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Abstract

In today’s dynamic and complex business environment, companies face challenges like shifting workplace demographics, increasingly innovative technology, and growing global competition. As organizations confront these trends and combat new, never-before-seen business challenges, many management scholars agree that high-quality leadership is needed more than ever. Increasingly, this high-quality leadership is developed through programs at the undergraduate level. This study investigates the implications of using a principle-based leadership development framework in undergraduate leader development programs. Using a case-study methodology, we interviewed participants of the Select Leadership Development Program at Ohio University who graduated between 2009 and 2013. After analyzing the interviews using a content analysis scheme derived from a new, proposed taxonomy of outcomes, we ultimately found that: 1) The program has positive implications for the development of leadership skills, especially those associated with self-leadership, and 2) Experiential activities, when coupled with theoretical learning components, provide a holistic developmental impact on program participants. Our findings and limitations of the study are also discussed.
1. Introduction

In today’s dynamic and complex business environment, companies face challenges like shifting workplace demographics, increasingly innovative technology, and growing global competition. As organizations confront these trends and combat new, never-before-seen business challenges, many management scholars agree that high-quality leadership is needed more than ever (Day, 2001; Orvis & Ratwani, 2010; Patterson, 2012; Van Velsor & McCauley, 2004; Waldman, Galvin, and Walumbwa, 2013).

“As the key elements of the external corporate environment of the last decade or so comprise rapid technological advancements, excessive uncertainty, intense world competition and severe hostility, organizations experience tremendous turbulence that not only calls for speed in decision making, but also alters fundamentally the organizational landscape in which leaders are expected to operate. The hierarchies of the past are no longer applicable; they hamper an organization’s actions. For organizations to survive and succeed through such demanding conditions, exceptional leadership is needed at all levels.”

- Afroditi Dalakoura (2010)

The need for exceptional leadership can be attributed to a number of different factors, one of which is the shifting demographics of employees currently in the workforce. A recent article by Lee Hecht Harrison (2009) stated, “Research has shown repeatedly that Generation X and Y employees do not respond to organizational hierarchy in the same way as Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation (born 1925-1945). One-style-fits all leadership is no longer acceptable, creating a critical need for leaders who can adapt to changes in the workplace and the workforce”.

Drastic changes in technology have also placed an increased emphasis on leadership. New technology has made the workplace flatter, more flexible, and
ultimately more accessible from all levels (Deiser, R., & Newton, S., 2013). This is further emphasized by Kubit (2014) who argues that, “leaders need a different set of skills than their predecessors to thrive in an era of commoditized and democratized technology. Collaboration, innovation, and strategic alignment with institutional goals are essential to their own success”.

Finally, the onset of international business challenges calls for leadership more attuned to the intricacies of global commerce and competition. According to one survey of senior executives, 76% of companies believe modern global business operations call for increased global-leadership capabilities, but only 7% of companies believe they are effectively developing these capabilities in their employees (PRME, 2008).

In order to effectively solve these challenges and meet the need for high-quality leadership, companies have begun to emphasize the development of leadership skills in the workforce and as a result are seeing significant economic benefits (Patterson, 2012). In a 2012 study, Bersin & Associates found that companies that prioritize leadership development saw a 66% increase in positive business results, a 67% increase in their leaders’ abilities to engage and collaborate effectively, and a 73% increase in employee retention rates. If employees can become more proficient in key leadership areas like self-awareness, self-regulation, and self-motivation, organizations can become more productive, efficient, and competitive in the global marketplace (Day, 2001; Dugan, 2006; Patterson, 2012).
The interest in high-quality leadership has also increased the attention given to recruiting high-potential leaders. A large source for these high-potential leaders is undergraduate colleges and universities (Accenture, 2013). A noteworthy study by Dugan & Komives (2007) explained that, “Increasingly, higher education is being turned to as a source for potential change given its significant role in developing leadership capacity among today’s youth. As a result, it is becoming imperative for colleges and universities to commit generous time and resources into the development of leadership skills in their students.”

Frequently, this commitment of resources leads to the creation of formal leadership development programs. Studies estimate that over 1,000 of these programs are in existence across the country, with more being developed every year (Scott, 2004). Studies investigating the effectiveness of formal leadership development programs show that generally, students participating in these programs graduate with better interpersonal skills and are more prepared to lead than their counterparts who were not involved in a leadership development program (Cress et. al., 2001; D’Abate, 2010; Patterson, 2012; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004).

Formal leadership development programs will commonly incorporate different activities and exercises, such as mentoring components, 360-degree feedback assessments, and a structured curriculum (Burkhardt & Zimmerman-Oster, 1999; Day, 2001; Day et al., 2014; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004). While these activities are important to the overall success of the program, when used without an organizing framework, they only address certain leadership skills and competencies in program
participants and do not provide the level of integrated, internal development required to produce high-quality leaders. Therefore, program developers may choose to devote resources to design programs that have an organizing approach, grounded in the literature and in tested leadership models (Day 2001; Day 2014).

These foundational models or frameworks help the program to achieve desired results and can strengthen the program by focusing and streamlining its components. Despite their importance however, there is limited research examining the specific implications and effects of these leadership development models and frameworks (Day et al. 2014). This study will address this gap in the literature by examining the effectiveness of the model(s) used to create leadership development programs.

More specifically, given the current climate of the global business market after the 2008 financial crisis, we have chosen to focus on a principle-based leadership development model.

After the crisis began, and as the actions of financial institution’s leaders began to surface, many attributed the crisis to a failure of leadership. Leadership author Bill George (2008) suggested that to fully recover from the crisis, we need leaders who exemplify principles like authenticity, integrity, adaptability, and resilience. In our study, we argue this suggestion to be true and thus focus on the implications of a principle-based leadership development model.

By examining these implications, it is our hope that the research contained in this study will help universities and business organizations to create more impactful leadership development programs. These programs can help to produce higher-quality
leaders that will be better suited to operate effectively in the changing global business environment and successfully navigate challenges like shifting demographics in the workforce, changing technologies, and an increasingly global marketplace. Better leadership development programs will positively affect society and therefore are worthy of research.

In the remainder of this thesis, we will first thoroughly examine the current and historical literature in order to gain a better understanding of what a leader is and how they are developed. We will then discuss the background for our research, our methodology, our findings, and finally the implications for those findings.

2. Review of Leadership Literature

Research in the leadership field has a long and dynamic history. Due to the complex nature of the subject and influences from scholars in areas like social psychology, management, and higher education, there exist many different definitions of leadership. Bernard Bass, a renowned researcher known for his work with transformational leadership theory, asserted that the definition of leadership is dependent on the context in which it is being used and what the definer is ultimately searching for (Bass, 2008).

For our purposes in this study, we will use David V. Day’s (2012) definition of leadership:

“Leadership can be defined in terms of (a) an influencing process—and its resultant outcomes—that occurs between a leader and followers and (b) how this influencing process is explained by the leader’s dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader, and the context in which the influencing process occurs” (Antonakis & Day, 2012).”
We have chosen to use this definition for multiple reasons. First, it encompasses many different processes and aspects of leadership, thus enabling a more comprehensive, holistic understanding of the topic. Second, it explains the relationship between the process of leadership and a leader’s dispositional characteristics and behaviors. This becomes important when examining the impact of a model that focuses on developing internal principles that affect a leader’s behaviors and the leadership process. Third, this definition includes context. This is also important, as we will focus our study on the undergraduate higher-education environment, which is rather different when compared to a business organization where most leadership research has been done (Day, 2014). While there are many definitions of leadership, we find this definition fits best with our study.

2.1. Periods of Leadership Research & Leadership Theories

While a standard definition of leadership may not exist, researchers generally agree that there have been two main periods of research on the concept of leadership, the “industrial” and “post-industrial” periods (Dugan, 2006; Sheperd & Horner, 2010; Rost, 1993). While it would be impossible to assign exact dates to these periods, it can be argued that the industrial period was prevalent from the 1890s to about 1950, and the post-industrial period from about 1950 to the current day (Dugan, 2006; Sheperd & Horner, 2010; Rost, 1993). Table 2.1 summarizes the main differences between these two periods.

