Interview with Dr. James MacGregor Burns

Author of Leadership and Senior Scholar
Center for Political Leadership and Participation
University of Maryland at College Park

This interview with Dr. Burns was conducted by NCLP staff, Susan R. Jones and Nance Lucas, at the University of Maryland, September 14, 1993.

NCLP: What are your opinions about the current trend of institutionalizing leadership in higher education?

Burns: There is a difference between institutionalizing leadership programs and institutionalizing leadership. It's like the difference between teaching someone how to play tennis and teaching someone how to critique a tennis game. From what I have seen from institutions of higher education across the country, very few of them institutionalize either leadership or leadership studies on their campuses. Leadership is not a familiar concept in terms of what colleges and universities do. In fact, my experience in trying to get universities interested in institutionalizing either leadership or leadership studies has not been very satisfactory and has been very meager.

I happen to be acquainted with a college, Williams College, where the history of the college is a history of students making big changes that happened in the 19th century and this century. I think that is rather rare. There is very little considered thinking on the part of faculty and administrators about what kind of leadership experiences students are getting. I am not sure how much recognition is given to students just for leadership. They get a lot of recognition for athletics and scholarship, but I am not sure that the rewards for leadership as such are very great at most universities.

Leadership studies are very modest. It is not an accepted subject. Leadership is very difficult to institutionalize as a subject of study because the study of leadership has to be very interdisciplinary. You can teach a lot of history just as history and you can teach a lot of political science just as political science. Leadership is very dependent on several disciplines—first psychology, though I am not a psychologist, then maybe history, political science, theology, and philosophy. And if you want to institutionalize the study of leadership, getting those fields and people together from very separated departments is also difficult. So I think the bottom line on this question is that it is still an infant industry, and still has an elementary institutional foundation both in terms of institutionalizing leadership itself and leadership studies.

NCLP: In your opinion, are we on the right track to be thinking about institutionalizing leadership programs? Is that something that higher education should aspire to do?
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Since the 1970's, leadership programs on college campuses have experienced steady growth. Historically, leadership offerings were found predominantly in schools of business and public policy. In more recent years, leadership is taught by faculty and student affairs professionals through curricular and cocurricular formats. Today, over 600 leadership programs at institutions of higher education may be found in academic departments such as history, education, humanities, philosophy, management, psychology, and political science. Cocurricular leadership programs are coordinated by offices such as student activities, residence life, Greek life, health education, and career centers. The range of leadership programs extends from traditional academic courses to outdoor adventure experiences. Some campuses claim to offer everything in the leadership program menu, while others are wrestling with the idea of teaching leadership on their campuses. These crucial dialogues are at the heart of decisions and strategies regarding institutionalizing leadership programs.

Many scholars contend that leadership is an interdisciplinary study, best understood by analyzing the concept from many fields of study. Eminent scholar and author James MacGregor Burns discusses this idea in this issue's guest column. Several academic departments on a given college campus offer leadership courses grounded in theories and concepts related to their academic disciplines while student affairs staff typically provide leadership programs that emphasize skills development and practical application. A current trend in leadership education is an institutional approach that integrates the study and practice of college student leadership, bringing together faculty and staff to work collectively in providing leadership program offerings. The collaborative efforts of faculty and student affairs are needed to support an institutional approach to student leadership development. A recent project at Franklin College (highlighted in this issue) serves as one example of a college working successfully to institutionalize leadership education. Foundations such as Kellogg and Lilly funded proposals involving leadership curriculum transformation projects that required joint efforts of faculty and student affairs professionals. We need to see more examples where academic affairs and student affairs work collectively to support one another's programs and to thoughtfully integrate leadership programs based on sound theoretical constructs and substantive practical experiences.

Such collaboration and integration becomes critical given evidence of ardent critique of leadership programs. Rigorous debate exists among academicians about whether or not leadership is a bona fide discipline of study. Benjamin DeMott, Mellon Professor of Humanities Emeritus at Amherst College, authored an essay in Harpers Magazine (December, 1993) entitled, "Choice Academic Pork: Inside the leadership-studies racket." Dr. DeMott is a self-proclaimed "non-believer" and "anti-leadership" scholar. He criticizes the very notion of leadership as a formal, academic discipline and questions the idea that leadership can be taught. Most importantly, DeMott raises an eyebrow to leadership programs that lack theoretical foundations and substantive content. His concern, shared by others, reinforces the importance and value in institutionalizing leadership programs in which faculty and student affairs staff work collaboratively to study, teach, and coordinate student leadership programs. This issue is testimony to the success of such efforts.

Nance Lucas, Director
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
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How can I democratize this university if the faculty won't do what I tell them?" This was Woodrow Wilson's statement of frustration during his tenure as President of Princeton. It illustrates the greatest threat that leadership program directors face: the temptation to ignore the very theory that they teach.

