2015

Career Outcomes for Participants in a Leadership Development Program

Cheryl Louise Meheden
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Cheryl Meheden

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Laura Weidner, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Elizabeth Kehoe, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Glenn Ayres, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2015

Abstract

Career Outcomes for Participants in a Leadership Development Program

by

Cheryl Meheden

MBA, Edinburgh Business School, Heriot-Watt University

BS, Athabasca University

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

April 2015

Abstract

In an attempt to raise the level of leadership competence and to increase the number of qualified candidates for leadership positions within post-secondary institutions, many colleges are supporting leadership development training for faculty and staff. This qualitative case study explores whether participating in a leadership development program resulted in career advancements that can fill leadership gaps. The study's framework, expectancy theory, suggests that individuals who participate in leadership development expect to become leaders. This exploratory case study sought to learn whether, upon completion of a comprehensive leadership development program, participants applied for, and assumed, leadership positions. The leadership program under study was attended by a cohort of 58 participants from a diverse set of 17 institutions across Canada. A purposeful sample of 12 individuals was drawn from this cohort and participated in structured interviews conducted by the researcher. Data were collected and coded to reveal their career progression. The results provided evidence that using leadership development programs to fill a leadership gap is productive, and that the effectiveness of this strategy is enhanced when institutions purposefully select and support participants through all stages of their leadership development. Participants who pursued leadership opportunities indicated the importance of institutional involvement in leadership development. Social change can be achieved by following the recommendations of this study as they illuminate participant expectations, beliefs, and values that help create effective leaders who are more capable of providing better learning environments for students.

Career Outcomes for Participants in a Leadership Development Program

by

Cheryl Meheden

MBA, Edinburgh Business School, Heriot-Watt University

BS, Athabasca University

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

April 2015

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my three children, Erika, Josef, and Vanessa. You are all the finest of individuals, and I know in my heart that the world is a better place because you are in it. I hope that I have instilled in you a sense of curiosity about the world and about yourselves, encouraging you to learn and challenge, and be grateful for that which surrounds you.

Acknowledgements

You would not be reading this dissertation had I not received unlimited and unwavering guidance and support from committee members Dr. Laura Weidner (chair) and Dr. Elizabeth (Jan) Kehoe. These two women were inspiring and encouraging throughout the process and I could not have reached the end without them. I acknowledge their contributions and commitment to this work. I also acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Glenn Ayres, who ensured rigor and accuracy in my writing.

I acknowledge my dear friend Shelley Lesperance, who read many renditions of my writing and always offered constructive feedback.

I acknowledge my husband, Robert Michael Meheden, who travelled this journey with me, celebrating my victories and sharing my frustrations while never discouraging me from committing the resources necessary to finish the task.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Background

Colleges and universities throughout the world are experiencing a critical shortage of qualified people applying for leadership positions at every level (DeZure, Shaw, & Rojewski, 2014). There are several reasons for this shortage, including low levels of interest from internal candidates (Appadurai, 2009; Ekman, 2010) that result in low numbers of applicants (Evelyn, 2001) and the sheer volume of vacant positions anticipated from the large exodus of retiring leaders (DeZure, Shaw, & Rojewski, 2014). Evelyn (2001) stated that almost 90% of community college presidents started as faculty members before moving into administrative roles, but programs that train community college leaders have been dwindling.

The literature shows that colleges and universities have been responding to this crisis by investing significant resources in leadership development programs for existing employees (Aalsburg-Wiessner & González-Sullivan, 2007; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Miller, 1997) and pursuing innovations, such as a grow-your-own approach (Barden, 2008; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Evaluation of the success of these programs has amounted to largely an assessment of participant satisfaction (Crosson, Douglas, O'Mera, & Sperling, 2005; Reille & Kezar, 2010). If, however, as suggested by the literature, leadership development programs are intended to address the leadership crisis, then an argument can be made for exploring whether participants in leadership development programs actually apply for leadership positions within their institutions and whether they are then chosen for those positions. Understanding what program participants choose

to do after completing a leadership development program, and why, will likely result in better-informed institutional decisions about supporting such programs.

In most cases, it is the individual who pursues leadership development, making it important to distinguish between *leader* development and *leadership* development. Whereas *leader* development is mostly concerned with the expansion of the *individual's* leadership capacity (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2005), *leadership* development is concerned with expanding the *organization's* capacity (Ardichvili & Manderscheid, 2008). Leader development is oriented towards developing the individual's ability to perform in the current position. Leadership development integrates the individual within the organization's social systems, strategies, and goals (Olivares, Peterson, & Hess, 2007). Burns (1978) noted that leaders are often categorized according to traits and behaviors, but that leadership preparation is an organizational development process that requires training specific to an organization.

Leadership education may be a contemporary topic, but has been under study for many years. Brungardt (1997) stated "the study of leadership has been a major scholarly activity over the last 100 years" (p. 82). Leadership education is traced to American colleges that had a founding goal of training a new generation to lead a new nation (p. 87). Investigation of the effectiveness of leadership education can be found in research studies as early as 1919 by scholars such as Fretwell (1919) and Mayberry (1925). Using elementary and secondary school settings, Fretwell discovered that leadership development would result from providing added responsibilities to students. When students were given added responsibilities, it was found that they responded by

demonstrating leadership through task organization, peer support and delegation, and taking responsibility for completing the task. Similarly, Mayberry too discovered that increasing responsibility could be achieved by providing opportunities for practice in roles such as student government. Referring to industry reports that involved dozens of research studies, Brungardt (1997) observed that leadership development training continued to be a healthy practice with both private and public sector employers. Barker (1997), who said "leadership training has become an industry" (p. 348), supported Brungardt's statement and challenged the efficacy of leadership training in view of the training models that were being used to develop leaders. A detailed account of leadership development programs is described in Chapter 2, where program design, participant experiences and expectations, institutional involvement, and program evaluation are discussed.

Problem Statement

This study addressed whether participating in a leadership development program results in career advancement that helps to fill a leadership gap in colleges and universities. The diminishing number of leadership programs has been identified as one contributor to the leadership gap (Evelyn, 2001) and many institutions are responding by supporting leadership development (Aalsburg-Wiessner & González-Sullivan, 2007; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Miller, 1997). Whether leadership development programs result in participants successfully moving into leadership positions at their institutions has not been established in existing research.

This study explores the connection between a specific well-established international leadership development program for higher education, the Chair Academy (http://www.chairacademy.com/), based at Mesa Community College in the Maricopa Community College District, and the subsequent career outcomes of a cohort of participants. Barden (2008) presented the strategy of supporting leadership development for college faculty, administrators, and staff who occupy mid-level positions in order to address the leadership shortage as a good idea. Barden stated that "growing your own leaders would seem a totally rational, indeed prescient, stratagem" (p. C2). This approach can be traced back to the launch of a department chair training program sponsored by the American Council on Education in 1979 (Hecht, 2004). Hecht stated that the interest in training department chairs resulted in the development of many programs, including a program out of Maricopa Community Colleges in 1991. The Maricopa program evolved into the Chair Academy, offering leadership development training. To date, the Chair Academy staff identify the Academy has trained more than 7,000 individuals (T. Coleman, personal communication, December 5, 2011) and the website (retrieved April 25, 2015 from http://www.chairacademy.com) recognizes more than 9,000 individuals who have occupied faculty or mid-level administrative positions in colleges and universities throughout the English-speaking world. Due to the breadth of institutions using the Chair Academy's leadership development program and its long history, the Academy offers a diverse set of participants and institutions to study.

The benefits of leadership development have been confirmed through the analysis of program content and participant satisfaction (Reille & Kezar, 2010). However, I was

unable to discover any published studies on whether participants apply for and assume leadership positions in their institutions following a leadership development program. I did uncover one unpublished study, titled “Investing in Leadership Development,” written by Barker, Brunn, and Bullock (n.d.) for the Wisconsin Leadership Development Institute (WLDI; G. Filan, personal communication, September 20, 2011). The purpose of the WLDI program, which somewhat resembled the Chair Academy model, was to enhance the leadership abilities of mid-level managers as they prepared for higher-level leadership roles. The WLDI study included success indicators that identified the number of leadership program participants who either occupied presidential or vice-presidential positions or experienced an increased level of responsibility that was supported by a change in title. It also indicated that 43% of WLDI graduates increased their level of leadership responsibility and that the program contributed to the support and retention of leaders (p. 8).

This study builds on the information obtained from the WLDI study by investigating what participants do in their careers at their institutions after they complete a leadership development program. By investigating whether participants expect to advance to leadership positions within their institutions and whether or not those expectations were realized, this study contributes to the body of knowledge on using leadership development programs to address the leadership gap in higher education. Understanding individual expectations is expected to help colleges, universities, and individuals make more informed decisions on investing considerable time, money, and energy in leadership development training. The participants in this study were supported

in attending a leadership development program by their respective institutions. Therefore, understanding the career progression of those individuals would be of primary interest to the institutions. It is also of interest to individuals who seek a leadership position and to the developers of leadership development programs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative, exploratory case study was to discover whether participants who successfully completed a comprehensive leadership development program subsequently applied for, and assumed leadership positions in, their institutions. The study explored whether participants realized the career enhancement or progression they desired, and whether advancement could be attributed, at least partially, to participating in the leadership development program. Thus, the study investigated not only the outcomes but also the conditions or attributes that may have influenced those outcomes. Faculty and mid-level administrators have many reasons for choosing particular career paths and using a leadership development program to assist with career exploration and/or advancement is only one approach. For the purpose of this study, the reasons were delimited to those of expectancy theory. This made the study manageable in size while also identifying possible areas of further research. Limitations and areas for further research are discussed in Chapter 5.

Program participants were considered to be the best candidates for identifying the value of the Chair Academy training with respect to their careers. All of the study's participants were faculty and mid-level administrators who participated in the same yearlong leadership development program (Chair Academy, 2007-08), so that there was

consistency in the developmental opportunity, even if the perception or interpretation of the program was different. Participants were selected from a cohort of the same program in order to minimize the differences in their experiences and make it possible to carry out a more comparable analysis. All participants came from colleges, technical institutions, and polytechnic institutions in Western Canada. A more detailed discussion of the program and its participants is found in Chapter 3.

Research Questions

This study was designed to answer five research questions that address the purpose of the study. The first question addresses the nature of expectations that the leadership development program participants held regarding their career paths. The second question is in two parts and addresses: (a) whether the participants believed leadership development would lead to leadership opportunities, and (b) whether they believed that the top leadership at their institutions held similar beliefs. The third question addresses the value that participants placed on attaining a leadership position. The fourth question addresses whether participants applied for one or more leadership opportunities at their institutions and why. The fifth question addresses to what participants who were successful in attaining a leadership position at their institutions attribute the success, in terms of: (a) successfully getting the position and why, and (b) successfully doing the job. The rationale for developing the research questions is provided in Chapter 3, along with the interview questions that support the research questions.

Research Question 1. Did participants who successfully completed the leadership development program expect to become leaders in their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2a. Did participants believe that successfully completing the program would lead to leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2b. Did participants believe that the top leadership in their institutions believed that the leadership development training would prepare them for leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 3. Did participants value attainment of a leadership position within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 4. Did participants apply for one or more leadership opportunities at their institutions for which they met the stated minimum qualifications? Why or why not?

Research Question 5. If participants were successful in attaining a leadership position at their institutions, to what did they attribute their success: (a) in getting the position, and (b) in doing the job?

Conceptual Framework

Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory was used as the conceptual framework for explaining what motivates people to make certain decisions about their behaviors to facilitate career advancement. Expectancy theory works on the premise that individuals choose between behavioral alternatives based on a combination of three motivational

forces called *expectancy*, *instrumentality*, and *valence* (Illuminations, 2008, para. 8). The first, expectancy, arises from the individuals' beliefs that their efforts will lead to their desired results. This belief is based on several factors, including their past experiences, their level of self-efficacy, and their understanding of or perception of how difficult the behavior will be to perform. The second force is derived from the individuals' confidence that a particular type of behavior will yield a particular reward. Vroom's (1964) concept of instrumentality works on the premise that the harder one works, the greater the reward. The third force, valence, works on the premise that the outcome is valued by the individual, thus encouraging him or her to pursue it. What an individual values depends on the individual, allowing Vroom to reinforce the notion that no single motivating factor could be applied to everyone.

When these three forces are put into Vroom's expectancy equation, they are multiplied to produce an expected level of motivation. It is important that all three forces have a degree of effect because if any one of them is zero, the equation will always equal a motivational force of zero. For example, if a leadership development program participant has no desire to be a leader, thus indicating a valence of zero, he or she will not be motivated to pursue leadership opportunities even if the institution offers significant training opportunities and creates an environment for success.

Determining the expectancy, instrumentality, and valence of program participants was achieved through the use of questionnaires, interviews, archived data, and institutional records. At the onset of the study, participants completed a questionnaire, which was followed by an interview. The data collected from these sources was

triangulated against institutional records, that is, job postings and professional development plans. More information on the research design is discussed in Chapter 3.

Nature of the Study

This study uses the case study as a qualitative method of research. According to Yin (1994) a case study is defined as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 13). Using simpler language, Stake (1994) explained case studies as a "strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, or process, of one or more individuals" (p. 13). To summarize the nature of the study, as researcher my method of inquiry involved a case study with a purposeful sample that was recruited from one cohort of a leadership development program. Data collection and analysis followed the systematic plan that will be explained in Chapter 3. All sources of information were then used to answer the research questions and provide results that are later used to form conclusions and make recommendations.

Operational Definitions

The following terms are defined in order to provide clarity and consistency of terminology within the context of this study.

Career outcomes: Career outcomes are defined as the identifiable changes in work behavior or position movement that leadership development participants' individually experienced after they successfully completed the leadership development program. Outcomes refer to both intrinsic and extrinsic measures. Seibert, Kraimer, and

Liden (2001) identified salary and promotion as extrinsic measures, and individual feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction as intrinsic measures. For the purpose of this study, career outcomes referred to extrinsic measures because the movement into a leadership position falls into that category.

Chair Academy: The Chair Academy (http://www.chairacademy.com/) is an organization that conducts leadership development training internationally. The training is a yearlong program that includes seven elements: (a) an individualized professional development plan, (b) a mentoring program, (c) reflective practice and journaling, (d) electronic connection, (e) leadership surveys, (f) graduate credit, and (g) an academy certificate of completion. The Chair Academy program was selected for this study because of the breadth and large number of colleges and universities that use the program for leadership development, and because of the large number of participants who have completed the program.

Expectancy theory: A theory of motivation developed by Vroom (1964) that identified motivation based on the forces of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. According to Vroom, "an expectancy is defined as a momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome" (p. 17). Instrumentality is defined in relation to the outcome and Vroom explained this by stating:

> If an object is believed by a person to lead to desired consequences or to prevent undesired consequences, the person is predicted to have a positive attitude toward it. If, on the other hand, it is believed by the person to lead to undesired

consequences or to prevent desired consequences, the person is predicted to have a negative attitude toward it. (p. 16)

Vroom used valence in "referring to affective orientations toward particular outcomes" (p. 15).

Exploratory case study: According to Yin (1994), "case studies are the preferred strategy when 'how' and or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (p. 1).

IPDP: Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) refers to the individualized action plan leadership development program participants complete to develop their leadership competencies.

Leader: An individual who demonstrates the skills and abilities ascribed to those who lead followers. In some cases leader also refers to the person who holds a position of responsibility, regardless of their skills or abilities.

Leader development: Training and development provided to individuals for the benefit of personal skill development and expanding individual capacity to lead (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2005).

Leadership development: Training and development intended to expand organizational capacity through integrating individual leader development with organizational leader development that benefits the organization (Day, 2001).

Leadership development program: A structured program that occurs over a defined period of time with an intention of preparing participants for leadership opportunities.

Assumptions

For purposes of this study, it was assumed that the leadership development program participants willingly and voluntarily participated in the program and, in doing so, were able and willing to work at building or enhancing their leadership skills. It was also assumed that the participants provided truthful and insightful responses and did not feel threatened or intimidated into disclosing information, regardless of whether their experience was positive or negative. Participant privacy protection measures were used to reinforce this assumption.

With regard to the leadership development program chosen for this study, it was assumed that the program was representative of other leadership development training programs that were referred to through the literature review (Crosson, Douglas, O'Mera, & Sperling, 2005; Inman, 2009; Orr, 2007; Stewart, 2009); and that it was well-organized, based on principles of classical and contemporary leadership theory, supported by many colleges and universities, and capable of providing learning opportunities that build or enhance the leadership skills of participants. A review of the Chair Academy's mission and values, and an outline of the leadership program curriculum, indicated that these assumptions were reasonable (http://www.chairacademy .com/academy/index.html).

It was assumed that the colleges and universities that employed the participants supported their leadership development and provided opportunities for participants to demonstrate their leadership skills. It was also assumed that the institutions valued and encouraged the demonstration of leadership skills.

Scope and Delimitations

Post-secondary institutions, including colleges, universities, and other higher education instiutions, invest considerable resources in leadership development for their employees (Aalsburg-Wiessner & González-Sullivan, 2007; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Miller, 1997). This study explored the career outcomes of individuals who worked in post-secondary institutions across western Canada but completed the same leadership development program as an identifiable cohort. This cohort was also chosen because the end date of the program allowed for a reasonable amount of time to identify changes in career outcomes once the program had been completed. Participants were contacted and interviewed in their fourth year after completing the program; this was believed to be a reasonable amount of time for changes in career outcomes to be realized. Participants who left their sponsoring institutions were noted, but were not included in the study because their career path was not tracked outside their sponsoring institution.

This study included a sample of 12 participants from one cohort of 58 participants who completed all requirements of the Chair Academy. Individuals who advanced their careers without participating in the Chair Academy were not studied.

To constrain the scope of the project, the research questions were framed by participants' expectations for career outcomes after completing the leadership

development program. This delimitation restricted consideration to one factor that could contribute to potential leadership opportunities. The study did not explore participant competence nor motivation for pursuing leadership opportunities.

The participants were asked to discuss the leadership opportunities at their institutions, but no further assessments of those environments were made apart from determining the number of posted leadership opportunities. The choice not to study institutions' hiring practices was a delimitation.

Limitations

Limitations from this study were associated with the purposeful selection of participants, all of whom were part of the same leadership development program cohort that represented a geographic area. This restriction in sampling could constrain generalizability to institutions in other geographic areas. Repeating the study in other geographic areas is recommended.

The study participants represented institutions throughout Western Canada, a geographic area of 2.9 million square kilometers. While face-to-face interviews can provide richer experiences, these vast distances meant that interviews had to be conducted online or by telephone. Although this limitation was accounted for in the questions, it likely affected the depth of information that could be collected. Being aware of this limitation ensured that I was careful not to draw conclusions about the participants' responses; I simply reported the information that was provided.