The earlier of these periods, the industrial period, views leadership largely as an individual phenomenon rather than an organizational set of interdependent skills.
and networks (Dalakoura, 2009; Dugan & Schuh, 2006). At the time, leadership best practice was considered to be largely unidirectional, with the leaders of the organization relaying orders down to the rest of the company and executing with a top-down approach to management and communication (Sheperd & Horner, 2010; Rost, 1993). During this industrial period, the main goal of business was production and efficiency, and as a result most leadership theories from this time focus on specific traits, behaviors, and situations as key indicators and success factors for leadership (Komives, 2005). Two of the most influential theories of leadership during this time were the trait-based and behavioral leadership theories.

The **trait-based leadership** or “Great Man” theory, suggests that there are certain characteristics or traits, such as dominance or intellect, which differentiate leaders from non-leaders (Antonakis & Day, 2012; McCleskey, 2014; Zaccaro, S.J. 2007). This theory was extremely influential from the early 1900s to the early 1940s, but lost clout following pessimistic interpretations of research findings by other researchers in the field (Antonakis & Day, 2012; Brungardt, 1997).

Another influential industrial period theory is **behavioral leadership** theory, which focuses on the behaviors of leaders and their consequential effects on followers (Brungardt, 1997). This theory describes two classifications of leadership, one being **consideration**, which views leaders as personable, supportive, and people-oriented. The other classification is **initiating structure**, which views leaders as being directive and task-oriented. While there may be some overlap between the classifications, the theory describes leaders as generally being more of one classification than the other.
This theory began to lose potency as researchers found no consistent, consequential evidence that showed that leaders preferred and used one type or classification of leadership consistently through various situations (Antonakis & Day, 2012).

Following the industrial period is the post-industrial period, which started in the mid-20th century and continues to this day. In this period, leadership is seen as a systemic, organizational, behavioral capacity where leadership within the company is the responsibility of every person, regardless of level (Dalakoura, 2010; Komives, 2005). This period was produced as a result of the changing business environment, mostly due to a shift in economic activities from manufacturing to more service-oriented business models. This shift, coupled with increasingly impactful technology and a decrease in complexity of global business operations, has changed the focus of business from production and efficiency to flexibility and adaptability.

This new focus requires constant, dynamic discussion across all areas and levels in order to solve critical business problems (Dugan & Schuh, 2006; Rost, 1993). Here, the focus is on an organization’s networks and the relationships among employees. Organizations leverage these embedded networks in order to remain flexible and further an organization’s capabilities with regards to cooperation, efficiency, trust, mutual respect, etc. (Day et al., 2014). Some of the most influential theories in this period are the contingency, relational, and transformational leadership theories.

*Contingency leadership* theory states that leader-member relationships, task structure, and the position power of leaders determine a leader’s effectiveness
(Brungardt, 1997). Multiple subsets of this theory have emerged, such as the “substitutes-for-leadership theory” which focuses on conditions where leadership is unnecessary due to follower maturity, clear policies, and organizational structure. The contingency theory, however, has faded greatly in popularity and fewer scholars choose to use it in their research studies (Antonakis & Day, 2012).

*Relational leadership* theory focuses on the effects and implications of relationships between leaders and followers. A subsequent theory, termed Leader Member Exchange theory (LMX), states that high-quality relationships between leaders and followers, based on things like trust and mutual respect, tend to create more positive outcomes for organizations, while low-quality relationships lacking in trust and respect tend to result in slower and less efficient outcomes (Day & Antonakis, 2012).

Finally, *transformational leadership* theory is the most current and prominent theory of leadership and is also closely related to the theories of charismatic and visionary leadership. The theory of transformational leadership differs greatly from industrial period theories and paints leaders as transformational figures who inspire followers to transcend and overcome their individual wants and needs for the good of the overall organization (Erkutlu, 2008; McCleskey, 2014). This theory, along with charismatic and visionary leadership theory, has been the main focus of research over the past two decades (Brungardt, 1997; Day & Antonakis, 2012; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004).
Table 2.1. Periods of Leadership Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-Frame</th>
<th>Industrial Period</th>
<th>Post-Industrial Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1890s - 1950</td>
<td>• 1950 - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Interest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Individual</td>
<td>• Networks &amp; Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavior/traits</td>
<td>• Organization’s behavioral capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Top-down management</td>
<td>• Leadership at all levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories and Approaches</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trait-Based</td>
<td>• Relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavioral</td>
<td>• Transformational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contingency</td>
<td>• Charismatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Situational</td>
<td>• Visionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To explain what makes a leader, both the industrial and post-industrial periods have produced important leadership theories. However, to understand what makes a leader great, one must examine how these leaders are developed, which is an area that has a much shorter history of research (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, McKee; 2013).

2.2. Leader and Leadership Development Theories

Although the words leader and leadership are often erroneously exchanged in the literature with little clarification or distinction, it is important to note that there is a distinct difference between leader development and leadership development (Day & Halpin, 2001; Dugan & Komives, 2011).

The primary emphasis of leadership development is the creation and development of a network of embedded relationships among individual employees and the leveraging of this network, along with collective individual competencies, to further enhance the competitive capabilities of an organization (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, and Mckee, 2014; Dalakoura, 2010).

Leader development, in contrast, focuses more narrowly on the individual and growth on an individual level. Researchers in the leadership field tend to agree that
leader development places the emphasis on individual leadership skills and competencies as well as the development of a leadership identity (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2013). Additionally, it is focused on the expansion of an individual’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2013; Dalakoura, 2009; Day, 2001; Van Velsor and McCauley, 2010). Table 2.2 displays a summarization of key differences between leader and leadership development, along with some best practices commonly applied to both.

### Table 2.2. Leader Development vs. Leadership Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Leadership Development</th>
<th>Leader Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networks &amp; Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The combined workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Components &amp; Best Practices</td>
<td>Support Networks</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action Learning</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Challenges</td>
<td>Job Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Formal Programs</em></td>
<td>Self-directed Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td><em>Formal Programs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>360 Feedback</em></td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> The Common Components and Best Practices that are italicized apply to both leader and leadership development.</td>
<td><em>360 Feedback</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researchers agree there is some overlap between leader and leadership development (Day, 2001). This can be seen in the Best Practices section of the above table. Formal programs, mentoring, and 360-feedback can be applied to both leader and leadership development. Furthermore, researchers argue it is important for organizations to understand and utilize both approaches in order to be truly effective (Day, 2001; Conger, 1993). For example, although it is important for a company to leverage its employees’ networks and combined skill sets, this strategy has a limited
usefulness. If a company first focuses on building its employees’ leadership skills on the individual level, there will be much more value provided when it needs to leverage their employees’ networks and combined skill sets to achieve organizational goals.

For the purposes of our research, however, we will focus on leader development. This is because the context for this study, higher education, tends to place less emphasis on the relationships between students and focus more on the development of knowledge, skills, and competencies on the individual level, which aligns more closely with leader development processes (McClellan, 2013). This is different from a business context, which would be more closely aligned with leadership development practices as organizations rely more heavily on leveraging internal networks and relationships among employees to accomplish organizational goals (McClellan, 2013). Therefore, it is important that we examine the leader development process, which we will do in depth in the following sections. More specifically, we will examine the processes behind leader development, as well as different outcomes commonly associated with the development process.

2.3. Leader Development

*Leader development*, when compared to leadership development, focuses much more on growth at an individual level (Day, 2001; Day, 2014). This growth takes the form of leadership related skills and competencies, as well as a developed leadership identity.

To fully understand this growth and the leader development process, we will examine the literature investigating leader development more in depth. Doing so will
give context to our research question, as well as allow us to more definitively explore
the impacts the process has on individuals. To this end, we will discuss what
constitutes a leader development method, processes and models of leader
development, the role of identity in leader development, and finally the outcomes of
leader development.