In developing the leadership program at Franklin College, we have tried to adhere to the premise of modern leadership theory — defining mutual purposes, encouraging campus-wide involvement, respecting and empowering participants, and aligning procedures with principles.

The Franklin College leadership program, which is funded by the Lilly Endowment Inc. is in its third year. The initial focus of the program is the education of faculty and student affairs professionals to prepare them to teach leadership effectively to their students. Each year a new group of thirteen to fifteen participants begins a two year process of learning and practicing leadership education. It is the widespread involvement of people at the heart of the mission of the college that has caused the leadership program to become a priority on the Franklin campus. A director, chosen from the faculty, administers the program.

Joseph Rost in his book, Leadership for the 21st Century, stresses the importance of defining mutual goals in a leadership relationship. This takes time, research, reflection, and consultation. It is a good exercise periodically for programs at all stages of development. We spent two years involving faculty, administration, and staff in discussion, researching existing programs, seeking out experts, and reviewing our college mission and current circumstances. THEN we developed an action plan.

Because Franklin College is a liberal arts college that truly values the role of teaching, our program was based on integrating leadership education with traditional liberal arts disciplines. We started with a core group of faculty salted with a few student affairs professionals and top administrators. Through persuasion, personal influence, and the use of transactional leadership techniques in designing incentives, we were able to attract key spokespeople and opinion shapers. Constructive skeptics were particularly recruited as they challenged the program to improve.

As incentives for our faculty, we offered readings, seminars, top-quality speakers, a chance to work with a personal mentor in their own discipline, and stipends. We offered the same activities to student affairs professionals but, more importantly, we offered a chance for participation and communication on an equal basis between faculty and administrators. Incentives must address the psychological as well as the resource needs of faculty and staff.

We were very careful to avoid identification of the program with one segment of the community. A program will not become an integral part of the institution if it is only perceived as "the President's baby" or as "the business of Student Affairs."

Participation cannot be coerced but should be encouraged. Everyone was invited to apply, and for the first year we treated the program almost as an exclusive club with privileges for members. After a second group of participants was recruited to fulfill the expectations of our grant from the Lilly Endowment Inc., we provided avenues of involvement for all faculty and staff. Currently 60% of our faculty and 50% of our student affairs staff are full participants in the program. The level of voluntary and continuing participation is the best measure of our success.

Max DePree, author of Leadership is an Art and Leadership in Jazz, has said that the first job of a leader is to respect the followers. A leadership program should provide a safe place for all to come together to learn and to grow. At Franklin, we accomplish this through three day study seminars that include reading, discussion, reflection and sharing by all participants. In addition, there are monthly discussion meetings on topics of interest chosen by the participants. The program has served to draw the community together and to increase our respect for each other and the jobs that we do. The only real mistake or problem that we encountered was our failure to anticipate the amount of time required to coordinate the program and to keep so many people engaged. Currently, the director teaches three courses...
and carries the usual advising and committee responsibilities in addition to administering this program.

There is much written in the leadership literature about empowering followers. At Franklin, participants who receive stipends must develop their own individual leadership project for students. This increases investment in and commitment to the campus-wide program. All activities focus on preparing participants to take what they have learned about leadership to the students. All projects are reviewed and evaluated by our ultimate "customers," the students.

Upon completion of the individual project, participants are encouraged to help determine the next initiative for the whole program. The role of the director is one of influencing and guiding, but the ownership of the program belongs to the campus.

The involvement of administrators and trustees is crucial. Workshops, presentations, and applications can be used to demonstrate the relevance of the program and to elicit support. For a leadership program to succeed, administrators must understand their own leadership styles, be open to change, and not be threatened by examination of leadership issues. The director of the project must command the respect on the campus and have the courage to raise questions of leadership to ensure a climate in which the program can grow.

Leadership programs can only be successful if they are tailored to the mission, circumstances, and climate of the particular institution. Perhaps even the notion of "institutionalizing leadership" is an oxymoron, because producing leaders produces change.

Bonnie Pribush is the Director of the Leadership Project and Associate Professor of Mathematical Sciences at Franklin College, Franklin, Indiana.

Dr. James MacGregor Burns
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Burns: Yes, very much so and I might not have answered this way a year or so ago. There is a yearning among many students for this—they want to be leaders. They are not quite sure how to be leaders. They need a helping hand—and more than what a teacher does in passing. They need a foundation, they need an institution that they can turn to for guidance about what kind of leadership they may want to explore—what courses they should take related to that. They need a foundation for going out into the community and taking leadership roles with high school kids or with the elderly or with labor unions—whatever kind of leadership it might be. I think that's awfully important.

NCLP: Where is your thinking evolving these days with respect to transformational theory?