Significance of the Study

This study investigated what happens to participants in a leadership development program after they successfully completed the program. It addressed a gap in the literature between leadership development and the career outcomes of participants. It was expected to yield information that would allow institutions to make better-informed decisions about who to sponsor for leadership development training and how that could translate into an increase in capable applicants to leadership opportunities. The results of this study add to the literature on the career outcomes of leadership development program participants. Findings could lead to further study on how to choose the best candidates for leadership development and the best way to support those candidates.

Determining whether participation in leadership development programs results in the program participants successfully moving into leadership positions at their institutions helps institutions in several ways. First, it demands that questions be asked about what is expected of a leadership development program and of those who participate in them. Having a clear understanding of the intent of such program participation is of benefit to both the institution and the individual, because it aligns interests and allows for clarity in the future. Secondly, investment in leadership development programs is costly, both for institutions and individuals. Direct financial costs for the institution include program registration fees, accommodations, travel, and incidentals. Indirect costs include the productivity loss of individuals who are away on training, which the institution must absorb until the individual returns. Participants may experience anxiety as a result of uncontrollable events involved with travel challenges, ambiguity associated with a new

learning environment, and the additional organization required to be away from home. Participant commitment to a rigorous learning environment comes at the expense of being able to do other things, such as relax and explore the surroundings, which could stress participants. Thirdly, funders, critics, and stakeholders could raise questions of whether the resources spent on leadership development are worth the investment.

This research is significant because it provides evidence of the effectiveness of using leadership development programs to fill a leadership gap at colleges and universities. It illuminates participant expectations, perceptions, beliefs, and values surrounding leadership development and career outcomes. It may help individuals and institutions make more informed decisions about investing resources in leadership development programs, as well as provide useful feedback to the developers of leadership development programs. This study is expected to have implications for positive social change. As institutions grapple with the allocation of limited resources, results from this study allows them to determine whether the significant investment in leadership development produces more leaders. In addition, it is presumable that individuals who receive leadership development training, and go on to become leaders, are more competent and able to lead their institutions in positive ways. Students are beneficiaries of these positive actions, allowing them to study within a learning environment that is led by competent leaders. The positive social change extends beyond the benefits the individual leaders or institutions receive, as students take their place in society.

Summary

Providing leadership development training is a rational approach to addressing the leadership gap in post-secondary institutions (Barden, 2008). This chapter provides the context for conducting a study to investigate whether institutional investments in leadership development results in the program participants becoming leaders at their institutions. Using a cohort of leadership development program participants, a purposeful sample of program participants provide information on their expectations, experiences, and value of outcomes achieved. The institutional goal of increasing the number of capable applicants to leadership positions was determined by identifying those participants that pursued leadership opportunities. The study provides evidence that both individuals and institutions can use to formulate better-informed decisions on investing in leadership development training.

Chapter 2 provides a review of contemporary and classical literature on leadership development, particularly as it relates to higher education. Chapter 3 explains the research methodology and includes the structure for explaining how the research questions were answered. This includes a detailed description of the exploratory case study method, which is defended as the best alternative. Chapter 4 describes how the research method unfolded and answers the research questions. Chapter 5 describes the analysis of the collected data, interprets the results, recommends actions, and states implications for social change.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative, exploratory case study was to discover whether participants who successfully completed a comprehensive leadership development program subsequently applied for, and assumed, leadership positions in their colleges and universities. Leadership development programs have been promoted as a means of addressing the shortage of leaders in higher education (Barden, 2008; Knight & Trowler, 2001; McNair, 2010). In order to ascertain what work has been done in developing and assessing leadership development, this literature analyzed program design (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; Stewart, 2009), participant experiences and expectations (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Griffin, 2003; Orr, 2007), institutional involvement (Allen & Hartman, 2008; Coppard, 2006), and ways in which leadership programs are evaluated. The underlying question—whether leadership development program participants go on to become leaders at their institutions—was explored using the conceptual framework of expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964). Although it may be logical to presume that participants in a leadership development program intend to become leaders, it is important this be confirmed in order to ensure that the goal of having an increase in competent leaders can be achieved by supporting individuals who participate and successfully complete a leadership development program. . This identification has been a key component of understanding what motivates some individuals to pursue leadership and what factors prevent others from doing the same

(Isaac, Zerbe & Pitt, 2001; Mathibe, 2008). The data presented through this research study will help institutions make informed decisions about supporting individuals for leadership development and help individuals make decisions about participating in leadership development programs.

This chapter begins with an explanation of expectancy theory and then explores leadership development, including the dimensions of program design, participant experiences and expectations, institutional involvement, and leadership development program evaluation. These topics were chosen because they emerged as areas of common focus within leadership development (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981; Diabach, 2006; McNair, 2010). In addition, researchers who investigated leadership development programs as a strategy for building leadership skills often targeted these areas (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; Crosson, Douglas, O'Mera, & Sperling, 2005; Inman, 2009). This study was designed to answer five research questions that evolved from the dimensions of Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory and relate to expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. These questions, as taken from chapter 1, are:

Research Question 1. Did participants who successfully completed a leadership development program expect to become leaders in their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2a. Did participants believe that successfully completing the program would lead to leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2b. Did participants believe that the top leadership in their institutions believed that the leadership development training would prepare them for leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 3. Did participants value attainment of a leadership position within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 4. Did participants apply for one or more leadership opportunities at their institutions for which they met stated minimum qualifications? Why or why not?

Research Question 5. If participants were successful in attaining a leadership position at their institutions, to what did they attribute their success: (a) in getting the position; and (b) in doing the job?

Literature Search Strategy

In acquiring scholarly materials for the review, the following databases were used: ABI/Inform, Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, ERIC, JSTOR, Professional Development Collection, and SAGE. The following keywords were used: *leadership, leadership theory, leadership development, program, higher education, post-secondary, administrator, leader,* and *expectancy theory*. In addition to contemporary peer-reviewed journal articles, several dissertations on current leadership research were consulted. These search strategies provided the breadth and depth necessary to conduct an extensive literature review. The chapter concludes with an introduction to the methodology that was applied to the study and is thoroughly discussed in Chapter 3.

Expectancy Theory: The Conceptual Framework

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) works on the premise that individuals would pursue courses of action that resulted in outcomes that they believed were likely to occur. The degree of effort individuals put towards achieving the outcome would depend on how much they value the outcome. Being able to predict how much effort individuals would exert and how much they valued particular outcomes would help to identify the degree of motivation individuals would direct towards particular outcomes. Vroom identified this as the motivational force. Other dimensions of the theory were based on the perceptions and expectations of the individual. First, what the individual believed he or she could accomplish, the expectancy probability, demonstrated to what degree effort lead to a desired level of performance. Secondly, the instrumentality probability is the dimension relating to the perception of how an individual linked performance to rewards. Valence, the third dimension, relates to the value that an individual placed on the outcome. This theory has been used to quantify the motivational force of individuals, as represented by the equation MF = expectancy *x* instrumentality *x* valence. For clarification, consider the following two examples. If Mary believes she is capable of working hard, and that hard work means she will move into a leadership position, which Mary values, then her motivational force is likely high. On the other hand, if Mary believes she is capable of working hard but believes hard work does not mean she will move into a leadership position, even though she values being a leader, it is likely her motivational force will be low.

Mathibe (2008) used the expectancy theory assumption – that people make decisions based on their expectation that a particular behavior will lead to a desired outcome – to show the need for balance between employee needs and institutional needs. A synergy between employee needs and institutional needs was believed to create more productive tendencies. In order to make these behaviors productive, as deemed by the institution, Mathibe expanded upon Vroom's three-part equation, stating that expectancy theory is comprised of five elements: (a) goals/expectations, (b) unlocking potential, (c) effort, (d) equity, and (e) performance. These five elements have been defined and applied as follows.

Identifying goals and clarifying their meaning forges a shared understanding between the individual and the institution. When individuals know and understand what is expected, Mathibe (2008) stated they would be motivated to achieve. This reciprocal determinism was viewed as necessary for unlocking the potential for productivity. In referring to the possible, as opposed to the actual, the unlocking of potential required identifying what an individual needed in the form of communication, workload allocation, job standards, and degree of involvement in decision-making. As is consistent with expectancy theory, individual perceptions and needs vary and the degree of empowerment offered through the aforementioned essentials required personalization in order to achieve successful outcomes. This would allow effort to be directed towards achieving the goals or expectations without abdicating responsibility or relationships. Mathibe used the equity element to replace Vroom's (1964) definition of valence. Whereas valence was determined to be the value placed on an outcome, Mathibe believed

that a failure to balance the inputs and outputs of individuals acted in the same way. For example, if something is not valued, the motivation to achieve it will be low, just as individuals are not motivated to pursue a course of action if they believe the outcome to be unfair. All of the preceding elements lead to performance, using expectancy theory to predict that employees would be motivated when they believed that putting in more effort yields higher levels of performance.

Further development of the conceptual framework involved connecting expectancy theory to a research paradigm. The appropriate paradigm for this study is constructivism because the social constructivists have interpreted experiences in ways that helped them gain understanding (Creswell, 2009). Expectancy theory and constructivism both declare that participant interpretation is subjective, allowing the participants to create meaning that is satisfactory to them. Creswell stated that these interpretations create meanings that are directed towards objects or things. Referring back to the example of Mary, her constructivist view would depend upon how she interpreted whether her hard work would result in securing a leadership position.

I investigated the meanings participants have surrounding expectations of whether a leadership development program facilitates entry into a leadership position. Using expectancy theory, I sought to understand participant beliefs and intentions regarding participation in a leadership development program; and examined whether clear goals were established prior to attendance, how individuals were selected, the degree of effort the participants put forward, whether participants believed the institution fairly recognized their efforts by providing leadership opportunities, and how these factors

impacted the leadership pursuits of program participants. This investigation used the dimensions of expectancy theory relating to expectancy, instrumentality, and valence to frame the study, while considering the reciprocal relationship between the individual and the institution. According to Creswell (2009), this meant that the research questions needed to be open ended and broad. This type of questioning has been consistent with research conducted for studies that were investigated as part of this literature review and has resulted in identifying ways to help individuals move into leadership positions. For example, Coppard (2006) conducted a study, using an open ended, broad questioning style that investigated the experiences of faculty who moved into chair roles.

Leadership Development

Allen and Hartman (2008) observed that billions of dollars have been spent on leadership development programs every year, even though "little academic work connects the theory of leadership development to the interventions used in leadership development programs" (p. 10). Evidence is also lacking on whether leadership development has led to advancement that fills the growing need for leaders. In higher education, leadership development spending has been fuelled by the pending college leadership crisis, predicting as many as 1,500 vacant leadership opportunities by 2012 (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Campbell, Syed, and Morris (2010) stated that, in order to fill the leadership gap, it is important to increase the understanding of leadership attributes and work styles that are possessed by successful presidents. Although this study has investigated leadership positions at a lower level than a presidency, understanding leadership attributes for positions in higher education remains applicable on several

levels. The literature has revealed that there are similarities in leadership development programs, even when the targeted participants are different (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Inman, 2009; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Robinson, Sugar, & Miller, 2010). The landscape is littered with a variety of ideas on the best way to develop leaders, and college administrators must pick through them to decide which would have a useful application in their respective institutions.

When defining leadership development, the distinction between leader development and leadership development should be made. McCauley and Van Velsor (2005) defined leader development as directed towards expanding individual capacity, whereas Day (2001) defined leadership development as directed towards expanding organizational capacity. Burns (1978) also separated the definition of leadership from the definition of leader. Leaders were defined by traits and behaviors, whereas leadership was defined as a process that existed within a context. Even though the definitions were separated, Burns maintained that, as distinct entities, neither approach can be as singularly effective as it would be if it were integrated and understood in the context of the other. The leader offers leadership and leadership is offered by the leader, requiring both the leader and the leadership to receive due consideration.

Brungardt (1997) supported the distinctions in leaders and leadership; he said that all leadership theories could be categorized under five general approaches. These approaches included trait, behavioral, situational, power-influence, and transformational. Recognizing that different types of individuals pursue leadership development, this literature review limited the exploration of leadership theories to the trait and

transformational categories. The reason for this is that trait theory addresses the individual leader's capacity for leadership according to identifiable characteristics, and transformational theory reoccurs in the literature as a leadership development program focus when determining and designing program content (Davis, 2003; Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981; Hawkins, 2009; Isaac et al., 2001). Trait theory further identifies differences and similarities in leaders, whereas transformational theory further specifies how leadership can be defined. Addressing both leader and leadership is consistent with the distinctions made by Burns (1978) and Brungardt (1997).

Early trait research conducted by Stogdill (1948) and Mann (1959) identified differentiating characteristics for those who were leaders, as did later studies by Gardner (1989). As one of the earliest subjects to be researched under the topic of leadership, many trait models exist (Medina, 2006). These models emphasize the personal attributes of leaders and how combinations of traits, motives, and skills can predict leader effectiveness. Although there have been many studies aimed at identifying the common characteristics of effective leaders (DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991), no definitive predictors have been solidified. Further research revealed that trait theory could not identify leaders in all situations because it did not consider the context requirements for particular traits. The presence of particular traits could indicate the propensity for leadership, but not accurately predict whether individuals possessing those traits would end up as leaders (Davis, 2003; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). The trait theory of leadership was founded on the belief that leaders have natural abilities and attributes that are well aligned for leadership. The assumption was

that leaders were born and not made, allowing individuals to create expectations around their leadership propensity.

When identification of traits did not prove to be a successful predictor of effective leadership, researchers shifted, in the 1950s, to study the actions of leaders. Actions were analyzed according to what leaders did with the personal traits, skills, and motives that they possessed. The significant difference between these new behavioral models and trait models was that behaviors can be learned whereas traits are innate. Within the framework of expectancy theory, one aspect of this study sought to determine to what participants attributed their leadership success. It was interesting to discover what traits or behaviors participants identified as important to their success, as these may serve to reveal how leadership programs can or do serve individuals in their career advancement.

Transformational leadership is often used as the theoretical backdrop on which many leadership development programs have been successfully modeled (Ardichvili & Manderscheid, 2008; Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981), because it views the leader as the change agent who, either before or after undertaking leadership development training, can inspire or motivate followers. Heavy criticism of leadership models during the 1980s led to a leadership gap because of what was defined as the "performance-cue effect." When times were good, leadership was deemed effective, but when times were bad, then leadership was blamed even if the leadership during both periods was similar. This resulted in a new type of leadership, labeled "charismatic leadership," developed by Conger and Kanungo (1987). Based on the Greek word meaning special or divine gift, charismatic leadership relies on the effect the leader has on followers. Follower

commitment stems from the relationship with the leader, which is one aspect of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) noted that follower commitment is significant to challenging organizational goals. The transformational leader presents these goals as a compelling vision that appeals to followers' value systems, allowing the leader to then incite positive feelings towards a new vision. Change occurs when followers reevaluate their behavior options and become committed to supporting the espoused vision of the leader. Signaling change, transformational leadership addresses the need for action and many contemporary scholars, including Bennis and Nanus (1985), Kouzes and Posner (2007), and Covey and Merrill (2006), have presented the leader as a catalyst for change. Medina (2004) observed that transformational leadership has become a dominant theme in leadership studies. The leadership development program under study for this dissertation has been grounded in transformational leadership theory. Participants in the study provided information about whether this type of training prepared them for leadership roles within their institutions.

Leadership Development Program Dimensions

In order to develop an understanding of leadership development programs, this literature review explored the dimensions of program design, participant experiences and expectations, institutional involvement, and the methods used for evaluating the effectiveness of leadership development programs. The leadership development program that was chosen as the focus of this study was the Chair Academy (http://www.chair academy.com). This program was selected for the reasons identified in Chapter 1, including the number of institutions who have sent employees to the Chair Academy for

leadership development and the number of people who have participated in the program. The program has been designed in a way that begins with a one-week residency where participants from multiple institutions come together to explore principles of leadership. Participants have been supported by their institutions and, prior to attending the residency, completed a number of leadership assessments that serve as a starting point for individual leadership development. When participants have completed their residency, they return to their institutions where they put into practice the individual development plans that they created during the residency. Institutional support and involvement continues, as participants have been provided opportunities to enact dimensions of their individual development plan, including the assignment of a mentor who guides participant development over the following year. At the end of the year, participants have returned to the Chair Academy to complete a capstone residency. This weeklong event has allowed participants to review their progress, receive feedback, and plan for future development. The program content has encompassed multiple leadership theories and principles that the Chair Academy has stated they accomplish through the provision of "a systems approach to transformational leadership" (http://www.chairacademy.com/academy/index.html). The unpublished 2011 Leadership Academy Research Report, entitled "Investing in Leadership Development," that was produced by the Chair Academy for use as promotional material, revealed that participants reported changes in leadership competence, commitment to growth as leaders, and increased confidence in their leadership competencies (Barker, Brunn, & Bullock, n.d.). This overview of the Chair Academy highlights the facets of program design, participant experiences and

expectations, institutional involvement, and evaluation methods. These same dimensions were explored in the literature review, and confirmed that the Chair Academy satisfied many of the positive recommendations in the following sections.

Program Design

There are no hard and fast rules about how to design a leadership development program, but a review of the literature has identified practices that are commonly referred to as important for success (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; Crosson, Douglas, O'Mera, & Sperling, 2005). These included "action learning" by putting theory into practice that focused on leadership situations, opportunities for mentorships and coaching, and recognizing individual participant needs and adapting programs accordingly.

Action learning originated from the work of Lewin (1997), and emerged as a concept in the 1940s. Revans (1986) defined action learning as a continuous process of learning and reflection that is derived from solving a real problem. Learning is centered on developing solutions that address the problem and the learner's developmental needs. Action learning is a process that requires time to complete, with Revans recommending four to nine months.

Reille and Kezar (2010) used an "action research" plan to understand successful leadership development program design. Action research is different from action learning but shares the element of consideration for real events. In their study, Reille and Kezar supported a curriculum that addresses leadership competencies instead of focusing on managerial skills. A focus on skills was driven by the biases of managers and often resulted in the elimination of much needed elements that included mentoring, job

shadowing, and team projects. Several researchers extolled the benefits of mentorship and coaching in their work, including research from McNair (2010) on college leaders in the California higher education system where an emphasis on mentoring and on-the-job training was supported.

In their evaluation of leadership development programs, Robinson et al. (2010) deviated from the requirements identified by other scholars cited in this research and recommended that "there should be less emphasis on social skills such as team building, and more emphasis on more significant topics to community college faculty" (p. 620). Robinson et al. supported an action learning model with real problems as the focus, rather than detractors that, in their view, simulate or occupy time without the purpose of developing a solution. Leaders also needed the opportunity to receive feedback from within the institution in order to understand their strengths and weaknesses, as without feedback, the possibility for effective personal growth would be limited (Allen & Hartman, 2008). Feedback would make a valuable contribution to the required reflection in action learning.

