leadership is a word spinning through today's conversations. You may hear employers requesting "leadership" be a part of the perfect applicant's resume. Or members of struggling student organizations call for the emergence of someone to be their "leader." In the public forum, political candidates continuously reference their "leadership experience." What then, in light of these broad appeals, is the role of leadership educators? How can leadership educators help supply new leaders?

A collegiate leadership student once said, "The most surprising thing I have learned about leadership is that it is not defined by ONE thing. It means something different to everyone, is valued differently by everyone, and is a dynamic, ever-changing process." Students are excited about learning leadership! They continue to seek answers to a rapidly changing society and turn to leadership classes, theory, and practice to make sense of chaos. Scholars have responded to students' leadership questions and leadership education programs have sprouted and grown at universities throughout the United States. College students are drawn to leadership classes and experiences by their recognition of how change affects constituents.

The question is raised, then: Can students be educated to become leaders? Without hesitation, leadership scholars have mobilized to seek the answer. They have responded with research investigating leadership competencies and the effectiveness of leadership education. Results have shown that leaders do practice certain activities, and that leadership education programs can translate theory into practice.

Choosing Theory to Teach

In developing education programs that successfully transfer theory to practice, determining the theory to teach is a complicated task in itself. From early Greek times to today, many documents have been created to describe successful leaders. Scholars have searched for the perfect combination of traits found in successful leaders. Historians have studied leaders of the past to ascertain what combination of skills is found in successful leaders. Many leadership researchers and authors have attempted to find a suitable definition of leadership and have also tried to define what encompasses a leader. Because the terms are ambiguous, with many published definitions, this is an arduous task. Webster (1984) defined leadership as the capacity or ability to lead, and a leader as...
The overall goal of this edition of *Concepts & Connections* is to address the theoretical ground upon which the study and practice of leadership education stands and to clarify and shape the conceptual diversity that tends to cloud our understanding of the complex relationship between leadership theory and practice.

The past several decades have seen an increase in attention concerning the intentional development of leaders and leadership. With more and more colleges and universities making direct and indirect references to their desire to equip students for leadership, it is important to recognize that we provide, on our campuses, some of the best learning environments and laboratories for the application of theory to practice.

In this edition of *Concepts & Connections* we will focus on the purpose and functions of a theoretical knowledge base as a way of guiding practice. To begin the conversation, we must make meaning of the task of using theory effectively and understanding the nature of theory, of practice, and of translation. Leila Moore and M. Lee Upcraft’s (1990) work in *Evolving Theoretical Perspectives on Students* provides useful guidance in thinking about theory. According to Moore and Upcraft, theories are a set of definitions and statements specifying the relationship between the defined concepts. Theories explain phenomena, they predict outcomes, and they permit us to influence outcome. Theories are usually based first on multiple observations of the same phenomenon under different circumstances. These observations become the foundation of beliefs about why and how that particular phenomenon occurs. The beliefs are then tested through application in other settings and evolve into theories to be tested and refined further. When there are no relevant theories to explain phenomenon, theorists and researchers construct models. Models, like theories, explain the relationship between variables under examination; unlike theories, they lack the specificity of clear definitions. Instead they include analogies: this is like that, but not like this. Models are, in effect, emerging theories. With refinement and further testing, these models can evolve into theories.

Through the guidance of theory it is critical that we honor practice. Lee Knefelkamp (1984) in the Wells/Knefelkamp Practice-to-Theory-to-Practice model suggests that we accord ourselves the serious attention that we accord theory. She says that too often we do not take the time to stop and think about what we are doing. Instead, we let the daily press of our work dictate what it is we do and therefore what it appears that we stand for. Knefelkamp believes we need to take the time to give intellectual consideration to the nature of our practice and to the why behind what we do. We need to honor practice, honor ourselves, to spend time together seriously talking about educational goals, methods of delivering services, methods of educating, standards of practice, concepts of maturity, and what we hope to facilitate in our students.

Treated simplistically, the concept of “Student Leadership Development” entails characterizing a student and characterizing leadership and then applying the concepts of development to the student. Leadership development, in the context of this conversation, signifies the ways that a student grows, progresses, or increases his or her leadership capacities as a result of a meaningful application of theory to practice.

