

3 This chapter will discuss the foundations of effective pedagogy and content, and how to apply these to leadership education. International Leadership Association overarching Content Guiding Question: “What is the content of the leadership education program and how was it derived?”

Leadership Pedagogy: Putting Theory to Practice

David M. Rosch and Michael D. Anthony

Building leadership capacity in college students is both an art and a science. Knowledge of college student development and specifically college leadership development, as well as research in leadership theory and practices, can help college leadership educators become more effective. International Leadership Association (ILA) Guiding Questions (2009) is another tool which educators can use to develop their knowledge in creating leadership programs. Educators who apply this knowledge while building a powerful learning environment for students create powerful opportunities for students to grow as emerging leaders. This chapter begins with a review of the structure of pedagogy, and discusses the importance of creating an intentional environment in higher education for this learning and growth. It continues by suggesting an overarching structure for the content of higher education leadership development programs, and examines relevant leadership theory necessary to include in comprehensive education programs. The remainder of the chapter focuses on the importance of understanding the particular student context in delivering effective pedagogy, and reviews how effective pedagogical practices can be applied within the framework of student services and higher education. Specifically, the work of supervising and advising students and student organizations will be discussed, as well as how to deliver effective leadership programs both within and outside of classroom environments.

What Is Leadership Pedagogy?

The word *pedagogy* has roots in the Greek *paidagōgeō*, which literally translates to “lead the child.” The emphasis on leadership as the foundation of

successful pedagogy, then, means educators should conceptualize pedagogy as larger than teaching strategies, where educators serve as leaders themselves in helping students learn and grow. Successful pedagogy encompasses three distinct areas: (1) the implementation of effective instructional strategies, (2) environmental/classroom management techniques, and (3) program design (Marzano, 2007). Therefore, educators who maximize their potential in building student leadership capacity must be intentional in matching their intended program or course outcomes with relevant student and leadership development theory, and then apply effective strategies for the delivery of material to a diverse student population. For example, supervisors of students should have an explicit set of outcomes in mind for the leadership development of these students; they should understand the incoming developmental level of typical students they supervise and construct an overall plan for building their leadership capacity; and lastly, they should utilize an effective set of educational techniques within their meetings, interactions, and overall supervision of students to achieve their goals. Clearly, intentionality is essential for success.

Theoretical Framework for Leadership Education

Despite the overwhelming number of popular definitions of leadership, there is a growing consensus around the general structure of effective leadership practice. Northouse (2009) summarizes this consensus by describing leadership as a combination of individual traits, abilities, skills, and behaviors practiced within one or more relationships with others to achieve common goals. Given this inclusive yet diffuse definition, an increasing number of leadership educators are beginning to adapt their programs and services around a three-tiered structure focused on student attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors. The importance of an emerging leader's "being," "knowing," and "doing" is seen in such diverse leadership development programs as the U.S. Army Official Leadership Manual (Hesselbein and Shinseki, 2004) the Harvard Business School (Nohria and Khurana, 2010), and the popular student leadership textbook, *Exploring Leadership* (Kouzes, Lucas, and McMahon, 2007).

Being (Attitudes). Kouzes and Posner (2010) state that after decades of surveys in government, business, and education, inner qualities such as character, credibility, optimism, and integrity were first and foremost requisites for successful leaders across these disparate sectors. A popular quote often attributed to Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Your actions speak so loudly, I cannot hear what you say," is instructive in regard to the importance of credibility in engaging in effective leadership practices. Therefore, programs and interventions designed to build student leadership capacity should explicitly focus on nurturing and developing these inner qualities in students.