Other types of learning have been investigated by different researchers and have been used to generate programming ideas for leadership development. Allen and Hartman (2008) used the work of Conger and Kanungo (1987), recognized experts on leadership, to categorize all of the different sources of learning into four developmental approaches: (a) personal growth; (b) conceptual understanding; (c) feedback; and (d) skill development. Sources of learning indicated how information was delivered and provided opportunities to enhance the learning environment and delivery through activities such as

group reflection, service learning, team building, degree programs, assessment centers, simulations, and action learning. The delivery choice addressed a particular developmental approach, which could include personal growth, conceptual understanding, feedback, or skill building. Providing alternative delivery options meets individual participants' needs while also serving the larger goal of building leadership skills. In order for leaders to develop a conceptual understanding of the skills they needed to practice, Allen and Hartman believed it was necessary to have activities in all four of the developmental approach categories.

Stewart (2009) stated that learning from experience, or action learning, had advantages that included empowering participants to address strategic issues, being able to quantify outcomes of the learning process, and learning how to learn. Not without its challenges, Stewart concurred with Revans (1986) that action learning took extra time and resources, demanded participant commitment, and required a level of trust between participants if they were to feel comfortable sharing problems. Although action learning was viewed as an effective program design, Stewart cited negative participant responses to this approach. These responses were centered on two key areas that related to the action learning process: Participants wanted more preliminary information on how the process worked and felt facilitators needed an increased understanding of the action learning process.

Proponents of action learning view it as a singular strategy for leadership development. The research by Campbell et al. (2010) reflected other researchers who supported multiple strands of learning opportunities. Using the Occupational Personality

Questionnaire (OPQ) to assess institutional fit for individuals, Campbell et al. were able to translate work styles into competencies. Preluded by traditional coursework, inquiry-based rationale building, and development of interpersonal competencies, leadership development spanned the boundaries of course work, research, data analysis, and personality profiling. Campbell et al. stated that matching personality profiles and work profiles to traditional leadership development methods would assist with closing the gap between interpersonal competencies and development-program curriculum. Griffin (2003) also supported recognizing how the characteristics of individuals impacted their ability to lead. Successful leadership development programs were involved in tailoring programs to satisfy individual learning styles. Citing a leadership program from Nationwide Financial, Griffin was able to demonstrate that aligning individuals with different development strategies produced better leaders. Similar to Allen and Hartman (2008), who proposed a long-term approach to leadership development, Campbell et al. believed sustained and systematic efforts were required. They also believed that, although students could assess their level of competency using traditional evaluation methods, mastery and change in behavior required personality and work-style profiling that led to executive coaching for areas targeted for improvement. Other research conducted by Stewart (2009) proposed that a move away from the individual and toward the leadership situation would provide a clearer definition for leadership development. This would result in a focus on challenges, context, and characteristics that could provide the continuous activity necessary for leadership development.

In programs designed to train leaders, Keim and Murray (2008) stated that attending a doctoral program gave legitimacy to higher education leaders, regardless of where that doctorate was earned. It also did not matter what the subject area specialization was, as legitimacy has been linked to the credential and not the content. According to Golde (2006), more than 400 American universities have offered doctoral programs, awarding more than 40,000 doctoral degrees per year. These numbers indicate that opportunities for legitimacy from completing a doctoral program do exist in higher education. The Conference Board of Canada (http://www.conferenceboard.ca/hcp/Details/education/Phd-graduates.aspx), which provides performance data and insights into economic trends, public policy, and organizational performance, disagreed with the seemingly generous allotment of PhDs in the United States. The board reported that, in 2003, a grade that indicated the number of degrees granted per capita slipped from C grade to D for the U.S. In 2007, the number of PhDs granted per 100,000 people in the United States was 289. As a comparative, Canada also received a D grade, granting 209 degrees per 100,000 people. Other comparative countries that received A grades fared much better, such as Sweden with a showing of 734 and Switzerland with 721, indicating how difficult attaining an A grade had become for Canada and the U.S. If, as Keim and Murrary (2008) state, obtaining a doctoral degree can give legitimacy to leaders, few leaders in Canada or United States will be able to derive this benefit.

The literature revealed that leadership development program design choices were many and varied. As a baseline, it was shown that effective programs consider individual

learning needs, provide mentorship and coaching opportunities, use multiple strands of learning, and incorporate action learning that is based on real-life leadership issues.

Program Participants

Leadership development programs are filled with participants who may go on to occupy leadership positions, and participants and their experiences required further study. Understanding participants and what can be done to best serve their needs also serves to satisfy the leadership gap within institutions if participants can translate their leadership development experiences into leadership positions. The areas for consideration in this study included participant selection, variables for creating meaningful participant experiences, and factors to consider for successful participant development.

Institutions that attempt to select participants by aligning individual traits with the definition of leadership have been faced with many challenges because there is no agreed-upon definition of leadership (Davis, 2003). Following a trait theory approach, Davis noted that leaders need knowledge, skills, ability, and enthusiasm to be effective but questioned leadership theory that attempted to classify good leadership and concluded that "there is currently no unified theory of leadership" (p. 10). Rather than attempt theoretical conclusions, Davis suggested making practical interpretations. A competent leader could turn a group into a team, which Davis defined as a group with a mission. Further development could lead to a high-performance team that possessed characteristics such as a "clear goal, results-driven structure, competent team members, unified commitment, collaborative climate, standards of excellence, external support and recognition, and principled leadership" (p. 69). This statement aligns with how

transformational leadership uses the leader as a catalyst for change and suggests that participants who possess the charismatic traits defined earlier should be selected.

Diabach (2006) and Inman (2009) deemed traits to be less effective than other factors when development opportunities were being considered. Using a model to provide further insight into the perceptions of community college leaders, Diabach created the CAMEO model to determine how climate, ability, motivation, experiences, and opportunity to perform affected performance. Using the significant factors of perceived performance, Diabach determined that ability was most significant, and therefore proposed that the selection of participants needed to consider this factor. Even though ability was determined to be more significant, Diabach recommended that development opportunities needed to consider all of the CAMEO factors. Citing other examples of leadership theory, Inman (2009) stated that job experience played a more critical role in leader development than innate ability. This belief would discourage the use of trait theory as a means of selecting program participants because traits are deemed less important than experience, as supported by Diabach and Inman.

Participant selection is also not easy if one wishes to ensure gender balance among those selected for leadership development opportunities. Gender balance was not identified as a selection criterion for attending the Chair Academy. In some cases, an assessment of factors may discriminate against females (Roy, 2008), reducing their participation rates in leadership development programs. Roy believed that women have been at a disadvantage because person-centric perspectives suggested that women were "responsible for the obstacles that they face in the path of their professional progress"

because they are “inherently less ambitious,” “lack the skill of portraying their achievements,” and “lack organizational political acumen” (p. 3). Coupled with situation-centric perspectives where “internal organizational processes and practices are responsible for creating barriers” (p. 3), it is plausible that many women would be overlooked for leadership development opportunities. Golde (2006), who noted that systematic bias in doctoral training, which leaders of higher learning should possess, resulted in the underrepresentation of women, cited similar observations. More recently, this disadvantage was not as apparent because women outpaced men in desired leadership skills, as was supported in a meta-analysis study comparing men and women where “on an average women managers prove to be better leaders than men in equivalent positions” (Roy, 2008, p. 4). Keim and Murray (2008) also provided evidence that indicated the representation of women in top academic administrative positions at American community colleges had grown from 21% in 1990 to 44% in 2006. According to Roy (2008), characteristics such as problem articulation, coping with diversity and divergence, securing amicable solutions to problems, and superior interpersonal skills that encourage participatory decision making were more likely to be found in women than men. Preparing women for leadership would be easier if leader roles required these characteristics. Keim and Murray (2008) suggested more progress toward gender equity would be made if women with leadership potential were recruited and supported with encouragement and mentorship opportunities.

Moving beyond participant selection, due consideration needed to be given to creating meaningful experiences for those who were moving into leadership roles.

Coppard (2006) explored dimensions that related to how well institutions prepared individuals for leadership roles and identified factors of values, attributes, philosophies, and mentoring as important. Investigating the Community College Leadership Academy (CCLA) project, Crosson et al. (2005) identified how meaningful experiences were created. Factors included holding high expectations of participants, referring to them as fellows, and connecting them to college presidents at leadership luncheons that encouraged personal engagement and candid discussion. Using others as a source of learning emerged as a theme in participant experience, identified under a different name by DeRue and Ashford (2010) as a social-construction process. Rather than having it as an external practice involving other leaders, they stated leader identity was best developed from interaction with followers within their own institution.

The participants themselves would also hold expectations for leadership development and the opportunities that arose from leadership positions. As expectancy theory emphasizes individual perceptions of the environment, leadership development program participants would have different expectations (Isaac et al., 2001). Furthermore, the lack of definition surrounding what leadership is has resulted in different perceptions. Barker (1997) stated that not defining leadership is acceptable among scholars who discuss leadership. A study conducted by Rost (1991) analyzed 587 articles with the word *leadership* in the title and found that 366 of them had not provided a definition of leadership within the article. Without a guiding definition, Stewart (2009) identified leadership development approaches that included trait theories, path-goal theories, situational and contingency models, transactional models, and transformational models.

An informal survey conducted by Barker (1997) that asked individuals to complete the sentence “leadership is a…” resulted in 54% defining leadership as a skill or ability, 6% defining it as a role or position, 12% defining it as an action, and a further 12% not defining it at all. The remainder “suggested that it is a responsibility, a weapon, a process, a function of management, a factor, a lifestyle, or an experience” (p. 345). In order to gain some clarity on participant perceptions of leadership, the Isaac et al. study (2001) used expectancy theory to ascertain the individual beliefs potential leaders held of their environment and the subsequent actions resulting because of those beliefs. Individuals would move between roles of leaders and followers while they developed skills and clarified roles. By allowing leaders and followers role crossover, Isaac et al. suggested that individuals increased their achievement of organizational goals as they were allowed to adapt behavior according to situational demands. Attention to both leader and follower roles was also recognized in DeRue and Ashford’s (2010) grounded-theory study that verified whether individuals would demonstrate leadership behaviors if that behavior was endorsed and recognized not only by other leaders but by followers as well. This would indicate that program participant development opportunities should be determined by institutional leaders and supported by those to whom participants would potentially become leaders.

Referring back to individual experiences, Coppard (2006) used a grounded-theory approach to describe and dissect experiences from faculty who had moved into leadership roles. These faculty members had taken up the position of department or area chair and ranked a list of activities they found helpful in their transition. In addition to what was

helpful, the experiences also provided insight into the fact that most institutions did not adequately prepare faculty for the new role. This led to poor fits between individuals and leadership roles. The consequences of not aligning personality or work style to leadership roles resulted in leaders who were disillusioned, abandoned their roles as leaders, or expressed discontent with their institutions. Using the expectancy-theory framework provided by Vroom (1964), suggesting that people consciously choose actions that lead to specific outcomes, it would be reasonable that leadership development program participants who have invested in their own development would expect a positive experience. When the experience is negative, the expectancy model translates the valence into a negative number, indicating that the individual would want to avoid that outcome. In this case, the individual would then choose actions that would have them avoid leadership positions.

This leads to a discussion of conditions to be considered for the successful growth and development of program participants. Campbell et al. (2010) used a model that identified the keys for enacting change in leadership development programs. By following a 3-R model built on the concepts of relate, repeat, and reframe, program participants started the process by relating their targeted work-challenge areas to other participants, repeatedly addressing the development they were trying to make in the targeted area with other participants, and finally reframing their challenges in ways that were more conducive to demonstrating leadership competencies. The participant pool would challenge the use of detrimental, inadequate, or negative behaviors with learning

interventions that led to new behaviors. The pool would in turn then support and encourage the use of these new behaviors.

The ongoing development of leadership capabilities was further explained by Yip (2009), using a return-on-experience framework. Starting with critical awareness, leaders moved through knowledge, practice, and independent application to eventually arrive at skilled performance. This was accomplished through strategic assignments, job rotation, and action-learning projects.

Tailoring leadership development to institutional needs was viewed as effective. According to Reille and Kezar (2010), grow-your-own programs were determined to be more effective because they could incorporate the college's characteristics, culture, goals, and needs. This was supported by Robinson et al. (2010), who stated that the existing leadership gap in community colleges presented an opportunity for institutions to take a more active role in the development of their leaders by creating internal programs that would meet the competency needs of their institutions. Yip (2009) stated that the true measure of learning is application, and that when learning is derived from experiences, the transferability of that learning to other experiences is greater. The Community College Leadership Academy (CCLA), studied by Crosson et al. (2005), demonstrated how goals were translated into learning experiences that could be delivered to participants by facilitators from vested institutions. Merging theory and practice was determined to be an effective way to provide leaders with developmental experiences. Campbell et al. (2010) took this one step further by integrating competency building with individual work styles, and Allen and Hartman (2008) stressed that integrating leadership

development with organizational support was necessary even though the individual did the majority of the work. Similar to the executive coaching strategies presented by Campbell et al., Allen and Hartman suggested that coaching and mentoring could assist participants with translating theory into practice.

In order to effectively launch and provide a meaningful leadership development experience, Campbell et al. (2010) insisted on a minimum program training period of twelve to eighteen months. Crosson et al. (2005) followed the yearlong CCLA project being undertaken by colleges in the state of Massachusetts. Participants in this project attended monthly seminars and a capstone residency, studying a curriculum that had been designed to develop well-prepared leaders. Other programs, such as the New Superintendents Seminar Series studied by Orr (2007), followed a long-term development strategy by spanning their program over a one-year period that included five weekend sessions and a one-week summer residency. In Orr's study, participant success was related to their attendance and participation in the yearlong process. This was consistent with the findings from Reille and Kezar (2010), who observed that programs that extended beyond the short term allowed for the application of learned skills.

The research has shown that there is no standard or unified way to ensure that participant experiences with leadership development are successful. Factors to consider included attention to participant selection, identification of variables for creating meaningful experiences, and consideration of conditions from which participants could benefit. The research indicated there were several ways to tackle each of these factors. The study that I am conducted approached them from the perspective of participant

expectations, investigating whether participants believe that their attendance in a leadership development program will result in career advancement that will help fill a leadership gap. DeRue and Ashford (2010) found that when individuals view themselves as leaders, or expect to become leaders, “the stronger and more stable that particular identity construction will be” (p. 629).

Institutional Involvement

The previous section noted that participant experiences often required institutional involvement and support. In order to facilitate success, the institution should recognize that it is responsible for providing participants with opportunities to develop leadership skills, as well as creating expectancy for individuals to become leaders. The conceptual framework for this study – expectancy theory – has suggested that participants have expectations around institutional support and believe that the instrumentality for achieving levels of performance is impacted by the institution. A review of the literature found that providing opportunities was more easily achieved if differences in individual learning were appreciated and addressed, and if institution-participant relationships were developed.

Even with evidence that institutional involvement is crucial, research indicated that institutions did not capitalize on the opportunity to use sources of learning to develop leaders (Allen & Hartman, 2008). If developmental opportunities were considered through a leadership lens, Allen and Hartman believed more opportunities could be created. In the planning stage this would involve consideration of how a developmental opportunity contributed to leadership development. They also stated that linking

individuals, the organization, and the training wove leadership through the fabric of the organization and created a culture that identified leadership development through a learning orientation. If it was to be achieved, a cultural shift required a long-term approach. It also required different programs to satisfy different needs, as was stated by Griffin (2003), who believed a one-size-fits-all method was ineffective.

Rather than adopt holistic practices which developed multiple dimensions of individuals, institutions were more likely to pursue a standardized training program that resulted in a culture of leaders who were left to function within a very competitive environment where only the fittest survived. This environment created the conditions for failure that resulted in leaders being reassigned or disciplined. Griffin (2003) proposed that this could be avoided by creating categories within a leadership development program that tackled different dimensions based on the dominant style of the student. Rather than having different programs, individualism could be addressed through feedback and suggestions for practices going forward. Inman (2009) also criticized the generic approach to leadership development, stating that the identified developmental needs of leaders were often ignored if they did not subscribe to the generic model. Using Knight and Trowler's (2001) seven types of leadership and management knowledge framework, Inman sought to include knowledge dimensions relating to control, people, educational practice, conception, process, situation, and tacit skill in leadership development programs. Inman proposed aligning the training method to the dimension, and recognizing value in how the dimensions worked independently and in conjunction with each other.

In addition to not capitalizing on the opportunities to use sources of learning, institutions were also seen not to support the training being undertaken. Coppard (2006) noted criticisms from program participants who stated that, although they believed the list of readings and required writing assignments were valuable for their leadership development, they received no release time or reduction in workload from their job in order to complete these tasks. This made on-time completion difficult and stressful for program participants. Another area of concern for participants was that, although sitting presidents supported the program through single, isolated events like luncheons, they did not offer ongoing developmental mentoring. Recommendations gathered by Stewart (2009) indicated that providing a channel for continued dialogue and interaction between program participants would be beneficial. Robinson et al. (2010) also provided evidence from program participants that echoed the desire for ongoing support after the program ended in order to practice and disseminate their new knowledge and skills. Robinson et al. suggested that this desire could be satisfied in the form of a learning community that offered continued involvement with current issues, a service project, or an online discussion group.

A further dimension to this discussion included the expectations of the leadership program participant. The success of the leadership development program participants was found to be more likely when employees were motivated to achieve (Mathibe, 2008). Mathibe used expectancy theory to explain this position, stating that employees were more acquiescent to productive tendencies when their needs were being met. Expectancy theory is predicated on the finding that people are motivated to act in ways that produce a

desired or valued outcome. Organizations that want to improve motivation by strengthening the expectancy of employees needed to ensure that the five elements were being properly addressed. According to Mathibe, this would mean: (a) goals and expectations were clearly communicated; (b) employees' potentials were aligned with their intellect, emotion, and skills; (c) employees were willing to exert effort to achieve goals; (d) these efforts were fairly compensated; and (e) feedback on performance was received and used for learning, producing, and creating future expectations. Mathibe concluded that employees who understood the system and had expectations of being able to meet the clear goals that were set out by the organizations would have increased productive capacity if they valued the outcomes that would arise from their actions. Isaac et al. (2001) agreed, stating that individuals would act through self-interest by choosing actions that maximized the probability of an outcome they desired.

Individuals may pursue self-interest, but leadership requires a relationship. Davis (2003) explored these relationships and discovered that they developed from individuals by having repeated activities, frequent high quality interactions, reciprocity, and opportunities for complementary disclosure. Institutions are in a position to facilitate these relationships. Based on the literature reviewed in this section, the key lessons for institutions that are creating or supporting leadership development programs are to accommodate the individual's developmental needs through flexible programming, to provide on-going mentorships or opportunities to keep learning active, and to strengthen the expectancy elements of employees who are pursuing leadership development. Key

areas to avoid are one-size-fits-all programming and insulating participants from institutional experiences where they can practice leadership.

