**Common Practices in Leadership Education: A Systematic Review**

**Abstract**

Leadership has made its way as a significant tool of a personal development. Therefore, many researches have emphasized on the theories and principles of leadership in which translated in to leadership education in the modern times. Teaching leader/leadership has been spreading through modern settings that concern with a development of individual. However, there is a lack of attention on the appliance of leadership education. This study aims to analyze the existing evidence of leadership education, precisely, the completed leadership-education programs. Hence, 16 documents which recorded as the evidences of leadership-education were gathered through a systematic search. The search is conducted to look for those evidences between the year of 2009 to 2017. Those documents were then systematically reviewed. The main objective is to determine the common and uncommon practice of leadership education based on their practical frameworks. The findings respectively show that a skill-based approach and a multilevel approach are placed as the common practices among the collected evidences. On the other hand, knowledge-based and attitude-based approach are the uncommon practices. But equally important to the findings is the questions which has arose as the gap of possible future-study. For instance, an effectiveness of each and different combinations of leadership approach.

**บทคัดย่อ**

ภาวะผู้นำถือเป็นเครื่องมือหรืออุปกรณ์สำคัญสำรับการพัฒนาบุคคลหรือการพัฒนาตนเอง มีงานวิจัยมากมายที่นำเสนอทฤษฎีและหลักการที่เกี่ยวข้องกับภาวะผู้นำซึ่งหลักการและทฤษฎีเหล่านี้ถูกนำไปใช้ในการจัดการเรียนการสอนภาวะผู้นำในปัจจุบัน การจัดอบรมภาวะผู้นำถูกนำไปใช้ในสภาพแวดล้อมต่างๆเพื่อส่งเสริมการพัฒนาบุคลากร แต่อย่างไรก็ตามองค์ความรู้ส่วนของภาวะผู้นำนั้นยังขาดแคลนเรื่องวิธีและหลักการที่นำไปใช้ในการเรียนการสอนภาวะผู้นำ งานวิจัยนี้มุ่งเน้นที่จะวิเคราะห์หลักฐานของการจัดการสอนภาวะผู้นำผ่านหลักฐานทางเอกสารบันทึกประสิทธิผลการสอนที่ได้รับตีพิมพ์ในฐานข้อมูลต่างๆ ผู้วิจัยได้รบรวม 16 เอกสารที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการศึกษาภาวะผู้นำ หรือ การเรียนการสอนภาวะผู้นำ หรือ การอบรมภาวะผู้นำผ่านการสืบค้นแบบเป็นระบบ (systematic search) จากฐานข้อมูลต่างๆโดยกำหนดช่วงระยะเวลาของเอกสารในการสืบค้นตั้งแต่ปี ค.ศ. 2009 ถึง ค.ศ. 2017 หลังจากนั้นเอกสารเหล่านี้ถูกนำไปวิเคราะห์โดยวิธีการปริทัศน์เป็นระบบ (systematic review) จุดประสงค์หลักของงานวิจัยฉบับนี้คือการวิเคราะห์และชี้ให้เห็นความมากน้อยของวิธีและหลักการการเรียนการสอนภาวะผู้นำซึ่งตั้งอยู่บนพื้นฐานของกรอบการนำไปใช้ (practical framework) ของเอกสารหรือหลักสูตรเหล่านั้น ผลการวิจัยแสดงให้เห็นว่าการจัดการสอนแบบมุ่งเน้นความสามารถ (skill-based approach) และ แบบมุ่งเน้นหลายระดับ (multilevel approach) นั้นถูกจัดทำมากที่สุด ในทางกลับกันการจัดการสอนแบบมุ่งเน้นภูมิปัญญา(knowledge-based approach) และ แบบมุ่งเน้นเจตคติ (attitude-based approach) นั้นถูกจัดทำขึ้นน้อยที่สุด นอกจากนี้ที่สำคัญไม่แพ้กันคือคำถามที่เกิดขึ้นมาจากการวิจัยครั้งนี้ เช่น ประสิทธิภาพของการจัดการสอนภาวะผู้นำ และ ประสิทธิภาพในการรวมกันของวิธีการสอนแบบมุ่งเน้นหลายระดับ

**Teaching leadership**

According to Fish (2011), in the early 1900s, the talented educators would have a great doubt towards students’ literacy and scientific knowledge. In general, only the small part of population was expected to be equipped with such practice while the rest were either left uneducated or moved towards the vocational programs. However, as the time goes by, the pedagogy structures had shifted through an integration of three components which are the changing needs of society, beliefs towards the children, and outstanding pedagogy. The educators’ perceptions have changed and the statement regarding literacy and scientific knowledge were completely flipped. Arguably, knowledge towards literacy and scientific knowledge has become the norm of the education and the society. Leadership among with the mentioned literal and scientific knowledge can arguably be perceived as the main source of self-development. This study aims to portray a fraction of structural knowledge on possible development and mindfulness of an individual (for both self and others) by employing leadership education.

In leadership education, during the late 1800s, the common perception would explain that all successful leaders were born leaders and leadership cannot be taught (Fish, 2011). However, Bardou et al. (2003) clearly stated that leadership is a characteristic. Precisely, a characteristic that can be embraced by an individual and that individual with leader characteristics should have the ability to influence others. On the other hand, Komive et al. (2005) explained leadership as an ability to manage relationships. Hence, to be able to build a collaboration in an interpersonal environment. This notion somewhat disregards the individuality- type of leadership and give more importance on how leadership is very positional. Relatively, education, as an industry of building an individual, it concerns greatly with leadership and tends to be applied throughout. Once leadership is applied in an educational setting, the prioritized area of the subject may vary. For example, student as an individual or in the institutional level. Nonetheless, it seems to be essential for higher education to apply some forms of leadership development/training passively or proactively within the institutional structure or practicality (Skalicky et al, 2020). The previous mentions and examples are used to lay out the rationale and the significance of this study. This makes leadership education undeniably significant. It possibly would unleash the potentials of individuals. Despite the status of the participants/leaners, this study aims to capture and analyze the common practices used to teach leadership education.