Knowing (Knowledge). The practice of effective leadership looks much different today than it did in recent generations, owing to significant global demographic, economic, and technological shifts (Friedman, 2007; Kanter, Stein, and Jick, 2003). Contemporary leaders must understand the complexities and interrelatedness of systems and organizations (Allen and Cherry, 2000), know how to connect to and build relationships with diverse populations (Kezar and Moriarty, 2000), and recognize the difficulty of acting with integrity and a sense of ethics in ambiguous situations (Johnson, 2011). Success in these areas cannot simply be gained through practice or repetition, but must be learned through study. People will only willingly be led by those who know what they are doing.

Doing (Skills). One of the key reasons for leadership failure is that the leader in question, even when possessing adequate knowledge and a requisite attitude, is not sure what to do when under pressure to act in real time. Katz (1955) was the first to describe effective leadership as encompassing technical skill (e.g., hands-on ability at specialized tasks), interpersonal skill (e.g., perspective-taking, making and building relationships), and conceptual skill (e.g., shaping policy, strategic planning). Capacity-building programs in higher education should therefore focus an aspect of their curriculum on helping students practice these three skills areas in different contexts, so they can learn how to apply them regardless of their particular environment.

A Multilevel Approach. Many leadership capacity-building programs do not explicitly distinguish the level of focus they apply to their curricula or outcomes. Day (2001) describes this as a failure to distinguish between leadership and leader development. Leadership development, he explains, is focused on building capacity within collectives for the practice of leadership within an organizational context—that is, where individuals within those organizations can more easily and successfully practice effective leadership. Leader development, by contrast, deals with the development of skill within individuals. More specifically, Yammarino, Dionne, Uk Chun, and Dansereau (2005) describe four interrelated “levels of analysis” relevant to leadership educators: (1) the Person level, where the focus of programs is on individuals and their traits, skills, abilities, and behaviors; (2) the Dyad level, where the focus is on interpersonal relationships, often within a leader-group member context; (3) the Group/Team level, which includes both hierarchical work teams with supervisors or non-hierarchical social or nonwork teams; and (4) the Collective/System level, where programs are focused on leadership within systems, communities, and society as a whole. Competent leadership educators, therefore, should extend their own curricula to incorporate aspects of each of these four levels, attending to students’ individual competencies, their ability to connect and collaborate with other students and organizations, and their desire and skill in creating positive large-scale impact.

The Role of the Leadership Educator

The true success of effective leadership programs is measured, not by the relationship students have with their instructor, but by students' ability to apply their learning to the challenges they will face after program completion (Baxter Magolda and King, 2004). Therefore, educators should attend to learning more than teaching. This student-centered approach places educators in the role of conduit rather than distributor, and requires attention to be given to collaborative learning practices, personal responsibility for growth and development, and the construction of an inclusive learning community. Leadership educators should, therefore, practice transparent teaching practices and embrace their own learning within the process. It is important for practitioners to model the type of leadership that is being taught. If, for example, the Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007) is chosen as the theoretical frame for the educational experience, does the leadership educator practice the values and behaviors described within the model? If the programs and training that students receive are not integrated into the personal practice of the educator, then students will see that as inconsistent with what is being taught, and are therefore likely to disengage from the experience.

A value that educators and students tend to overlook or discount within leadership education is spirituality. Spirituality, broadly defined as "the deepest values and meanings by which people live" (Sheldrake, 2007), is often integral to the value-orientation of leaders, and therefore affects how leaders interact with others. Spirituality may also determine how, why, and to what extent leaders will impact the world around them. Utilizing the being, knowing, doing framework referenced earlier in this chapter, leadership educators must model how to effectively and transparently incorporate one's personal values and spirituality into the practice of leading. Doing so allows students and educators to be authentic in how they discuss being, knowing, and doing in practice, and an attention to spirituality creates an inclusive space where students can bring all parts of themselves into their experience as a leader.

Content of Leadership Programs

In summarizing a century of research in leadership, Van Fleet and Yukl (1989) created a metaphor between the study of leadership and the study of atoms. In the early study of atoms, these particles were considered to be indivisible, and the building blocks of all other things. Later research, however, proved that atoms are made up of several smaller parts, each of which must be understood within a larger context. The study of leadership follows a similar path, where early studies focused on a broad, singular concept, while later research showed that leadership takes place within a larger, more complex system, where leaders must understand its interrelated parts.