Program Evaluation

The literature has established that billions of dollars have been spent on leadership development every year (Allan & Hartman, 2008; Dolezalek, 2005; Vicere & Fulmer, 1996). Evaluation of those programs would provide insight into whether this has been money well spent. In order to do this, there would need to be clarity on what the program has intended to accomplish. In this section, I discuss evaluation methods that are frequently used and options for choosing an evaluation method.

Similar to the issue whereby a lack of definition for leadership has complicated understanding, no agreed upon curriculum for leadership development has existed (Stewart, 2009). Leadership development has primarily focused on the development of the individual, supporting that leadership development should be adapted to meet individual needs. A plethora of needs requires a diversity of strategies. The question of whether the leadership development program has met its objectives should frame the evaluation scheme used, reverting to the initial inquiry on expectations.

A variety of assessment methods have been proposed. One possible strategy, suggested by Allen (2009), was to review the leadership program and assess whether the initial objectives resulted in participant behavior changes or advancement. This was not easily accomplished, as Allen observed the difficulty in establishing linkages between developmental objectives and behavior outcomes. It was important to assess whether

program objectives were met, and not just participant satisfaction (Robinson et al., 2010) or personal benefits obtained (Stewart, 2009).

Doctoral degrees have provided leaders with legitimacy, but McNair (2010) proposed areas for further study that include exploring the doubt that community college leaders have had surrounding the capacity of doctoral programs to develop competencies for effective leadership for their particular institutions. Regardless of the provider, structure, or content, the effectiveness of leadership development programs has been challenged, thus making proper evaluation important.

Program assessments have included simple surveys (Crosson et al., 2005; Robinson et al., 2010), qualitative participant comments and quantitative numerical rating scales (Stewart, 2009), multifaceted designs that include demographics, essays relating to participant expectations, debriefing and feedback-session discussions, observer documentation, and participant evaluation (Orr, 2007). McNair (2010) assessed the ability of graduate programs to prepare community college leaders using the lens of the American Association of Community Colleges' (AACC) core competencies for effective leadership, and found that three of the competencies (organizational strategy, resource management, and communication) can be acquired through doctoral study. Regardless of the assessment method, Campbell et al. (2010) insisted on using a skilled evaluator who could properly interpret assessment data so that the benefits of a leadership program could be properly identified.

Choosing an evaluation method could be linked to the type of developmental activity being undertaken (Allen, 2009), such as direct observation of a skill-building

activity or subject-object interviews to measure cognitive development. Due to the complexity of competencies that leadership development programs hope to develop, Allen recommended using more than one type of measure. A holistic approach would include qualitative and quantitative measures but could also fall short, as Allen believed participants know more than they can tell. To overcome this, Allen proposed a user-focused theory of action that asks leaders a series of targeted questions that allows subliminal awareness to be turned into explicit knowledge. Using this theory involved steps for: (a) understanding organizational context and program participants; (b) defining objectives and desired outcomes; (c) clearly articulating the theories to participants; (d) providing emotional comfort and direction on how to espouse theories that participants believe undergird their actions; (e) being clear about the causal chain; (f) validating assumptions; (g) identifying areas of focus; (h) discussing constraints and brainstorming solutions; and (i) evaluating the process with participants. Although a lengthy process, Allen believed that translating these steps into an evaluation instrument would yield more effective leadership development initiatives.

Although the benefits of leadership development have been confirmed through the analysis of program content and participant satisfaction, Reille and Kezar (2010) conducted a study that revealed program design was often determined by the designer, which led to decisions that were “based on convenience and ease rather than on the literature about curricular and pedagogical effectiveness” (p. 75). As an example, very little research had been conducted on whether participants progressed to occupy leadership positions following their attendance in a leadership development program. The

suggested evaluation strategies have included multiple types of evaluation, aligning the evaluation with the developmental activity, and using skilled evaluators. Reille and Kezar suggested that all of these would be good practices to adhere to. Adding a longitudinal component that tracks participant career movement would likely make the evaluation process more meaningful, because it could determine/verify whether the objective of using leadership development programs to address a leadership gap was successful.

Summary and Conclusions

The need to provide institutions of higher learning with effective leaders has been well documented and calls for an assessment of how meeting this challenge may be accomplished. This chapter investigated leadership development programs and provided a review of literature that explored program design, participant experiences and expectations, institutional involvement, and program evaluation. Using leadership development programs to build skills and provide opportunities for faculty and mid-level administrators or managers, has been shown to be a well-practiced strategy and a completely rational approach (Barden, 2008). Allen and Hartman (2008) revealed the significant amount of money spent on leadership development, while Reille and Kezar (2010) raised the alarm on the sizeable number of vacant leadership positions. The literature review revealed that there has been no unified approach to leadership development and no agreement on what defines a leader. This has made it difficult, not only to develop programs, but also to measure and evaluate their effectiveness. For these reasons, this study has used a conceptual framework based on Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory to identify and clarify participant expectations and perceptions of

leadership development as it relates to their individual career progression. A review of the literature found that most of the research investigated leadership development program content, structure, and the satisfaction of participants (Crosson et al., 2005; Reille & Kezar, 2010; Robinson et al., 2010). This review identified a gap in the literature surrounding the expectations and career outcomes of leadership development program participants – the focus of this study. Understanding participant expectations that have arisen from leadership development training and whether these lead to leadership positions will allow institutions to make informed decisions on supporting individuals for leadership development training and will allow individuals to make informed decisions on participating in leadership development training.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology, outlining a plan for an exploratory case study to understand leadership development program participants' expectations and their career outcomes. It describes the qualitative methodology used to discover whether participants who successfully completed a comprehensive leadership development program apply for and assume leadership positions in their institutions, and why.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Qualitative research investigates rich sources of data that are well grounded and found in identifiable local contexts (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The purpose of this exploratory case study has been to investigate the career outcomes of individuals who participated in a leadership development program 4 years after program completion. The shortage of leaders in higher education has prompted many institutions to invest in leadership development (Aalsburg-Wiessner & González -Sullivan, 2007; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Miller, 1997), and supporting faculty and mid-level administrators in leadership development programs is one way to fill a leadership gap (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Understanding if there were changes in the career paths of individuals who completed the leadership development program would allow institutions to be better informed about the possible career outcomes of leadership development participants that they sponsor. If the institution has been using leadership development programs to address a leadership gap, the evidence provided from this study would be important for institutional decision-making.

This chapter describes the qualitative research paradigm and the exploratory case study design for this study of career outcomes for leadership development program participants. For the purpose of this study, *career outcomes* is defined as the (a) identifiable changes in work behavior or (b) position movement which leadership development participants experienced after they attended the program, and which they attributed, at least partially, to their participation in the program. A *leadership development program* is defined as a structured program that occurs over an identifiable

period of time with the intention of preparing participants for leadership opportunities.

In addition to describing the case study design, this chapter describes the methodology for the study, including the demographics of the participants, how participants were chosen, the role of the researcher, and ethical considerations. Also included in this chapter is an explanation of why the chosen method of exploratory case study was the preferred method, the data collection tools, and how data was collected and analyzed.

Research Design and Rationale

Research Questions

This research attempted to answer the following questions with respect to people who completed the leadership program of the Chair Academy, described elsewhere in this document.

Research Question 1. Did participants who successfully completed the leadership development program expect to become leaders in their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2a. Did participants believe that successfully completing the program would lead to leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2b. Did participants believe that the top leadership in their institutions believed that the leadership development training would prepare them for leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 3. Did participants value attainment of a leadership position within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 4. Did participants apply for one or more leadership opportunities at their institutions for which they met minimum qualifications? Why or why not?

Research Question 5. If participants were successful in attaining a leadership position at their institutions, to what did they attribute their success: (a) in getting the position; and (b) in doing the job?

Method of Inquiry

Social science research may be conducted using a variety of qualitative methods. Case studies are one such method and are best used to answer how and why questions when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon that is present in a real-life context (Yin, 1994).

For the purpose of this study, a single-case study using multiple participants was acceptable because it could test the well-formulated expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) while it studied a single cohort from a single leadership development program. From a pragmatic perspective, Yin (1984) noted that a multiple-case study requires “extensive resources and time beyond the means of a single student or independent research investigator” (p. 45). The delimitation of choosing a single cohort was identified in Chapter 1 and was appropriate for this study.

As Stake (1995) asserted, the first obligation of case-study research is to understand the case and maximize what can be learned. Part of this maximization comes from being able to “pick areas which are easy to get to and hospitable to our inquiry” (p. 4). A letter of cooperation from a community research partner indicating a hospitable

relationship, signed by the Chair Academy executive director and sent to me, may be found in Appendix A.

The case study method was selected because of the type of research questions being investigated. According to Yin (1994), case studies answer how and why questions, the investigator does not have control over the events, and the phenomenon under study exists in a real-life context. All of these conditions are satisfied with this qualitative study and do not fit within the structure that quantitative studies follow.

Other qualitative design choices include phenomenology, ethnography, grounded theory, and historical research (Johnson & Christiansen, 2008), but those alternatives were deemed to be less effective at answering the research questions. For example, phenomenology describes experiences of participants from the participant perception and is limited to the phenomenon under study, while this study has encompassed a wider scope because it studies multiple phenomena, that is, participants, leadership programs, and institutional involvement. According to Husserl (1970), phenomenological research also seeks to describe, rather than explain experiences as this study has done in its exploration of career outcomes for leadership development program participants. Ethnography is concerned with describing the culture of a group of individuals, which this study has not attempted to do. Grounded theory hopes to generate a theory from the data collected, whereas this study has attempted to increase understanding of an existing situation. Historical research focuses on the past, whereas this study has considered current and future events. For these reasons, the exploratory case study method was the best alternative.

Not all scholars would agree that case study was the best method, but there is support to counter this opposition. In response to researchers who believe case studies were part of a hierarchical view, thereby making them only appropriate for the exploratory phase of research, Yin (1994) maintained that this view has been replaced with a pluralistic view that accepts the value of using case studies for descriptive and explanatory purposes. Bechhofer and Paterson (2000), who stated that case studies were a feasible method for social science researchers to "obtain the aims and objectives of the research" (p. 47), also rejected the restriction of only using case study for preliminary research. In this study, the aims and objectives were to explore whether participants from leadership development programs went on to apply for and successfully move into leadership positions at their institutions. The conditions for choosing case study as a research strategy have included the type of research question, the control of the researcher over the events, and the degree of focus on contemporary, not historical, events (Yin, 1994).

The type of question being asked in this study relates to what happened to leadership development program participants, how, and why. Patton (2002) supported the use of this type of question in case studies, because it leads to answers that can provide a holistic picture of what happened in the reported activity. Yin (1994) maintained that this type of question provides a "justifiable rationale for conducting an exploratory study" (p. 5). Further analysis revealed that this type of what question seeks to identify the outcomes of what happened, and that this objective may lend itself well to a survey strategy. Surveys are best used when the research goal is to "describe the incidence or

prevalence of a phenomenon" (p. 6). This research study has not investigated the incidence or prevalence of career outcomes using a quantitative approach, which would verify how many or how much of an outcome occurred in the case-study group as compared to another group or groups. For these reasons, a qualitative approach is most appropriate and case study was the best method of research for the type of questions being explored.

The second condition, control of the researcher over events, refers to the ability of the investigator to manipulate behavior. This is possible when the research is confined to a laboratory and the variables under study can be isolated or controlled. In this situation, an experiment would be superior to a case study. Experiments can occur outside the laboratory, such as when a social experiment is conducted in the field. This type of research involves treating groups of people in different ways in order to manipulate behavior. Case study does not manipulate behaviors, and in the research conducted for this study, I had no control over events, further justifying the use of case study as a research strategy.

The third condition addresses whether the researcher has access to the events under study. Case study can involve multiple sources of data, such as those identified by Creswell (1998) (e.g., documents, interviews, observations, and artifacts). According to Yin (1994), when the researcher has no access to the events and must rely on documents and artifacts as the main source of evidence, a history is the preferred strategy. However, Yin went on to state that "although case studies and histories can overlap, the case study's unique strength is in its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence –

documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations – beyond what might be available in the conventional historical study" (p. 8). This study has explored a contemporary event that the researcher has had access to, making case study the preferred strategy.

In light of the three conditions stated above, the case study method of qualitative research was chosen because how individuals described their career outcomes has been more indicative of understanding their experiences than simply quantifying their movement. The strength of being able to provide complex textual descriptions favors a qualitative approach over a quantitative approach (Denzin, 1978). These descriptions can help to identify the intangible factors, such as norms and institutional culture, which affect participants' career outcomes.

Role of the Researcher

As researcher, I had an active role in ensuring the stated research design was followed, making me responsible as I implemented and executed elements of the design. My role included aspects of designing, administering, interviewing, and interpreting data.

As indicated in Chapter 1, the Chair Academy has trained more than 9,000 individuals, and my familiarity with the Chair Academy arises from my participation in a leadership development program at the Chair Academy in 2008. Recognizing that my institution made a significant investment in my leadership development, I became curious as to whether leadership development program participants went on to become leaders. Exploring the leadership development program options that were relevant to colleges and universities, I found that the Chair Academy met the objective criteria scholars have ascribed to effective leadership development programs. Since completing my leadership

development program experience, I have had no contact with the Chair Academy, except to request permission for this study, and I do not have an affiliation or relationship with the Chair Academy as an organization or with any of the staff members. I have no bias towards the leadership development program offered by the Chair Academy, and when selecting a leadership development training program, the objective criteria identified from the literature review in Chapter 2 were used. The program that I participated in was not the program used for this study, and in addition to having no relationship with the Chair Academy, I had not previously met any of the participants who were part of this study. Having the lived experience of participating in a leadership development program did not bias my research, as my research was directed at participant outcomes and not the Chair Academy program. I was not investigating a causal relationship between the Chair Academy and the participants' development of leadership skills, but the career movement of leadership development program participants. The Chair Academy provided a purposeful sample that meets the objective criteria of this study.

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

The Chair Academy offers a number of leadership development programs every year, with each program targeting a cohort of around 50 participants. The Chair Academy began in 1992 as a grassroots movement and focused on providing leadership training to midlevel managers who mostly occupied positions as academic chairs or deans within post-secondary institutions. It has since expanded to include all midlevel organizational leaders, up to but not including the executive level. Individuals who occupy these roles

are seen as instrumental to the effectiveness of the institution, but often receive little training (Inman, 2009; Orr, 2007; Robinson et al., 2010). The Chair Academy has attempted to fill this training void by offering leadership training and development programs through a systems approach to transformational leadership. According to Major (2011), a systems approach will "combine inputs and processes in meaningful ways to achieve outcomes or purposes" (p. 53). Using theory and practices that can be applied to actual workplace situations, participants are encouraged to develop their skills over a one-year practicum period bookended by weeklong residential training sessions. The popularity of this program is evident in how well it has been received by post-secondary institutions, which continue to send candidates for leadership training. By the end of 2011, the Chair Academy had trained more than 7,000 individuals (T. Coleman, December 5, 2011).

The population for this study was drawn from a cohort of leadership development program participants who attended the Chair Academy. This cohort consisted of 58 individuals who came from 17 different institutions located across western Canada. As an international program, the Chair Academy sometimes hosts leadership development training in targeted geographic locations in order to make it easier for participants to attend. The program is not altered according to geography. The population for this study came from a targeted geographic location, but as a factor, geography was not considered. As will be explained later in this section, the factor of program completion time relative to time for pursuing leadership opportunities was the determinant for purposefully selecting this cohort. Of these 58 individuals, a purposeful sample of 12 individuals

agreed to participate in the study. The Chair Academy offers a limited number of programs each year, and participants from this cohort were selected because the start and end dates would allow for a reasonable amount of time for program completers to pursue leadership opportunities. As the program content is consistent and target audiences similar, it is believed that participants across programs could have similar experiences and outcomes.

In justifying the sampling strategy and the relationship between saturation and sample size, research supports selecting a small number of participants from a single case. Creswell (1998) and Yin (1994) stated that the researcher must consider whether they will use a single-case or multiple-case design. The more cases under study, the less the depth of detail. However, more depth of detail from having fewer cases under study results in the likelihood that details will not be considered compelling. Creswell (1998) stated that generalizability is more likely with a large number of cases, whereas Yin (1994) stated that generalizability can come from a single case. Both agreed that the researcher must evaluate the conditions to determine whether a single-case or multiple-case study is appropriate, and in either decision recognize that the methodological framework remains the same.

The purposeful sample of 12 individuals allowed for exploration of the career outcomes of faculty and mid-level administrators who participated in the leadership development program. Merriam (1998) supported using a purposeful sample when the researcher had selected a sample from which the most could be learned and was the preferred sampling method when attempting to assemble the lived experiences of

individuals. The entire Chair Academy cohort sample participated in the same leadership program between June 2009 and June 2010, but their home institutions were varied. As individuals agreed to participate in the study, it became evident that the sample represented seven different institutions. This variance supported the application of a qualitative research strategy that led to an inductive approach, allowing the researcher to make sense of the situation without manipulating it (Patton, 2002). Although Patton stated that purposeful sampling does not generalize to other cases, the presence of a variety of home institutions may have allowed for the generalizability that Yin (1994) stated was possible from a single-case study. This particular cohort was also purposefully selected because of its June 2010 completion date. I believed that the time since completion of the leadership program was sufficient to allow for changes in work behavior or position and recent enough to recall if elements of the leadership training contributed to these changes, and if so, in what ways.

As a final note, it was known that participants would meet the criteria for this study, having completed a leadership development program, because they were identified by the Chair Academy. Completion of the program supported participant selection logic.

Instrumentation

Data collection instruments that supported this study were developed and included a letter or cooperation (Appendix A), an e-mail contact script (Appendix B), a participant informed consent form (Appendix C), a structured interview guide (Appendix F), and a questionnaire (Appendix G). All of these instruments were developed by the researcher using valid and trustworthy sources that included Walden's research center and published

scholars. The interview questions were formulated using Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory as a conceptual framework (Appendix F), and together with the other sources of information, were used to answer the research questions. One tenet of this theory is that individuals who have the ability to perform will consciously do so in ways that lead to expected outcomes that they prefer or desire. The questions were used to gain insight into the participants' perception of their ability to perform leadership functions, determine the expected career outcomes they believed would arise from participation in the training, and track changes in work behavior or movement in careers since completion of the leadership training program.

In addition to the above mentioned data collection instruments, devices were used to capture and store information. Devices included a networked laptop computer containing Word software for transcribing and Qualitrics software for entering and organizing data. A recording device with Dragon Speak software, to capture and transcribe voice into text, was also used.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

Participants were recruited from one cohort of the Chair Academy leadership development program. As indicated earlier, this cohort included 58 individuals from 17 different institutions. Following IRB approval (05-29-13-0133294), I submitted a copy of the proposal to the Chair Academy administration, together with a request for permission to access the Chair Academy records. The proposal detailed the process, purpose, data-collection procedures, voluntary participation, protection of privacy, and anticipated risks associated with the study.