Burns: It is something I think about a lot. I'll be just as forthcoming as I can, but I am a person in the process of rethinking this whole area and turning to others. I would say one kind of interesting aspect about all of this is a shift from the word "transformational" to the word "transforming." That may sound rather pedantic, but in fact it has a lot of meaning to me because the concept of transformational is very much one of "we transformers are transforming you, and maybe institutions." Transformational leadership implies leadership which is top driven and top focused. By using the term transforming, one emphasizes the more active aspects of transforming, a verb more than an adjective. It is much more the leaders transforming themselves or even better, as they mobilize followers, the followers transform the leaders—it's a much more collective effort. And I relate this back to teaching where the teacher teaches the taught, but teaches them so well that the taught become the original teacher's teacher. This also relates to one of my main interests which is leadership by women. Traditionally when we talked about transformational leadership, it was a white man on a white horse galloping to the rescue and being transformational. Now when we are talking more about transforming leadership, we look at how the original leaders become transformed themselves. The power of this idea is that you really bring about lasting change, rather than telling people where to go or what to do, you let them tell you where to go and what to do.

You modify your original leadership and it becomes a big collective effort. This has often been the case in mass movements and social movements. In doing so, the concept of transformational leadership becomes less elitist, more democratic, and related to leadership by women.

NCLP: If we applied the concept of transforming leadership to a college campus, what would that institution be like?

Burns: I have a feeling that part of the transformation may already be taking place and it may not call for any leadership at the top because it is happening particularly from very active, very remarkable women students. Then the big question becomes—to what extent do students have influence over the institution itself? I am afraid that my answer to your question, as one who believes in transforming leadership, is not very optimistic. I can dream about this if you like, but I am afraid my dream gets awfully unrealistic. If this happened, then I think students would have more influence over the curriculum, over student rules and behavior. I don't think they would have much more influence over
hiring the faculty, adoption of new programs, new majors, and the like. I don't see major changes. That does not mean there is not a lot of room for incremental changes. Sometimes it is possible for institutions to wither away—you know the old bromide about rearranging the deck chairs as the Titanic goes down. Students are already doing much more than rearranging the deck chairs, but the pilot up there is an established university administrator.

I think one of the big questions of the next century is that since there has been improvement in student influence and in the rise of remarkable student leadership, how much is this going to change the institution and structure? If one believes in student leadership, then there will be restructuring to allow more effective student leadership—but slowly. Institutions are very laissez-faire about reaching out and responding to, encouraging, and mobilizing people who have natural leadership qualities. We tend to think that students will be active, athletically, politically, and so on. There is never a time as wonderful as undergraduate life to do all these things, and that is where I think universities have some rethinking to do to become less elitist. One other thing I should mention about transformational leadership is that we are now thinking about leadership much more broadly. We are seeing leadership oriented toward the group and less geared toward strong individuals.

NCLP: What on a college campus would encourage or discourage transforming leadership?
Burns: I think that early and excessive specialization would discourage the kind of leadership we are talking about. When universities segment or sequester students in units where they are all supposed to be homogeneous, they frustrate the kind of leadership we are talking about.

This is sensitive because people teach the way they want to teach, but I would doubt that historians, political scientists, etc. are doing much teaching about leadership—they are teaching about leaders. But leadership is something much more complex. The more these courses overspecialize, the more we sacrifice breadth. And leadership intellectually is a matter of great breadth—it encompasses many approaches, many disciplines, and huge ranges of history. An important part of all this is the nature of the teaching.

NCLP: Earlier you mentioned your interest in women's leadership. What are you discovering in your studies of this?
Burns: I am now turning to women, although I am aware that it is talked about frequently today. It is a conception of leadership women have that tries to get away from the excessively competitive, individualistic, "king of the hill" politics that we currently have—the destructive, mean-spirited kind of politics. We are talking about a much more nurturing, mentoring, sharing type of leadership. This type of leadership still has to be competitive because that is democracy, but competitive in a different way. There are all kinds of problems in a democracy because democracy means conflict. But we need to figure out how to rechannel conflict so that it is creative and constructive.

I hesitate to say much more because I am still listening to women talk about leadership.

NCLP: What do you think about universities teaching students about ethical leadership?
Burns: First let's differentiate between values and ethics. I distin-

guish among three levels of values. I differentiate between what I call top substantive values or the Great Values. They are the ones we talk about all the time—freedom, liberty, justice, equality, and order. I don't think you should teach these values, but we should teach about these values because in my view, the Great Values are the continuing values in this country. These are the transforming values. Today they are interpreted differently and they have different emphasis at different times in history. Women might add nurturing, sharing, and sisterhood to the Great Values.

Then the next level to me is what I call modal values. These are really behavioral—how we deal with one another in ordinary human relations. Qualities like responsibility, courtesy, reliability, listening to others, honesty, and integrity are all important modal values. But, you can be very honest and still ignore the Great Values.