2.3.1. Leader Development Methods

Leader development occurs through a variety of methods. These include
formal instruction, job assignments, self-directed learning, executive coaching, and
feedback, to name just a few (Boyce, Zaccaro & Wisecarver, 2010; Day, 2000;
McCauley, Drath, Palus, O’Connor, & Baker, 2006). These methods can be used
independently, but many times are used together to craft comprehensive leader
development programs (Boyce, Zaccaro & Wisecarver, 2010).

The frequency and manner in which these methods are used depends on the
organization and the organization’s goals. In the context of a business organization, it
may make sense to use methods like job assignments or self-directed learning because
they align more closely with pre-established business processes and procedures, those
of which may interfere with methods like formal instruction programs (Day, 2014).
Studies have even found that formal instruction programs may not be the best use of
resources for organizations because they frequently occur off-site and can take
valuable work-time away from employees (Boyce, Zaccaro & Wisecarver, 2010).
However, in a different context like higher education, formal instruction may be more
valuable as it mimics and aligns more closely with preexisting organizational
processes like the creation and implementation of educational curriculum and initiatives.

2.3.2. Leader Development Processes and Models

While leader development methods offer different avenues and strategies for growth, they share the important commonality of learning through experiences, which is a fundamental process of leader development (Day & Zacarro, 2004). Experiential learning is important to the development of leadership skills because although participants of development programs learn through curriculum and classroom work, the best learning is coupled with other strategies, like experiential learning, to deepen the understanding of key concepts with opportunities for application and reflection (Belton, 2010).

This experiential learning can be explained through Experiential Learning Theory (ELT), which is a theory of learning that examines how experiences shape human knowledge (Kayes, 2002; Kolb, 1984; Mughal & Zafar, 2011). The most popular model of ELT can be attributed to David Kolb, due to its pedagogical roots in several learning epistemologies including Dewey's pragmatism, Lewin's social-psychology, Piaget's cognitive-development, Rogers's client-centered therapy, Maslow's humanism, and Perls' Gestalt therapy (Kolb, 1984).

In Kolb’s model, learning occurs by individuals recognizing and responding to situational and environmental challenges and then ultimately reflecting on these experiences (Kayes, 2002). This learning is iterative and transitions through four different phases, Concrete Experience, Reflective Observation, Abstract
Conceptualization, and Active Experimentation (Kolb, 1984). In this way, “learning describes a continuous process of responding to diverse personal and environmental demands that arise from the interaction between experience, concept, reflection, and action in a cyclical – albeit not necessarily orderly – fashion” (Kayes, 2002). Through iterative participation in different experiences and subsequent reflection, leaders build skills on an individual level, and become more aware of themselves as leaders (Belton, 2010; Bialek and Lloyd, 1998; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991, 2005; Patterson, 2012). Figure 2.3 shows Kolb’s model.

![Figure 2.3. Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model](image)

This iterative process of skill development and increasing self-actualization is demonstrated most frequently by models that are derived from Jean Piaget’s theory of stage-development (McCaulley et al., 2006). Piaget’s theory describes a set of predetermined stages that children transition through as they grow older and mature. As children develop and progress intellectually, they experience changes in the ways they perceive themselves, make judgments on their environments, and experience the world (Piaget, 1954). The basic idea is that as these individuals transition through
these stages, they begin to conceptualize their own selves and become acutely aware of external factors affecting their behavior and reality. Deriving its pedagogy from Piaget’s theory of stage-development, the model most frequently used to exemplify and explain the leader development process is constructive-developmental theory (CDT) (McCauley et al., 2006).

Fundamentally, CDT describes the development of meaning and meaning-making processes through an individual’s lifespan (McCauley et al., 2006). CDT is *constructive* as it engages a person’s constructs and interpretations of their own experiences, and is *developmental* because it then views how these interpretations grow and change over a period of time (McCauley et al., 2006). CDT extends Piaget’s stage-development theory by also including emotions and their effects on development, by focusing on the transition process which includes the challenges and costs of transforming personal knowledge, and finally by extending its focus to include the external social context and its effect on development (McCauley et al., 2006).

Although there have been different theories derived from CDT, one of the most influential came from researcher Robert Kegan (1980). According to Kegan (1980), CDT is fundamentally focused on two components of development, which are *orders of development* and *developmental movement*.

The orders of development describe the organizing mechanisms that people use to make sense of themselves and of the world. Developmental movement describes how these mechanisms are constructed and reconstructed over time as a
person moves through developmental stages, which are sometimes called the *Orders of Consciousness*. (Kegan, 1980; McCauley et. al, 2006). Kegan proposes that there are three Orders of Consciousness through which an individual moves and that each subsequent order is inclusive of the orders that came before it (Kegan, 1980).

The first of these orders is the *dependent* stage, where an individual lacks an identity and is largely dependent on others for confirmation and approval. In the second, or *institutional*, stage, the individual forms a self-possessed identity and relies mostly on internal values and morals to make decisions. Finally, the individual moves to the final, or *inter-independent*, stage, where the individuals’ identity becomes the object of their reflection and is viewed as a continuous work in progress (Kegan, 1980).

By examining this continuous development process behind an individual’s identity, and then applying it to leader development, we can more thoroughly understand the implications of designing high-quality leader development programs. This is especially important for undergraduate students who are in the formative years of their leadership identity development.

2.3.3. The Role of Identity in Leader Development

Recent studies have begun to explore the role of identity in leader development processes. In these studies, identity (commonly referred to as leadership identity) is considered to be the manifestation of a leader’s self-concept or self-identity, which is affected by a leader’s skills, traits, competencies, and knowledge, as well as their role in and relationships with their external environment (Komives et al., 2009; Lord &
Hall, 2005). Furthermore, researchers in the leadership field believe that an individual’s leadership identity changes and develops over time through experiences and learning (Komives et al., 2006; Lord & Hall, 2005).

Although research on the topic of leadership identity development is scarce, it has given rise to an important model developed by Komives et al. (2006), aptly named the Leadership Identity Development model (LID).

The LID model seeks to explain how individuals, specifically students, situate themselves in leadership over time (Komives et al., 2006). The model identifies an iterative development process with six developmental stages (awareness, exploration/engagement, leader identified, leadership differentiated, generativity, and integration/synthesis) which individuals progress through. As individuals move through the six stages, they experience a transition from dependency, where they view leadership as largely positional, to interdependency, where it is ultimately understood that leadership can come from anywhere and that a leadership identity is a continuous process of self-development.

Furthermore, through this process, a leader’s identity development is influenced by five main factors: broadening view of leadership, developing self, group influences, developmental influences, and the changing view of self with others (Komives, 2009). Figure 2.4 shows the LID model.
Ultimately, when examining leader development processes it is important to understand LID, CDT, and ELT. LID and CLT explain the “what” of the leader development process. They explain the different stages that leaders transition through while developing as well as indicators associated with these transitions. ELT, on the other hand, describes the “how” of the development process and examines how experiences, coupled with reflection and application, move individuals through progressive developmental stages.

This idea of progressive developmental stages can also be seen in other models that have been applied to leader development. One such model, made famous by
Stephen Covey in his seminal work, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Covey advocates for a principle-centered, character-based development approach to achieve personal and interpersonal effectiveness, which aligns closely with the objectives of the leader development processes (Covey, 2004).

In his book, Covey explains that through his journey to understand the landscape of research on success and effectiveness, he found there were two main periods of literature: a period of literature with a *Character Ethic* focus and a period of literature with a *Personality Ethic* focus (Covey, 2004).

The *Character Ethic* period of focus is rooted in about 150 years of research leading up to World War I and aligns very closely with the industrial period of leadership theory discussed earlier in this review. Character Ethic, according to Covey, suggests that there are, “basic principles of effective living and people can only achieve happiness if they integrate these things into the very makeup of their being”. Character is seen as the fundamental qualities that are distinct to each individual. These might include principles such as integrity, humility, courage, patience, and encouragement (Covey, 2004).