Initial contact with all 58 participants was made through electronic mailing to the e-mail addresses on file with the Chair Academy (Appendix B). Participants were invited to respond to the e-mail and provide a telephone number and time zone, which I used to contact them to provide an oral explanation of the study and explain the conversation would be immediately followed by the distribution of the consent form. This contact provided an opportunity to review the consent form for questions and to establish a rapport with the participants. Participants were reminded that the consent form indicated that their participation was completely voluntary, and no compensation, gifts, or rewards for participating in the study were offered. Each participant provided written consent through an informed-consent process. Topics of informed consent included an explanation of the study, identification of demographic and personal information to be collected, the voluntary nature of the study, including that withdrawal could occur at any time, an explanation of the risks and benefits to the participants, the intended use of the collected information, and my contact information (Appendix C).

This study collected data and supporting documentation from participants and institutions that participated in the leadership development program under study. Requests for documents were made electronically using online directory information from the institutions. In the case where there was no response, telephone calls to the appropriate institutional area, such as Human Resources, were conducted. Appendix D represents a request for documentation from participants, and Appendix E represents a request for documentation from institutions.

The diverse geographic locations of participants made personal face-to-face interviews impractical; rather, the interviews used technology that included structured online or telephone interviews. Participants were asked their preferred method of interview, which included Skype, teleconference, or other methods. If a preferred method could not be found, the default was to conduct the interview by telephone. Online interviews that included a written message portion were followed up with telephone calls to allow participants to elaborate on the online interview information. I was responsible for administering and conducting all of the interviews. Information that was provided online was captured as text. This text was printed and copied into Word or Qualitrics for further analysis. Telephone interview data were captured via Dragon Speak software and interviewer note taking. Dragon Speak performs a voice to text transcription, allowing telephone data to be captured in Word or Qualitrics. No research assistants or others were involved in this process, and all data were securely stored. In cases where communication between the researcher and the participant was through electronic mail, this mail served as a member check confirmation that the captured content was accurate. In the case of telephone interviews, participants received electronic mail with attachments that reflected how the researcher captured the content using text documents.

At the conclusion of the interviews participants were asked to provide further information. The Chair Academy was an external source that verified participants had completed the leadership development program, leading to the initial contact of participants. Following the interview participants were asked to provide their professional development plans through a request for information (Appendix D). This data would be

used to further explore the research questions, including career expectations and progression. Participants had provided information on their career progression as they responded to interview question number five from the Interview Guide (Appendix F). In order to validate whether leadership positions existed at institutions, data collection on the availability of leadership positions at institutions was obtained from responses to requests for information sent to institutions (Appendix E).

Data Analysis Plan

The Interview Guide (Appendix F) contained eight questions that were constructed using the research questions. Responses were provided according to the order of the questions, which followed the research structure of determining expectancy, instrumentality, and value that participants held with respect to leadership development. Data from the interviews was connected to the research questions, using multiple interview questions to answer research questions. For example, interview question one asks participants if they expected to become leaders, which speaks to the research parameter of expectancy. This response was compared to question four, asking whether participants had applied for leadership opportunities, which speaks to instrumentality in whether they believed they might become leaders but also speaks to expectancy as participants who expected to become leaders would need to apply for opportunities.

Coding of data identified not only the what, but the why of participant experiences. Using the example from the previous paragraph, participants may have expected to become leaders (question one), but did not apply for leadership opportunities (question four) because none were available or none met their preferences for a

leadership opportunity they wanted to pursue. The study involved 12 participants, and it was therefore possible to draw a data tree to indicate the direction of participant's responses. For example, participants disclosed whether or not they expected to become leaders and yes/no was noted on the data tree. Asking participants why or why not introduced an open-ended opportunity to provide insights, or branches on the tree, into the why of this decision. As participants provided data it was possible to separate different and attach similar responses in order to explore the responses more thoroughly.

Following this rudimentary graphic compilation, participant responses were documented and transferred into Qualitrics software, a program designed to facilitate qualitative research analysis. The software allowed for importing and working with the different types of documents that were collected. For example, the decision tree would highlight whether or not a participant had a professional development plan and the software provided an added dimension of confirming connections between having a plan and pursuing leadership opportunities. Qualitrics purports to uncover connections in ways that manual methods cannot. The coding procedure involved categorizing dimensions of the findings according to themes that were related to the expectancy theory framework. These include the major categories of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence with subcategories that include motivation, effort, performance, and outcomes. Discrepant cases were used to revise, expand, or confirm and disconfirm research findings.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Findings from this study go beyond what is found in existing research and are supported using strategies related to credibility, transferability, dependability, and

confirmability. The literature review revealed that current literature regarding leadership development is focused on the content and learning outcomes of leadership development programs, with the success of these programs being measured by participant satisfaction with the program (Brungardt, 1997; Crosson et al., 2005). A review of the existing research exposed a gap with regard to whether leadership programs contribute to participants' career growth and development, as indicated by movement or changes in work behavior. The findings from this study address the knowledge gap using trustworthy strategies.

Credibility was achieved through triangulation and member checking. Some studies have been successfully conducted using only one source of data, but Yin (1994) did not recommend this for case studies. As a single method of data collection, interviews, would not have sufficed due to the problem of rival factors (Denzin, 1978), nor would converging lines of inquiry (Yin, 1994) have been possible. Internal validity was established using triangulation, which is defined by Merriam (1998) as the use of multiple sources of data in order to confirm findings. Data triangulation was accomplished by adding documents as a data source. The documents used were: (a) verification of participant completion in the leadership development program, (b) participant professional development plans, (c) verification of career progression after the program, and (d) institutional postings of leadership positions. Credibility through member checking involved providing each participant with a transcript of any information that was used about him or her in the study for validation, and to assure accuracy and confidentiality, prior to its use.

Transferability was addressed through the thick descriptions of the findings, allowing other researchers to transfer the conclusions to different settings where leadership development is being used to fill a leadership gap. The research context is thoroughly explained in the methodology so that other researchers will be able to make credible transfers to their own research, indicating external validity is present.

The changing nature of qualitative study does not allow for dependability to be achieved from the positivist perspective. Reliability, however, can be determined if future researchers would be able to repeat the study as a result of the research design and implementation being thoroughly described. Chapter 3 provides a detailed procedure for conducting the study and could be used by other researchers wanting to explore similar areas.

Confirmability can be achieved by following the methodology undertaken in this study to corroborate the findings. A challenge to confirmability may arise from the objectivity of the researcher. As the researcher, I strove to achieve objectivity through the use of cognitive reflection (Baldi, Iannello, Riva, & Antonietti, 2013) to ensure personal beliefs and assumptions did not bias the findings.

Ethical Procedures

Access to participants was gained through a formal agreement with the Chair Academy. No participants were contacted prior to receiving IRB approval, which was received by electronic mail on April 5, 2013. Following this approval the Chair Academy issued a letter of cooperation (Appendix A), which allowed me to contact the leadership development program participants that were part of this study. All participants were

provided with an informed consent form (Appendix C), clearly outlining the study background, procedures, voluntary nature, risks and benefits, and where to direct questions or concerns. All study participants consented that they had read and understood the study and agreed to be involved.

Participant confidentiality was maintained before, during, and after the study. No participants were named in the study; instead, they were coded Participant 1, 2, and so on. Collected information is stored on a password-protected computer. Backups and paper sources will be are kept in a locked filing cabinet in my office for 3 years.

Summary

This qualitative exploratory case study collected data from structured interviews and documents to determine what career outcomes have emerged for participants who completed the leadership development program under study. The research design was defended with supporting evidence from scholarly sources that identified case study was an appropriate way to explore the concepts under study. The researcher was the primary investigator, who followed research practices for conducting credible qualitative research that included designing, administering, interviewing, and interpreting data. A discussion of the methodology used to conduct this study has been provided, including participant selection logic, instrumentation, procedures for recruitment, participation, and data collection. The methodology has been described in sufficient depth that will allow other researchers to replicate this study if desired. Issues of trustworthiness were satisfied through the description of appropriate strategies that included triangulation, member

checking, thick description, and objective cognitive reflection to show credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the study.

Chapter 4 will elaborate on the data collection process and analysis, including reporting on the findings that answer the research questions.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

In order to close the leadership gap and attempt to fill the growing number of leadership vacancies, colleges and universities have been investing in leadership development programs for current employees (Aalsburg-Wiessner & González-Sullivan, 2007; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Miller, 1997). Leadership development programs have been promoted as a successful means to achieve the goal of addressing the shortage of leaders in higher education (Barden, 2008; Knight & Trowler, 2001; McNair, 2010). It is not known whether investment in leadership development programs leads program participants to apply for leadership positions. Understanding what program participants have done, and in particular, whether they have applied for or assumed positions of leadership, after completing a leadership development program, will help institutions make better informed decisions on whether to support such programs.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether participants who completed a comprehensive leadership development program moved into leadership positions at the institutions that sponsored their participation. The intent of an exploratory case study is to answer how and why questions arising from real-life situations over which the researcher has no control (Yin, 1994). An exploratory case study methodology was used in conjunction with a conceptual framework that applied Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory. Using this conceptual framework, the study sought to determine whether the potential leaders expected to move into leadership positions based on the dimensions of

expectation, instrumentality, and valence. The choice of exploratory case study was an appropriate method to explore and understand the career movement of leadership development participants. In conducting the research, the following five research questions were addressed.

Research Question 1. Did participants who successfully completed the leadership development program expect to become leaders in their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2a. Did participants believe that successfully completing the program would lead to leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 2b. Did participants believe that the top leadership in their institutions believed that the leadership development training would prepare them for leadership opportunities within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 3. Did participants value attainment of a leadership position within their institutions? Why or why not?

Research Question 4. Did participants apply for one or more leadership opportunities at their institutions for which they met the stated minimum qualifications? Why or why not?

Research Question 5. If participants were successful in attaining a leadership position at their institutions, to what did they attribute their success: (a) in getting the position; and (b) in doing the job?

Answering these questions resulted in an understanding that could lead to better-informed decisions by institutions on supporting leadership development. Chapter 4

presents the study and how it was undertaken by describing the influence of the setting on participants, the demographics of participants, what and how data was collected and further analyzed to ensure trustworthiness, and the results found for each research question.

Setting

The study was conducted with 12 participants from educational institutions in Canada. Participants were faculty and administrators at seven different institutions in western Canada and all had attended the same Chair Academy leadership development program. Following the program, participants returned to their institutions, and further contact with the Chair Academy was voluntary and self-directed. This lapse in connection with the Chair Academy may have influenced the setting in that only participants who were able to be contacted and willing to participate in the study became part of the data.

As noted in Chapter 3, this study had a 4-year gap period between participants' completing the leadership development program and participating in this study. The intent of this gap was to allow for changes in work behavior or positions while being recent enough for participants to recall if elements of the leadership development training contributed to these changes. The setting effect in this situation is that the time gap may have influenced participants' ability to recall their experience.

Demographics

A total of 58 participants from 17 different academic institutions of higher learning began the 1-year Chair Academy leadership development program in June 2009,

with anticipated completion in June 2010. From this cohort, a purposefully selected group of 12 individuals became active participants in this study. These participants occupied the positions of instructor, program chair, educational technologies liaison, and vice-president for academic research in 2-year, post-secondary institutions in western Canada. Seven of the participants were women and five were men. No other demographic data relating to participants were collected, nor was it necessary for the purposes of this study.

Data Collection

The purposeful sample of 12 participants from seven different institutions across western Canada provided data through instruments that were developed to answer the research questions. Instruments included interviews and document requests from both participants and the host institutions at which they were employed. All of the participants were identified as having participated in the 2009-2010 Chair Academy leadership development program and had been sponsored to attend by their host institutions.

The Chair Academy authorized my contact with participants for the purpose of this study (Appendix A). A total of 58 participants were registered in this cohort, and all were contacted via e-mail and invited to participate (Appendix B) with the goal of securing at least 12 participants for the study. Merriam (1998) supported this purposeful sampling method as a sample from which the most could be learned when attempting to assemble the lived experiences of individuals.

The Chair Academy provided the names and institutions of record for the participants but did not provide other contact information. A search involving institutional directories was conducted and, of the 58 identified participants, 14 were no

longer associated with the institution that had sponsored their leadership development training. Determining the location of these individuals was not undertaken, as the research questions related directly to their leadership development experience and their career path within their sponsoring institutions. A recommendation for further research on the career paths of individuals who left their sponsoring institutions is discussed in Chapter 5.

Of the 44 individuals who were still employed by their sponsoring institutions, only four responded to the initial e-mail invitation. A reminder to respond was sent out 14 days following the initial e-mail request (Appendix B). The reminder did not generate any more responses, leading to the more assertive contact approach of telephoning all the potential participants via the telephone numbers identified in their institutional contact information. By this point in time, the academic year had ended and most calls were not returned. Of the calls that were returned, three more participants agreed to take part in the study. At this juncture, it was decided that the study would proceed with the existing seven willing participants and an attempt to secure five more participants at the start of the next academic year, in 8 weeks, would be made. At this later time, five additional participants agreed to participate in the study and their responses were included.

Participants were e-mailed an informed consent form (Appendix C), and all responded that they were in agreement with the terms described and consented to participate. Participants were then contacted and asked if they wanted to respond to the interview questions online or in real time using a telephone or other electronic medium such as Skype. As noted in Chapter 3, all participants were geographically removed from

my local area, and these options would allow me to gather information without having to travel extensively. The closest participant was located 250 kilometers away, and the farthest was 530 kilometers away. Six of the seven participants elected to respond to the interview questions online and one of the participants elected to respond through a telephone interview. The five participants who joined the study at the later date all responded online. Although the medium was different between online and telephone, the questions were exactly the same and have been represented in Appendix F: Interview Guide, and Appendix G: Questionnaire. The different mediums captured the information differently as well. The online responses were easily transposed whereas the telephone interview was recorded using note taking and Dragon Speak software which was later transcribed into a text document. Information collected from these data sources are detailed later in this chapter.

The initial e-mail requesting participation in the study yielded seven participants; five short of the required number. Further action was required to identify five more participants. Following the commencement of the academic term (August 2013), all of the participants who had not yet responded (33 individuals) were again contacted via e-mail using the same invitation that is represented in Appendix B. This generated three responses; these individuals were sent an informed consent form (Appendix C), and they agreed to the terms and to participate in the study. A phone campaign to solicit more participants from the remaining 30 was then undertaken and led to the identification of two more participants. This brought the total number of participants to 12, which is consistent with the research method plan outlined in Chapter 3. Recommendations to

address the challenges and difficulties experienced in attempting to secure participants may be found in Chapter 5, and should help future researchers understand the complexity of securing voluntary research participants.

Stage 1 of the data collection process involved asking participants for answers to the research questions. None of the participants hesitated in providing a response, nor did any ask for clarification of the questions, so it is believed that the questions were clearly understood. All participants answered all seven of the research questions that were presented in the interview guide (Appendix F). Eleven of the 12 participants elected to provide responses online, making the data recording an electronic capture of text. This information was then transferred into qualitative data analysis software, which will be explained further under the heading of data analysis. The other participant requested a telephone interview. Using a speaker phone, the participant responses to questions were captured using Dragon Speak software via an iPad. The software converts text to voice and a transcript of the conversation was created. This transcript was reviewed against researcher notes from the interview to ensure accuracy of the text to voice conversion.

During the first stage of data collection, interview questions were posed to participants in an attempt to understand if there were changes in the roles or job titles of individuals who completed a leadership development program. In addition to asking specifically for this information, supplemental questions were used to explore more deeply the expectations, beliefs, and value that participants assigned to leadership opportunities. The responses not only served the purpose of exploring the participants' experiences, but could also later be triangulated against data collected on the

opportunities available in the institutions that sponsored the participants' leadership development. For example, if a participant indicated that she or he did not apply for a leadership position because none were available, the institutional information could confirm whether the participant indication was accurate.

The interview questions were organized in a way that reflected the likely chronological process of the leadership development experience and the career outcomes associated with it. The first question asked participants about their expectations of becoming a leader, and the latter questions asked about whether they valued a leadership position and if they had applied for any positions within their institutions.

In order to ensure the anonymity of participants, collected data from each participant was randomly assigned a number. The response analysis includes specific quotes from different participants who are identified as P1, P2, P3, and so on.

Although online completion was quicker than the real-time telephone interview, the quality of data received was comparable. I believe this was a result of having questions that were designed to target a specific phenomenon in a way that Patton (2002) described as leading to answers that provide a holistic picture of what happened in the reported activity. The interview questions were open-ended, in that they allowed participants to provide information relative to their specific situations, but, at the same time, they were focused on a particular dimension of the leadership development experience and its outcomes.

Stage 2 of the data collection process involved asking participants to provide copies of existing professional development plans and a list of the positions that they

have applied for since completing the Chair Academy leadership development program. Appendix D presents the request for information that was e-mailed to all participants. Of the 12 participants, only three were able to provide evidence of a professional development plan. All 12 participants were able to identify positions that they had or had not applied for since completing the leadership development program. This information was transcribed and tabulated in anticipation of later being analyzed against the research findings of DeRue and Ashford (2010), who maintained that individuals would engage in demonstrating leadership behaviors if those leadership behaviors were endorsed. This finding is along the same line as, though in contrast to, findings from Coppard (2006), who stated that most institutions did not adequately prepare faculty for leadership roles. Of the participants who had completed professional development plans, it was noted that professional development plans receive institutional endorsement, making them a legitimate means of identifying individuals who are seeking development opportunities. Leadership development may be a part of that plan, or not. Institutions that did not require professional development plans would have to identify individuals for developmental opportunities from other sources. Those sources were not explored as part of this study.

Stage 3 of the data collection process involved asking institutions that sponsored the participants' leadership development to provide information on posted mid-level and senior-level job opportunities for the period starting when the participants began their leadership development program in 2009 through to the end of 2013. Human resource departments at the sponsoring institutions were all presented with the Appendix E request

for information via electronic mail to the contact address found on the institutions' websites. One week after sending the e-mail, to which there were no responses, I telephoned the institutions in an attempt to gather the required information. Collecting information for Stage 3 data collection did not prove any less challenging than Stage 1 or 2, and I initially met with resistance. Reiterating the purpose of the study and the need for triangulation of data reassured institutions that there was no harm in providing information related to past job postings. Because several of the participants came from the same institution, it was only necessary to contact the human resource departments at seven institutions.

All of these institutions are publicly funded, meaning that they rely on government grants and funding to operate. During and after the period of time in which this study was conducted, many of the funding bodies imposed constraints that led to budget freezes and reductions. A possible outcome of fiscal constraints could be that leadership opportunities were not available to some potential candidates. Results and analysis of the collected data, including that gained from individual participants and their institutions, has been presented in the data analysis section of this chapter.