Craig Slack
Director
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one in charge or command of others. Kotter (1993) defined leadership as a contrast to management, whereas management deals with complexity (in practices and procedures), leadership deals with change. Cronin (1993) defined leaders as people who perceive what is needed and what is right and know how to mobilize people and resources to accomplish mutual goals. In these representative descriptions, some commonalities exist, but the magnitude of leadership success continues to be dynamic and effected by situations, personalities, and culture. In fact, one can recall historical leaders who were successful but displayed varying and diverse characteristics from those of other leaders. Successful leaders have been conversation experts and quiet listeners; male and female; tall and short; directive and laissez-faire.

Complicating the issue of choosing leadership theory to teach, in the 1990s organizations in the United States began to undergo a transition from leader-centered to group-centered leadership strategies. This new leadership paradigm was informed by the philosophy that decisions were more effective if the decision-making process involved the group it affected. In other words, the leader became more participative with the group and decisions were not made at the top of a pyramidal structure. In this new leadership paradigm, leaders were described as transformational (Bass, 1984), servant (Greenleaf, 1998), participative, or group-centered (Cummins, 1995). An underlying theme in the new leadership paradigm was that as followers or group members were “transformed” into stakeholders and decision-makers, the organization became more systems-oriented (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, and Smith, 1994). As organizational paradigms change, leadership educators face changes in their course content.

Leadership Can Be Taught

Understanding the plethora of leadership models, definitions, and activities available for inclusion in a course is the first step in translating theory to practice. A second, and perhaps more daunting task, is wrestling with the question, can leadership competencies be taught and what methods enhance the learning of these competencies?"
taught the theory of team development to one group and not to the other. Following education and completion of team projects, students did transfer team theory into practice and increased their task and maintenance skills following instruction. However, it was reconfirmed that student's leadership attitudes did not change following this course (Cummins and Townsend, 1998).

Leadership education researchers continued to seek the perfect combination of factors to ensure transfer from theory to practice. McNulty (1996) wondered if a student's learning style influenced the successful transfer of theory to practice. She researched a college level leadership course and concluded that successful transfer was not related to a student's learning style. Thorp (1997) and Taylor (1998) thought that perhaps gender was a significant factor determining whether or not students could transfer the leadership theory into practice. Results of these studies indicated that following a leadership course, women in a single gender laboratory had a higher perception of their ability to lead than the women in a coeducational laboratory. However, male students' perceptions of their leadership skills were not affected by the gender make-up of the class. Males had the same perceptions regardless of whether the class was coeducational or male-only.

**Educational Best Practices**

In light of these results, how can leadership educators create the optimum environment to develop successful leaders? To teach leadership, scholars must plan their educational "best practices." The first best practice is to study leadership theory. Leadership theory investigation provides students with a benchmark from which to work. It allows students to understand how to analyze and critique leader actions. As one student explained, "I've learned why I am sometimes misunderstood — I am less task-oriented and more relationship-oriented than I thought." Theory gives students the power to understand WHY a leadership action is successful or unsuccessful (Townsend, 1999).

A second best practice is to provide students with a place to exercise their leadership. Educational institutions are natural leadership laboratories where students can try out their instinctive leadership tendencies and test the leadership processes learned in class. A leadership student suggested, "There are many leaders out there that are BAD leaders. How did they get there and what do they think they are doing? I know many leaders who have no clue about much of the topics we covered in leadership class."

The third best practice for consideration by leadership educators is to consider the many factors which affect student learning. As discussed earlier, the gender make-up of a leadership class may, in fact, affect how women students translate leadership theory into practice. Could other factors such as cultural background, early leadership experiences, or family make-up be determinants of successful leadership education programs?

Transferring leadership theory to practice is an awesome task. Leadership theory is well researched and educators have a profuseness of information for students to study. However, students are human beings and they expect great results from their leadership courses. "I want to learn how to inspire and motivate groups, to be a more decisive role model, and to handle 'grey-area' matters." And students have great expectations of their teachers. "I expect my teacher to be a leader!" Based on educational research, leadership instructors can plan successful courses by understanding that student attitudes are difficult to change in the short term and that some of their characteristics may affect their ability to transfer theory to practice. Scholars have determined that leadership theory can be translated to practice. Leadership educators can enhance their effectiveness by implementing some educational best practices into their programs.
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**The Relational Leadership Model:**

*Challenges for Institutions of Higher Learning*

*by Matthew R. Chase and Larry L. Kiser*

Living an idea differs radically from just thinking about it. Try, for example, living Rosé’s (1997) idea that the industrial paradigm of leadership still prevails and that it presents formidable challenges to anyone contradicting it. Faculty and student affairs staff trying to institute a post-industrial inspired leadership program at Eastern Washington University are experiencing the truth in Rosé’s claim. Sometimes the challenges seem nearly overwhelming.

