areas were most popular in both iterations—community service/volunteer programs (100% and 88.6% in 2009 and 2015, respectively), academic departments (95.7% and 88.1% in 2009 and 2015, respectively), and student activities/programming (95.6% and 97.4% in 2009 and 2015, respectively). In 2009, the least popular collaborations were with learning assistance programs (46.9%) and disability resources and services (49.3%). Collaborations with health centers (27.5%), community political and advocacy groups (27.5%), chaplain's office (28.6%), and community businesses (29%) were least frequent in the 2015 MSL-IS iteration.

Financial Resources

The third CAS standard investigated in this study was the financial and human resources standards, which spotlights the necessity to have adequate funding and staffing to execute LDPs (CAS, 2015). Tables 4.19 and 4.20 showcase the results of the 2009 and

2015 MSL-IS iterations. There was one institution that shared a budget (\$1.5 million) that was above and beyond the other respondents. This skewed the mean and standard deviation results enough that it was essential to display the results in a second format (Table 4.20). This table reports a shift in the amount of funding for LDPs. More than half (58%) of 2009 MSL-IS respondents had budgets less than \$30,000, whereas 57% of respondents in 2015 have budgets of \$30,000 and more. No program in 2009 indicated a budget of more than \$300,000; while in 2015, two programs had that large of a budget.

Table 4.19

Reported Amount of Annual Funding for Primary LDP, Excluding Salaries

	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2009	67	\$750	\$200,000	\$38,600	\$41,400
2015	63	\$1,500	\$1,500,000	\$93,500	\$208,000

Table 4.20

Reported Amount of Annual Funding for Primary LDP, Excluding Salaries

	\$0- 15k	\$15- 30k	\$30- 45k	\$45- 60k	\$60- 75k	\$75- 125k	\$125- 300k	\$300k+
2009	22	17	7	5	4	8	4	0
Valid %	32.8%	25.4%	10.4%	7.5%	6.0%	11.9%	6.0%	0.0%
2015	14	13	6	9	4	9	6	2
Valid %	22.2%	20.6%	9.5%	14.3%	6.3%	14.3%	9.5%	3.2%

Human Resources

The MSL-IS instrument also asked about the number of faculty and staff positions dedicated to the primary co-curricular LDP. The tally of faculty and staff includes full-time, part-time, graduate assistants, student staff, and administrative support staff. There was a subset of this question in 2015 which asked about number of volunteers; this was not asked in 2009, and therefore not incorporated into the total numbers reported. The data show a similar mean number of positions between 2009 and 2015 ($M_{2009} = 9.62$, $SD_{2009} = 15.82$; $M_{2015} = 10.55$, $SD_{2015} = 13.16$) (Table 4.21) and that a plurality of institutions have less than 10 positions working on the primary leadership development program (Table 4.22).

Table 4.21

Descriptive Statistics of Faculty/Staff Positions (Professional and Student) Solely Dedicated to Primary Leadership Development Program

	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2009	67	0	75	9.62	15.82
2015	71	0	66	10.55	13.16

Table 4.22

Frequency and Valid Percentage of Faculty/Staff Positions (Professional and Student) Solely Dedicated to Primary Leadership Development Program

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-25	25-50	50+
2009	38	10	6	7	4	2
Valid %	56.7%	14.9%	9.0%	10.5%	6.0%	3.0%
2015	39	12	3	8	8	1
Valid %	54.9%	16.9%	4.2%	11.3%	11.3%	1.4%

Guthrie and Jenkins (2018) argue a need for leadership educators to be more prepared in advancing LDPs. Table 4.23 and 4.24 demonstrate the results of leadership educators rating themselves on their knowledge of the leadership development field. The results indicate no change in the perception between 2009 and 2015 ($t = .56$, $df = 138$, $p = .11$). For each MSL-IS iteration, a vast majority of leadership educators rated themselves either “informed” or “highly informed” (91.3% in 2009 and 90.1% in 2015).

Table 4.23

Number and Frequency of Perception of Leadership Educator Knowledge About the Field of Leadership Studies

	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>n</i>	Valid %
Not informed	0	0.0	1	1.4
Somewhat informed	6	8.7	6	8.5
Informed	42	60.9	36	50.7
Highly informed	21	30.4	28	39.4

Table 4.24

Reported Level of Leadership Educator Knowledge About the Field of Leadership Studies

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2009	69	3.22	.59
2015	71	3.28	.68

Table 4.25 suggests there have not been any substantial shifts in highest degree that leadership educators have achieved, although it does look like more respondents had

achieved their doctorate degree in 2015 (29.6%) than in 2009 (21.7%). The 2009 MSL-IS did not ask any additional questions about leadership educator preparedness. The 2015 MSL-IS did inquire about the respondents' coursework related to leadership theory and development (Table 4.26). One in seven respondents indicated no focus on leadership theory and development, almost 60% said some focus, and more than 25% answered extensive focus.

Table 4.25

Number and Frequency of Highest Level of Education for 2015 MSL-IS Respondents

	2009		2015	
	<i>n</i>	Valid %	<i>n</i>	Valid %
Master's	53	76.8	49	69.0
Doctorate	15	21.7	21	29.6
Specialist	1	1.4	0	0.0
High School/GED	0	0.0	1	1.4

Table 4.26

Number and Frequency of Significant Coursework in Leadership Theory or Development Post-Baccalaureate for 2015 MSL-IS Respondents

	<i>N</i>	Valid %
No focus on these topics	10	14.3
Some focus on these topics	42	60.0
Extensive focus on these topics	18	25.7

Assessment and Strategic Planning

The last CAS standard under review in this study was assessment and strategic planning (CAS, 2015). This standard incorporates learning outcomes, multiple assessment methods, and a strategic planning process into LDPs.