Using this metaphor, the content of contemporary leadership programs should focus on leadership as a multifaceted concept, where students see their own leadership practice as their traits, knowledge, and skills implemented within organizations and systems of other people. Several key texts serve as excellent reviews of significant leadership theories relevant to student leadership capacity-building programs, including *The Handbook of Student Leadership Development* (Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, and Wagner, 2011) and *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Northouse, 2010). However, a brief overview of relevant theories is provided here.

Conventional/Industrial Leadership Theories. Conventional, or “industrial,” theories—named for their role in describing successful leadership within industry during and after the Industrial Revolution—often place leaders themselves at the center of attention, and therefore focus on their individual traits, skills, and behaviors. Productivity and results are explicit outcomes often included as part of these models. Capacity-building programs that utilize conventional models often focus their curriculum on individual skill building, personality and leadership, and the types of technical skills required for success in particular environments (Dugan and Komives, 2011). Significant theories that fall within these categories include trait-based, style, and situational/contingency approaches to the practice of leadership.

Trait-Based Approach. Essential to the trait-based approach is the idea that leaders possess inner traits or characteristics that lead to their capacity for effective leadership. The “Great Man” theory is a precursor to this approach, and began with the study of what led famous men to success in their fields in the late 19th century and early 20th century. Current research in trait theory is focused on the role that leaders’ intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability play in their effectiveness (Northouse, 2010).

Style Approach. The foundation of the style approach to leadership is that one’s behavior determines the potential for success. While many students exhibit a preference for focusing on either task- or relationship-oriented behaviors, the most effective leaders display a high concern for both, and should recognize that most organizational goals require some combination of them for leaders to succeed (Northouse, 2010). Blake and Mouton popularized a “leadership grid” to help aspiring leaders recognize the benefits and weaknesses of several different styles that combine varying degrees of concern for tasks and relationships (Blake and McCanse, 1991).

Situational/Contingency Approach. Leaders who utilize this approach recognize that different situations call for different styles, and therefore maintain flexibility in displaying concern for tasks and people, choosing their style depending on the skill and comfort level of team members (Northouse, 2010). Later contingency approaches added a complex set of situational and environmental variables to help leaders determine the degree of group involvement leaders allow team members (Yukl, 2010).

Postindustrial Leadership Theories. Postindustrial leadership theories, as a contrast to industrial theories, place the relationship that leaders co-create with group members at the fore (Rost, 1993). These theories do not assume that the end goals of the group are autocratically chosen by the leader, but rather reflect the shared goals and common purpose of the group as a whole. Moreover, given the shared responsibilities of both leaders and members, ethical and authentic practices are given significant attention in models based on postindustrial theories. Reflecting a contemporary view of an interconnected world, social justice should be an explicit goal of an effective postindustrial leader (Kezar, Carducci, and Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Current popular theories that can be categorized as postindustrial include transformational leadership, servant leadership, authentic leadership, and chaos/systems approaches.

Transformational Leadership Approach. The early work of Burns (1978) helped shift the field of leadership study when he focused on the difference between transforming leadership (i.e., mutually beneficial processes with ethical ends) and transactional leadership (i.e., exchange-based processes, where group members provide leaders power while leaders take responsibility for the direction of the group). Bass (1998) relabeled the approach “transformational leadership” and went on to further describe the mutual responsibilities for shared influence among leaders and followers within this approach.

Servant Leadership Approach. Students whose primary goal is to serve the organization and individuals within it, even before their own needs, are servant leaders. Through placing the group's needs first, students become quite influential and transform themselves into leaders (Greenleaf, 1977). Implicit within this approach is that not only is the organization and its goals served by students, but the students themselves grow and develop into effective and ethical leaders ready to engage in interdependent relationships with other members (Komives et al., 2007).