During spring 1996, a small group of EWU faculty and student affairs administrators initiated a proposal for a new leadership and community studies program. The group sought to capitalize on the dean of students’ deepening knowledge in leadership studies and his suggestion that the divisions of student and academic affairs collaborate to develop the program proposal. Partially inspired by the 1993 report of the Wingspread Group on Higher Education and the 1990 Carnegie Foundation report, *Campus Life: In Search of Community,* the group wanted a student leadership program that would advance the interests of the entire university not just the interests of a few campus units.

The group proposed to initiate a leadership and community studies program that would embrace what Roberts and Ullom (1989) identified as one of the central and traditional purposes of higher education - to prepare students for public service. They also wanted to break from the higher education mold that Burns (1996) describes as leaving public service preparation to student affairs offices. The faculty-student affairs group sought deliberately to integrate academics with student life, which would demonstrate for students and the administration that leadership and community service are a vital part of academic study as well as student affairs programming.

Above all, the group sought to develop a program that is consistent with the relational leadership model, as set forth in Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998). The group thought that the program should encourage collaboration among parties from various perspectives and with differing interests and encourage shared leadership responsibilities. Thus, they proposed to establish a curriculum that would:

- Involve collaboration between faculty and student affairs personnel,
- Ask students to integrate perspectives from various disciplines,
- Ask faculty to lay aside their role as experts and to share leadership with students in the classroom,
- Invite student affairs staff and faculty into mentoring relationships with students,
• Involve collaboration between university people and community leaders outside the university.

Besides theoretical underpinnings provided by a relational leadership model, program initiators also incorporated the Boyer (1987) and Roberts and Ullum (1989) recommendations that the program should offer theoretical study, experiential learning, and guided reflection. The group also considered Morse’s (1989) and Boatman’s (1996) recommendations that service learning should be included for the purpose of learning about social responsibility and leadership for developing community.

Initially the program functioned with a monthly series of leadership workshops and fora for students headed by faculty, student affairs administrators, and community leaders, combined with yearlong community service projects. Students met periodically to reflect and write on their experiences and to report publicly. Meanwhile, faculty and student affairs administrators talked with university administrators about designing a formal certificate program of interdisciplinary and experiential work in leadership and community studies. Although the campus community generally regards the leadership initiative a success, senior administrators and academic officers have been slow to support the certificate program.

The challenges to instituting a relational leadership model in the university curriculum are stiff. There is a constant challenge in nurturing the student-air aspects-faculty collaboration. Faculty and student affairs personnel function in different cultures and have different ways of relating to students. Student affairs personnel, for example, see themselves as providing co-curricular opportunities and experiences to students, while faculty see themselves as providing information and knowledge. These approaches to student learning might seem complementary, but often they clash. Student affairs staff are more willing than faculty to get close to students, while faculty often use their credentials and positions to distance themselves from students.

Another challenge comes from academic departments. Departments, such as Business and Communication Studies, with leadership courses predating the EWU leadership initiative are proud of their courses. Faculty teaching those courses may like the new attention from the program proposal, but they also jockey to retain control over their courses. Meanwhile, other interested faculty suspect that the original faculty are trying to dominate or even capture the new program for their departments.

Danger lurks in a university environment that fosters turf battles and mutual suspicions among departments and disciplines. In order to get along with each other, wary faculty might agree too readily to an interdisciplinary program and then carve up the curriculum to give each department a fair share. The result for students could be multidisciplinary rather than interdisciplinary courses. Students could wind up with a series of distinct disciplinary courses in leadership but without guidance for integrating among them. Integration would be left to program administrators and to students to do on their own.