Table 4.27 shows the difference in frequency of learning objectives for primary co-curricular leadership programs between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS. Although there is a higher percentage of institutions that have learning objectives in 2015 (82.3%) than in 2009 (73.9%), a chi-square analysis shows that there is not a significant difference in the percentages ($\chi^2 = 1.43$, $df = 1$, $p = .23$).

Table 4.27

Responses to “Does Your Primary Co-curricular Leadership Program Have Stated Learning Objectives?”

	Yes	No	Total
2009	51	18	69
2015	56	12	68
Total	107	30	137

The MSL-IS also asked respondents to respond to what level LDPs are assessed and what types of assessments are completed. In the 2009 iteration, respondents could only provide one answer on the level programs are assessed (program, institutional, program and institutional, are not assessed, and other). Forty-three respondents answered program-level assessment, one respondent selected institutional-level assessment, 17 chose program and institutional, five reported that they did not assess their LDPs, and

two selected other. The 2015 MSL-IS iteration allowed respondents to choose more than one answer and an additional response of unit/divisional level. The results were 58 program level, 38 unit/divisional, 16 institutional, two programs were not assessed, and one respondent did not know how programs were assessed.

Table 4.28 shows the frequencies and percentages of programs that utilize various methods of assessment. Tracking attendance and satisfaction assessment still remains the most popular methods; however, there was substantial growth in LDPs that incorporated pre/post measures, portfolios, and raters/rubrics.

Table 4.28

Frequency and Percentage of LDPs Using Various Assessment Methods

	2009	Valid %	2015	Valid %
Tracking attendance	68	98.6%	67	94.4%
Needs assessment	34	49.3%	29	40.8%
Satisfaction assessment	63	91.3%	62	87.3%
Outcomes assessment	47	68.1%	55	77.5%
Self-report data	46	66.7%	51	71.8%
Pre/post measures	27	39.1%	46	64.8%
Portfolios	13	18.8%	23	32.4%
Raters/rubrics	14	20.3%	28	39.4%
Benchmarking	26	37.7%	27	38.0%
Cost effectiveness measures	10	14.5%	13	18.3%
Assessing organizational culture	8	11.6%	10	14.1%
Using nationally accepted standards to assess needs (e.g., CAS)	30	43.5%	33	46.5%
Qualitative/anecdotal assessment/focus groups	41	59.4%	43	60.6%
Participatory/action research methods	8	11.6%	11	15.5%

Strategic planning is the last aspect explored through statistical analysis of the MSL-IS 2009 and 2015 iterations. The percentage of institutions with a strategic planning process increased from 2009 (42.6%) to 2015 (59.2%) (Table 4.29). However, the difference was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.79$; $df = 1$; $p = .06$). Furthermore, the responses as to how often the strategic planning process was utilized varied little from 2009 to 2015 (Table 4.30). A majority of LDPs in both iterations conduct the strategic planning process yearly or every 2-5 years.

Table 4.29

Responses to “Does Your Co-curricular Leadership Program Have a Strategic Planning Process?”

	Yes	No	Total
2009	29	39	68
2015	42	29	71
Total	71	68	139

Table 4.30

Of Respondents Who Have a Strategic Planning Process, How Often is the Strategic Planning Process Engaged?

	2009	Valid %	2015	Valid %
Has been done only once	8	27.6%	9	21.4%
Every 6-10 years	0	0.0%	2	4.8%
Every 2-5 years	11	37.9%	16	38.1%
Yearly or more	10	34.5%	14	33.4%

Conclusion

This chapter provided a comprehensive data analysis of the 2009 and 2015 iterations of MSL-IS responses. A variety of descriptive statistics, *t*-tests, chi-square tests, and correlation analyses were completed to answer the study's three research questions. It was determined that level of LDP institutionalization in 2015 is correlated to six different variables. Furthermore, it was found that the level of institutionalization as measured in 2015 is significantly higher than in 2009 for both the cross-sectional and cohort samples. Finally, an analysis of various institutional and programmatic environments was performed. The concluding chapter summarizes the study and its findings and presents implications for practice and future research.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The first two chapters of this study provided an introduction and overview of current literature related to leadership development programs (LDPs). The next two chapters outlined the study methodology and data analysis for three research questions utilizing the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership – Institutional Survey (MSL-IS) as the instrument to measure structural environments of LDPs. The final chapter offers a summary of the study, discussion and conclusions related to the data analysis, implications for the results, and potential future research.

Summary of the Study

There is a plethora of LDPs within U.S. higher education institutions (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; ILA, 2018). Colleges and universities allocate numerous resources to LDPs, whether it be monetary, human resources, or physical space (Lunsford & Brown, 2017; Owen, 2012). Despite the numerous research articles about student leadership development outcomes, the number of empirical studies regarding the programs themselves is lacking. The focus of this study was to help address this gap.

The purpose of this study was to determine how LDPs have transformed over the 6-year period between 2009 and 2015 related to structural environments. Three research questions were developed to answer this question:

- What is the relationship between overall LDP institutionalization and various programmatic and institutional characteristics as measured by the 2015 MSL-IS survey?
- Is there a difference between level of institutionalization for LDPs from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS surveys?
- Is there a difference in LDP characteristics between the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS survey related to five CAS SLP standards (mission, program, financial and human resources, and assessment and strategic planning)?

The research design consisted of a quantitative analysis for the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS datasets. The MSL-IS is an instrument developed specifically to measure programmatic and institutional structural elements for LDPs. The final sample consisted of 90 and 71 institutions from the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS, respectively.