Data Analysis

Data analysis commenced once the first interview had been completed and was performed in the order that the information had been received. As was specified in the data collection explanation, an important first step involved acquiring answers to the interview questions in Appendix F, followed by the Appendix D information request from participants regarding their professional development plans and history of position

applications post leadership development program completion, and finally the review of job postings requested from institutions using Appendix E. For all participants in the data analysis process, I undertook a fresh perspective by using reflective reminders to focus on each participant individually. As stated by Baldi, Iannello, Riva, and Antonietti (2013), our evaluations and predictions of others can be influenced by the social visibility of the person we are interacting with. As the researcher, I recognized that it was important that I did not bias data analysis by assuming that such things as attending a leadership development program indicated that the participant desired leadership opportunities. These reminders ensured that I did not rush the process by comparing and contrasting responses as they were collected. Baldi et al. (2013) showed that cognitive reflection reduces bias in decision making by "allowing individuals to overcome the constraints imposed by the mechanisms of social influence by leading them to analyze deeply the features of the situation and making them aware of what it actually involves" (p. 270). Reflective reminders included evaluating each question response separately, without anticipating how response to one question would lead to an expected response for another question. For example, if a participant stated they did not expect to become a leader, I did not allow myself to anticipate that they likely did not apply for leadership positions, which was a different question. The research began by considering outcomes before reasons, making it important to contain the analysis process to the described process.

Data analysis included reading all of the participant responses and then rereading them to ensure understanding. The first analysis included loosely grouping all similar responses together, allowing for a comparison of experiences or expectations that were

similar while also being able to identify differences within those similar experiences or expectations. For example, multiple participants indicated that they expected to become leaders but for different reasons. Repeated reviews of the data built researcher confidence in understanding what participants were reporting.

The next step involved separating the research question responses into categories that aligned with the theoretical framework of Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory, as mentioned in the discussion under the heading Expectancy Theory: The Conceptual Framework in Chapter 2. These categories were expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. Data analysis revealed that the factors within this framework were program design, participant experiences, and institutional involvement both before and after program completion.

Leadership development program participants shared beliefs, expectations, and values that covered a range from positively pursuing leadership opportunities to consciously avoiding an expanded leadership role within their institutions. It was anticipated that such a range would be discovered. In all but one of the cases, the participants shared positive thoughts, indicating that they felt the program was beneficial, even if they did not pursue leadership opportunities. The one discrepant case was found in a response by P1, who shared more negative thoughts on the experience. For example, P1 indicated that the reason for attending the program was never communicated, that the institution did not follow up after the experience, and that she or he was not interested in any of the leadership positions available at the institution. Data from P1 was informative

in that it provided an alternative view that offered insights into possible reasons leadership development program participants may not pursue leadership opportunities.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Internal validity, referred to as credibility, of the data analysis was confirmed through the adherence of strategies that were stated in Chapter 3. Triangulation is another provision for assuring credibility and uses different methods in concert to compensate for individual limitations from single methods (Shenton, 2004). Triangulation was achieved by asking participants to provide copies of existing professional development plans and requesting institutions to confirm the availability of mid-level and senior-level opportunities through job vacancies that had been posted. Not all participants provided professional development plans, and this adjustment to credibility is noted. External validity, referred to as transferability, was achieved from obtaining a purposeful sample of participants that represented multiple academic institutions in western Canada. At the time the sample population was identified, it was unknown what professional capacity leadership development participants would occupy. Data analysis indicates that participants occupied the positions of instructor, chair, educational technologies liaison, and vice-president for academic research. In light of the aforementioned elements of triangulation and variation in participants, the data can be confirmed as being reliable. In addressing reliability, Shenton (2004) explained that it is necessary to employ techniques that will show that if the study were repeated using the same context, methods, and participants, similar results would be obtained. In this research, the results are tied to the situation used for this study, drawing observations that are from static descriptions which

may change over time, but as the process has been reported in detail, the research can be repeated. Dependability has been shown through the research design and its implementation. This leads to confirmability of findings being derived from the data, leading to an objective statement of results.

Results

The research questions and supporting data were compiled and sorted into themes that are discussed in this section. The information is organized according to research questions and then themes.

Research Question 1

The first research question was parallel to the first interview question that asked: When you successfully completed the Chair Academy, did you expect to become a leader in your institution? Why or why not? Participant expectations were explored because the conceptual framework of this study uses Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory to identify three critical elements that determine why individuals pursue particular paths of action, of which expectations is one.

The range of responses varied from P3, who stated, "Yes, I expected to become a leader," to P9, who stated, "No. Our department has a Chair who is well suited for the position. I would be interested in a managerial position in one of the service areas of the institution if the right one came up, and to P5, who stated, "No. I have no desire to move out of the classroom and into a leadership role." Of the 12 participants interviewed, four stated that they did not expect to become leaders and eight said that they did. Of the four without leadership expectations, three clearly stated that they had no expectation of becoming

leaders, whereas P9 did not expect to become a leader immediately but was open to suitable leadership opportunities that might arise in the future. The results are that eight people held varying degrees of expectation for becoming a leader; one person did not immediately expect to become a leader but would consider the opportunity in the right situation; and three people held no present or future expectation of becoming a leader.

Table 1

Summary of Participant Expectation Responses

Number of participants	Response category
8	Held expectations of becoming a leader within their institution
1	Did not hold expectations of becoming a leader but would if the right opportunity arose
3	Held no expectations of becoming a leader, either now or in the future

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 was separated into part A and part B because it explored the dual dimension of whether participants believed that completion of a leadership development program would lead to leadership opportunities versus the belief that their institutional leaders would value participation in a leadership development program when providing leadership opportunities. Specifically, Research Question 2a read, “Did participants believe that successfully completing the program would lead to leadership opportunities within their institutions?”, and question 2b read, “Did participants believe that the top leadership in their institutions believe that the leadership development training would prepare them for leadership opportunities within their institutions?” As

supported by the case study method of questioning presented by Yin (1994), both of these questions were shadowed with “why or why not,” as case study analysis seeks to explore the how and why of phenomenon. All participants explained the why or why not element of the question, allowing for open ended responses that revealed that all but one of the participants believed that completing the program could or would lead to leadership opportunities, if they chose to pursue them. The beliefs included not only advancement to new leadership positions, but also, as indicated by P4, who already occupied a leadership position, “it would help me be more effective in my current position.” Dissenting, P5 stated that she or he “did not take the program for advancement,” which indicated that this participant did not connect investment in leadership development to pursuing leadership opportunities. As explained by Isaac et al. (2001), it is reasonable for different participants to have different expectations.

Research Question 3

The third dimension of Vroom’s expectancy theory is about the value individuals place on the outcome that they are working towards achieving. Research qQuestion 3 specifically asks: “Did participants value attainment of a leadership position within their institution?” Responses were varied, including both yes and no answers, with clarifications of the response ranging from P1, who stated that “attainment of a leadership position is not necessarily based on merit or on criteria that I personally value”; through to P6, who stated “somewhat”; and P7, who simply said, “I do.”

Further exploration of this understanding is presented in the later discussion of themes and demonstrates that the reasons provided by participants are consistent with the

research conducted by Isaac et al. (2001) and Mathibe (2008) indicating that some individuals are motivated to pursue leadership opportunities and others are not. Participants used phrases such as “not important” and “no value” when they did not pursue leadership opportunities, and phrases such as “knew the importance” and “necessary for advancement” when they did pursue leadership opportunities.

Table 2

Value of Outcome as Reflected by Language Used

Number of Participants	Response Category
8	Used language to indicate they highly valued the pursuit of leadership opportunities.
4	Used language to indicate they did not highly value leadership opportunities.

Interview Question 6

This question was an interview question that was used to support research question 3 and asked participants what they had done with the large, framed certificate of completion they received from the Chair Academy. The question has been presented here in the research findings, following research question 3, because it relates to the symbolic value participants placed on their leadership development experience, through exploration of what they did with the certificate. During the interviews, the question was not asked out of order but rather, logically following question 5. The decision to do this was made in order to prevent participants from connecting value to the symbolism associated with the certificate. In 11 of the 12 situations, the participants have prominently displayed their certificates of completion. This would indicate that the

participants valued the leadership development experience, even if they did not value attainment of a leadership position within their institution. The dissenting participant (P5) confirmed what she or he values, although it is not the certificate, by stating: “my office cubicle walls are covered in pictures of my students and posters from our study tour experiences.” The dissenter went on to say that, if she or he were in a leadership role and assigned an office “with real walls,” she or he would “display the certificate with pride.” Further exploration of the decision to display the certificate based on practicality and value expressed by the dissenter has been undertaken in the response analysis section later in this chapter.

Research Question 4

The question of whether or not leadership development participants have gone on to pursue leadership opportunities was evidenced by Research Question 4, which asks “Did participants apply for one or more leadership opportunities at their institutions for which they met minimum qualifications?” For those individuals who did not value attainment of a leadership position, this question may have seemed superfluous. For those individuals who were unsuccessful in their leadership pursuit, it may be worth exploration to determine if this outcome of applying for and not receiving the position negatively impacted their beliefs and the value they attributed to pursuing leadership opportunities. The effect of negative impact, however, was not a question under study, and has been identified as an area of potential further research in Chapter 5.

None of the participants indicated a lack of leadership opportunities. This view was supported by the information collected from institutions, which showed a wide range

of leadership opportunities had been available for leadership development participants over the 4-year period (2010-2014) in question. What was surprising to discover was that, of the 12 participants, only three said that following the Chair Academy experience, they actively pursued leadership opportunities within their institutions. The remaining participants were divided between having been appointed or temporarily placed into interim positions and not having applied for or accepted offers for leadership positions. Although ten participants moved into leadership positions, 2 of those 10 participants did so reluctantly and did not intend to stay in those positions or actively seek other leadership positions. The reasons given were that they "did not fit in with my career goals" and had "no interest in the job as an ongoing experience." The table below summarizes and categorizes these responses.

Table 3

Application to Leadership Opportunities

Number of Participants	Response Category
2	Not interested in any of the positions.
3	Actively applied for leadership positions.
5	Placed into acting leadership role or interim role with willingness to take on similar future roles.
2	Placed into acting leadership role or interim role with no desire to pursue future leadership opportunities.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5 was an extension of question 4, in that it asked "if participants were successful in attaining a leadership position at their institutions," and "to what they attributed their success." Three of the participants said that this question was not applicable to them because they did not pursue a leadership position. Two of the participants said that they were already in leadership positions when they undertook the leadership development training, and they returned to the same jobs after the training. The other 7 participants shared responses that attributed their success to their own personal knowledge and experience, understanding the college environment, and leadership training. Of these 7 participants, 4 specifically stated the leadership training contributed to their success.

Table 4

Attribution of Success for Leadership Opportunities

Number of Participants	**Response Category**
3	Not applicable as no leadership opportunities were pursued.
2	In leadership positions prior to undertaking leadership development training and returned to same job.
7	Success in leadership opportunity attributed to intrinsic factor, not to attending leadership development training.

Other Observations

Regardless of whether participants valued attaining a leadership position, they consistently confirmed that they believed leadership development is the best way to

ensure quality, that understanding leadership is a worthwhile objective, and that the knowledge and skills imparted in the program would be effectively demonstrated by good leaders. The responses indicate that even if participants did not value attainment of a leadership position, they understood that leadership development was valuable for those who did.

All of the research questions led to an exploration of the purpose for this research study, including participant expectations, beliefs, and values surrounding attainment of a leadership position. The findings from questions 4 and 5 were most directly related to the purpose of this study, which was to explore whether participation in leadership development programs resulted in participants applying for, and successfully moving into, leadership positions at their institutions. The responses to the questions were coded and organized into three themes. These themes were: effectiveness of training, participant expectations and experiences, and institutional commitment to leadership development.

Theme 1: Effectiveness of Training

The first theme that emerged was connected to what participants shared about the content of the leadership development program. The Chair Academy program is designed from a set of 12 leadership principles and values:

1. Building and sustaining a learning and leading community
2. Developing effective, inspired, and transformational leaders
3. Developing communication and coaching skills
4. Engaging in learner-centered environments
5. Appreciating, valuing, respecting, and celebrating diversity
6. Recognizing, valuing, and capitalizing on strengths
7. Being relevant and current with research on leadership
8. Seeking results from personal and professional change and growth
9. Engaging in dialogue and discovery

10. Engaging in journaling and reflective practice
11. Seeking to understand self and others for the purpose of mindful communication and leadership
12. Making a difference in the lives of others

A review of the Chair Academy revealed that the program principles and values were consistent with the best practices identified by scholars such as Campbell et al. (2010) and Crosson et al. (2005). These practices included an action learning approach (Levin, 1987; Revans, 1986) that included a continuous process of learning and reflection, putting theory into practice, and opportunities for mentorship and coaching. As stated earlier, an example of one element in the process includes participants completing an individual professional development plan (IPDP).

Participants revealed that they found leadership development training to be helpful for a number of reasons that were consistent with the best practices. P6 stated that "leadership training had a significant role as I was able to apply my training." Comments from other participants included being able to use the provided leadership training resources in their jobs, enhancing their leadership skills through participation in the program, and believing that the program offered useful and appropriate information to help prepare individuals for advancement.

In addition to what should be present in a leadership development program, Robinson et al. (2010) stated that there should be less emphasis on social skills and more on workplace topics. For example, the opportunity to dialogue with members of the group (social) was less valuable than solving problems that were real and relative (work-place) to participants. This was echoed by P1, who stated that programs should "include

practical skills as well, not just soft skills." Overall, the comments from participants were consistent with the scholarly research that indicated that effective design of a leadership development program, and in this case the Chair Academy, allowed participants in the program to build skills and then transfer those skills into effective leadership practice. Institutions that are interested in developing leaders need to pay attention to the design of the leadership programs that they enlist employees to attend. In the case of the program used for this study, participant consensus was that it was a good program for developing leadership skills, whether or not participants went on to become leaders. The result of sending employees to a leadership development program could lead to a direct benefit of more leadership applicants. An indirect benefit is employees having better skill sets and understanding of leader and leadership dimensions; hopefully resulting in better employees. An exploration of direct and indirect outcomes is presented in Theme 2, revealing whether or not participants in this study went on to pursue leadership opportunities.

Theme 2: Participant Expectations and Experiences

The second theme that arose involved what program participants shared regarding the reasons they pursued or did not pursue leadership opportunities. Isaac et al. (2001) stated that individuals would choose actions that maximize the probability of an outcome they desire.

The program participants identified a range of reasons for why they pursued, or did not pursue, leadership opportunities. Four participants were already in leadership roles and were required to complete the leadership development program under study if

they expected to advance to higher levels. Two participants were not in leadership roles but held expectations of entering a leadership role upon completion of the program. For example, P2 stated that “the program is required before one can take on a leadership position,” and P10 stated that the program was “to prepare me for advancement in my institution.” One participant was already in a senior leadership role and was using the training to “help me be more effective in my current position.”

Participants spoke highly of the leadership development program, indicating that the instruction was excellent and that the program facilitators were passionate about developing leaders in academic institutions. Participants made comments that indicated they valued the content and design of the program, but more importantly, the research from this study intended to determine if these positive experiences led to changes in behavior involving pursuit of leadership opportunities. Comments included: “I enjoyed the experience very much” (P5); “I found the experience to be very valuable” (P7); and “I believe in the training provided” (P10). Although assessments were positive, scholars have indicated that there is merit in assessing whether participants changed behaviors or advanced in their institutions (Allen, 2009), and that simply determining whether participants had a positive experience does not adequately evaluate the program (Stewart, 2009).

In addition to positive experiences, some participants affirmed that they did use the learning to enhance their roles, and in other cases, that they did advance to leadership roles within their institutions. Participants who made positive comments about the leadership training also indicated that they were maximizing the probability of a desired

outcome. For example, P1 stated that she or he would "be more confident in my belief that I could succeed in a leadership position," P6 stated that she or he "believed it would increase my range of opportunities," and P7 stated that she or he believed that she or he would "enhance my leadership skills through participation in the program."

Participants who completed the leadership development training but did not actively pursue a leadership role were divided into two groups. One group containing two participants had no desire to pursue a leadership role. In both cases, the participants stated that they preferred working in the classroom in a faculty role, P9 stating that "my primary role is faculty," and P5 "I have no desire to move out of the classroom." The other group of remaining participants was not adverse to the idea of assuming a leadership role, but they were not interested in actively pursuing this role. They stated that they worked in a department that "has a Chair who is well suited" (P1), or that they would "work in a higher level role in an acting position" (P7). P1 also stated that she or he would be interested in a leadership role "if the right one came up." Of the participants who did not actively pursue leadership, it emerged that the relationship with their institution would play a role in providing encouragement and future support. The concept of institutional involvement is explored in theme 3.

Theme 3: Institutional Commitment to Leadership Development

The third theme resulted from analysis of participant comments on the level of involvement they believed their institutions demonstrated with respect to leadership development. Allen and Harman (2008) spoke of the importance of leaders being able to receive feedback from within their institutions, because without it, the potential for

growth was limited. Participants recognized the importance of institutional involvement and spoke positively when there was involvement and negatively when they believed it was lacking.

Institutional involvement was a factor that contributed to whether participants felt that a positive climate or encouraging environment was present. In these situations, participant comments reflected connections to the institution. Positive comments included those from P7, who stated: “I shared a lot of my learnings with the other coordinators in my department. I was encouraged and given time to take our leadership team through an entire strategic planning initiative”; P12 stated: “it is a highly valued program at our institution”; and P10 said, “They spoke highly of the program and there was great internal support for it.”

In order to validate whether participants had indicated a desire to pursue leadership development, professional development plans were analyzed. Professional development plans are part of institutional procedures that involve collaboration amongst multiple individuals or groups and may indicate future goals and ambitions, including the pursuit of training or development opportunities. Participants who identify leadership development as part of their professional development would be indicating a more proactive or methodical approach to undertaking leadership development training. Participant professional development plans were obtained from participants using Appendix D: Request for Information from Participants. Two of the three individuals with professional development plans had indicated on their plans that they desired or planned to undertake leadership development. The second piece of requested information

asked for a list of positions that the participant had applied for since completion of the leadership development program. Participants who had professional development plans indicating a desire for leadership development all applied for leadership positions within their institutions. The relationship between expressly stating leadership development as an interest and later applying for leadership opportunities will be discussed further in the Chapter 5 interpretations. Participants without professional development plans secured their leadership positions because they were asked, rather than having pursued positions on their own initiative. A longitudinal study opportunity exists in this area and is presented in Chapter 5 as a recommendation for further research.