And then I go to the bottom level, and that is what I call sin—where you may believe in the Great Values and you may be a wonderful person, but you violate the Ten Commandments. I think some of these Ten Commandments are very important although they are culture specific.

NCLP: What do you think are the challenges for universities to prepare college students for leadership beyond graduation?
Burns: Well, I think there are some specific courses that actually help produce leaders—I am being cautious here because again, it is very hard to teach leadership. But I can think of a very obvious example: a course in public speaking. And lots of cocurricular activities are great practice grounds for leadership. Athletics can be a great practice ground. But there is one problem with those practice grounds because they are usually very specialized. You maybe get to be an excellent team captain in Lacrosse, but that is very specific. The main thing about understanding leadership is to recognize it as a very broad concept—leadership relates to teaching, politics, education, religious leadership, and the like.
FUN FACTS ABOUT
THE NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS!

One year and a half after we officially opened the doors for membership, NCLP boasts:

★ 325+ members
★ representing 44 states, three countries
★ reciprocal affiliations with the National Association for Women in Education, American College Personnel Association, Association of Fraternity Advisors, Association of College Unions-International, the Robert K. Greenleaf Center, and National Association for Campus Activities
★ multiple ways for our members to contact us:

NCLP
1135 Stamp Student Union
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742-4631
(301) 314-7174
FAX (301) 314-9634

While we are very proud of our accomplishments, we are also interested in your satisfaction as a member. In an effort to seek your feedback, we have designed a short survey which is located on page 12. We would really appreciate your completing the survey and returning it directly to NCLP.

Upcoming Leadership Happenings

February 18, 1994 Partnership and Collaboration: The Next 20 Years 20th Anniversary of Maryland Student Affairs Conference held at the University of Maryland at College Park

• keynote speakers include Lee Knefelkamp and Arthur Levine.
• invited sessions by Lee Upcraft on professional issues; Don Creamer and Cathy Engstrom on the “Ten Things Never to Talk About in Student Affairs”; and Robert Young on the essential values in Student Affairs.
• interinstitutional roundtable: “Trends and Forecasts in College Student Leadership Programs” cosponsored by NCLP and James Madison University’s Leadership Education and Development Center.

June 2-4, 1994 Tenth National Conference for College Women Student Leaders
Sponsored by the National Association for Women in Education
Registration materials available February 15, 1994
held at George Washington University, Washington, D.C.
202-659-9330
Leadership Training Concepts & Techniques
A National Approach to Institutionalize Leadership Programs on College Campuses
By Nance Lucas

The National Leadership Symposium is a professional development experience designed for higher education faculty, student affairs professionals, community service agency representatives, and graduate students who coordinate college student leadership development programs or courses. The primary mission of the Symposium is to bring together diverse scholars, practitioners, and educators for the purpose of studying, analyzing, and understanding leadership concepts and theories. The Symposium is one of several leadership education programs that brings scholars together to discuss, debate, conceptualize, and dream about the many possibilities to affect college student leadership development.

In 1990, representatives from the InterAssociation Leadership Project, University of Maryland at College Park, and the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) came together to pursue a common goal of developing a type of think tank experience around emerging themes in leadership education. The program founders were Karen Silien, Rhodes College; Ray Wells, formerly of NACA; and Nance Lucas, University of Maryland at College Park. The first program was offered in June of 1990 at the University of Maryland at College Park. The Symposium has continued to be offered annually in the summer and has attracted student affairs professionals, faculty, community service staff, and graduate students from across the country. Past program sponsors have included NACA, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the University of Maryland, the University of Michigan, Consulting Psychologists Press, and the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Three major outcomes of the program are the creation of new leadership paradigms and models, stimulation of research and assessment in leadership education, and the provision of professional development opportunities for scholars, practitioners, and educators. The National Leadership Symposium aims to embody the characteristics of emerging leadership themes in its collaborative planning model and program design. Leadership concepts, theories, and models are studied using an interdisciplinary approach. The intent of the program is to empower participants to go back to their respective communities and apply models and formats in ways that make the most sense for their situations. The primary outcome of past symposia has been that participants engage in critical thinking around the various themes of the readings, discussions and synthesis of information.

Themes addressed during the past programs include cultural influences on leadership, research and assessment intervention, community and leadership, interdisciplinary influences on leadership, gender and leadership, leadership as service learning, spirituality and leadership development, and ethical leadership. The hallmark of the Leadership Symposium is the richness of discussions from a diverse group of participants. It is evident from the intensity of the discussion and passion expressed by participants that there is considerable dedication throughout the higher education community to prepare college students for many forms of leadership.

Symposium participants are encouraged to share information they receive during the program with colleagues at their home institution, thereby working towards the institutionalizing of leadership. To document the information and creativity generated by participants, a comprehensive set of program proceedings is assembled at the conclusion of each program and distributed to participants. In recent years, two or three professionals from the same institution attended the program as a team with the goal of returning to their campuses and transforming various leadership programs offered by faculty and staff.