The results of the data analysis showcase several key findings. Institutionalization of LDPs in 2015 relates positively to an institution having a leadership center, programs primarily focused on leadership education, and programs incorporating mentoring relationships. Furthermore, a negative relationship exists between institutionalization of LDPs in 2015 and programs that primarily focused on individual skill building and development and institutionalization of LDPs in 2009. It is important to note that a correlation does not imply causation, just that there is a relationship between the two variables being explored. The potential meaning of these findings is discussed below.

Other important findings include a significantly higher level of institutionalization of LDPs in 2015 when compared with 2009 LDP institutionalization (both through cross-sectional and cohort analyses). There was no significant difference in numbers of leadership centers (physical spaces) from 2009 to 2015. Unfortunately, analyses for the other variable relationships determined significant from the correlation analysis could not be completed due to the questions not being asked on the 2009 MSL-IS.

In answering the last research question of comparing the variables related to LDP institutional and programming changes from 2009 to 2015, the following conclusions were reached: (a) there was no difference in the number of institutions that incorporate student leadership development as an aspect of their institutional strategic plans; (b) more institutions have their primary co-curricular leadership program informed by a clear definition of leadership; (c) more LDPs are open to all students rather than to students with leadership roles or specific populations; (d) a higher number of LDPs are concentrating on leadership training and leadership development than leadership education and individual skill building; (e) LDPs are focusing on mentoring relationships, socio-cultural conversations, and community service “to an extent” or greater; (f) greater funding, but no additional staff, is being allocated to LDPs; and (g) LDPs are incorporating more sophisticated assessment techniques (pre-/post-tests, rubrics, etc.) in 2015 than in 2009.

Findings Related to the Literature

In Owen’s (2012) analysis of the 2009 MSL-IS data, she wrote, “Now that collegiate leadership development is no longer in its infancy, it faces the awkward

adolescent phase where there is incongruity between what is known about effective leadership education and what is enacted in programs” (p. 20). To continue the metaphor, one of the purposes of this study was to determine if LDPs still remain in the adolescence stage or if they have moved forward to “young adulthood.” The results of this study can be interpreted as mixed.

Institutionalization

Seeing as there is no formal theory proposed for what institutionalization looks like for LDPs, there is no foundation to help determine what institutionalization could be. It is only through the continual commitment of the campuses over time that a sustained institutionalization of LDPs can be realized. This means that higher education institutions have accepted the responsibility to provide integrated and theory-based LDPs which develop leadership capacities within their students. Chunoo and Osteen (2016) have implored institutions to take up the challenge of leadership development as a cornerstone of the purpose of higher education.

Furco (1999) developed a three-stage continuum toward institutionalization for a related functional area, service learning: (a) critical mass building; (b) quality building; and (c) sustained institutionalization. As mentioned previously in this study, institutionalization has been operationalized in service learning. Klentzin and Wierzbowski-Kwiatkowiak (2013) determined eight common elements found in successful service learning institutionalization: (a) inclusion of service learning language in the institutional mission statement; (b) a centralized service learning office; (c) a dedicated staff; (d) internal hard funding and supplied physical resources, including

space; (e) training/development opportunities, including active organizational membership; (f) faculty rewards, including release time; (g) program assessment; and (h) a service learning advisory board comprised of multiple stakeholders. The next section utilizes these criteria to evaluate LDPs institutionalization, as many of these standards were measured through the MSL-IS.

When asked directly, leadership educators stated their institutions reported greater levels of institutionalization through the 2015 MSL-IS when compared with the 2009 MSL-IS. However, it does not seem that institutions report any higher levels of student leadership concepts incorporated into institutional strategic plans in 2015 than in 2009, despite the fact that 60% of MSL-IS respondents in 2015 responded that “institutional policy-making boards/committees recognize student leadership as an essential goal.” Likewise, there was neither a greater percentage of leadership centers (physical space) nor additional staffing. The results did show a larger amount of funding and more comprehensive assessment methods.

Program Characteristics

It does seem that LDPs are aligning better with leadership theory and best practices. Dugan et al.’s (2013) high-impact practices, Eich’s (2008) high-quality LDP attributes, and Guthrie and Jenkins’s (2018) characteristics of distinctive curricular and co-curricular programs can serve as guides for leadership educators as they craft and execute LDPs.

In 2015, 84% of respondents said that their LDPs are “informed” or “highly informed by a clear leadership definition or framework,” whereas 74% indicated such in

2009. LDPs should be led by a clear definition or framework because programs need to have a focus to organize programmatic content and sequencing, and also to make more critical choices with resources. Dugan et al. (2013) suggest LDPs be open to all students, as having students in LDPs has a broader effect in helping non-participants demonstrate leadership (Cress et al., 2001); this study shows that 64.8% of institutions have half of their LDPs open to all students.

Socio-cultural conversations are an important way for students to develop leadership capacities (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2010), as these conversations provide opportunities for participants to increase social perspective-taking skills. This study indicates that socio-cultural conversations are a popular mechanism for LDPs (81% of respondents said that their programs focus “to an extent” and “greater”).

Furthermore, mentoring relationship and experiential learning can be key practices of LDPs (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Eich, 2008). Mentoring relationships are important as they provide students the opportunity to engage in important conversations with trusted mentors. Performing leadership actions through experiential learning, such as service learning, allow students a mechanism to practice and also learn more about society. This research demonstrates 89% of LDPs incorporate community service and almost 75% of LDPs offer mentoring relationships. These findings differ slightly from Lunsford and Brown (2017), who found that less than half of their sample of leadership development centers used mentoring practices as an aspect of their programmatic efforts.