Another challenge arises in asking faculty to shift from their stance as experts who present information and knowledge to students to that of collaborators who interact closely and share leadership with students. The shift asks faculty to focus less on their own teaching activities and more on student learning activities. Despite extensive research findings that active learning approaches are more effective for students than traditional lecturing, most faculty according EWU alumni surveys still rely heavily on lecturing. They still position themselves as the dominant authority in the classroom and fail to generate opportunities for interaction between students and themselves and among students. They fail to generate opportunities for sharing leadership in the classroom.

Students need the experience of sharing leadership. Without it they do not know how to work collaboratively with one another, and therein lies another challenge. Reading the relational model in Komives, et al., (1998) excites and provokes students, but once involved in their community service projects they often act as though they have never heard of the model. Their supposed collaborative projects tend to splinter into individualistic endeavors, and faculty mentors - rather than students - begin to assume responsibility for the projects.

Behaving according to a relational model of leadership requires skill and, therefore, training. In addition, it requires patience, time, and a tolerance for chaos. Busy students, busy faculty, and busy student affairs personnel might be excused for not possessing many of these requirements. Busy people tend to rush from one activity to another and grow irritated when one falters. Compounded with an American proclivity for individualism, it comes as no surprise that a program founded on relational leadership principles should struggle.

Students are not to blame. They face the old leadership development
dilemma - do as we say and not as we do. As Kofman and Senge (1995) write, the industrial paradigm of leadership is not going away anytime soon. Positional leaders will continue to loom large in organizations. Faculty and student affairs staff as well as students need to learn to integrate the relational leadership model into their busy lives and into existing organizational structures. While we endeavor to nurture community and collaborative leadership skills and values, we also need to nurture positional leadership that honors and values relationships and service to others.

Can the principles of a relational leadership model withstand these challenges? Can a program founded on relational principles possibly emerge from a typical university environment with its principles intact? Student affairs staff and university faculty involved in the program at EWU think so, and we believe that students will benefit from the challenges. After all, that is what students will experience after they leave the university. We even think that the challenges are inherently healthy. As John Stuart Mill noted, ideas are never so alive as when they are challenged. They die when people cease to debate them.
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Program Spotlight

The UNLV LEAD Team
by Sunny Martin

For the past four years the Division of Student Services at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) has been utilizing the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as a foundation for all leadership programs and training. While implementing the values of the Social Change Model is more easily said than done, the Division has been pleased with programmatic initiatives and their impact on students and the campus climate.

In 1996, guided by the UNLV Strategic Planning Process, the Division of Student Services formed a Leadership Process Group to act as a vehicle through which the Division could address the need for leadership development interdepartmentally.

After an extensive review of the current literature and numerous focus groups with students and staff at UNLV, the Leadership Process Group submitted a recommendation to utilize the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as a foundation for all leadership development initiatives (Kuh, Schroeder, et al., 1994; Bennis and Goldsmith, 1994; Burns, 1995; Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). The Division of Student Services and the major student governing bodies (Student Government, the Residence Hall Association, the Greek Councils, and the Ethnic Student Council) agreed unanimously.

The adoption of a non-hierarchical leadership approach on a university campus requires a philosophical shift that transcends organizational structure. While many of the leadership programs already in existence at UNLV contained some components of the Social Change Model, in order to embrace the Model and impact the leadership culture at UNLV, we needed to do more than tweak our programs and change our language. The Leadership Process Group decided the best way to implement the Social Change Model would be to utilize the values of the Model during the planning process.

In the spring of 1997, the Division of Student Services opened the selection process for the creation of the Leadership Education And Development Team (LEAD Team). The students and professional staff on the LEAD Team work as partners to achieve a common purpose of providing non-hierarchical leadership development opportunities. Before creating any new leadership programs, the LEAD Team needed to learn to work together. Following the concepts of the Social Change Model, the LEAD Team began by exploring individual and group values. Through exercises and discussions, members of the LEAD Team clarified their own values pertaining to leadership development and created a common vision for the team. Each year, as membership in the LEAD Team changes and expands, this process is recreated to help assimilate new members and refocus the efforts of the LEAD Team.

The collective vision for the UNLV LEAD Team is to enhance and empower the leadership development of students and student organizations by providing opportunities for the adoption of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Since professional staff at UNLV agreed to incorporate the Social Change Model into leadership-training initiatives for current student leaders, the LEAD Team focused initial programming efforts on emerging student leaders.