The second of these periods, which focuses on *Personality Ethic*, arose after World War I and aligns very closely with the post-industrial period of leadership theory discussed earlier in this review. Success and effective living at this point were more a “function of personality”, which is seen as an individual’s distinct set of attitudes, behaviors, skills, and techniques (Covey, 2004). Covey then goes on to explain that focusing on *personality* instead of *character* to develop long-term
effectiveness is like attempting to find your way around a city with the wrong map. No matter how hard you try and use your skills or change your behaviors (i.e. personality), you will always be lost because your map is wrong (i.e. character) (Covey, 2004).

Covey argues that this long-term development approach occurs through paradigm shifts or major changes in our character and is “a continuing process of renewal based on the natural laws that govern human growth and progress. It’s an upward spiral of growth that leads to progressively higher forms of responsible independence and effective interdependence” (Covey, 2004). More succinctly, Covey says this development occurs over three distinct stages on a “Maturity Continuum”, which closely resembles the Orders of Consciousness described in CDT. Figure 2.3 describes the stages of the Maturity Continuum.

Figure 2.3. Stephen Covey’s Maturity Continuum

3. **Interdependence** focuses on an individual’s relationships with others. Individuals who are interdependent are completely self-reliant and realize that far more can be accomplished by working with others.

2. **Independence** places the emphasis on the individual. At this stage, reliance on others begins to subside and we begin to take care of ourselves and become self-directed and self-reliant.

1. **Dependence** indicates an individual’s total reliance on others to do things for them. An individual at this stage is emotionally, physically, or intellectually dependent on others for direction and nourishment.
The principle-based leadership development model that this study focuses on is a term that is adopted from Stephen Covey. We chose to focus on principle-based leadership development because it incorporates many of the aforementioned processes and models. It takes from LID and CDT in that growth is achieved by transition through stages toward a higher level of self-reliance and maturity and it also takes from ELT in that an upward spiral of growth is achieved through a process of experiences, reflection, and application which also results in a number of positive individual level outcomes (Covey, 2004).

2.3.4. Outcomes of Leader Development & A Proposed Taxonomy

In the field of leadership studies, research on leader development are fragmented. Depending on the study’s geographic and social context, the authors, and the time period in which the study took place, a variety of different models and frameworks have been used and studied. This has in turn created a large variety of cited results and outcomes. One purpose of this study is to propose a new, comprehensive taxonomy of outcomes that can be used to better understand and evaluate the effectiveness of leader development methods and approaches, as well as aid in meta-analyses of programs in general.

For the purposes of this new taxonomy, we will ground our outcomes into a slightly modified version of Stephen Covey’s Maturity Continuum. To organize the outcomes, we will group them into five categories: Knowledge (dependence), Character (dependence), Leading Self (independence), Leading Others (interdependence), and Leading Organizations (interdependence). Figure 2.7
summarizes the categories and outcomes. A full table with definitions, citations, and outcome indicators can be found in Appendix A.

We have chosen to split interdependence into two categories, as there is an important difference in the complexity of the skills and competencies required to lead other people and those required to strategically lead organizations. Additionally, we have split dependence into Values & Orientations and general Knowledge as these represent two fundamentally different ideas. Values and Orientations directly affect the way that an individual interacts with the world, mostly through effecting behaviors, emotions, and feelings. Knowledge, in contrast, affects an individual’s thought processes and awareness of leadership-related concepts, like different leadership styles or career paths.

**Figure 2.7. Proposed Taxonomy of Outcomes**

![Maturity Continuum Diagram]

The remaining sections of this report will focus on our research question, the methodology we utilized, our findings, and finally the implications of our analysis and
implications for leader development programs.

3. Research Question

This study addresses a gap in the current leader development literature by examining the implications and effects of models and frameworks used in the design of leader development programs.

This study investigated the answers to the following question:

“What are the implications and effects of using a Principle-Based Leadership development model in undergraduate leader development programs?”

In order to best answer this question, we used a single embedded case, study design focusing on the Select Leadership Development Program at Ohio University from the years 2009-2013.

4. Methodology

Leader development is a learning process that is extremely complex and difficult to operationalize, with rich, contextual nuances that need to be examined and analyzed qualitatively in order to be best understood. Learning in this sense is a complex and latent process, and as such is difficult to separate from the context in which it takes place.

We decided to use the case-study method to investigate this complex phenomenon. The case-study method is one of the best methods to use when attempting to answer a “how” or “why” question about complex phenomena,
especially when it is believed that contextual conditions are highly pertinent to the phenomenon of the study (Yin, 1994).

4.1. **Case Study Method Overview**

Robert Yin (1994) describes the case study method as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and when multiple sources of data are used.” For these reasons, a qualitative case study design was more appropriate for our research as opposed to other research strategies. Experiments, for example, would not have been appropriate as they attempt to limit the influence of context over the phenomenon in order to increase the amount of control researchers have (Yin, 1994). This limits the ability to observe and analyze naturalistic relationships stemming from the phenomenon’s contexts, which is what this study aimed to do.

Yin describes four different types of case studies: single-case, holistic studies; single-case, embedded studies; multiple-case, holistic studies; and multiple-case embedded studies (Yin, 1994). In holistic studies, only one unit of analysis is used, while in embedded studies, multiple units of analysis are used. Single-case studies are most usually appropriate when the case is the first of its series or is revelatory. Additionally, single-case studies also tend to create a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. This is contrasted with multiple-case studies, where, although the understanding of the phenomenon may be limited, more compelling evidence is produced.
4.1.1. Our Methodology

For our study, we used a single-case, embedded study design. We chose to use a single-case design because it provided us a deeper understanding of the effects of a principle-based leadership framework on program participants in the context of the Select Leaders program. Additionally, because this particular model is not widely used in undergraduate leadership development programs, the model is unique in nature and thus warrants the use of a single-case design (Yin, 1994).

Additionally, we focused on analyzing developmental impacts on multiple individuals within the context of the Select Leaders program. These individuals, considered embedded units, served as our units of analysis for the study. This approach contrasts with a holistic study design where only one unit of analysis would be used (Yin, 1994).

4.2. The Case (The Select Leaders Program at Ohio University)

The Select Leaders program began in 2009 when two separate leadership programs in the Ohio University College of Business, Ohio Business Fellows and Corporate Leadership Fellows, were combined. The first year of the program (2009-2010) consisted only of senior level students, however as the program progressed, the program began to recruit and develop sophomore, junior, and senior level students.

For the purposes of our study, we will only be interviewing program participants that graduated from the program between 2009 and 2013 in order to ensure a consistent set of data. During this time, the program’s mission stated:

“The Select Leadership Development Program accelerates personal growth, professional development, and leadership identity of high-
potential students using principle-based leadership practices. Through the process of discovery, application, and evolution, students develop skills to differentiate themselves as leaders.”

Foundationally, the program used a three-tier principle-based development model, which closely resembles previously discussed development models such as Constructive Developmental Theory and Stephen Covey’s development model. Figure 4.1 displays a graphic representation of this model, along with tier-specific targeted outcomes.

![Figure 4.1. Principle-Based Leadership Development Model](image)

During the required, weekly two-hour seminar, program participants engaged in a process of discovery, application, and evolution, in order grow personally, develop professionally, and develop a leadership identity. In order to achieve these goals, students used a number of activities, such as the creation of a leadership portfolio, participation in coaching and mentoring sessions, and participation in executive engagement sessions. Figure 4.1 displays this process, and associated developmental activities.
Figure 4.1. Select Leaders’ Targeted Outcomes and Associated Development Activities

4.3. Units of Analysis

As stated previously, our study design was embedded, meaning that multiple units of analysis were used. For this study, our units of analysis were the individual past program participants, while the context for the study was the Select Leadership Development Program at Ohio University between the years 2009 and 2013. Studying program impacts at the individual level allowed for a richer analysis as comparing outcomes across the collected data sets resulted in observable patterns and trends.