Negative comments were concentrated on the senior leadership's response to the participants' training and included comments such as "no follow-up from the top leadership" (P1), and "my institution's leaders give lip service to the importance of this training, yet demonstrate contradictory practices in the workplace" (P2). P2 was discouraged because they did not feel that the skills and practices taught in the leadership development training were practiced by the institution that sponsored them to take the training. These criticisms were consistent with work done by Coppard (2006), who reported that participants were dissatisfied when they did not find that the institutions supported their development by offering follow-up opportunities to dialogue or share knowledge and skills, or practice and demonstrate skills through special projects and enriched work. In addition, the need for continued dialogue after the training (Stewart, 2009) would cause angst for participants if opportunities for continued dialogue were not available. Investment in leadership development can be significant, and it would make

sense for the dialogue to continue past the completion of the program. The participant can disseminate information to others, creating more meaningful and enriched dialogue around topics that would in turn benefit others within the institution.

Overall, participant comments were consistent with research that indicated a need for institutional involvement. In order to strengthen the expectancy that individuals would go on to pursue leadership opportunities, a critical component is ensuring that feedback from institutions has been used for development and provided to the participant. (Mathibe, 2008). When institutions have failed to follow up with participants after the training, they have missed out on this important aspect. The Chair Academy allows a 1-year period between residencies, where participants are expected to work on their individual professional development plans (IPDP). Ideally, institutions could use this time for scheduled follow-up information or debriefing sessions with participants. None of the participants in this study indicated that their institutions were doing this follow-up.

The responses from the discrepant case of P1, who unlike other participants seemingly attended the leadership development program grudgingly, were included in the analysis of the responses that resulted in the themes because even though P1 held a different position on the value of the leadership development program than was held by all other participants, P1 shared information that related to the three themes. For example, referring to themes 1 and 3, P1 did complete the program and was able to make a determination on the value of the content and outcome effects of the program. For theme 2, P1 did have a reason for attending, to develop as a faculty member, which was discrepant from all other participants. For theme 3, P1 was able to say he or she ended up

in the program after being asked by the institution and not because of any interest in leadership, which indirectly indicated/suggested the level of institutional involvement in making participant selections for the leadership development program. The discrepant case of P1 provided a response that was very different from the other participants but nonetheless contributed to the purpose of the study, and consequently, it was included in the analysis. The response did raise questions for further study, in particular how participants are selected and the responsibility of institutions to follow up with participants. These recommendations for further research have been noted in Chapter 5.

Summary

This qualitative exploratory case study set out to discover whether participants who successfully completed a comprehensive leadership development program subsequently applied for and assumed leadership positions in their institutions. A purposeful sample of 12 individuals who had successfully completed a comprehensive leadership development program actively participated in the research study.

Chapter 4 describes aspects of the setting and the demographics of the participants that were relevant to the study. Data collection procedures reflect the research plan that was outlined in Chapter 3. Collected data were coded, sorted into themes, and analyzed, and unusual circumstances and discrepant cases were noted.

In summary, the findings were that leadership development program participants held varying expectations of the leadership development training and its application to their pursuit of future leadership opportunities. Participants who pursued leadership opportunities were most likely to identify positive outcomes from the training.

Participants who did not actively pursue leadership opportunities were also able to identify positive outcomes for the training. Overall, the participants found the training was beneficial. When commenting on program design, participants supported action-oriented learning and in particular commented on the benefits of practical applications. All participants believed institutional involvement played an important role in participant expectations and pursuit of leadership opportunities. Participants who pursued leadership opportunities felt supported by their institutions. Participants who did not pursue leadership opportunities expressed that their institutions either failed to model the participant's desired leadership behaviors or failed to follow up with participants after the training was completed.

Chapter 5 contains an interpretation of the findings, identification of limitations of the study, future research recommendations, and implications for positive social change.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this qualitative exploratory case study was to discover whether participants who successfully completed a comprehensive leadership development program subsequently applied for and assumed leadership positions in their institutions. Participants were purposefully selected from a cohort of the Chair Academy leadership development program because this popular and well-attended program attempts to fill a leadership void in academic institutions through a systems approach to transformational leadership. Since 1992, the Chair Academy has delivered competency-based leadership development programs to more than 6,000 college and university leaders. Major and Major (2011) found that a transformational approach can be used to achieve outcomes or purposes, which in this case are to fill a leadership gap in academic institutions.

The cohort under study attended the yearlong program, from June 2009 through June 2010. This year was chosen because it was thought to allow enough time to pass between completion of the leadership development program and subsequent application for, and assumption of, leadership positions. The use of an exploratory case study research design is supported by findings from Yin (1994) as the best way to research a contemporary phenomenon in a real-life context. The five research questions make enquiries that meet this criteria. Questions were developed to explore whether there were changes in the roles or job titles of individuals who completed a leadership development program. The topic was explored by using a conceptual framework from Vroom (1964) that revealed whether individuals (a) expected to attain, (b) believed they were capable of attaining, and (c) valued attaining leadership positions in their institutions.

In addition to personal perceptions and outcomes, individual participants were able to provide information about whether their institutions expected and valued their pursuit of leadership positions. Participants in leadership development program provided the information under study; institutions can benefit from this information because the expectations and values of participants can help institutions make more informed decisions on investing in leadership development and training.

The key findings of this study emerged from the three themes that were common to all participants in the study. These themes deal with the design of leadership development programs, participants and their experiences, institutional involvement, and evaluation of the program. An analysis of individual participants' responses indicated that there is a continuum of positive and negative associations for each theme, but that those with positive associations were more likely to go on and pursue leadership opportunities. The findings from those with negative associations were supported by evidence from the research (Allen & Hartman, 2008; Coppard, 2006; Griffin, 2003) which indicated potential problems and shortcomings with leadership development programs, participant preparation, and institutional involvement would impede individuals from pursuing leadership opportunities. As a result, participants with negative associations were less likely to pursue leadership opportunities than those with positive associations. Although this may not seem surprising, it indicates that there are practices that could be changed to improve the likelihood that leadership development participants would later pursue leadership opportunities. Coupling the findings from this study with those from existing

research helps to understand whether participants in leadership development programs go on to pursue and attain leadership positions.

Interpretation of Findings

This study was undertaken as a result of my observations surrounding how colleges and universities are addressing the leadership shortage. Colleges and universities are investing in leadership development training for existing employees, and I questioned whether this investment actually results in more employees seeking leadership opportunities. Additionally, employees who successfully attain leadership positions would demonstrate that the colleges and universities are meeting their objective of developing leaders, as evidenced by those individuals who participated in leadership development and then moved into leadership roles.

Analyzing the collected data has resulted in the emergence of three themes that are explained in Chapter 4. Themes surrounded areas of program design, participant expectations and experiences, and institutional involvement. Consistencies with existing scholarly research on the effectiveness of particular program designs and on the value of institutional involvement were uncovered during the data analysis. I also discovered during my research that the value that participants ascribe to a leadership development program is not indicative of whether they go on to pursue leadership opportunities, even when the ascribed value is positive. Program participants have different motivations and expectations for pursuing leadership development, and in most cases, these motivations and expectations are not directly related to a purposeful plan that is part of the individuals' professional development plan. As a result, the findings indicate that

participants who complete a leadership development program may come to do so as a more random or opportunistic event than as part of a plan. These individuals are not necessarily expecting to pursue leadership opportunities within their institutions. Exploring the data and analyzing the findings has resulted in a summary of the three themes as follows.

Theme 1: Effectiveness of Training

As discussed in Chapter 4, the design of the leadership program used for this study satisfies the requirements leading to the best practices that have been identified by scholars who research leadership program design. Analysis of the program identified that The Chair Academy program is comprised of components and begins with an initial five day residency where participants attend day-long leadership development sessions, including the creation of an IPDP. At the end of the period, participants return to their institutions and implement their IPDP while carrying on reflective practices and journaling. Participants follow through on these practices for a period of 1-year, with intermittent feedback interviews from the Chair Academy via electronic forums. At the end of the year, participants return for another 5-day residency that includes additional theory instruction and professional activities. Throughout the duration of the program, participants are encouraged to apply principles to professional activities that will lead to a conversion of theory into practice.

Participants used adjectives such as excellent, interesting, and valuable to describe the program. Participants can see how the program is relevant to their work environment and how applying their learning from the program in the work environment improves

their workplaces. For example, P7 stated, “I do think that the investment they make in staff to attend the program is money well spent as there is leadership enhancement even if it does not lead to a higher position.” Based on program design principles and participant response, the Chair Academy would be useful for both those who become leaders and those who want to enhance their current role, without pursuing leader opportunities.

Theme 2: Participant Selection

Investment in the Chair Academy leadership development program is significant for both institutions and participants, suggesting that the choice of participants should be a thoughtful, methodical process. To determine whether that is true, this study explores how participants are selected to attend the program and reveals that participants are selected in different ways. P3 stated that all faculty who are identified for a leadership role must take the program, indicating a purposeful selection of individuals. P12 did not have this experience, indicating that “not a lot of thought” went into participant selection, leading to the recommendation that institutions should require potential participants to self-identify or be recommended.

Using data collected on participants’ professional development plans, and specifically whether or not those plans indicate an interest or intention to pursue leadership development training, it was found that the majority of institutions do not require participants to self-select or indicate a future desire to pursue leadership development training. Participants are selected by deans and other members of the senior leadership team, but there is no consistency between institutions in how selection criteria are employed. In one instance, a participant disclosed that a member of the senior

leadership team is a Chair Academy facilitator, and this senior leader selects participants to attend. In other instances, faculty are identified by the dean. Purposeful selection with identified criteria was not the norm for choosing participants to attend the leadership development program. Only one participant clearly indicated that a professional development plan that includes leadership development training is a necessary component for her or him to advance within the institution, indicating a purposefully proactive interest in leadership development by the participant.

This information has been triangulated against the participant responses to research questions 1 and 2, which ask about participant expectations and beliefs surrounding whether they might pursue leadership opportunities within their institutions, to reveal that participants do believe they could become leaders, as was summarized in Chapter 4 Table 1. Translating this belief into a reality requires proactive and purposeful action on the part of the participant. My interpretation is that although most participants believe that they could become leaders within their institutions, they do not have identifiable action plans, such as evidence of a professional development plan that expresses leadership intentions.

Regardless of whether participants expect to pursue leadership opportunities, they hold the Chair Academy program in high regard, as reflected by the comments that have been mentioned in Chapter 4. The Chair Academy program meets the criteria for many of the best practices in leadership development training program, and it is therefore not surprising that participants had positive comments. A recommended addition to the program would be using a purposeful preliminary screening of potential participants

against a defined set of criteria. As highlighted by Stewart (2009), a positive experience does not necessarily indicate that the participants will adopt any of the teachings or change their behavior to incorporate good leadership practices. If the intention of creating a more capable pool of potential leaders is a reason to support leadership development, then participant selection needs to be improved.

One of the assumptions stated in Chapter 1 was that the intent of sending individuals for leadership development is to grow the pool of competent applicants to leadership opportunities, resulting in more applications. Thus, the number of participants who go on to pursue leadership opportunities determines the effectiveness of the program. Participants recognized that the leadership training has value and benefits which improved their job performance, but some did not expect to pursue a leadership opportunity. As a grow-your-own approach to having more competent internal candidates for leadership positions, the institutional objective of sending individuals for leadership training was not met in the majority of cases.

Further investigation into research question 5, which asks to what participants attribute their leadership success, demonstrated by obtaining a leadership position, indicates that fewer than half the participants ascribe their leadership success to leadership development training. Instead, they cite personal knowledge and an understanding of the college environment as reasons for their success. This would indicate that participants, although satisfied with the program, are not connecting previously stated benefits and value from attending the program to their personal leadership success. A recommendation for future research will be to explore the

disconnect between attributing success to external factors, such as attending a leadership development program, and internal factors, such as personal attributes.

It would appear that the lack of institutional commitment to follow up the individuals' leadership development might lead to the participants ascribing their success to intrinsic factors that they themselves were responsible for, instead of acknowledging the extrinsic investment of the institution and its support of the participants' leadership development. This may be an unintended consequence that institutions should be aware of when they do not follow the best practice of demonstrating commitment to participants who attend leadership development programs. When institutions fail to demonstrate this commitment, participants do not feel the institution values leadership development, even though the institution supported the participant to attend. As discussed later in this chapter, this oversight also leads to an area for further study.

Theme 3: Institutional Commitment to Leadership Development

Research by Allen and Hartman (2008) and Coppard (2006) supports institutional involvement as part of the continued development necessary for program participants. One way institutions can express support is through the promotion of individuals into leadership positions. All of the institutions that have had participants in this study were able to identify posted leadership opportunities. In some cases, the opportunities were internal postings, such as department chair positions filled from a pool of current faculty members, and others were posted as combined internal/external opportunities that also invited applications from outside the institution.

Providing opportunities is not enough to satisfy the dimension of offering institutional support. As noted by Stewart (2009) and Mathibe (2008), continued dialogue after the training indicates to participants that leadership development is an ongoing process, and post-program feedback and interaction should be used constructively to further develop leadership skills within the context of the participants' work environments.

As noted from Theme 1, participants believed what they learned from the program was relevant to their work environment, and if what they learned were applied to the workplace, improvements would occur. Unfortunately, most participants feel that their institutions are not supportive or interested in adopting these practices. Scholarly researchers have identified institutional commitment as necessary, and that commitment is clearly lacking in many of the participants' experience. Although institutional involvement is evidenced by the support given to participants to allow them to attend the yearlong program, participants have identified a shortfall in institutional commitment after completion of the leadership development program. Few participants identified ways in which their institutions embraced the leadership principles they had been taught at the Chair Academy, including asking or expecting participants to share or disseminate information about their leadership development.

Institutions have chosen to send participants to a leadership development program that teaches/promotes best practices. Employees are sent to the program for training that is intended to develop their leadership competencies. It is therefore curious that several participants stated that their institutions do not embrace the principles that participants

learn during their program training, including the major component of identifying and building on the strengths of employees. Both institutions and participants have committed to the program and although participants recognize the institutional commitment of funding the program, they often felt that there was a lack of follow-up interest once the participant returned to the institution. Feeling inspired to engage in leadership practices, participants may have held higher outcome expectations than institutions. A further recommendation will include post-evaluation practices for both participants and institutions.

The process of going through leadership development training can be summarized in the three steps of selection, attendance, and follow-up. Selection has been explored in Theme 2, indicating some shortcomings that result in change recommendations. Attendance has been explored in Theme 1, indicating mostly positive experiences from participants. Follow-up is explored here, in Theme 3, as an indicator of how participants believed their institutions valued the leadership development experience. Value was determined by whether participants believed their institutions were interested in, and supported, hearing what the participant had to share about their experience and whether or not the institution seemed to practice the principles that the participant believed were evident in good leadership.

Results from the study indicate that institutional shortcomings on selection and follow-up have affected participants' ability and desire to put their leadership development training into action. Regarding selection, participants who included pursuing leadership development as part of their PD plan, or who were aware that

attending leadership development training was a requirement for consideration in advancement, had positive comments about institutional commitment because they could clearly see the connection between being supported by the institution and attending the program. Participants who were unsure why they were selected or indicated no desire to pursue leadership opportunities relayed negative comments about institutional commitment. The Chair Academy provides institutions with compelling reasons for sending staff to leadership development, but does not provide insights or direction on who the best participants would be or how to choose participants. Among institutions that had sent participants, there was no consistency in how participants were selected.

The middle stage, involving attendance in or at an appropriate leadership development program and supporting individuals to attend the program, is evidenced as being sufficient. No participants identified shortcomings in program design or components, or expressed any negative sentiment towards the program.

The third stage, follow-up, did reveal shortcomings. As part of participants individual professional development plans (IPDP), a mentor from the home institution was identified and this person assisted the participant with achieving the goals from the IPDP between the first and second residency period. The participant is responsible for choosing the mentor, and although the program does provide recommendations for choosing a mentor, there is no required follow-up to determine if and how the mentor is helping the participant achieve the IPDP goals. There is also no requirement to include the IPDP as part of any broader participant development, such as in an institutional professional development plan. Unless the participant elects to share the IPDP with

others, development remains insulated to the participant and the mentor. The same is true of the participants' final report. Participants complete a final report at the end of Year 2 but there is no requirement to include the mentor or share that report with the institution. In conclusion, how individuals are selected and the follow-up after the program could be improved.

According to the theoretical framework from Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory, individuals will exert effort if they believe they are capable of achieving the outcome and if they value that outcome. In the case of participants who have attended leadership development training but are either not sure what the institutional motivation is for sending them or did not indicate that they desire a leadership opportunity, the desired outcome is unclear. These participants may still indicate that they enjoyed the experience, but according to Vroom's theory, the participant is willing to work harder toward the goal of pursuing leadership opportunities if participation in the program is initially aligned with an institutional and personal goal. The first step to rectify the problem of unclear participant expectations is communicating to potential participants the reason they are being asked to consider attending the leadership development program, and they should accept the invitation only if they are interested in pursuing the possibility of assuming a position of leadership. The recommendations section of this chapter identifies other ways to improve participant expectations, including an invitation process and proactively using professional development plans for participant identification.

During the Chair Academy training, individuals create an individual professional development plan (IPDP) which is based on participants' specific workplaces and

identifies areas that they wish to impact by implementing some of the learned strategies from the program. The literature from Chapter 2 (Allen & Hartman, 2008; Coppard, 2006; Griffin, 2003) stated that developing leadership skills within the context of the learners' environments is a best practice, and the IPDP addresses that point. Institutions could use this information as a follow-up mechanism for participants by exploring whether or not participants were successful in implementing their professional development plan. A level of institutional engagement could also be helpful in providing assistance to participants who required resources and further support in order to complete the IPDP. Best practices include institutions providing follow-up for participants after completion of the program. Institutional support should increase the participants' beliefs that they are capable of achieving the outcome, and that the outcome is valued because the institution is investing by supporting the participant. If Vroom's theory were to be quantified, the higher values on outcome, belief, and value would indicate a higher likelihood of success.

The research has shown that institutions have made a good choice in selecting the Chair Academy to provide leadership development training. The program meets the recommendation requirements of an effective program. Participants identified that their level of skill and knowledge has increased. Adding the recommendations from this research will further ensure that institutions achieve their intended purpose when sending participants for leadership development training.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations identified from purposeful participant selection and data collection methodology were considered when determining the trustworthiness of the study. All participants were from institutions in western Canada and all attended the same leadership development program. This may lead to questions about the generalizability of the study findings.

The generalizability of the study is not restricted by the purposeful sample because the participants represented a cross-section of positions within a variety of institutions. Although institutions of higher learning are not identical to each other, there are many similarities in structure and purposes for colleges and universities across Canada and United States. Participants in this study have job functions and work in academic institutions that are similar to others which were not included in the study. Furthermore, as identified in the literature, a shortage of qualified people applying for leadership positions has been identified as an international challenge.

Confining the study to one leadership development program does not restrict the trustworthiness of the study because, as stated earlier, the program meets the requirements of researchers and scholars who determine good program content and delivery methods. As a result, the execution of this study did not create limitations that impacted the trustworthiness or generalizability of the findings.