Since 1990, approximately 300 professionals have attended the National Leadership Symposium. Through presentations at national and regional professional association conferences about cutting edge themes in college student leadership development generated at the Symposium, another 500 professionals have been reached by the program.

On our respective campuses, we need to initiate discussions on critical issues of leadership using faculty and staff from the many disciplines represented at our institutions. Leadership may be
viewed as an interdisciplinary field of study, which necessitates the influence of diverse scholars. We need leadership on our respective campuses to bring together those who teach and study leadership, who often unintentionally work in isolation, to work collectively toward institutionalizing leadership programs. When this happens, a true community of leadership educators can be empowered to transform leadership curricula, impact the leadership culture on campus, advance cutting edge leadership ideas and models, and most importantly, to prepare our students for the leadership challenges they will face beyond their college careers.

There is still an unfinished leadership agenda. If we believe that leadership development is a lifelong learning process ending only when the desire to lead or learn flickers out, then leadership educators will need to see themselves as lifelong learners in the study of leadership. The fluid nature of leadership calls us to persist in its study and to be open to changing our philosophies and approaches that we pass on to our students. We look forward to future symposia that will bring together diverse scholars to address the growing and exciting agenda in leadership education.

For information on the 1994 National Leadership Symposium, contact Co-Chairs Elizabeth McGovern at (517) 629-0433 or Dusty Porter at (303) 871-9526.

Nance Lucas is the Assistant Director of Campus Programs and Director of NCLP, University of Maryland at College Park.

---

**National Association for Women in Education Joins NCLP in Collaborative Partnership**

We are pleased to announce a new initiative for NCLP which began this fall. In a joint venture with the National Association for Women in Education (NAWE), the clearinghouse will now maintain the National Women's Student Leadership Project, founded by NAWE.

The clearinghouse was particularly eager to join NAWE in this effort to promote, develop, and recognize women's student leadership. NAWE has a long track record of success in providing leadership for women in education and in developing women student leaders. Their very successful National Conference for Women Student Leaders, now in its tenth year, is just one example of their commitment.

Through this partnership, NCLP will house the National Women's Student Leadership Project at the University of Maryland and further enhance its offerings and expertise in the area of gender and leadership. An upcoming newsletter issue will be devoted to this area of inquiry.

---

**CONGRATS TO JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY**

The Office of Student Activities at James Madison University (JMU), Harrisonburg, Virginia, has established the University's Leadership Education and Development (LEAD) Center located in Taylor Hall. The LEAD Center programs are designed to enhance student involvement and improve the leadership attitudes, skills, and knowledge of JMU students. The programs allow students to participate in leadership training, regardless of their previous leadership experience. Through workshops, service-learning, peer education experiences, and organizational involvement, students are given the opportunity to discover their unique leadership abilities and develop a foundation for life-long leadership. LEAD Center staff include Renee Staton, Coordinator; Iris Zimmerman, Assistant Director for Organizational and Leadership Development; and Debbie Fine, LEAD Center Receptionist. If you would like more information about JMU's LEAD Center, call (703) 568-7892. NCLP wishes the LEAD Center staff much success in their endeavors!
A CALL FOR CLEARINGHOUSE MATERIALS...

We invite you to submit leadership program materials (brochures, pamphlets, course syllabi, etc.) to NCLP. Your materials will be categorized in the Clearinghouse according to program type (retreats, emerging leaders, academic courses, community service, etc.) and shared with NCLP members who request information about specific programs.

Our goal is to include as much information as possible in the Clearinghouse so we can be effective in our mission to provide quality services and a wealth of information to our colleagues. Ideally, we would like to have information on every higher education leadership program! The materials you send us will serve as the foundation for a network among leadership educators from all over the country and internationally.

Please send your leadership materials to:
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
University of Maryland at College Park
1135 Stamp Student Union
College Park, MD 20742-4631

NCLP Proudly Announces the Availability of LEADERSHIP SCHOLAR PAPERS

The National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs strives to bring cutting edge leadership education strategies, resources, and thinking to leadership educators in higher education. A new service of NCLP is the publication of low-cost, timely series of leadership papers.

Leadership Papers are available for purchase by contacting NCLP. The cost is $5.00 for NCLP members and $8.00 for non-members.