Authentic Leadership Approach. The popularity of Authentic Leadership approaches stems from the logic that contemporary leaders who base their actions on their true values and convictions will be more successful in interconnected organizations and communities (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). According to this approach, student leaders should be confident in themselves and their values and display behaviors that reflect these values—and at the same time, they should seek to create authentic and balanced interpersonal relationships with other group members.

Chaos/Systems Approach. This approach to leadership emphasizes the uncontrollable nature of organizational issues and crises, which often reflect countless influences and results in unknowable outcomes (Allen and Cherry, 2000). Leaders competent in this approach to their leadership practice are comfortable with ambiguity, possess clear and direct goals yet are flexible to changing conditions, and recognize the need to attend to potential connections between disparate parts of an interconnected system.

Models Popular in Higher Education

While there is no single model of leadership practice that predominates on college campuses, several popular models emphasize similar aspects of industrial and postindustrial theories. The three models most widely utilized within higher education are the Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007), the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996), and the Leadership Challenge (Kouzes and Posner, 2007).

Relational Leadership Model. Within this model, the practice of leadership is viewed as a complex process aimed at positive purposes. Student leaders should be inclusive of others and diverse points of view, ethical in their practice, and empowering of group members. As an “aspirational” model, it does not seek to summarize or incorporate existing leadership theory, but rather prescribe the necessary traits and behaviors of effective leaders working to create healthy communities (Komives et al., 2007). Many campuses that espouse this model coordinate programs that educate students about the importance of building positive and authentic interpersonal relationships, constructing strong personal and organizational ethics, and incorporating aspects of social justice into their strategic goals.

Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development. The SCM was also created as an aspirational model, serving to prescribe to students the capacities required for effective leadership in an interconnected and complex society (Astin, 1996). The model describes three domains that include seven related capacities (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). In the Individual Domain—focused on personal skills—leaders are pressed to be “Conscious” of themselves; “Congruent” in their values, words, and behavior; and “Committed” to their goals and values. In the Group Domain—focused on interpersonal skills—leaders should effectively “Collaborate” with others, help groups they work with to attain a “Common Purpose,” and deal with group and individual conflict gracefully through the capacity “Controversy with Civility.” Finally, in the Community Domain, leaders should display “Citizenship” through positive engagement with the larger society. The end goal for leaders, as described in the SCM, is positive change. Leadership educators who wish to adopt the SCM and would like to include an assessment for students can utilize the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS), a popular instrument that has undergone significant psychometric testing.

The Leadership Challenge. This model describes five overall behaviors that successful leaders should display when working within contemporary organizations: Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. Originated in studies of private sector success, Kouzes and Posner (2008) broadened their model to include college students through the

creation of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI), another personal leadership assessment instrument utilized on many college campuses (Kouzes and Posner, 2007).

Applying Leadership Theory to Student Services

The remainder of this chapter focuses on the importance of context in effectively delivering leadership content, and specifically how to apply effective pedagogical practices within the framework of student services. Delivering effective leadership programs both within and outside the classroom, supervising and advising individual students, and advising student organizations/groups of students will be discussed. This section begins with an examination of curricular leadership, and provides practical strategies to incorporate successful pedagogy as discussed at the beginning of the chapter.

Curricular Leadership. The classroom context presents a unique opportunity for significant shifts in leadership learning and behavior. It is within the classroom that many students first recognize leadership as a discipline worthy of study and reflection. This realization creates a powerful opportunity to help students experience leadership in new ways. Several components must exist within the curricular context to make it a meaningful theory-to-practice experience. The following should be explicitly stated within the course curriculum: (1) clear statement of purpose for the course; (2) relevant required readings; (3) relevant professional standards for the course; (4) student learning outcomes and objectives; (5) course requirements; (6) criteria for grading; (7) relevant expectations and criteria; and (8) a course outline/schedule.