Haber (2011) encouraged institutions to develop integrative leadership programs that “weave together many different experiences, areas of content, and opportunities to create a more complete whole that facilitates leadership learning” (p. 233). LDPs appear to be doing just this by incorporating different types of leadership training, education, and development, as well as featuring opportunities for mentoring relationships, socio-cultural conversations, and community service. This is important, as integrated LDPs impact a student’s ability to see and experience leadership, where a participant observes leadership happening and also practices demonstrating leadership (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018).

Previous theorists and researchers highlight the need for LDPs to continuously improve through assessment and strategic planning (CAS, 2015; Eich, 2008; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Owen, 2012). This study indicates that LDPs are doing marginally better in 2015 than in 2009. LDPs are engaging in about the same percentages related to having learning outcomes for their programs and employing the strategic planning process. It does seem LDPs are utilizing more complex methods of assessment such as pre-/post-tests, portfolios, and raters/rubrics while maintaining similar frequencies of other assessment approaches. Collecting multiple forms of data through robust assessment methods can provide a more comprehensive picture of how LDPs are effective and efficient. However, just collecting data does not mean that it is being utilized to improve LDPs; the assessment cycle needs to also include how these data are helping to inform changes that improve LDPs.

Collaboration is a key concept for an individual to demonstrate socially responsible leadership and is also an important aspect of LDPs. The CAS (2015) Standards implore LDPs to “collaborate with colleagues and departments across the institution to promote student learning and development, persistence, and success” (p. 5). The results of this study indicate that there is less collaboration in 2015 than in 2009 between LDPs and various campus constituencies. Leadership educators seem to rely on “easier” collaborations with student activities/programming and community service/volunteer programs. Collaborating with campus partners takes time and effort and it is not possible for LDPs to collaborate with all possible collaborators. However, the benefits of partnering with other functional areas are increasing community awareness of the leadership program, access to fiscal and human resources, and access to additional sources of leadership expertise (Haber, 2006).

The CAS (2015) Standards state that LDPs must have adequate funding and staffing to accomplish their mission and goals. It is difficult to ascertain if LDPs are meeting this expectation with this study alone. It does look as if LDPs, in general, are receiving more funding in 2015 when compared to 2009. This is interesting, as the financial downturn during the period of time of the two MSL-IS iterations coincides. Lunsford and Brown (2017) found in their study that the average budget ranged from \$1,500 to \$900,000, with an average of \$188,330. They also found that nearly two-thirds of the leadership centers (63%) had a budget of \$100,000 or more. This study’s findings differed in that only one of four LDPs had a budget of more than \$75,000, with an average of \$93,500. An explanation may be that salaries were included in the Lunsford

and Brown article which were not incorporated in this study; conversely, their article does not indicate such.

As for staffing, this study indicates that LDPs are not operated with any more additional staff than in 2009. On average, there were 10.83 positions in 2009 and 10.55 positions in 2015. Again, Lunsford and Brown (2017) learned through their study that their mean number of staff was 3.7, with a range of one to 12 full-time staff. This discrepancy can be explained by the inclusion of full- and part-time faculty, part-time staff, and student positions in this research. Furthermore, the question for the 2009 and 2015 MSL-IS iterations asked for the number of faculty and staff who were “connected to/affiliated” with the primary co-curricular program. Lunsford and Brown utilized the program websites for each institution for their study to determine the number of staff coordinating LDPs.

Recently, there have been several articles and books related to leadership educator preparedness (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Priest & Seemiller, 2018). The CAS (2015) Standards suggest that leadership educators should have several competencies such as (a) knowledge of the history and current trends in leadership theories, models, and philosophies; (b) knowledge of organizational development, group dynamics, strategies for change, and principles of community; (c) the ability to create, implement, and evaluate student learning as a result of leadership programs; and (d) the ability to effectively organize learning opportunities that are consistent with students’ stages of development. This study suggests that leadership educators are no more knowledgeable about the field of leadership studies in 2009 than in 2015. More

leadership educators have doctorate degrees in the intervening 6 years, but only one-fourth of respondents have an extensive focus of coursework in leadership theory or development after their baccalaureate experience. The results raise additional questions about leadership educator preparedness to be able to deliver effective and efficient LDP offerings.

Conclusions

Now that a summary of the study and the study's findings as they relate to other research have been discussed, the final section of this chapter provides implications for leadership educators, recommendations for further research, and some concluding remarks.

Implications for Action

One of the major constructs studied as part of this research was level of institutionalization of LDPs. If leadership education as a field wants to become imbedded as an integral aspect of college and university environments, similar to how service learning has engrained itself as a vital component of many campuses, it needs to continue its development from "adolescent" to "young adult" and beyond. Leadership studies as a field has been challenged over the past few years to examine for whom leadership development is focused and who can participate in such opportunities (Dugan, 2011, 2017). As this study shows, LDPs need to focus on leadership education and leadership development (significant positive correlations) rather than individual skill building (significant negative correlation) as it relates to institutionalization. Leadership

educators must re-examine the philosophies and outcomes of LDPs to further embed their LDPs within their campuses.

As LDPs continue to mature, it remains to be important for them to align with leadership theory and research. The Inter-association of Leadership Education Collaborative (ILEC, 2016) urges leadership educators, regardless of professional identity, to increase access to, knowledge of, and critically evaluate existing resources. Findings from the MSL and publications such as *New Directions for Student Leadership* provide essential information for leadership educators to advise their LDPs. Leadership educators must continue to stay abreast of changes within the field and develop professionally to ensure that LDPs are of the highest quality and benefitting their participants. Recent research indicates that high-impact practices such as mentorship opportunities, socio-cultural conversations, and experiential opportunities are important mechanisms to exhibit and practice socially responsible leadership (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2010). This study demonstrates that a good number of programs incorporate these practices; however, more can be done to align with leadership theory and research.