The following papers are available for purchase:

Leadership Paper #1:
“Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmonies”
by Dr. Kathleen E. Allen,
Vice President of Student Development
College of St. Benedict

Leadership Paper #2:
“African American Men at Risk”
by Bernard Franklin,
Assistant Dean of Student Life
Kansas State University

Leadership Paper #3:
“Teaching, Educating, and Developing Men: The Missing Piece in Student Development Education in Colleges and Universities”
by Bernard Franklin,
Assistant Dean of Student Life
Kansas State University

Leadership Paper #4:
“Leadership Assessments: A Critique of Common Instruments”
by Nancy Snyder-Nepo,
University of Maryland at College Park
and
Dr. Susan R. Komiwos,
University of Maryland at College Park

An order form for the Leadership Scholar Papers is on the back of this page.
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
LEADERSHIP SCHOLAR PAPERS
Order Form

Please indicate on the form below which leadership papers you wish to purchase and in what quantity. The cost of each leadership paper is $5.00 for NCLP members and $8.00 for non-members. Please send the completed form and a check payable to the University of Maryland, 1135 Stamp Student Union, The University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, MD 20742-4631.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #1: “Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmonies” by Dr. Kathleen E. Allen</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #2: “African American Men at Risk” by Bernard Franklin</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #3: “Teaching, Educating, and Developing Men: The Missing Piece in Student Development Education in Colleges and Universities” by Bernard Franklin</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #4: “Leadership Assessments: A Critique of Common Instruments” by Nancy Snyder-Nepo with forward by Dr. Susan Komives</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $       

NAME:
TITLE:
INSTITUTION:
MAILING ADDRESS:
PHONE: ( ) -

Premier Issue of The Journal of Leadership Studies!

The first volume (Volume I, Number 1) of The Journal of Leadership Studies is out with an impressive array of scholarly articles. The Journal is published quarterly and is intended as a forum for the expression of current thought and research for all who teach, study, or practice leadership.

Included in this issue are articles such as: “Situational Leadership After 25 Years: A Retrospective” by K.H. Blanchard, D. Zigarmi, and R.B. Nelson; “Selecting Leaders: Making the Most of Previous Experience” by E.H. Potier, III and F.E. Fiedler; and “Leadership Development in the New Millennium” by J.C. Rost.

For information regarding submissions to the Journal or to subscribe ($46.75 for one year), write:

Stephen L. Williams, Editor
Journal of Leadership Studies
Center for Graduate Studies
Baker College of
Michigan/Flint Campus
1050 W. Bristol Road
Flint, MI 48507
(313) 766-4105
Kellerman's book, Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives, provides the nourishment needed to digest the intoxicating elixir of leadership. Although written nearly a decade ago, her broad brush and inclusive approach to leadership theory still ranks as one of the best basic primers of leadership thinking. As bookshelves become ever populated with mindless "how-to" books on leadership (wonderful for the beach but debilitating in classrooms!), Kellerman's classic serves up sturdy fare.

The ideas presented in Kellerman's 1984 work remain disconcertingly relevant: truth be known, we have not made much headway in the past ten years in understanding the nature of leadership. Recently, several leadership colleagues and I got together with the help of a small Kellogg grant, to discuss the latest thinking on leadership theory. Bernie Bass, who identified more than 5,000 definitions of leadership in his recent Handbook on Leadership, ended the weekend observing that we still have a long way to go before we establish even the outlines of a general theory of leadership.

Perhaps we should all re-read Kellerman. The Forward by the dean of leadership thinkers, James MacGregor Burns, observes that "leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth". But the book nevertheless makes a bold attempt. It provides a base of substantial leadership thinkers, to include James G. Hunt, David Rosen, Sonya Hunt, Kellerman herself, and Robert Kegan among many others.

Kellerman's style is inclusive and creative. The first eight chapters contain a broad discussion of the ways in which a variety of disciplines view leadership—history, psychoanalysis, anthropology, political science, social psychology, and organizational behavior among others. She includes chapters such as Melvin Hill's psychoanalytic approach, Susan Carroll's feminist examination, and Monica Strauss' thought-provoking piece on the artist as cultural leader.

Kellerman has always been a leader among leadership theorists in her inclusion of an international perspective to leadership, and Rosen's chapter on "Leadership Systems in World Cultures," which identifies four types of leadership systems (Egalitarian, Semiegalitarian, Rank, and Stratiform) across cultural and economic factors, stretches our thinking to new territory.

These pieces and others, which normally would be annexed in their own disciplinary ghettos, force the reader to consider a multideterminant view of leadership and enriches our leadership fare.

Anyone who has been on a Kellerman panel at a professional association knows how adept she is at creating a lens in which to integrate a variety of perspectives and to cogently pull together disparate presentations and thoughts. Her book is yet another example of her gift and continues to inspire us to try harder to elicit the elusive creature of leadership in our thinking and practice.

Dr. Georgia Jones Sorenson is the Director of the Center for Political Leadership and Participation at the University of Maryland at College Park.
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
Membership Satisfaction Survey

1. Newsletter themes to date have included leadership and community service, cultural influence and leadership, and institutionalizing leadership programs. The next issue will focus on ethics and leadership. What themes would you like to see in future issues?