4.4. Data Collection
In the spirit of Yin’s case study methodology (Yin, 1994), we triangulated evidence by using multiple sources of qualitative data. This allowed us to examine and analyze the case and its units of analysis in a natural state, keeping intact important relationships between data points and processes that might otherwise have been lost if approached using quantitative methodology.

Our central source of data was in-depth interviews with past participants of the program. We used the interviews to assess their undergraduate program experiences and perceived outcomes. Our population consisted of 60 individuals who graduated from the program between the years of 2009 and 2013 and who had participated in the program for at least one year. All 60 were asked to interview for the study. Of these 60, 15 individuals responded and were interviewed, resulting in a 25% response rate. Table 4.1 summarizes the demographics of the interview participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1. Participant Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Years in the Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews with these individuals lasted between 30-60 minutes via phone or Skype, were audio recorded, and subsequently transcribed to allow for data analysis. During the interviews, open-ended questions were asked to assess the programs perceived outcomes on the individuals, as well as the individual’s experiences with different components of the program. Appendix B lists the questions used during these interviews.

In addition to in-depth interviews, we also collected important documentation used in the creation of the Select Leaders program. We used this documentation, in addition to interviews with the program developers, to fully define our framework and to drive the interview questions used with interviewees.

4.5. Data Analysis

We performed content analysis using the data analysis model developed by Miles and Huberman (1994). Figure 4.1 shows a visual representation of this model.

Figure 4.1. Miles and Huberman’s (1980) Data Analysis Method
In our analysis we followed the interactive, iterative process of data collection, data reduction, data display, and then ultimately drew and verified conclusions. Our content analysis used inductive and deductive techniques. We started with the content analysis scheme derived from the literature and outlined in figure 2.7 Taxonomy of Outcomes. Please refer to Appendix A for our content analysis scheme.

Specifically, we qualitatively and quantitatively documented instances where program participants cited specific outcome indicators, such as increased self-confidence, or an improved capability to develop others. We used the interview as our unit of analysis for the content analysis. In addition, we documented commonly recurring themes related to perceived effectiveness of specific program methods like executive engagements or class trips to identify the methods used and their effectiveness.

5. Results

The main objective of this study was to explore, document, and analyze impacts and effects of a principle-based leadership development framework on undergraduate students participating in the Select Leaders program at Ohio University. The following section outlines results from the study. It answers the research question by detailing specific results related directly to our proposed taxonomy of outcomes, including those not mentioned during interviews. We discuss noted trends and patterns in the collected data in subsequent sections.

5.1. Impacts on Knowledge
In our proposed taxonomy, we defined knowledge as, “a conceptual scaffold, a foundation for subsequent learning that colors and filters one’s school and nonschool experiences” (Alexander, 2000). Through our interviews, we found that 100% of interviewed participants cited an increase in leadership related knowledge as an outcome of participating in the program. Most commonly, this knowledge pertained to discovery of different leadership styles, leadership skills associated with great leaders, and new or previously unknown career paths and industries. Table 5.1 summarizes cited impacts on this construct.

### Table 5.1. Summarized Impact on Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants Citing a Positive Impact</th>
<th>Example From Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Leader knowledge/expertise</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>So, for me, that was a big thing to understand truly, you know you read leadership in books and you talk about it in school but what does it actually look like? I learned a little bit more about that. Then in terms of actually studying leadership and understanding it, the work that we did, researching with the 7 habits really helped me understand how a leader thinks and what differentiates a leader in kind of the day-to-day setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Character

For this study and in our content analysis framework, we defined character as: “the leader’s moral center (and) influences his/her vision, goals, self-concept, strategies, work ethic, attitude, perception, code of ethics, behavior, and the search for excellence” (Sankar, 2003).

In regards to specific outcomes, 6.67% of respondents cited the program as having a positive impact on their service orientation, 13.33% cited a positive impact
on their sense of commitment, and 26.67% of respondents stated the program had a positive impact on their sense of initiative. Table 5.2 summarizes cited impacts on this construct.
Table 5.2. Summarized Impact on Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants Citing a Positive Impact</th>
<th>Example From Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Values &amp; Orientations</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>It’s something where I see not just me, but everyone that I know that was involved in the program, they really kind of have the sense of wanting to give back and help foster new generations of Select Leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>But then she also really taught me a lot about conviction and truly sticking to my principles and being strongly aware of who I am as a person and what is important to me and making sure I hold true to that, which is also really impactful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.37%</td>
<td>Again, I think it’s just the confidence it gave me and the awareness it gave me about my leadership style that we just talked about. Those two things impacted the frequency of when I would take the lead on things or decide to take the initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/social/political/cultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. Leading Self

Through discussions with past program participants, it became clear that skills associated with leading self were highly impacted by the Select program and principle-based development model. We defined leading self as, “a process, through which individuals control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves
through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies” (Neck & Houghton, 2006).

The two most cited outcomes were increased self-understanding (73.33%) and self-confidence (66.67%). Self-regulation was not as frequently mentioned (40%). Most often, interviewees attributed this increased in the ability to Lead Self to program components like self-assessments and the leadership portfolio. Table 5.3 summarizes cited impacts on this construct.

Table 5.3. Summarized Impact on Leading Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants Citing a Positive Impact</th>
<th>Example From Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self</td>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>Emotional Awareness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>I might think I’m a really great leader that really involves everyone in what I’m doing and trying to keep everyone involved in the group project or whatever it might be but if I take a step back and really try and analyze... how am I treating other people, what sort of responsibilities am I giving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Understanding</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>Yeah, so from a self-awareness prospective I guess you learn a lot about yourself when you’re leading a group of leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>You know I think it’s a little bit of both but I think they definitely shaped kind of my... a lot of things. The way I approached things, the way I manage myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>It gave me. I think, a little more confidence. It helped me realize that I am a leader and sometimes I don’t always think that I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4. Leading Others

For our content analysis scheme, we defined leading others is a construct that “can be defined in terms of (a) an influencing process—and its resultant outcomes—that occurs between a leader and followers and (b) how this influencing process is explained by the leader’s dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader, and the context in which the influencing process occurs” (Day & Antonakis, 2012).

We found that the ability to build and maintain relationships was the most frequently cited impacted skill in terms of leading others (66.67%). A couple respondents also cited developed listening skills as an impacted skill (26.67%). When discussing improved skills in the Leading Others category, respondents spoke about the positive impact of working with other highly motivated peers, as well as networking and building relationships with executives through executive engagement sessions. Table 5.4 summarizes cited impacts on this construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants Citing a Positive Impact</th>
<th>Example From Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Others</td>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>Effective Listening Skills</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>One of the habits that we talked about that I really liked was that seek to understand before being understood. I think that goes a long way too... It's unbelievable how much that plays out and how much it makes a difference in a situation that is difficult to make or one that other people don't like. It makes a world of a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking Skills</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>It made me a better public speaker, because we had to speak in front of the group all of the time, you know, it was kind of a constant thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Skills</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>I mean, I don’t remember having courses or sessions on how to behave with people. But I think select leaders kind of naturally helps to kind of teach you the right way to respond or follow up with people to keep your network going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and cooperation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>So I guess within the program I learned how to really build that trust with your team and expanding them opportunities to do the work as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relate to other groups</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>You know, understanding strengths of yourself and the strengths of others is also a business skill that I really carried with me throughout my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5. Leading Organizations

Leading organizations is our final construct and we defined it as, “a process involving highly-developed and complex interpersonal and intrapersonal skills used in dealing with and balancing multiple entities to achieve strategic organizational goals.”