Assessment of the efficacy and efficiency of LDPs and the strategic planning process are fundamental and central ways to obtain additional resources, whether they are human, financial, or physical. It is not reasonable to ask leadership educators to utilize every assessment method to measure students' gains in leadership capacities. However, it is incredibly important for assessment to be multifaceted to articulate the benefits of

such programs. Likewise, a sustainable strategic planning process that involves many constituents and stakeholders can be leveraged into better levels of institutionalization.

It cannot also be understated the importance of a physical location for leadership development. Klentzin and Wierzbowski-Kwiatkowiak (2013) highlight the need for a “centralized service learning office” in their criteria of service learning institutionalization. This study established a relationship between a physical leadership center and level of leadership development institutionalization. As leadership educators craft a vision of their future plans for LDPs, they would be prudent to include a leadership center site if one does not already exist.

It is critical for leadership educators to think about their own LDPs and how they may or may not follow with best practices. ILEC (2016) implores leadership educators to “engage in, apply, and share theoretical and practice-based research on leadership education efforts” (p. 7). Utilizing the CAS Standards and the associated self-assessment guide can only strengthen programs to be more effective in helping students develop their leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities. The guides provide leadership educators a standard-by-standard outline to assess if their LDP does not meet, partly meets, meets, or exceeds a particular substandard.

The CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs is up for review in the near future. This study utilized these standards as a frame for understanding the research questions and results. As an outcome of this study and its review of the literature, it is important for those reconsidering the standards to (a) encourage the incorporation of leadership development language in institutional mission or vision statements, and not

just to align the program mission with the institutional mission; (b) promote programs to incorporate leadership education and leadership development themes over individual skill development; (c) ground programs in multiple leadership theories; (d) increase the attention of LDP to dimensions of social identity and systematic oppression; and (e) create truly integrated LDPs that offer a variety of theories, methods, and collaborators to enhance participants' learning.

Recommendations for Further Research

Institutionalization of LDPs was a main paradigm examined as an aspect of this study. Yet, a framework for institutionalization of LDPs has not explicitly been developed, unlike the work and research from Furco (1999) and Klentzin and Wierzbowski-Kwiatkowiak (2013) for service learning. As the functional area of collegiate leadership development continues to become more advanced, LDP institutionalization should be established to allow leadership educators to benchmark their initiatives.

It is unknown if another iteration of MSL-IS will be administered. If it is, a similar study comparing the three versions will allow for a trend analysis, which will only strengthen the understanding of where LDPs stand in relation to institutionalization and aligning with theory and research. Because the MSL-IS is only administered to those institutions who participate in the MSL, the results of this study might not capture as accurate a snapshot as one would like due to the self-selection of institutions. The MSL-IS could be sent out via a different method in an attempt to gather a more representative picture of LDPs in higher education institutions. Additionally, as further findings of the

MSL and other research are published, this will only help to inform best practices in institutional and programmatic environments for LDPs. Just as the MSL-IS was fine-tuned between 2009 and 2015 apprised by new theories and research, questions and responses will need to be updated. For example, with the current MSL-IS instrument, there are no questions about how LDPs allow for reflection opportunities for participants, which have been shown to strengthen gains in leadership capacities and are considered a distinctive characteristic of LDPs (Eich, 2008; Guthrie & Jenkins, 2017).

The National Leadership Education Research Agenda from 2013 to 2018, through the auspices of the Association of Leadership Educators, provided a guide for researchers (Andenoro et al., 2013). In a review of the document, there was a substantial focus on individual outcomes associated with leadership development, but not much emphasis on a research agenda related to programmatic delivery. There was one portion of the agenda that targeted longitudinal studies “that address programs with differing approaches to Leadership Education [sic], sequencing of curricula, unique pedagogies, learning communities, and environments [which] might address this area of inquiry most directly” (Andenoro et al., 2013, p. 7). After reviewing the current literature, the study presented here seems to be the only one that addresses this agenda item.

One aspect of the research agenda neither covered in recent literature, nor in this study, is the effectiveness of LDP offerings on individual leadership development. Owen (2012) implores the necessity for research to be completed in determining the “individual and institutional interaction effects while simultaneously controlling for inputs allows for a much more sophisticated analysis of the latent construct of leadership” (p. 19). This

current study would inform such research, if it were to be conducted. Such analysis could be extremely helpful in understanding how all of the pieces of LDPs and their interactions may affect student leadership development.

Concluding Remarks

At most U.S. colleges and universities, there is some type of leadership development education being taught. This study aimed to provide a clearer understanding of how LDPs have evolved from 2009 to 2015 within these institutions and to supply a picture of LDP structural environments. The results show that educators believe their LDPs to have become more institutionalized over the 6 years, but analysis of individual components of LDPs presented show mixed results that do not necessarily support that LDPs have become more engrained in colleges and universities.