2. What advice or specific feedback would you offer us as we continue to develop NCLP?

3. The list below contains current benefits of membership. Please indicate by placing a check, which items you have utilized. Then, please indicate your satisfaction with these items by circling the items you have found most useful to you.

   - Concepts and Connections Newsletter
   - Leadership Scholar Papers
   - Leadership Bibliography
   - Leadership Program Model
   - NCLP leadership files
   - Telephone consultation with NCLP staff

Please Return the Survey to: NCLP
1135 Stamp Student Union, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

---

Video Conference Announcement
"National and Community Service: Roles for Higher Education"

Last September, the President signed the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. This landmark legislation charges the newly formed Corporation for National and Community Service with engaging Americans of all ages and backgrounds in community-based service. In February the Corporation will issue final regulations and application guidelines for a variety of grants to support locally driven programs that “get things done” in our nation’s troubled communities.

Higher education is encouraged to play an integral role in supporting national and community service. On Wednesday, February 23rd at 1:00 p.m. EST, the Corporation will sponsor a free, live teleconference designed to inform the higher education community about the grant programs. Information will focus on how to apply for funding under the AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America programs.

Look for more details, including satellite coordinates, in the near future. In the meantime, mark your calendars and reserve a downlink facility on your campus. We hope you will tune in! For additional information about the video conference call 1-800-305-0880.
In what ways does a student leadership experience make a difference in student growth and change? How do we measure the direct effects of courses and training, the indirect effects of unplanned but meaningful experiences, and the influence of maturation? How do we assess both programs and the people in them?

The current state of assessment in leadership development seems to primarily center on program evaluation. Evaluation is frequently thought to be either summative or formative. Summative leadership evaluation takes place when evaluation forms are distributed at the end of a workshop, class, or training session. Participants are asked to reflect on what they liked, how effectively material was presented, and whether or not they learned anything new as a result of their participation. The typical evaluation is then used for new program design or to document that most of the participants were glad they came. Little evaluation is formative which requires pausing in the midst of a program and then redirecting the activity based upon the results of the evaluation.

Most program evaluation is done on campuses using staff designed surveys. Very little is published about the results of such surveys. As reported in previous columns, Tony Chambers, now at Michigan State University, developed the Leadership Programs Evaluation Instrument designed to assess program structures and outcomes in a comprehensive leadership program. Several articles on the development of this instrument are in the literature (including the July, 1992 Journal of College Student Development, Vol.33). (This is the only program evaluation instrument I am aware of, so please let me know of others). You may use this instrument in exchange for a data set. Write Tony at the Department of Higher Education, Michigan State University, 429 Erikson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 (517) 353-8768.

What modest amount of student leadership outcome assessment exists is primarily quantitative in nature. Assessment instruments are most often used to provide individual insight in trainings. Leadership educators usually do not collect the results of instruments which assess skills or individual styles to determine a description of the group or to study the scores for sex differences or other categorization that would aid in planning. If your campus is involved in a comprehensive student outcomes assessment project (and MANY are), it may be possible to integrate an assessment of leadership competence into the campus project.

The Nancy Snyder-Nepo review of over 50 leadership assessment instruments may be of benefit to you. This paper is available through NCLP. A review of leadership assessment instruments measuring group and organizational dimensions of leadership by Michelle Howell and Brad Crownover is forthcoming from NCLP. Gary Hanson (University of Texas) has done a terrific review of general student development assessment instruments for the College Outcomes Evaluation Program for the New Jersey Department of Higher Education. His paper is out of print, but a review of all the instruments and others (200 instruments in total) are available from the Clearinghouse for Higher Education Assessment Instruments, 212 Claxton Education Building, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-3400 for $10. Contact Director Michael Smith at 615-974-3748 or FAX 615-974-8718 to request a complete copy of their assessment materials, made possible from a three year FIPSE grant on assessment. You may also wish to contact Alverno Institute, Alverno College, 3401 South 39th Street, Milwaukee, WI 53215 (414) 382-6086 or Trudy Banta, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement and Editor of Assessment Update, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN 46202-2896 (317) 274-4111. Commission IX of the American College Personnel Association also has an instrument clearinghouse. Contact Pat King in the College Student Development program at Bowling Green State University.

Several published studies support the hypothesis that involvement in student leadership experiences (e.g. holding positional leadership roles) relates to later managerial success and development of select skills. Ann Howard’s study of “College Experiences and Managerial Performance” (Journal of Applied Psychology, 1986, Vol. 71 #3, pp. 530-522) reports two AT&T longitudinal studies of managers in 10 different organizations which correlated such factors as involvement in extracurricular activities and leadership positions held while in college with later man-
agerial success. See also John Schuh and M. Laverty's 1983 "The Perceived Long-term Influence of Holding a Significant Student Leadership Position" in the Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 24, pp.28-32. Helen Astin and Laura Kent present strong evidence that undergraduate women leaders show substantial gains in social self-esteem compared to all women and to men leaders (Journal of Higher Education, 1983, Vol.54 #3, pp.309-324). None of these studies examined the long term influence of leadership development or training apart from holding leadership positions; nor do we know what kind of training the student received in their positional roles.