Interviewed participants most often cited positive impacts on their capacity to develop others (60%). This impact was mostly attributed to the mentoring processes that participants experienced while in the program. Organizational skills did not seem to be largely impacted, aside from the ability to develop effective work groups (13.3%). Through the interviews, respondents did not describe improved problem solving skills as positively impacted due to participation in the program. Table 5.5 summarizes cited impacts on this construct.
### Table 5.5. Summarized Impact on Leading Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants Citing an Impact</th>
<th>Example From Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Organizations</td>
<td>Problem-Solving Skills</td>
<td>Ability to respond to and solve complex problems</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to think and act strategically</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Skills</td>
<td>Ability to set goals</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing skills</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning skills</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to vision</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>I think more than anything it was just a learning experience and I think the biggest thing I learned was to be conscious of what you're doing and to take a step back and look at some different angles and think about the next step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Skills</td>
<td>Ability to develop effective work groups</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>Okay for me leadership was more working with the people around me, leveraging the people around me, identifying other peoples' strengths and weaknesses and really trying to feel up the team. Figure out where people should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity to develop others</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>I think the biggest thing I learned was really I guess how to act like a leader, how to have confidence, how to ask the right questions, and we comfortable around people of authority and really kind of how to help others and coach others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivating/influencing others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to initiate and implement change</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>I actually think Select played a significant role on me. I think it helped me mature a little bit more faster in a leadership role, it made me see things, it made me more comfortable with decision making and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6. Program Methods

The Select Leaders program utilized a number of different methods designed to build leadership skills. Interviewed participants most frequently cited executive engagements as most impactful (73.33%). Almost every respondent stated that this executive exposure helped to increase his or her sense of professionalism, ability to ask pointed questions, and ultimately resulted in an improved sense of self-confidence.

Additionally, the interactions with peers in the group was mentioned as an impactful component a number of times (53.33%), as well as guidance and coaching from the program facilitators (33.33%). Table 5.6. summarizes the impacts on this construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants Citing a Positive Impact</th>
<th>Example From Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Sessions with Executives and Business Professionals</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>They were a fantastic opportunity to learn and I thought that... it was really interesting for me to see different people and different companies with different positions and learn from their experiences but it's more than sometimes just the experience that they had.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Peers in the Group</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>I think that one piece that I haven’t mentioned is that I think that one of the coolest parts of the Select is you surround yourself with the brightest. So they're all people that are go getters that are in your cluster groups and probably</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the leaders of other cluster groups so I think that when you can get all those brains in a room with all their different thoughts, introverts, extroverts, blue, green, orange, all the different personalities I think that makes for a really cool opportunity and sort of a melting pot to be able to learn from other people and the thought process of other people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance/Coaching from Program Facilitators</th>
<th>33.33%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I also think the professors, Hala Annabi and Sean McGann, played such a huge role in that too because they were completely invested into the program and helping us. Whether that was to find a job, prepare for an interview or just find our strengths and weaknesses and how we can play on those was a huge part of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Discussion

This study set out to investigate the effectiveness and implications of using a principle-based leadership model in undergraduate leader development programs. Interviewed participants generally stated that the principle-based development model used in the Select Leaders Development Program positively impacted their leader development process in some way.

In terms of outcomes, the indicators associated with Knowledge, Leading Self, and Leading Others were most frequently cited. This includes leadership related knowledge (100%), self-understanding (73.33%), self-confidence (66.67%), and the ability to build and maintain relationships (66.7%). Conversely, the indicators associated with Character and Leading Organizations (aside from the capacity to develop others) were the most infrequently cited. The following section will discuss key takeaways from our analysis of the data.
6.1. **Observations on Impacted Constructs**

*Knowledge about Leaders and Leadership is the Foundation*

An increase in leadership-related knowledge was the most frequently cited outcome of the model (100%). Interview participants frequently discussed their experiences with studying literature on what makes great leadership, discovering different leadership styles, as well as participating in experiences that increased their awareness of different career paths.

It is not surprising that 100% of respondents mentioned this as an outcome of the program. Much of the Select Leaders program, the literature curriculum component especially, is designed to expose students to a variety of leaders and leadership styles, as well as different career paths and career opportunities. Additionally, the leadership curriculum, executive engagements, and class trips were frequently cited as beneficial to develop knowledge because these activities are experiential and help students to contextualize the theoretical knowledge. This balance between experiential and theoretical helps to make the program comprehensive developmentally.

Advancement in leadership-related knowledge is the foundation for improvement with the other four constructs we measured. It would therefore make sense that every program participant gained leadership related knowledge.

*Values and Orientations Were Strengthened, But Not Profoundly Impacted*
Participants generally stated that the Select program did not have a profound impact on their personal and professional values, aside from a handful that reported an impact on their sense of initiative and commitment (33.37% and 13.33% respectively). More commonly, respondents stated that although the program did not fundamentally change their values or orientations, it may have helped to strengthen them and stress the importance of values for leading. One respondent stated:

“I wouldn’t say that Select gave me values or created values for me but I would say that it gave me the clarity to recognize that I need to think about values and it gave me the tools and the time to think about those things.”

A reason for this lack of impact could be that by the time that participants are old enough to enter college, and enter the program specifically, many of what we would consider personal or professional values have already been thoroughly developed and thus much less likely to change. With this in mind, it may make sense not to focus on changing the values of program participants in undergraduate leader development programs. If this values and orientations focus was applied to development programs with younger individuals, high school students for example, it may be more beneficial.

Another aspect of this construct, and perhaps more important than an impact on the values of program participants, is the contextualization of the importance of leading and living with values. In a principle-based development model, the idea of leading with principle and committing to your values is vital to the success of the model. This also may explain why respondents cited an impact on initiative and commitment.
Leader Development for Undergraduate Students is Learning to Lead Self

Skills and competencies associated with leading self were the most frequently cited outcomes of the Select Leaders program and principle-based development model. This includes self-understanding (73.33%), self-confidence (66.67%), and self-regulation (40%).

The most compelling theme seen throughout many of the interviews was an increase in self-understanding. Many of the respondents explained that through processes involving reflection, self-assessments for example, they were able to gain an improved sense of their identities, leadership skills, and strengths and weaknesses. This is a promising finding as the development of an identity and a sense of self-understanding are vital to the transition between developmental stages and the development of high-quality leaders.

Improved self-efficacy and professional confidence were also commonly cited outcomes. Many interviewees explained that attending executive engagements and interacting with high-level professionals helped with their comfort level in professional situations, as well as their comfort in asking pointed questions. Additionally, being associated with highly-motivated peers was also frequently cited as a reason for increase self-efficacy. This is also a promising finding as professional confidence and comfort are very important in job interviews and in the workplace, especially for undergraduate students starting careers.
The implications for this finding are important. From the data, we argue that a principle-based leadership development model is adept at developing skills and competencies associated with Leading Self. In the context of higher education, specifically at the undergraduate level, these skills are foundational. Learning to lead self first will allow the later development of higher-tier skills associated with interdependence, such as the ability to initiate and implement change in an organization. In order to take advantage of trends in today’s dynamic business environment, Universities should aim to develop these self-leadership skills in their students and a principle-based model is a great way to do this.

*Leader Development is a Social Process Highly Influenced by Peer Group*

Many interview participants cited an improvement in their relationship skills when asked about their experiences with leading others during and after the program. More specifically, respondents reported improved networking skills (66.67%) and an increased capacity to develop others (60%).

When asked why these developments occurred, respondents frequently referred to the exposure they had to executives while in the program, as well as close personal relationships they had built with the program facilitators. This increase in relationship-related skills bodes well for the program and a principle-based development model.

The ability of individual employees to network and maintain professional relationships in the workplace is important for business organizations aiming to leverage the relationships among their workforce to achieve important business objectives.
Respondents did not generally report any increases in their ability to communicate via writing, although some did report increases in active listening skills and their ability to speak publicly. This may be because the program generally did not include activities and components designed to improve this skills, such as writing workshops. Future iterations of programs based on this model may be wise to include some components designed to improve writing as business writing is commonly cited as a skill employers are looking for in new graduates (Adams, 2014).

Skills Needed to Lead Organizations Take Significant Time and Experience to Develop

Throughout the interviews, respondents generally did not frequently cite indicators associated with management skills, aside from an increased capacity to develop others, which, we argue is mostly a result of the mentoring and coaching component of the program. Furthermore, very few respondents cited impacts on their abilities to problem-solve or organize.