Nevertheless, it is important for leadership educators to strengthen their own perception of best leadership development practices in order to provide better opportunities for college students who are looking to increase their leadership attitudes, knowledge, skills, and abilities. It is known that leadership is a crucial component necessary for a student's future success and that higher education settings are prime environments in which to develop these capacities. This study provides leadership educators with more information to help them better understand their own programs and create ways to enhance the leadership offerings within their purview.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. J., & Roberts, D. C. (2011). Our response to the question: Next steps in clarifying the language of leadership learning. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(2), 65–70. doi:10.1002/jls.20220
- Allen, S. J., Shankman, M. L., & Haber-Curran, P. (2016). Developing emotionally intelligent leadership: The need for deliberate practice and collaboration across disciplines. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2016(174), 79–91. doi:10.1002/he.20191
- Andenoro, A. C., Allen, S. J., Haber-Curran, P., Jenkins, D. M., Sowcik, M., Dugan, J. P., & Osteen, L. (2013). *National leadership education research agenda 2013-2018: Providing strategic direction for the field of leadership education*. Retrieved from <http://leadershipeducators.org/ResearchAgenda>
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bandura, A. (2007). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Blake, R. R., & McCanse, A. A. (1991). *Leadership dilemmas—Grid solutions*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

- Bok, D. (2013). *Higher education in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (n.d.). *About Carnegie Classification*. Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/>
- Chunoo, V., & Osteen, L. (2016). Purpose, mission, and context: The call for educating future leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2016(174), 9–20.
doi:10.1002/he.20185
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2015). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (9th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Cress, C., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(1), 15–27.
- Day, D. V. (2011). Integrative perspectives on longitudinal investigations of leader development: From childhood through adulthood. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 561–571. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.012
- Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 63–82.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004
- Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *An integrative approach to leader development*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Dugan, J. P. (2011). Pervasive myths in leadership development. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(2), 79–84. doi:10.1002/jls.20223
- Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dugan, J. P., Bohle, C. W., Gebhardt, M., Hofert, M., Wilk, E., & Cooney, M. A. (2011). Influences of leadership program participation on students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48, 65–84. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.6206
- Dugan, J. P., Bohle, C. W., Woelker, L. R., & Cooney, M. A. (2014). The role of social perspective-taking in developing students' leadership capacities. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51(1), 1–15. doi:10.1515/jsarp-2014-0001
- Dugan, J. P., & Haber, P. (2007). Examining the influences of formal leadership programs on student educational gains. *Concepts & Connections*, 15(3), 7–10.
- Dugan, J. P., Kodama, C., Correia, B., & Associates. (2013). *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership insight report: Leadership program delivery*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2006). Select descriptive findings from the multi-institutional study of leadership. *Concepts & Connections*, 15(1), 16–18.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(5), 525–549. doi:10.1353/csd.2010.0009
- Dugan, J. P., & Owen, J. E. (2007). Practicing what we preach: An institutional approach to student leadership development. *Leadership Exchange, 5*(2), 20–22.
- Eich, D. (2008). A grounded theory of high-quality leadership programs: Perspectives from student leadership development programs in higher education. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 15*(2), 176–187.
doi:10.1177/1548051808324099
- Furco, A. (1999). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley.
- Furco, A., & Holland, B. (2004). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education: Issues and strategies for chief academic officers. In M. Langseth & S. Dillon (Eds.), *Public work and the academy*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey in the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Guthrie, K. L., & Jenkins, D. M. (2018). *The role of leadership educators: Transforming learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Guthrie, K. L., & Osteen, L. (2016). Editors' notes. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2016*(174), 5–8. doi:10.1002/he.20184
- Haber, P. (2006). Structure, design, and models of student leadership programs. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Handbook for*

- Student Leadership Programs* (1st ed., pp. 29–51). College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Haber, P. (2011). Formal leadership program models. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Handbook for student leadership programs* (2nd ed., pp. 231–257). College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training & Development Journal*, 23(5), 26–34.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development (Version III)*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute.
- Inter-association of Leadership Educators Collaborative. (2016). *Collaborative priorities and critical considerations for leadership education*. College Park, MD: Leadership and Community Service-Learning.
- International Leadership Association. (2018, January 15). *Directory of leadership programs: Search results*. Retrieved from <http://www.ila-net.org/Resources/LPD/index2.asp>
- Jenkins, D. M., & Owen, J. E. (2016). Who teaches leadership? A comparative analysis of faculty and student affairs leadership educators and implications for leadership learning. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(2). doi:10.12806/V17/I1/R3

- Katz, R. L. (1974, September). Skills of an effective administration. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1974/09/skills-of-an-effective-administrator>
- Kellerman, B. (2012). *The end of leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Kezar, A. (2006). The impact of institutional size on student engagement. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1), 87–114.
- Klentzin, J. C., & Wierzbowski-Kwiatkowiak, A. (2013). Service-learning program institutionalization, success, and possible alternative futures: A scholarly perspective. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 6(2), 46–58.
- Komives, S. R., & Dugan, J. P. (2011). Leadership theories. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Handbook for student leadership programs* (2nd ed., pp. 35–57). College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S. D., Owen, J. E., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A Leadership Identity Development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(4), 401–418.
doi:10.1353/csd.2006.0048
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (1998). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2013). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 593–611. doi:10.1353/csd.2005.0061
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lunsford, L. G., & Brown, B. A. (2017). Preparing leaders while neglecting leadership: An analysis of US collegiate leadership centers. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 24*(2), 261–277. doi:10.1177/1548051816662613
- Maki, P. (2004). *Assessing for learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Meacham, J., & Gaff, J. G. (2006). Learning goals in mission statements: Implications for educational leadership. *Liberal Education, 92*(1), 6–13.
- Mencarini, S. M. (2017). Overview of the social change model of leadership development. In K. C. Skendall, D. T. Ostick, S. R. Komives, W. Wagner, & Associates (Eds.), *The Social Change Model: Facilitating leadership development* (pp. 42–62). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Owen Jacobs, T., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*(1), 11–35. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00041-7

- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2018, April). *Job outlook 2018*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacweb.org/>
- Northouse, P. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ospina, S. M., Foldy, E. G., El Hadidy, W., Dodge, J., Hofmann-Pinilla, A., & Su, C. (2012). Social change leadership as relational leadership. In M. Uhl-Bien & Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives* (pp. 255–302). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Owen, J. E. (2008). *Towards an empirical typology of collegiate leadership development programs: Examining effects on student self-efficacy and leadership for social change* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Maryland College Park). Retrieved from <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/8491>
- Owen, J. E. (2011). Assessment and evaluation. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Handbook for student leadership programs* (2nd ed., pp. 177–201). College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Owen, J. E. (2012). *Examining the design and delivery of collegiate student leadership development programs: Findings from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Institutional Survey*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Owen, J. E., & Komives, S. R. (2006). Does credit matter?: Examining the effects of curricular leadership programs. *Concepts & Connections*, 15(3), 4–6.