In the fall of 1997 the LEAD Team offered the first LEADing Edge Series, a ten-week leadership series designed to expose students to the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The series lasts for two hours per week, is co-curricular, and is marketed primarily to first year students through New Student Orientation, Campus Housing, and newsletters to first year commuter students.

The students on the LEAD Team are responsible for all aspects of the LEADing Edge Series including marketing, planning, designing interactive sessions, facilitating discussions, and serving as mentors for students enrolled in the series. At the heart of the LEADing Edge Series are the Seven C's of the Social Change Model: consciousness of self, congruency, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship. Each week participants are encouraged to build on their prior experiences by exploring a different C through interactive exercises and small and large group discussions.

For example, the week focusing on commitment builds on the self-awareness activities from the first three weeks of the series. Participants spend time evaluating their values, heroes, roles and responsibilities, life long goals, and passions and are asked to draft a Personal Creed, outlining who they are and making a commitment to uphold certain values. At the end of the series, during the Recognition Banquet, the participants receive a framed copy of their Personal Creed as a reminder of their commitment.
actualize the Model, UNLV opened the Student Organization Resource Center (SORCE). SORCE provides student organizations with workspace, computer access, photocopying services, message and mail services, poster making and office supplies, and access to campus policies and resources. The LEAD Team office and the Leadership Library are also located in SORCE.

Systems have been created to reinforce new attitudes and behaviors that reflect a non-hierarchical approach to leadership. For example, the Division of Student Services revised the Student Leadership Scholarship application and selection criteria to reinforce the Social Change Model’s definition of leadership. Instead of asking students to submit lists of leadership positions they have held, the application asks students to document situations in which they identified a need and worked collaboratively with others to affect positive change.

While implementing the Social Change Model is a continuous process, some visible benefits of adopting a non-hierarchical approach to leadership are evident. There has been an increase in collaboration among the various student groups. This is particularly observable through interactions in the Student Organization Resource Center and is also evident in the groups that have connected to co-sponsor campus programs.

Additionally, university officials have noticed that the way in which students approach issues of concern has changed. More and more, students see themselves in a partnership with the university administration. Rather than merely complaining about particular campus policies, many students attempt to work with other students and staff to make a change. For example, a group of students worked with faculty and staff to create the first ever UNLV Cultural Leadership Retreat to address a perceived need on campus.

The Division of Student Services at UNLV has been able to successfully implement the Social Change Model because numerous student groups and professional staff committed themselves to living the Model. When developing new programs, the LEAD Team focuses on learning outcomes and then looks to the Model to help achieve those outcomes.
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The National Conference for College Women Student Leaders

From a Student's Perspective

by Emily Robertson

I have the pleasure of serving on the planning committee for the National Conference for College Women Student Leaders (NCCWSL), an annual Washington, DC gathering of fabulous undergraduate women from across the country. I invited a former conference attendee to reflect on her experience, and share some of the insights that have stayed with her.

Sharon A. La Voy, former NCLP Coordinator

Attending the National Conference for College Women Student Leaders was a powerful experience, and three years later that experience continues to inspire me. As an emerging student leader at Gettysburg College, I was encouraged to attend the conference by one of my advisors. I arrived at the conference eager to engage in dialogue with other student leaders, as well as build upon the friendships of the other Gettysburg women who also attended the conference. The conference environment easily met my initial expectations and far more.

The conference gave breadth and depth to my thoughts regarding women. Each day I was challenged to articulate my views while listening to and acknowledging differing opinions. In many ways those conversations reaffirmed my views; however, many caused me to reevaluate my positions. I gained a greater perspective and began to understand the complexity of the issues affecting women.

The conference opened with a Finding your Own Voice exercise. Women were asked to voice their agreement or disagreement by standing up or remaining seated on a variety of comments or questions. Personally, the most difficult question for me was: Are you a feminist? A feminist? What is a feminist? Whose definition are you using? Each question lead to another and I did not know if I should sit, stand or just hover. I listened to women explain why they believed they did or did not consider themselves to be feminists. It all made sense, and I still did not know what I believed. Today, I have my own definition of what being a feminist means, and I do consider myself one. Regardless of my own understanding, I learned that individual women have distinctly unique opinions on the same issues.