We do not find these outcomes surprising. As stated previously, the main focus of the program is on developing skills associated with leading self. The abilities of Leading Others and Leading Organizations are associated with transitions to higher levels of maturity and development, which takes time and experience. Therefore, skills associated with higher levels of maturity will most likely not be developed during the short time an undergraduate participant is involved in the program.

Furthermore, we argue the lack of problem-solving and organizational skill development makes sense as well, as the development of these skills is not the focus of the program. As stated previously, the program components mostly focus on the
development of a leadership identity and the skills associated with leading self. Few program components would challenge participants and lead to the development of skills associated with problem-solving and organization. Additionally, this low impact may be due to the fact that many students entering the program are already highly developed intellectually. Thus, students would not have needed to develop these skills further.

**Self-Leadership Not Viewed as a Form of Leadership**

An interesting trend that became apparent after the analysis of the data was the lack of understanding around self-leadership as a form of leadership. Respondents realized when they had developed skills and competencies associated with Leading Self, but when asked how the respondent used their leadership skills in their current workplace, many responded with an answer citing their lack of use due to a lack of managerial responsibilities.

This association of leadership with position power and managerial responsibilities is troublesome. With the dynamic business environment we now found ourselves in, leadership is needed at all levels of the organization. In order to develop the highest-quality leaders, any individual, regardless of position or assigned set of responsibilities, must view leadership as a boundless concept attainable and useable by anyone.

**6.2. Observations on Program Methods**

By far, the most impactful program component cited by respondents was the executive engagements. Interviewees explained that the experience of being able to
ask questions of an executive in a small-group setting was very impactful on their
sense of professionalism and self-confidence. One respondent stated for example:

“When you get a chance to interact with Executives, in small, intimate sessions I
think that’s really important. I mean we had groups that were no bigger than 10 to
15 people. The focus was that you would get comfortable asking questions, and
talking with executives, listening to their stories trying to take away some of those
nuggets of information.”

We do not find this surprising. A large part of succeeding in a corporate work
environment is being comfortable professionally and being able to interact with
professionals from all levels of the organization. Thus, if undergraduate students are
able to develop this confidence before entering the work environment, they could
potentially accelerate much more quickly than their peers who might not have had the
same experiences.

Another highly impactful characteristic of the program was the interactions
between high-achieving students. Many times throughout our interviews, respondents
cited this component as being advantageous to the discovery and understanding of
different leadership styles as well as a motivating factor in their professional careers.

Personal coaching and mentoring was another component of the program that
interviewees cited as impactful. One respondent explained:

“I also think the professors, Hala Annabi and Sean McGann, played such a huge
role in that too because they were completely invested into the program and
helping us. Whether that was to find a job, prepare for an interview or just find our
strengths and weaknesses and how we can play on those was a huge part of it.”

We argue that this exposure to program facilitators is a very important component.
Many studies have been done on the positive implications of mentoring programs,
especially in undergraduate contexts where students’ professional identities are still being formed (Day, 2014).

To this end, we recommend that every undergraduate leader development program incorporate some form of mentoring in order to best prepare their leaders for the workforce and beyond. It is important however, to keep in mind the implications for this recommendation.

With faculty mentors, it takes experience in order to be effective. We argue that there is a level of previous experience with leader development required to be effective as a faculty mentor. We urge leader development programs to put time and energy into finding facilitators well suited to lead the program and mentor students as they develop.

6.3. Study Implications

We designed this study to address a gap in the literature surrounding the use of a principle-based development model in undergraduate leader development programs. Based on our results, we find this leader development model is positively impactful for undergraduate students who participate in programs foundationally based on it. The model seems adept at developing knowledge around leadership, improving relationship skills, and building skills associated with leading self, such as self-awareness and self-efficacy. These outcomes, when viewed in correlation with the three-tier model used in the Select Leaders program, are lower-tier outcomes, mostly associated with developing Knowledge and Leading Self.
This impact on lower-tier outcomes is most likely because this program occurred 2009-2013, which means that most of the participants interviewed are still in the early stages of their careers and still considered individual contributors. Therefore, even if the program aided these respondents in developing higher-tier leadership skills, they most likely have not been in situations that require the use of them and therefore are unaware of any improvement due to their involvement with Select Leaders and the principle-based leadership development model.

We do not believe the limited instances between the model and higher-tier outcomes are indicative of a negative of the model, however. Instead, we believe it is an outcome of the undergraduate context in which the model operates.

Undergraduate students participating in this program are likely not to have a background of development with most of the outcomes associated with leadership development programs. Students, for example, may be involved in extracurricular activities or sports teams where leadership opportunities are available, however these experiences are generally not as structured or streamlined as a formal development program would be. Therefore, when examining a student’s developmental process holistically, progress will need to be made in the lower stages first (the dependent or interdependent stages), before progressing to higher stages (the interdependent stage). This will result in improvements in constructs associated with the lower stages, mainly leadership-related knowledge and self-leadership skills.

Ultimately, the structure and components used in a leader development process will depend on the context and the desired outcomes. Overall, we believe that this
model is advantageous when used in designing leader development programs at the undergraduate level and, if used more frequently, will result in the production of higher-quality leaders able to handle the challenges of the dynamic business environment we now find ourselves in. An interview participant summarized this well:

“Select helped teach me who I am as a leader and how I am most comfortable leading and the things I still need to do to improve upon when I am leading. So now that I am now getting the opportunity, my experience through Select gave me the knowledge base and skill set to begin having leadership and as I’m doing it being able to self-identify.”

7. Limitations

As with any study, our research design and results have some limitations.

7.1. Data Sources

The largest limitation of this study is the fact that our analysis and results stem from in-depth interviews with the participants of the program. While these are the best qualitative method available, all data relating to impacts on program participants are self-reported and therefore subjective. This increases the likelihood that analysis stemming from the data is biased.

Future research on this topic should attempt to limit this subjectivity by interviewing other individuals that have interacted with program participants, such as bosses, professors, and peers.

7.2. Lack of Longitudinal Scope and Sample Size

Any research focusing on long-term effects should have pre and post data from interviewees, however due to the limited resources available to our team we were unable to do this. Additionally, because the Select Leaders program is relatively small
and produced a relatively small population to pull from, the results from this study are limited in generalizability.

Future research in this area should interview program participants continuously throughout their development, in order to fully assess the effectiveness of the program.

7.3. Did Not Account for Learning Styles

A limitation of this study was the fact that we did not take the impact of different learning styles into account when structuring our interviews and subsequent data analysis. Students with different learning styles will respond to and learn from program components in different ways. For example, if a program participant learns better through visual and verbal teaching methods, they may respond more advantageously to a lecture-based program as opposed to a program that requires them to physically participate in the exercise. This may limit the effectiveness of a program designed around the principle-based model and skew results. Future research on this topic should account for differing learning styles in order to increase the generalizability of the results.

8. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the implications and effects of using a principle-based leadership development model in an undergraduate leader development program.

Using a case-study method, we interviewed students who had participated in the program between 2009 and 2013. Using a content analysis framework we had
developed from reviewing the literature, we then analyzed these interviews to reach the conclusions of the study.

Despite some study limitations, we argue the results of this study are positive and have important implications for leader development programs everywhere.

First, the principle-based leadership development model is adept at developing skills associated with self-leadership, such as self-awareness and self-confidence. This finding makes sense, as students participating in the program most likely have not had prior leadership development experience, and is important, as these skills are considered lower-tier and foundational to the development of more complex skills associated with leading others and leading organizations.

Second, experiential components have a large impact on program participants. We found that executive engagements and interactions with peer groups were some of the most impactful components on respondents. This experiential learning, when coupled with theoretically focused development activities, such as a literature-based curriculum, are necessary for providing leaders with a well-rounded and integrated developmental experience.