Clear Statement of Purpose for the Course. The statement of purpose details the central concepts of the course, and details why the course exists. Educators should include a statement about why this course and its content are important for emerging leaders to master. The leadership model being utilized should be discussed at this time, including how the model is defined. This section should outline what the course will and will not do for students' leadership development—for example, “This course does not provide a ‘how-to’ for leadership; rather it allows for students to develop and refine their own way of thinking about leadership.” Concepts related to knowing, being, and doing can be discussed at this point, and how these concepts relate to the course experience.

Relevant Required Reading. This section should include a properly cited reference list for the course readings. Any inventories or assessments should also be included. Articles, websites, and other online resources provide powerful “real-life” examples for students and should be included in this section. Resist the urge to limit course reading to only a specific text—as the study of leadership is still emerging as a discipline (Riggio, 2011),

educators might not want to expose students to only one perspective of leadership.

Relevant Professional Standards for the Course. The Council for the Advancement of Standards (<http://www.cas.edu>) provides the framework for leadership education and development within student services, and therefore can be used to inform the structure of any leadership course designed within student services. Specifically, the CAS statements relating to Intellectual Growth and Leadership Education provide useful frameworks by which to assess your course content and are covered in other chapters. In addition, the ILA publishes “Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs” (ILA, 2009), which is designed to support educators in both academic and student affairs as they develop strong foundations for their programs. These guidelines are also covered in other chapters. Using the CAS and ILA Guidelines for support will help ensure that your practice is consistent with foundational theory and best practices as it relates to leadership development courses.

Student Learning Outcomes and Objectives. Course objectives should be written in clear, measurable language that makes it clear to students what they should know or how they should behave differently as a result of this course. Utilizing specific outcomes helps students take ownership of their learning before ever starting the course, and can also help students hold faculty and practitioners accountable for what they teach. An example of a poorly written outcome would be, “students will improve their interpersonal skills.” An outcome that can be assessed, for example, is, “students will be able to identify which of the five main conflict management styles are appropriate to utilize in a particular conflict situation.”

Course Requirements. Beyond simply stating the assignments and when they take place, the course requirements should outline in some detail the specific activities, assignments, and expectations for the course, as well as how the assignment will help students develop in their leadership capacity. This can include how much value is placed on each assignment, the level of quality that is expected for each assignment, and any other information needed for students to understand the course’s assignments within the greater context of the course’s learning objectives. The most effective leadership courses should incorporate practical experience, providing ample opportunity to practice the lessons learned in the text or in life. Leadership educators in higher education may be uniquely trained on helping students incorporate experience into their learning. A strong attendance policy is needed to ensure students show up to learn and experience the course. This should be reflected in the course requirements section. It may be helpful to create an additional “Assignment Packet” with additional details, rubrics, or requirements if the syllabus length is restricted. This section is particularly valuable in helping students develop the attitudinal components required for successful leadership.

Criteria for Grading. As important as the course requirements, the grading criteria should allow students to see exactly what they need for earning a particular grade in the course. Since this is an academic experience, clear and consistent grading should be applied to each student. Students may not understand the experiential nature of a leadership course, and therefore will underestimate the impact of poor performance within the course on their overall grade point average. In other words, students might misinterpret experiential activities for a lack of rigor, and therefore educators should make efforts to help students understand how the course fits within their overall academic experience.

Course Outline/Schedule. Finally, the syllabus should include a detailed schedule of all upcoming assignments. This includes the date, course topics/activities, what is due (reading or assignments), and any special notes for each course. Providing this allows for transparency and accountability for both the practitioner and student in the learning process. Additionally, educators may want to overlay the course outline with the leadership capacities or general approaches to leadership that are being covered, which helps students understand how each session relates to a larger pattern of leadership knowledge.