Individual campuses need to be more realistic about the likelihood that a single short term intervention would influence any short term change. But it may be that when considered over a longer time frame and in coordination with other interventions, a value-added outcomes does result. For example, whereas no significant change (as measured by the SID and SDTL) was found among first year students who participated in a five week emerging leaders program at James Madison University (JMU), interesting descriptive information did help evaluation and design. Cindy Olney in the Office of Student Assessment, and Leadership Educator Renee Staton (703-568-7892), would be glad to talk with you about their recent effort. JMU is now discussing a multimethod assessment using journals, peer ratings, self evaluation, and the documentation of competencies as part of a student’s leadership education.

Several years ago, the Center for Creative Leadership conducted a survey of leadership programs offered by colleges and universities. Their findings are reported in an article written by Robert Gregory and Sara Britt called "What the Good Ones Do: Characteristics of Promising Leadership Development Programs". This article appears in the Summer 1987 Campus Activities Programming journal (pp.32-36).

Leadership educators must begin leadership assessment programs that will systematically provide data on the "value added" outcomes provided by leadership programs. Campus programs should establish longitudinal data bases after deciding what outcomes they want to assess. Following your campus human subject use procedures, a program might collect a student ID number along with other information in the training process to unobtrusively access institutional data such as retention, academic achievement if these variables are part of the outcome plan. Simple pre- and post-test studies may not be sufficient to show the influence of your complex leadership program, particularly when the short term gains are small. Hanson promotes several principles for assessing value added education: (1) "Decide whether the purpose of the study is to assess student outcomes of the 'value' added from one or more educational interventions." (2) "Build a model to represent the variables of interest and how they are related to the outcomes." (3) "Identify or build instruments that assess both status and change." (4) "Use theory and practical experience to identify the critical data collection." (5) "Use statistical techniques appropriate to the analysis of change."

Many practitioners are uncomfortable with the assessment of outcomes regarding leadership programs because the research designs needed exceed our own research skills or available resources. Consult some fine readings to help reorient you to this type of research such as, Trudy W. Banta's 1988 edited book on Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Peril in the New Directions for Institutional Research Series from Jossey-Bass (#59). To understand the many different student experiences with involvement and their influence on outcomes, read Gary Hanson and Denise McGinty Swann's paper "Using Multiple Program Impact Analysis to Document Institutional Effectiveness" in Research in Higher Education, Vol.43, pp. 71-94.

The bottom line is we must be studying the influence of our programs and learning experiences on student leadership outcomes. It is hard, time consuming, but essential for professional practice. Read enough to know the questions to ask and design a sound model of what you are measuring. Teaming with a campus researcher to create a solid design is a terrific idea! If you are engaged in leadership outcome studies, drop me a note so we can network with your efforts.

Dr. Susan Komives, Associate Professor of Counseling and Personnel Services Department, and Faculty Associate, Division of Student Affairs, 3214 Benjamin Building, University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, MD 20742, (301) 405-2870.
LeaderShape Applications Available in January

Beginning in January, 1994, application materials will be available for organizations interested in sending students to The LeaderShape Institute. Participants at The LeaderShape Institute are exposed to six intensive days of experiential learning, reflection, and interaction with approximately 50 young adults throughout the country representing diverse organizations, institutions, and companies. The expectation for each LeaderShape graduate is that he/she will make a commitment to a vision, work diligently to bring that vision to reality, and sustain a high level of integrity. The results produced by those who lead with integrity are an extraordinary contribution to the world and its future. In 1994, five sessions of The LeaderShape Institute will be held during the months of June and July in Champaign, Illinois.

The LeaderShape Institute is the flagship program of LeaderShape, Inc. and has graduated over 1500 students since its inception in 1986. Anyone interested in receiving further information and applications should contact the Director of Programs, LeaderShape, Inc., 4001 West Kirby Ave., Champaign, Illinois, 61821, (217) 351-6200.

National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP)
Membership Application

Name ______________________________ Date ______________________________
Title ______________________________
Institution __________________________
Address ______________________________
City __________________ State _______ Zip ______

Telephone ____________________________

☐ New Membership
☐ Renewal
   (previous membership expired: ____________ )

Name of previous member (if applicable):

This form must accompany payment of $35.00 (federal tax ID#526002033).
Please make check payable to the University of Maryland and send to:
National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
1135 Stamp Student Union
University of Maryland at College Park
College Park, MD 20742-4631
(301) 314-7174
The National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
1135 Stamp Student Union
University of Maryland
at College Park
College Park, Maryland
20742-4631
(301) 314-7174