It is our hope that this study will aid leader development programs both in undergraduate and business environments. The incorporation of key findings from our analysis will help these programs to produce higher-quality leaders, capable of leading and improving organizations facing new challenges like changing technologies and shift workplace demographics.
## 9. Appendices

### APPENDIX A – Taxonomy of Outcomes & Content Analysis Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Leader knowledge/expertise (Day et al., 2013)</td>
<td>“knowledge… can be thought of as a conceptual scaffold, a foundation for subsequent learning that colors and filters one’s school and nonschool experiences” (Alexander, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character: “is the leader’s moral center (and) influences his/her vision, goals, self-concept, strategies, work ethic, attitude, perception, code of ethics, behavior, and the search for excellence” (Sankar, 2003).</td>
<td>Values and Orientations</td>
<td>Service orientation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>“Service orientation—the disposition to be helpful, thoughtful, considerate, and cooperative—is an aspect of nontechnical performance that is important in a variety of jobs.” (Hogan et al., 1984).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience (Johnson &amp; Murphy, 2011)</td>
<td>Service orientation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>“the process of effectively negotiating, adapting to, or managing significant sources of stress or trauma” (Windle, 2011).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism (Day, 2001)</td>
<td>Service orientation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>“the global expectation that good things will be plentiful in the future, and bad things scarce” (Curver &amp; Scheier, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007)</td>
<td>Service orientation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>“the capacity to adjust responses to changing external drivers and internal processes and thereby allow for development along the current trajectory” (Folke et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/social/political/cultural awareness (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999), (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008), (Black &amp; Earnest, 2009)</td>
<td>Service orientation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>Knowledge or perception pertaining to civic, social, political, and cultural contexts and factors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/social responsibility (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>Service orientation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>Understanding of what is expected of one’s self and one’s community and the willingness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leading Self: “a process through which individuals control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies” (Neck & Houghton, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Emotional awareness (Day, 2001)</th>
<th>“the ability of a subject to discriminate his or her own emotional state and that of others” (Lane et al., 1990)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring (Lord &amp; Hall, 2005)</td>
<td>“self-observation and self-control guided by situational cues to social appropriateness” (Snyder, 1974).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-understanding (Burkhart &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</td>
<td>“an individual’s knowledge and reflections on the self-as-known as well as on the self-as-knower” (Daonon &amp; Hart, 1982)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Management

| Self-regulation (Day, 2001), (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), (Lord & Hall, 2005), (Johnson & Murphy, 2011), (Lee & Riggio, 2007) | “self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals” (Boekaerts, 2005) |

Self-Efficacy

| Self-confidence (Day, 2001), (Lee & Riggio, 2007), (Black & Earnest, 2009), (Hall, Forrester, & Borsz, 2008) | “the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy” (Coopersmith, 1967) |
| Self-efficacy (Orvis & Ratwani, 2010), (Lee & Riggio, 2007), (Johnson & Murphy, 2011) | “the extent to which an individual believes him or herself capable of successfully performing a specific behavior” (Bandura, 1986) |
| Self-esteem (Burkhart & Zimmerman-Oster, 1999) | “a person’s positive or negative attitude toward himself or herself” (Wong, Lau, & Lee, 2012) |

Leading Others: “can be defined in terms of (a) an influencing process—and its resultant outcomes—that occurs between a leader and followers and (b) how this influencing process is explained by the leader’s dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader, and the context in which the influencing process occurs” (Antonakis & Day, 2012).

Communication Skills

| Effective listening skills (Lee & Riggio, 2007) | “the cognitive process of actively sensing, interpreting, evaluating, and responding to the verbal and nonverbal messages” (Castleberry & Sheperd, 1993) |

Writing skills (Coloma, Gibson, & Packard, 2012) | Ability to communicate a message via written language. |

Public speaking skills (Coloma, Gibson, & Packard, 2012) | Ability to communicate an oral message to a group or groups of other people. |

Relationship Skills

<p>| Ability to build and maintain relationships (Van Velsor &amp; McCauley, 2010), (Black &amp; Earnest, 2009), (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007) | Ability to make and sustain personal and professional connections with other people. |
| <strong>Collaboration and cooperation (Day, 2001), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007)</strong> | “the ability of team members to work together, anticipate each other's needs, inspire confidence, and communicate effectively” (Baker &amp; Salas, 1992) |
| <strong>Ability to relate to other groups (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008)</strong> | “The propensity of human beings to make strong bonds to particular others” (Bowlby, 1977). |
| <strong>Leading Organizations:</strong> “a process involving highly-developed and complex interpersonal and intrapersonal skills used in dealing with and balancing multiple entities to achieve strategic organizational goals.” | |
| <strong>Problem-Solving Skills</strong> | |
| <strong>Ability to respond to and solve complex problems (Black &amp; Earnest, 2009), (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999), (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008), (Duy et al., 2013)</strong> | “relevant knowledge, particularly representations derived from prior experience and knowledge of one’s job… reshaped and reformed to generate new solutions” (Mumford et al., 2000) |
| <strong>Ability to think and act strategically (Van Velsor &amp; McCauley, 2010), (Day et al., 2013), (Black &amp; Earnest, 2009)</strong> | “a way of solving strategic problems that combines a rational and convergent approach with creative and divergent thought processes” (Bonn, 2005) |
| <strong>Organizational Skills</strong> | |
| <strong>Ability to set goals (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</strong> | “an integrative, self-organizing and open system of personal qualities, habits and peculiarities, which enables the implementation and success level of the goal-setting process” (Dmitrieva, 2014). |
| <strong>Organizing skills (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008)</strong> | To create structures and allocate resources to achieve efficiency and clarity. |
| <strong>Planning skills (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008)</strong> | To understand future demands or opportunities and allocate resources to effectively manage them. |
| <strong>Ability to vision (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999)</strong> | “Reflection on experience… in relation to personal values and perceived social needs, allows people to abstract future goals and the key causes contributing to attainment of these goals” (Strange &amp; Mumford, 2002). |
| <strong>Management Skills</strong> | |
| <strong>Ability to build effective work groups (Van Velsor &amp; McCauley, 2010)</strong> | Allocate human resources to help in the achievement of organizational goals. |
| <strong>Capacity to develop others (Lord &amp; Hall, 2005), (Day, 2001), (Van Velsor &amp; McCauley, 2010)</strong> | Assisting others in the acquisition of important leadership skills and competencies. |
| <strong>Motivating/influencing others (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007)</strong> | Instill a desire to achieve a particular objective and persuade others to a particular point of view or perspective. |
| <strong>Ability to initiate and implement change (Van Velsor &amp; McCauley, 2010), (Black &amp; Earnest, 2009), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007)</strong> | “Leaders’ thoughts and skills are manifested in actions, structures, and processes that enhance or impede change, further strengthening the linkage between leader behaviors and effectiveness in implementing change” (Gilley et al., 2009). |
| <strong>Decision making (Black &amp; Earnest, 2009), (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008)</strong> | Propensity to engage in the process of selecting a course of action from a group of choices. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to delegate (Hall, Forrester, &amp; Borsz, 2008)</th>
<th>Allocating work to other groups or individuals in order to achieve organizational goals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution skills (Burkhardt &amp; Zimmerman-Oster, 1999), (Lee &amp; Riggio, 2007), (Duy, 2001)</td>
<td>“allowing both parties to express their needs and opinions to reach a collaborative solution or compromise” (Jordan &amp; Troth, 2002).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about yourself and your journey to your role at your current company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your involvement and experiences in the Select Leaders program at Ohio University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about what you learned about the concept of leadership in general?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you learn about yourself and your leadership in Select?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that Select played a role in preparing you for the workplace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you use your leadership skills in the workplace today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you talk about what, if any, impact Select had on your values or traits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think Stephen Covey’s 7 Habits of Highly Effectively People has impacted you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think Select played a role in how you lead or thought about yourself and if so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, how did Select Leaders change the way that you interact with others? Do you find that’s still true in your current position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel Select impacted the way that you lead others? Lead teams? Your organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you talk about what your experiences were with different components of the program? (Mentoring, executive engagements, self-assessments, travel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on themes that may emerge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What specific program activities/dimensions of the program have helped (if any):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying career goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting and leading others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the complexity of organizational politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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