Extracurricular and Cocurricular Leadership. Students develop leadership skills through such disparate aspects of the cocurriculum as informal interaction with faculty, participation in clubs and organizations, time spent utilizing campus resources, and peer interaction (Astin, 1984). For purposes of this chapter, “extracurricular and cocurricular” leadership involvement includes activities, programs, and services that happen outside of the classroom environment, and where students do not earn an academic grade or credit. The curriculum of leadership programs should be explicitly linked to the knowledge, behaviors, or attitudes you hope students possess after attending. The outcomes of the programs must be clearly stated prior to attending, and reiterated during the experience in order to help students make meaning of their learning. Much like with a curricular experience, learning outcomes help hold students responsible for their learning, and help them make sense of their experience in logical and intentional ways. Students must be given regular opportunities to succeed or struggle in various contexts if they are ever to learn to apply the behavior, knowledge, or attitudinal outcomes after the experience has ended.

As leadership educators, it is necessary to create a menu of opportunities for students to experience the multiple levels of leadership discussed above—individual, dyad, group, and organizational approaches. Distinguishing among them and offering skill development sessions targeted at each can help educators design programs that develop students' capacities for the diversity of experiences they are likely to face upon graduation. To illustrate, several campuses have first-year emerging leadership programs that provide individual attention to students, and that have a focus on personal skill building. Students on these campuses may then transition into

programs that focus on interpersonal or community development as a leader. A lack of intentional structure applied to programs leaves many students unable to grasp the difference in capacity necessary for personal success and organizational or societal leadership.

The extracurricular or cocurricular context provides three distinct advantages over the curricular context, and is therefore an important space through which students can learn and practice leadership. The first advantage is that student leaders can interact with several different “teachers” during their leadership education. Student leaders often have multiple advisors, additional role models, alumni, or community allies whom they can contact for support, advice, and guidance. In this environment, leadership educators can provide structure to a student’s education, help make meaning, and connect an understanding of developmental theory to one’s lived experience in a more informal way not tied to any academic calendar.

The second advantage of the extracurricular or cocurricular context is the opportunity for extended learning opportunities beyond one semester. Unless a student is in a leadership major or minor, that student may have limited long-term exposure to the study of leadership in a curricular sense. Furthermore, even within a major or minor, the student may interact with different faculty across different departments. Student services professionals have the opportunity to arrange interactions with students and groups of students across multiple semesters. In addition, these professionals can work with students across different contexts (i.e., different organizational settings and within different types of leadership experiences). This provides powerful learning opportunities for both the student and the practitioner.

The third advantage of teaching leadership through the cocurriculum is the opportunity for involvement with a large and diverse peer group. Several scholars have pointed to peer group interaction as producing student gains across many psychological, psychosocial, and cognitive outcomes (Astin, 1993; Cuyjet, 2006; Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005). Indeed, for some groups of students (e.g., students of color) the extracurricular or cocurricular context may be the first venue by which students experience leadership development and socialization within the college context (Museus, 2008; Sutton and Kimbrough, 2001). The section below discusses two specific contexts in which leadership educators can utilize the cocurriculum for advancing student leadership capacities.

Supervising and Advising Individual Students

Supervisors and advisors should view one-on-one relationships with students as a holistic developmental opportunity for leadership capacity building; thinking about the development of students before hiring them, while they are employed, and after they leave an educator’s direct supervision.

The following illustrates one way to help a student advisee or employee achieve flow and reach their full developmental potential:

Your first meeting or interaction should be used to set clear goals and expectations for the relationship. You might instruct your student to come prepared with their personal and professional goals. This would give leadership educators the opportunity to begin helping students to recognize the developmental opportunities inherent in their new role. Additionally, one could discuss the students' skills and desired skills, so they can be provided with opportunity to grow while not overwhelming them. For example, if your student is attempting to better prioritize his or her day, then you can build relevant topical discussions into your regular interactions. You can set very clear guidelines in how he or she might organize time while at the office, and provide him or her with appropriate resources to organize and balance the day. It is important when working with students to leave them with a sense of ownership and equality within the context of their work or leadership role. If our students are to achieve flow in their roles, particularly work roles, they must feel that they are genuinely part of the team, not subordinate within it.