The open environment of the conference facilitated this high intensity of conversation. So many participants were willing to open up and share their life experiences, which I could relate to or learn from. Workshop sessions enabled focused, intense and fun conversations on a variety of issues, while large group discussions displayed the energy and spirit of all the participants. At a networking session, all of the women were freely introducing themselves and joining in conversations. Women's voices filled the room and it was only after the fourth "Please be seated" from the facilitator that the conversations began to close.

The most rewarding experience was the Women of Distinction Awards Ceremony. The program recognizes women of all ages who have inspired other women through their accomplishments, either professional or personal. The dedication and passion they portrayed for their work was striking. I was amazed by their accomplishments and inspired by their remarks.

Over the course of the conference, we were able to reflect on how far women have advanced in leadership roles and the amount of opportunities available today compared to the past. I became aware of leadership issues facing women today and challenges that we can expect in the future. The conference motivated my spirit and encouraged me to maximize the opportunities in life.

Emily Robertson is a senior at Gettysburg College majoring in political science. She is the President of the Student Senate and actively involved in the Women's Center on campus. She plans to attend law school after she graduates.
The Leadership Bookshelf

Systemic Leadership:
Enriching the Meaning of our Work

Kathleen E. Allen and Cynthia Cherrey
Reviewed by Gregory G. Stone.

In their introduction to chapter seven of Systemic Leadership, Kathleen Allen and Cynthia Cherrey use a quote from Marcel Proust that defines their goal for the reader, "The real discovery consists not in finding new lands, but in seeing with new eyes." (p.131) Their work requires us to look at our work, our organizations, and ourselves in new ways—in a connected systemic way. We will all recognize our organizations and ourselves both in the description of traditional hierarchical organizations of the past and present, and in the description of the new networked organizations, the "Networked Knowledge Era", of the present and the future.

In Part I, "The Waves of Change", the authors explore the idea that higher education organizations (in fact most organizations) are in transition from a hierarchical structure that requires the traditional skills and knowledge of leadership, to a networked organizational structure that requires new skills to effectively influence the organization. However, both structures currently operate concurrently. This new organization is marked by multiple centers of influence, flow of information in all directions, exponential increase in the amount of information, increased access to information across the organization, creation of knowledge throughout the organization, and increased connectivity.

Allen and Cherrey's discussion of the interaction between the traditional model and the new model is valuable in helping to identify how these interactions impede the change process. It also identifies some leverage points that create opportunities for change to occur more rapidly. As the book progresses it inundates us with the "complex complexities" of the network organization. However, as our information about network organizations increases, the authors' spiral us back through previous information to create knowledge in the way that a network organization would create knowledge from information. In a sense, the book's structure models the way information is changed into knowledge in a networked world.

Part II of the book, "New Ways of Working", explores the new ways a leader must look at the organization, at themselves and at others, in order to relate to others, to influence change, to learn and make meaning from information, and to lead. This overview of the important aspects of leadership helps the reader to explore new ways of accomplishing these traditional tasks in the new environment.
Throughout the book, the authors supply reflective questions that help to focus the previous material and lead the reader to the next area. Each chapter builds on the previous information and focuses more on specific strategies and skills necessary to participate effectively in network organizations. This book is a very thorough treatment of all the dimensions of organizations and change. Allen and Cherrey successfully use organic examples to create an understanding of how network organizations work. In one example, they describe how the properties of wet sand resist being permanently marked by the direct force of feet running across it, making a comparison to the way a network resists direct power as a means of change. When the runner stops and stands in the wet sand, the sand surrounds and incorporates the feet, just as networks accept new information when it enters slowly.

In Part III, “Systemic Leadership: Integrating the Four New Ways of Working”, the book brings together the new ways of thinking about organizations to frame a holistic view of how we need to be in the future – Systemic Leaders for the Networked Knowledge Era. The authors identify four new ways of working: relating, influencing change, learning, and leading. These are integrated into a whole by exploring traditional assumptions about these areas and contrasting them with the emerging assumptions of a network organization.