- Ozdem, G. (2011). An analysis of the mission and vision statements on the strategic plans of higher education institutions. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *11*(4), 1887–1894.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pigza, J. M. (2015). Navigating leadership complexity through critical, creative, and practical thinking. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, *2015*(145), 35–48.
doi:10.1002/yd.20122
- Priest, K. L., & Clegorne, N. A. (2015). Connecting to experience: High-impact practices for leadership development. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, *2015*(145), 71–83. doi:10.1002/yd.20125
- Priest, K. L., & Seemiller, C. (2018). Past experiences, present beliefs, future practices: Using narratives to re(present) leadership educator identity. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *17*(1). doi:10.12806/V17/I1/R3
- Rath, T. (2007). *StrengthsFinder 2.0*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.
- Roberts, D. C. (1997). The changing look of leadership programs. *Concepts & Connections*, *5*(2), 1–3.
- Rosch, D. M., & Anthony, M. D. (2012). Leadership pedagogy: Putting theory to practice. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2012*(140), 37–51.
doi:10.1002/ss.20030
- Rosch, D. M., Collier, D., & Thompson, S. E. (2015). An exploration of students' motivation to lead: An analysis by race, gender, and student leadership behaviors.

Journal of College Student Development, 56(3), 286–291.

doi:10.1353/csd.2015.0031

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Seemiller, C. (2013). *The student leadership competencies guidebook: Designing intentional leadership learning and development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seemiller, C. (2016). Leadership competency development: A higher education responsibility. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2016(174), 93–104.
doi:10.1002/he.20192

Shankman, M. L., Allen, S. J., & Haber-Curran, P. (2015). *Emotionally intelligent leadership: A guide for students* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Skendall, K. C. (2017). An overview of the social change model of leadership development. In S. R. Komives, W. Wagner, & Associates (Eds.), *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development* (2nd ed., pp. 17–40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Solansky, S. T. (2010). The evaluation of two key leadership development program components: Leadership skills assessment and leadership mentoring. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(4), 675–681. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.06.009

Sorenson, G. A. (2007). An intellectual history of leadership: The role of James MacGregor Burns. In R. Couto (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership* (pp. 19–30). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2015). *Designing for learning: Creating campus environments for student success* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Troyer, M. (2004). *The challenges of leadership: A study of an emerging field* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kentucky, Lexington.
- Wagner, W., & Pigza, J. M. (2016). The intersectionality of leadership and service-learning: A 21st-century perspective. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 2016(150), 11–22. doi:10.1002/yd.20167
- Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). *Leadership in the making: Impact and insights from leadership development programs in US colleges and universities. Executive Summary*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF MSL-IS QUESTIONS UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

Research Question 1

- At which stage would you characterize the OVERALL student leadership development efforts on your campus?
- Does your institutional strategic plan mention/include student leadership development?
- Considering ALL the CO-CURRICULAR student leadership programs your campus plans to offer during the 2014-15 academic year (2 semesters, 3 quarters), what percentage meet the following criteria?
 - Programs open to all students.
 - Programs open only to students with specific leadership roles or positions.
 - Programs primarily concerned with leadership training or skill building.
 - Programs primarily focused on leadership education which address leadership theories, models, and approaches.
 - Programs primarily focused on leadership development (personal development and growth).
 - Programs primarily focused on individual skill building and development (e.g., how to delegate, run a meeting, budgeting, public speaking).
- Does your campus have a leadership center?
- Does your co-curricular leadership program have a strategic planning process?
- To what extent do the combination of leadership programs offered on your campus focus on the following:
 - Mentoring Relationships (people intentionally assisting the student's growth or connects the student to opportunities for career or personal development. Mentors include academic faculty, administrative, academic, and student affairs staff, employers, family members, community members, and peers.)
 - Socio-cultural Conversations (Formal and informal dialogues with peers about differences, as well as interactions across differences)
 - Community Service (Includes volunteer work on- or off-campus and with varying frequency from one-time events to ongoing commitments)

Research Question 2

- At which stage would you characterize the OVERALL student leadership development efforts on your campus?
- Does your campus have a leadership center?

- NOTE: The other variables included in Research Question 2 had slightly altered questions in 2009 than in 2015 and data could not be calculated.

Research Question 3

Mission

- Does your institutional strategic plan mention/include student leadership development?
- To what extent do institutional policy-making boards/committees recognize student leadership as an essential goal for the campus?

Program

- To what extent is your primary co-curricular leadership program informed by a clear definition/theoretical framework of leadership?
- To what extent are the following theories/models used to inform your co-curricular leadership development programs?
- Considering ALL the CO-CURRICULAR student leadership programs your campus plans to offer during the 2014-15 academic year (2 semesters, 3 quarters), what percentage meet the following criteria?
 - Programs open to all students.
 - Programs open only to students with specific leadership roles or positions.
 - Programs primarily concerned with leadership training or skill building.
 - Programs primarily focused on leadership education which address leadership theories, models, and approaches.
 - Programs primarily focused on leadership development (personal development and growth).
 - Programs primarily focused on individual skill building and development (e.g., how to delegate, run a meeting, budgeting, public speaking).
- To what extent do the combination of leadership programs offered on your campus focus on the following:
 - Mentoring Relationships (people intentionally assisting the student's growth or connects the student to opportunities for career or personal development. Mentors include academic faculty, administrative, academic, and student affairs staff, employers, family members, community members, and peers.)
 - Socio-cultural Conversations (Formal and informal dialogues with peers about differences, as well as interactions across differences)
 - Community Service (Includes volunteer work on- or off-campus and with varying frequency from one-time events to ongoing commitments)
- How often does your primary co-curricular leadership office or program collaborate with the following units?