Dunkel and Schuh (1998) provide a useful model in their Supervisory Cycle that is informative in supervising and advising individual students. The six-step model includes: team building, performance planning, communication, formal evaluation, self-assessment, and, finally, recognition. Using this model, leadership educators can create an intentional framework by which their students can learn how to be a better leader and a better employee—through socializing them into a team, creating goals and performance plans, incorporating structured self and supervisor evaluations, and recognizing success and areas in which to grow.

Advising Student Organizations or Groups of Students. Leadership educators who advise student groups can utilize a range of programs that can help students develop interpersonal and community change skills, including: (1) retreats; (2) cohort programs; (3) service learning or community service; and (4) student organizational/club involvement. Effective leadership educators provide more than one of these options as a way to attract a diverse pool of student leaders. When designing extracurricular or cocurricular leadership programs for groups of students, consider the following: target population, philosophy, and program intensity.

The *target population* simply refers to whom the program is marketed. Is the program designed for undergraduates or graduates, on-campus residents, underclassmen or upperclassmen, and does it include a gender-based component or not? The answers to these questions should largely be driven by campus and population needs. *Philosophy* refers to the context and conceptual framework utilized within the program. To which model of leadership will your programs subscribe? The program philosophy answers the “why” of one’s leadership programs, and regardless of the content of the program, the philosophy will underpin the experience. *Program intensity*

refers to the time commitment necessary for participation. Low-intensity programs (e.g., a one-hour workshop) require a minimal time commitment, while medium intensity (e.g., weekend long retreat experience) and high-intensity programs (e.g., academic course or yearlong leadership immersion experience) require sustained and intense commitment over the course of the semester or year.

As student organizations are a central context for teaching leadership, administrators must ensure good advising practice for faculty and staff advisors. Not all advisors are selected intentionally, or in a way that is best for students. Effective advisors have certain qualities ranging from being able to negotiate different personalities, listening, being honest and open, and possessing strong interpersonal skills (Rentz, 1996). Effective leadership educators possess these skills as well. Not coincidentally, these are often the same leadership outcomes of many programs. While students have many opportunities to develop individual skills related to leadership in the classroom or in their everyday interactions, student groups or organizations provide an opportunity to put learning into action in unique ways. This can happen only if leadership educators make developing strong group skills a focus for each experience.

Conclusion

Building leadership capacity in college students is both an art and a science. To maximize student learning potential, leadership educators should develop explicit leadership-oriented learning outcomes that not only reflect the expected level of maturity and prior learning in students, but incorporate relevant contemporary leadership theories and models reflective of modern society. Moreover, pedagogy should include content and design arranged to help students develop effective attitudes, knowledge, and skills related to their leadership behaviors. Leadership educators should model these attitudes, knowledge, and skills, as well as attend to a multilevel curriculum that builds capacity within the self, dyads, groups, and organizations. Within higher education, a wide variety of environments can be utilized for student leadership capacity-building, including both curricular and cocurricular settings.

References

- Allen, K. E., and Cherry, C. *Systemic Leadership: Enriching the Meaning of Our Work*. Lanham, Md.: American College Personnel Association and National Association for Campus Activities; University Press of America, 2000.
- Astin, A. A. "Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education." *Journal of College Student Development*, 1984, 40(5), 518–529.
- Astin, A. W. *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.
- Astin, H. S. "Leadership for Social Change." *About Campus*, 1996, 1(3), 4–10.