Recommendations for Colleges and Universities

The findings from this study should be communicated to all colleges and universities that support leadership development programs as a means of addressing the

leadership shortage. Leadership development is an expensive undertaking, not only financially but also in time and lost production while participants are away at training. Benefits need to exceed costs, whether these are actual quantifiable indicators or other gained advantages. The leadership program used for this study satisfies many of the best practices that scholars have identified for success, and this study does not make any recommendations for changing the program. Even so, sending participants to the leadership development program has not translated into an abundant number of leadership development program participants going on to pursue leadership development opportunities.

Findings did not indicate that there is no value in sending participants to the program. Rather, and more importantly, with changes in institutional practices related to participant selection and post-training follow-up it would be highly likely that more participants would go on to pursue leadership opportunities. This recommendation is supported by the evidence that participants who were selected using well designed criteria, and who continued using knowledge and skills gained from the program through post-program institutional involvement, went on to pursue leadership opportunities.

In order to better identify participants who would pursue leadership opportunities after successfully completing the leadership develop program

1. Potential participants need to be encouraged to self-identify leadership development as an area of interest. This interest should be formally stated through a prescribed institutional mechanism, such as a professional development plan, a performance review, an employee engagement circle, or

any other means that would be commonly used by the institution to identify potential participants.

2. Institutions should intentionally choose a field of candidates, provide information on the leadership program, and then encourage participants who are interested in pursuing leadership opportunities to apply for the program. Participant selection should be an important piece of the program, and this part of the process should be completed by those who have insights into future institutional leadership needs.
3. Institutional leaders should have conversations with potential program candidates about why they are investing in their leadership development and confirm that the candidate is interested in leadership opportunities or determine whether the candidate would use the training in a beneficial way. In cases where institutions lack diversity, special attention could be given to identifying women and minority candidates with leadership interest or potential.

In addition to these recommendations for participant selection, further recommendations relating to institutional follow-up have been developed. The literature review indicates institutional follow-up, whereby there is meaningful contact with the participant following successful completion of the program, as one of the best practices. As a result, it is recommended that

1. Institutions should have mandatory debriefing and scheduled follow-up sessions with participants in order to ensure the development process

continues beyond conclusion of the leadership program. Participants will have completed an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP), and this document could serve as an excellent tool for extending the development back into the institutional environment as the IPDP highlights areas of participant strengths and interest.

2. Institutions should create a cluster of leadership mentors and candidates and offer developmental in-service, resources, or opportunities for special projects that incorporate leadership knowledge and skills. Program candidates could use this group for supporting their leadership development experience.
3. Institutions should solicit and be receptive to participants' input regarding application of principles they learned in the Chair Academy training, even if they are not in a leadership position.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research into the study of leadership development program participants is needed. Participants who complete the program but do not pursue leadership opportunities may be adding value to their institutions in different ways. A study that compares pre and post behaviors of participants could be used to reinforce the value of leadership development training. Such a study could explore whether participants are more effective and efficient at their jobs, have adopted different philosophies, or have had shifts in attitude or understanding as a result of the training. For example, it is possible that people who have received the training will be more sympathetic to and supportive of what administrators are trying to do than people who did not receive

training, who may have difficulty seeing some issues from an administrator's point of view.

Participants who complete the program but leave their sponsoring institutions may go on to benefit other institutions. A study that includes a broader range of participants could reveal the global benefit that educational institutions receive and encourage collaboration among districts.

A further recommendation would be to conduct a comparative analysis of the ways in which participants are selected to attend leadership development training. The results of this analysis could then be measured against the selection criteria to predict whether the participant will go on to pursue leadership opportunities, and if the way in which participants are selected results in different rates of application to leadership opportunities.

A final recommendation would be to engage participants in determining what sort of follow-up and institutional support participants would like to have after they receive the training. This would also be an opportunity to further explore what, if any, aspects of the training resulted in the participant determining that they did not want to pursue leadership opportunities.

Implications for Social Change

This study analyzes whether individuals who participate in a leadership development program subsequently apply for leadership opportunities within the institutions that originally supported their leadership development. This study has the potential to allow institutions that support leadership development to make minor

changes that would yield big results. Using the information from this study will allow institutions to make better-informed decisions on whom to sponsor for leadership development. Using the information from this study will also increase the likelihood that leadership development participants will pursue leadership opportunities if some of the post-program support suggestions are practiced within the sponsoring institutions.

In addition to institutional benefit, participant expectations, perceptions, beliefs, and values surrounding leadership development will be illuminated. Individuals who receive leadership development training should be more effective leaders, adding value to their institutions. This value extends to the students because they will study in an environment that is led by more competent leaders.

Conclusion

This study explored whether participants who successfully complete a comprehensive leadership development program subsequently apply for and assume leadership positions in their institutions. Data collection has resulted in information that is organized around three key themes that identify important elements of successful leadership development. These were effectiveness of training, participant expectations and experiences, and institutional commitment to leadership development. Each of these themes has provided insights into ways to undertake simple but impactful actions that will help optimize the benefits of leadership development, including the incorporation of purposeful selection methods and scheduled debriefing and follow-up opportunities. Institutions and individuals are making significant investments in leadership development with the hope of addressing the critical shortage of leaders. Without change, institutions

will continue to expend resources to develop leaders who do not go on to pursue leadership opportunities. Adopting the practices of mindful participant selection and follow-up will contribute positively to the effectiveness and efficiency of investing institutional resources in leadership development programs. Attention to these practices will improve the expectations of the applicant and the institution, leading to increased goal compatibility between applicants and institutions. Applicants who are clear on the expectations and are supported by institutions will be more likely to apply to leadership positions. Institutions will benefit from this by addressing the leadership shortage through sponsoring and supporting quality applicants who in turn assume leadership roles within the institution. This study has shown that using a leadership development program to encourage and facilitate the pursuit of leadership opportunities is a good idea that helps institutions create a larger pool of competent leadership candidates.

References

Aalsburg-Wiessner, C., & González-Sullivan, L. (2007). New learning: Constructing knowledge in leadership training programs. *Community College Review, 35*, 88-112. doi:10.1177/0091552107306414

Allen, D., & Hartman, N. (2008). Leadership development: An exploration of sources of learning. *Society for Advancement of Management Journal, Winter*, 10-19, 62.

Allen, S. (2009). An exploration of theories of action in leadership development: A case study. *Organization Development Journal*, *27*(2), 39-51.

Appadurai, A. (2009). Higher education's coming leadership crisis. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(31), 60. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Higher-Educations-Coming/26495/

Ardichvili, A., & Manderscheid, S. (2008). Emerging practices in leadership development: An introduction. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 10*(5), 619-631. doi:10.1177/1523422308321718

Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 315-338. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001

Baldi, P., Iannello, P., Riva, S., & Antoneitti, A. (2013). Cognitive reflection and socially biased decisions. *Studia Psychologica, 55(4)*, 265-271.

Barden, D. (2008). The internal-candidate syndrome. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(35), C2.

Barker, B., Brunn, M., & Bullock, J. (1974). Investing in leadership development. In B. Bass (Ed.), *The Bass handbook of leadership.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Barker, R. (1997). How can we train leaders if we do not know what leadership is? *Human Relations, 50*(4), 343-362. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A%3A1016950726862

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bechhofer, F., & Paterson, L. (2000). *Principles of research design in the social sciences.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Benezet, L., Katz, J., & Magnusson, F. (1981). *Style and substance: Leadership and the college presidency.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Brungardt, C. (1997). The making of leaders: A review of the research in leadership development and education. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 3*(3), 81-95. doi:10.1177/107179199700300309

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Campbell, D. F., Syed, S., & Morris, P. A. (2010). Minding the gap: Filling a void in community college leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149*, 33-39. doi:10.1002/cc.393

Chair Academy. (n.d.). The Chair Academy homepage. Retrieved from http://www.chairacademy.com

Conference Board of Canada. (January 2010). Education and skills. Retrieved from http://www.conferenceboard.ca/HCP/Details/education/Phd-graduates.aspx

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management, 12*(4), 637-647.

Coppard, B. (2006). Study identifies five most helpful experiences for moving from faculty to department chair. *Academic Leader, 22*(8), 1-2.

Covey, S., & Merrill, R. (2006). *The speed of trust*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Crosson, P., Douglas, K., O'Mera, K., & Sperling, C. (2005). A community college leadership academy: Developing leaders for Massachusetts. *Community College Review, 33*(2), 45-63.

Davis, J. (2003). *Learning to lead.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Day, D. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 581-613. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00061-8

Denzin, N. (1978). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

DeRue, D., & Ashford, S. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(4), 627-647.

DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and

behavioral theories on leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64*, 7-52.

DeZure, D., Shaw, A., Rojewski, J. (2014). Cultivating the next generation of academic leaders: Implications for administrators and faculty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *46*, 6-12.

Diabach, G. (2006). There's more to leadership than motivation and ability. *Academic Leader*, *22*(8), 7-8.

Dolezalek, H. (2005). 2005 Industry report. *Training*, *42*(12), 14-28.

Ekman, R. (2010). The imminent crisis in college leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com.article/The Imminent-Crisis-in-College/124513/

Evelyn, J. (2001). Community colleges face a crisis in leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Community-Colleges-Face-a/5250

Fretwell, E. (1919). Education for leadership. *Teachers College Record*, *20*, 324-352.

Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005). Community college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *29*(3), 233-250. doi:10.1080/10668920590901176

Gardner, J. (1989). *On leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Golde, C. (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Griffin, N. (2003). Personalize your management development. *Harvard Business Review*, *81*(3), 113-119.

Hawkins, C. (2009). Leadership theories: Managing practices, challenges, suggestions. *Community College Enterprise*, *15*(2), 39-62.

Hecht, I. W. (2004). The professional development of department chairs. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2004*(126), 27-44.

Husserl, E. (1970). *Logical investigations.* New York, NY: Humanities Press.

Illuminations. (2008). *Expectancy theory: Motivate your team by linking effort with outcome*. Retrieved from http://www.lacpa.org.lb/Includes/Images/Docs/TC/TC341.pdf

Inman, M. (2009). Learning to lead: Development for middle-level leaders in higher education in England and Wales. *Professional Development in Education, 35*(3), 417-432. doi:10.1080/13674580802532654

Isaac, R., Zerbe, W., & Pitt, D. (2001). Leadership and motivation: The effective application of expectancy theory. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*(2), 212.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Keim, M. C., & Murray, J. P. (2008). Chief academic officers' demographics and educational backgrounds. *Community College Review, 36*(2), 116-132. doi:10.1177/0091552108324657

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(2), 48-60.

Knight, P., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Departmental leadership in higher education.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2007). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lahti, R. E. (1971). Management by objectives. *College and University Business, 51,* 31-33.

Lewin, K. (1997). *Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Major, D. L., & Major, H. (2011). A systems approach to improving community college courses. *Community College Enterprise*, *17*(1), 51-58.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*(4), 241-270. doi:10.1037/h0044587

Mathibe, I. (2008). Expectancy theory and its implications for employee motivation. *Academic Leadership Live*, *6*(3), 1-9.

Mayberry, B. A. (1925). Training for leadership by means of student government. *Journal of the National Education Association, 14,* 186.

McCauley, C., & Van Velsor, E. (2005). *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McNair, D. E. (2010). Preparing community college leaders: The AACC core competencies for effective leadership and doctoral education. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34,* 199-217. doi:10.1080/10668920903388206

Medina, R. (2004). *Business organizations and management*. Manila, Philippines: Rex.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Miller, A. A. (1997). Back to the future: Preparing community college faculty for the new millennium. *Community College Review, 24*, 83-92.

Olivares, O. J., Peterson, G., & Hess, K. P. (2007). An existential-phenomenological framework for understanding leadership development experiences. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 28*, 76-91. doi:10.1108/01437730710718254

Orr, M. T. (2007). Learning advanced leadership: Findings from a leadership development programme for new superintendents. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35*(3), 327-347. doi:10.1177/1741143207078178

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Reille, A., & Kezar, A. (2010). Balancing the pros and cons of community college "grow-your-own" leadership programs. *Community College Review, 38*(1), 59-81. doi:10.1177/1069397110375597

Revans, R. (1986). *ABC of action learning*. London, UK: Lemos & Crane.

Robinson, G., Sugar, W., & Miller, B. (2010). Fostering community college leaders: An examination of leadership development programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*(8), 605-623.

Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* New York, NY: Praeger.

Roy, S. (2008). Women in leadership: A discussion. *HRM Review*, (5). Retrieved from http://ssrn.com/abstract=1116193

Siebert, S., Kraimer, M., & Linden, R. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 219-237.

Shenton, A. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*, 63-75.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Stewart, J.-A. (2009). Evaluation of an action learning programme for leadership development of SME leaders in the UK. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, *6*(2), 131-148. doi:10.1080/14767330903006802

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362

Vicere, A., & Fulmer, R. (1996). Executive development: An analysis of competitive forces. *Planning Review, 24*(1), 31-37.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Yip, J. (2009). Return on experience: A mind-set for learning leadership at work. *Leadership in Action, 29*(4), 13-17.

Appendix A: Letter of Cooperation from a Community Research Partner

Dr. Gary Filan
Executive Director
Chair Academy
1025 North Country Club Drive
Suite 313
Mesa, Arizona, USA, 85201

Date

Dear Cheryl Meheden,

Based on my review of your research proposal, I give permission for you to conduct the study entitled An Exploration of Career Outcomes for Participants in a College and University Leadership Development Program: A Case Study. As part of this study, I authorize you to contact participants from the 2009-10 Academy for Leadership and Development cohort. Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion.

We understand that our organization's responsibilities include allowing you to access our website to gather contact information for the Academy participants. We reserve the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change.

I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting.

I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the research team without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gary Filan
Executive Director
Chair Academy

Appendix B: Initial E-mail Contact with Participants

Dear X,

In 2007-08 you participated in the Global Academy for Leadership Development, a training program that was sponsored by the Chair Academy. The purpose of this e-mail is to identify whether or not you would be willing to consider participating in a research study that explores your career outcomes since completing the Academy program. As the researcher, I am committed to ensuring confidentiality in the study and following all of the prescribed practices relating to research ethics.

I would be pleased to speak to you further about the details of the study. If you would be willing to provide me with your phone number and time zone, I will contact you and provide more information.

In no way does this enquiry commit you to participating in the study. Even if you decide to participate, you will be able to drop out of the study at any time.

The results of the study will be important to both institutions and individuals in helping them make informed decisions regarding supporting or participating in leadership development programs.

Kind regards,

Cheryl Meheden
Researcher
Walden University

Appendix C: Participant Informed Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a research study that explores career outcomes for individuals who have participated in a college and university leadership development program. The study intends to track the career movement of these individuals, with particular interest in investigating whether the program participants went on to secure leadership positions in their institutions. The researcher is inviting individuals who participated in the 2007-08 Global Leadership Academy to be in the study. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether or not to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Cheryl Meheden, who is a doctoral student at Walden University, an online university based in the USA.

Background Information:
The purpose of this study is to identify individuals who attended a leadership development program and then track their career movements at their institutions following completion of that program.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to:

- Complete an online questionnaire about your career outcomes following completion of the leadership development program. This should take 20-25 minutes to complete.
- Provide a copy of your professional development plan (if one exists).
- Provide a copy of any career opportunities related to leadership that have arisen in your institution since your completion of the leadership development program.
- Participate in a telephone interview with the researcher. This should take between 30-45 minutes.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. No one at your institution, the Chair Academy, or Walden University will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind during or after the study. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:
Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as the stress caused by taking time away from your required tasks in order to provide the researcher with information. Being in this study would not pose risk to your safety or wellbeing.

The potential benefits of this study include assisting institutions and individuals with making informed choices on supporting or participating in leadership development programs.

Payment:
As a study participant you will not receive any payment or gifts for your participation.

Privacy:
Any information you provide will be kept confidential. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. Also, the researcher will not include your name or anything else that could identify you in the study reports. Data will be kept secure by storage on a password protected computer and locked filing cabinets in the researchers' office. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university. You will be provided a transcript of any information that will be used about you in the study for validation, to ensure accuracy and confidentiality, prior to its use.

Contacts and Questions:
You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via email at Cheryl.Pollmuller@waldenu.edu or by telephone 403-332-4516.. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 1-800-925-3368, extension 1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is [IRB will enter approval number here] and it expires on [IRB will enter expiration date].

Please print or save this consent form for your records. (for online research)

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By replying to this e-mail with the words, "I consent", I understand that I am agreeing to the terms described above.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Appendix D: Request for Information from Participants

Dear X:

As part of your participation in the study that explores career outcomes for participants in a leadership development program, I am requesting that you provide me with the following information, if available:

- A copy of your Professional Development Plans for the years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
- A list of the positions, including job title if available, that you have applied for within your institution following completion of the Chair Academy Global Leadership Development program.

Kind regards,

Cheryl Meheden

Researcher

Walden University

Appendix E: Request for Information from Institutions

Dear X:

As part of a study that explores career outcomes for participants in a leadership development program, i.e., the Chair Academy, I am requesting that you provide me with some information. I am interested in viewing all of the mid-level and senior-level job postings that have been publicly advertised in the years 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Electronic or print versions of these positions are acceptable.

I will be using these postings to determine the number of opportunities for mid to senior level positions that were available in your institution, which is part of a larger study that investigates the same information from other institutions. In no way will this information be used in a comparative manner or used to assess any element of your institutional advertising or hiring practices.

If you are unable to provide me with the postings, a letter describing the position titles and brief job descriptions will suffice.

Kind regards,

Cheryl Meheden

Researcher

Walden University

Appendix F: Interview Guide

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study entitled "An Exploration of Career Outcomes for Participants in a College and University Leadership Program: A Case Study." There are eight questions, each of which will allow five or six minutes for your response. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes.

1. When you successfully completed the Chair Academy, did you **expect** to become a leader in your institution? Why or why not?

2a. Did you **believe** that successfully completing the program would lead to leadership opportunities within your institution? Why or why not?

2b. Did you believe that the top leadership in your institution **believed** that the leadership development training would prepare you for leadership opportunities within your institution? Why or why not?

3. Did you **value** attainment of a leadership position within your institution? Why or why not?

4. Did you apply for one or more leadership opportunities at your institution for which you met the minimum qualifications? Why or why not?

5. Were you successful in attaining a leadership position at your institution? If so, to what do you attribute your success:

a) In getting the position?
b) In doing the job?

6. Upon successful completion of the Chair Academy, you received a large framed certificate. Can you tell me where that certificate is now? What made you put it in that place?

7. Last question: Is there anything about the Chair Academy experience or your career growth and advancement that you want to add?

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer these questions. You will receive a written transcript of your responses so that you can: (a) check for accuracy; and (b) ensure that you cannot be personally identified by the details of your response.