Financial Resources

- Please provide raw dollar figures for the following funding sources for your primary co-curricular leadership program.

Human Resources

- How many of the following staff/faculty have positions solely dedicated to your primary co-curricular leadership program?
- Please rate your perception of your personal knowledge about the field of leadership studies.
- Highest degree obtained.
- To what degree did any of your post-baccalaureate education include significant coursework on leadership theory or development?

Assessment & Evaluation

- Does your primary co-curricular leadership program have stated learning objectives?
- Which of the following are used to evaluate the effectiveness of your co-curricular leadership programs?
- Does your co-curricular leadership program have a strategic planning process?
- How often does your co-curricular leadership program engage in the strategic planning process?

APPENDIX B**2009 MSL-IS PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS**

Alfred University
Baylor University
Berry College
Binghamton University
Bridgewater State College
Bryant University
Bucknell University
California Lutheran
California State University, Sacramento
Colgate University
Columbia College
Concordia College
Cornell College
CUNY Baruch College
DePaul University
Drake University
Drexel University
Elmhurst College
Furman University
Gallaudet University
George Mason University
Georgia Southern University
Gettysburg College
Guilford College
Hamline University
Indiana University-Bloomington
John Carroll University
Kansas State University
Loyola Marymount University
Mansfield University
Marquette University
Metro State College Denver
Millikin University
Missouri Western State University
Monroe Community College
Moravian College
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
Pacific Lutheran University

Regis University
Roger Williams University
Rollins College
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
Samford University
Sonoma State University
Southern Methodist University
SUNY Potsdam
Texas A & M University
Texas Christian University
University of Arizona
University of Buffalo
University of California, Berkeley
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Iowa
University of Louisville
University of Massachusetts, Lowell
University of Minnesota
University of North Carolina-Greensboro
University of San Diego
University of San Francisco
University of South Florida
University of Tampa
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Wartburg College
Wilson College
Youngstown State University

APPENDIX C**2015 MSL-IS PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS**

Bowling Green State University-Main Campus
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
Cabrini College
California Maritime Academy
California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo
Clemson University
College of the Holy Cross
College of William and Mary
Colorado State University-Fort Collins
CUNY Borough of Manhattan Community College
CUNY Kingsborough Community College
CUNY Lehman College
Denison University
Drake University
East Carolina University
Elon University
Emory University
Fairfield University
Gonzaga University
Harper College
Iona College
Iowa State University
Lehigh University
Loyola University Chicago
Loyola University Maryland
Marian University
Marymount University
Meredith College
Metropolitan State University of Denver
Northwestern University
Oregon State University
Saint Louis University
Saint Norbert College
San Jose State University
Seattle University
SUNY College at Brockport
SUNY College at Geneseo
Temple University
The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina

The College of New Jersey
The Ohio State University
The University of Tennessee
Towson University
Tulane University of Louisiana
University of California-Los Angeles
University of Central Florida
University of Cincinnati-Main Campus
University of Dayton
University of Delaware
University of Detroit Mercy
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Kansas
University of Maryland-College Park
University of Memphis
University of Missouri-Columbia
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
University of New Haven
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina-Pembroke
University of North Carolina-Wilmington
University of Oregon
University of Rhode Island
University of Rochester
University of Scranton
University of St Francis
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Washburn University
Weber State University
Western Washington University
Winona State University

APPENDIX D**INSTITUTIONS THAT COMPLETED THE 2009 AND 2015 MSL-IS**

Clemson University
Colorado State University-Fort Collins
CUNY Lehman College
Elon University
Loyola University Chicago
Meredith College
Northwestern University
Seattle University
SUNY Geneseo
Temple University
University of Central Florida
University of Detroit Mercy
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Kansas
University of Maryland-College Park
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina-Wilmington
University of Rochester
University of Scranton
University of Wisconsin-Madison

APPENDIX E
UNCG IRB DOCUMENTATION

IRB <ori@approved-senders.uncg.edu>

May 30, 2018,
2:32 PM

to SMMENCAR, cifarrio, irbcorre, LMGONZA2

To: Steven Mencarini
Teacher Ed/Higher Ed
Teacher Ed/Higher Ed

From: UNCG IRB

Date: 5/30/2018

RE: Determination that Research or Research-Like Activity does not
require IRB Approval

Study #: 18-0270

Study Title: A Longitudinal Examination of Structural Environments for U.S. College
and University Leadership Development Programs

This submission was reviewed by the above-referenced IRB. The IRB has determined
that this submission does not constitute human subjects research as defined under federal
regulations [45 CFR 46.102 (d or f)] and does not require IRB approval.

Study Description:

This study seeks to understand structural environments of leadership development
programs (LDPs) at U.S. college and university. Structural environments include
human/financial resources, mission statements, theoretical underpinnings of LDPs, etc.
The study utilizes the 2009 and 2015 iterations of the Multi-Institutional Study of
Leadership - Institutional Survey to gather the data.

- If your study protocol changes in such a way that this determination will no
longer apply, you should contact the above IRB before making the changes.

CC:

Laura Gonzalez, Teacher Ed/Higher Ed