- Avolio, B. J., and Gardner, W. L. "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership." *Leadership Quarterly*, 2005, 16(3), 315–338.
- Bass, B. M. *Transformational Leadership*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B., and King, P. M. *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Blake, R. R., and McCause, A. A. *Leadership Dilemmas: Grid Solutions*. Houston, Tex.: Gulf, 1991.
- Burns, J. M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Cuyjet, M. J. (ed.). *African American Men in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.
- Day, D. V. "Leadership Development: A Review in Context." *Leadership Quarterly*, 2001, 11(4), 581–613.
- Dugan, J. P., and Komives, S. R. "Leadership Theories." In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack, and W. Wagner (eds.), *The Handbook for Student Leadership Development*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.
- Dunkel, N. W., and Schuh, J. H. *Advising Student Groups and Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Friedman, T. L. *The World Is Flat 3.0: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York, NY: Picador, 2007.
- Greenleaf, R. *Servant Leadership: A Journey in the Nature of Power and Greatness*. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Hesselbein, F., and Shinseki, E. K. *Be, Know, Do: Leadership the Army Way: Adapted From the Official Army Leadership Manual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- Higher Education Research Institute. *A Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Version III)*. Los Angeles: University of California Higher Education Research Institute, 1996.
- International Leadership Association. "Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs." 2009. Retrieved March 24, 2012, from www.ilanet.org/communities/LC/GuidingQuestionsFinal.pdf.
- Johnson, C. E. *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership: Casting Light or Shadow*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2011.
- Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A., and Jick, T. D. *The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It*. New York: Free Press, 2003.
- Katz, R. L. "Skills of an Effective Administrator." *Harvard Business Review*, 1955, 33(1), 33–42.
- Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., and Contreras-McGavin, M. *Rethinking the "L" Word in Higher Education: The Revolution in Research in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.
- Kezar, A. J., and Moriarty, D. "Expanding Our Understanding of Student Leadership Development: A Study Exploring Gender and Ethnic Identity." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2000, 41(1), 55–69.
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., Owen, J. E., Slack, C., and Wagner, W. (eds.). *The Handbook for Student Leadership Development*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., and McMahan, T. *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. *The Leadership Practices Inventory*. San Diego: Pfeiffer and Company/University Associates, 2007.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. *The Leadership Challenge*. (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. *The Truth About Leadership: The No-Fads, Heart-of-the-Matter Facts You Need to Know*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Marzano, R. J. *The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction*. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2007.

- Museus, S. D. "Focusing on Institutional Fabric: Using Campus Culture Assessments to Enhance Cross-Cultural Engagement." In S. R. Harper (ed.), *Creating Inclusive Environments for Cross-Cultural Learning and Engagement in Higher Education*. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2008.
- Nohria, N., and Khurana, R. *Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press, 2010.
- Northouse, P. G. *Introduction to Leadership Concepts and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2009.
- Northouse, P. G. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2010.
- Pascarella, E. T., and Terenzini, P. T. *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Rentz, A., and Associates. *Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education*. (2nd ed.). Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1996.
- Riggio, R. E. "Is Leadership Studies a Discipline?" In M. Harvey and R. E. Riggio (eds.), *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*. Northampton, Mass.: Elgar, 2011.
- Rost, J. C. *Leadership For the 21st Century*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1993.
- Sheldrake, P. *A Brief History of Spirituality*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2007.
- Sutton, E. M., and Kimbrough, W. M. "Trends in Black Student Involvement." *NASPA Journal*, 2001, 39(1), 30–40.
- Van Fleet, D. D., and Yukl, G. A. "A Century of Leadership Research." In W. E. Rosenbach and R. L. Taylor (eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*. (2nd ed.). Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.
- Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Uk Chun, J., and Dansereau, F. "Leadership and Levels of Analysis: A State-of-the-Science Review." *Leadership Quarterly*, 2005, 16(6), 879–919.
- Yukl, G. *Leadership in Organizations*. (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2010.

DAVID M. ROSCH is an assistant professor of Agricultural Leadership Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

MICHAEL D. ANTHONY is the director of the Cultural Center at the University of Louisville.