Lastly, Allen and Cherrey explore the eleven capacities (active engagements, collaboration, continual learning, diversify perspectives, emotional competence, embracing paradox, making meaning, paradigm cognition, systems cognition, sustainability) that we must develop, both as individuals and within the organization, to successfully participate in the transformation of our institutions into network organizations and ourselves into systemic leaders.

Although this book focuses on organizational structures and dimensions of leadership, it also clearly defines how the “Networked Knowledge Era” will force significant change, potentially creating a new “Academe” where connected knowledge and interrelated experience will be the norm. Teachers and learners will often trade places, and action at the intersections of the network will create meaning and knowledge; the authors challenge their readers to become new leaders in this shift.

Systemic Leadership is a rich organic soup of new ways to look at organizations and leadership. Allen and Cherrey’s ideas are supported by the work of Senge, Wheatley, Helen Astin and others...

“Systemic Leadership is a rich organic soup of new ways to look at organizations and leadership. Allen and Cherrey’s ideas are supported by the work of Senge, Wheatley, Helen Astin and others...”

NCLP Launches Leadership List Service

Please join us! We are starting up a leadership list service for members. The purpose of the list is to provide a mechanism by which NCLP members can share best practices, problem solve, network, discuss theory, and share resources in an effort to advance our professional development and practice.

To subscribe, send an email message to listserv@umdd.umd.edu. The body of the mail message should only contain the phrase: “subscribe NCLP-L <name of subscriber>.” (The “<” and “>” are not including in the message.) For example, “subscribe NCLP-L Craig Slack”. If you have questions or difficulties subscribing please call (301) 405-0799 or email us at nclp@union.umd.edu.

Systemic Leadership, co-published by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA), and the University Press of America will be available in April, 2000. For order information, contact the University Press of America at (800) 462-6420 or www.unipress.org.

Gregory Stone is Dean of Students at Castleton State College in Castleton, Vermont.
Program Theme and Description

At the dawn of the new millennium, we are confronted with unique phenomena, vague predictions and uncertain outcomes within the evolving discipline of leadership studies. The overall goal of the 10th annual National Leadership Symposium is to address the theoretical ground upon which the study and practice of undergraduate leadership education stands. An objective is to clarify and shape the conceptual diversity that tends to cloud our understanding of the complex relationship between leadership theory and practice. The program will center on conversations and applications of civic, servant and character leadership development.

Scholars-in-Residence

Dr. Richard A. Couto
- Professor, and George Matthews and Virginia Brinkley Modlin Chair in Leadership Studies, Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond
- Co-editor of Teaching Democracy by Being Democratic

Mr. David D. Chrislip
- Principal of Skillful Mears
- Co-author of Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference

Dr. Linda Klebe Trevino
- Chair, Management and Organizational Behavior, Smeal College of Business Administration, Pennsylvania State University
- Co-author of Managing Business Ethics

Dr. Dennis Roberts
- Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, Miami University-Ohio

Contact the NACA Foundation at (803) 732-6222 for registration information.
Scholarship and Research Updates

From Theory to Practice

by Susan R. Komives

Until the late 1990s, much practice in teaching and programming in college leadership was fairly atheoretical. Some programs used various situational leadership theories and many began adopting various empowerment models designed to empower individual students to realize they could make a difference. Too often, teaching personal empowerment did not connect that individual empowerment to group leadership. The Social Change Model (1996) provided a theoretical frame useful to many student affairs practitioners to bridge that gap by combining individual development with group values of collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility. Sadly, many programs might teach a solid theoretical orientation (e.g., servant leadership) and then anachronistically combine it with teaching Robert's Rules of Order, not even noticing that the decision-making mechanisms being taught are in conflict with the espoused theory.

McEwen (1996) helps us understand the uses of theory. Applied to leadership, theories help us: (1) "describe" leadership and leadership practices; (2) "explain or understand" things like differences in leadership approaches, styles, outcomes; (3) "predict" how a follower might respond to the style of a leader; (4) "generate" new theory or research to test theory; (5) "influence" the development of leadership by designing interventions; and (6) "assess" how well a leadership program incorporates ethical and moral development. If you are still seeking a universal theory of leadership, my best advice is stop now. No one theory is appropriate at all times. It is highly desirable, however, to find a leadership theory or cluster of theories which address elements of leadership of value to your program and then apply that theoretical frame in program design, training materials, decision-making approaches, and assessment.

Peter Northouse’s Leadership: Theory and Practice (1997) is a useful book covering theoretical frames, applications, and the instruments that measure that theory. This book is a solid overview of main theories noting strengths, criticisms, applications, case studies, and a leadership instrument including sample items and in some cases, the whole scale. For example, he covers trait theory measured by a Leadership Trait Questionnaire; the style approach measured by a Style questionnaire; situational approaches measured by the Situational Leadership questionnaire; contingency theory measured by the Least Preferred Co-Worker [LPC]; path-goal theory measured by the Path-Goal Leadership questionnaire; Leader-member exchange theory measured by the LMX 7 questionnaire; transformational leadership measured by a short form of the Multifactor Leadership questionnaire included in the book; team leadership theory measured by the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire; the psychodynamic approach accompanied by the Psychodynamic Styles checklist; a chapter on women and leadership including the Attitudes Toward Women as Managers Scale; and servant-leader, spiritual-ethical theory, and empowerment models using a Popular Leadership Approaches Questionnaire.

In some cases Northouse appears to have taken basic principles in the theory and presented an assessment using those theoretical frames. For example, the style approach is frequently measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) or the Managerial or Leadership Grid. These basic two-factor theories look at dimensions of task and relationships that Northouse has developed into his own measure. No reliability or validity data are presented but they appear useful for training. In other cases he has adapted a well-known instrument with permission of the originators (e.g. the LPC from Fiedler & Chemers 1984 work or the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire from Bass). Our own book, Exploring Leadership (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998), is an example of taking one conceptual model and applying it to individual development and group practices. Remember that many of these books designed for classroom use also have instructor manuals (usually obtained free from the publisher with an order for classroom or training use) which contain other application materials.

The Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) continues to be a good source on instruments to assess leadership. The Leadership Resources (1995) manual contains basic information on numerous instruments. This information usually contains the conceptual or theoretical work the instrument was based on. If you are using a particular theoretical/conceptual frame, this is a good place to check for instruments that might assess that frame.

References


Dr. Susan Komives is Associate Professor of Counseling and Personnel Services, and Faculty Associate in the Division of Student Affairs, at the University of Maryland, as well as the Chair of the NCLP Editorial Board. She can be reached at 3214 Benjamin Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; (301) 405-2876; sk22@umail.umd.edu; fax (301) 405-9995.
# Leadership Scholar Series Order Form

Please indicate on the form below which leadership scholar series 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, College Park, MD 20742.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmonies&quot; by Dr. Kathleen E. Allen (1993, 17 pages) $__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;African American Men at Risk&quot; by Bernard Franklin (1993, 3 pages) $__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Teaching, Educating, and Developing Men: The Missing Piece in Student Development Education in Colleges and Universities&quot; by Bernard Franklin (1993, 11 pages) $__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Leadership Assessments: A Critique of Common Instruments&quot; by Nancy Snyder-Nepo with foreword by Dr. Susan Komives (1993, 53 pages) $__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Leadership for Community: A Conceptual Framework and Suggestions for Application&quot; by Dr. Sara Boatman with foreword by Dr. Susan Komives (1995, 29 pages) $__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Paper #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Organizational Development Assessments: A Critique of Common Instruments&quot; by Michelle C. Hoxell, Brad L. Crounse, and Mary Kay Schneider, with foreword by Dr. Susan Komives (1997, 80 pages) $__</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $__

---

Name: ______________

Title: ______________

Institution: ______________

Address: ______________

City: ______________

State: ______________

Zip: ______________

Date: ______________

Telephone: ______________

E-mail: ______________

Program Web Site: ______________

- [ ] New Membership
- [ ] Renewal

(Previous membership expired: ______________)

Name of previous member (if applicable): ______________

---

**THIS FORM MUST ACCOMPANY PAYMENT OF $45.00 for NEW members and $40.00 for RENEWING members**

(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
College Park, MD 20742-4631
(301) 314-7174
nclp@union.umd.edu
www.inform.umd.edu/OCP/NCLP
The National Clearinghouse
for Leadership Programs

1135 Stamp Student Union
University of Maryland
College Park, MD
20742-4631

(301) 405-0799
nclp@union.umd.edu
www.inform.umd.edu/OCP/NCLP