**Evolution of leadership**

To explain the movement of leadership from “leaders are born leader” to “leadership can be taught”, it is important to look at the history of leadership research. Early leadership research was conducted by sociologist and social psychologists, these research paid attention on the origin of leadership, its development, and the role of leader. It is common that these research approach towards the emergence of leaders. How one becomes a leader, and how that individual evolves (e.g. Banne & Sheats, 1948). Later, as the concept of leadership was applied throughout different social group, the leadership research moved towards how leadership can be applied in workplace, qualities of leader, and how leader can uplift the effectiveness of the group. During this period of time, the leader was perceived as a center of the group in some degree. This is where the leadership research had its major movement, for instance, theorizing leadership principles, or looking at leadership from psychological perspectives. Relatively, this is the golden era for trait-based leadership research. The studies of traits and characteristics in leader may varies anywhere from height, appearance, intelligence, to personality (Riggio, 2015). Hence, Stogdill (1948) conducted a review of 128 studies of trait-based leadership. In the paper, the research suggested that focusing entirely on leader traits was too narrow to conclude leadership. Alongside with trait-based leadership and the behaviorism in psychology, leadership research started to lean towards the behaviors of effective leaders. The main idea of those research findings provided structures regarding the task-oriented behaviors and relationship-oriented behaviors (Riggio, 2015).

The next evolution of leadership principles was known as the interactional models of leadership which concerned with how certain behaviors come into play with different leadership situations in order to induce effectiveness within the group (Riggio, 2015). One of the famous interactional theories was Fiedler’s (1967) contingency model of leadership. It suggests that pertinent characteristics of the leader were relatively fixed and stable. Despite the major focus given to task and/or relationship-oriented leadership, leaders should be observed in terms of task motivated and relationship motivated. Hence, leaders either mainly locate their attention on the tasks and results, or focus on their relationships with the subordinates and group functions. Leaders are mostly effective when the leader’s primary motivational orientation match with leadership situation which the leaders can relate to.

Later in the 1980s, the leadership theories which focused more on the quality of the relationship between the leaders and their subordinates were introduced by many researchers (Riggio, 2015). For instance, the leader-member exchange model explained that effectiveness of leadership can be determined by the quality of interaction between the leaders and their groups. Moreover, the transformational leadership combines the leader’s charisma with the leader’s ability to develop strong interpersonal relationship with their subordinates and also encourage the subordinates to be creative and productive. These leader-subordinate relationship theories and models can be explained from psychological and social science perspective; therefore, it grounded the leadership principles which can be used to train individuals (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

**Practical framework for leadership education**

Despite many models and theories which explain leadership, there are significant amount of studies which have shown the verification towards leadership education, its structure, and effective leadership practices. Northouse (2009) concludes leadership as a compound of individual traits, abilities, skills, and behaviors exercised within one or more relationship with subordinates to reach the common goals. Given this conclusion, a numerous amount of leadership educators is adjusting their programs around a three-tiered structure focusing on learners’ attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors. The importance of building a leader relies on their *being, knowing, and doing* which can be seen in many leadership development-programs. For instance, the U.S. Army Official Leadership Manual (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004), the Harvard Business School (Nohria & Khurana, 2010), and Exploring Leadership (Komives, Lucus, and McMahon, 2007). This section aims to discuss the three components in leadership education as it is the grounded theory of this paper.

**A multilevel approach**

**Figure 1** Different paradigms of leadership education

**Being (Attitudes)**

Inner quality is the most important and necessary aspect of the successful leaders; namely, character, credibility, optimism, and integrity. This statement was suggested by Kouzes and Posner (2010) according to their result from decades of surveys in education, business, and government. Nevertheless, as the famous Raplph Waldo Emerson once said, “Your actions speak so loudly, I cannot hear what you say”, this quote emphasizes the importance of credibility in leadership. Hence, leadership education should focus on how to bring out the ideal inner qualities from the learners (David & Anthony, 2012). During the late 1900s to the early 2000s, quite an amount of research would suggest that leadership is a unique characteristic and trait. Only those with this uniqueness may emerge as a leader (Bryman, 1992; Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001; Jacobsen & House, 2001; Judge & Bono, 2000). These characteristics/traits are namely: learning ability, creativity, responsibility, and social influence. It is claimed that the leader characteristics and traits become motives and those motives drive the leaders to lead and influence the group by affectively applying their power (Kirkpatrick, Wofford, & Baum, 2002; McClelland & Burnham, 1976, 2003; Spangler & House, 1991). Leader motives can be empirically measured; and those motives influence others based on the leader behavior. It is worth to be noted that even though this set of doctrine about attitude-based leadership based heavily on the inner-quality such as, leader characteristics and motives. It is emphasized that leader motives yet become an output as their leading behavior (De Hoogh et al., 2005).

**Knowing (Knowledge)**

As mentioned before, the practice of leadership has been evolving and leadership seems very different nowadays comparing to the past generations; given that globalization, economic, and technologies has also been constantly changing (Friedman, 2007). Modern leaders need to how to adapt along with the complex growth and the integration of systems and organizations (Allen & Cherry, 2000), know how to establish interpersonal relations with different group of people (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000), and understand the appliance of moral and ethics in different situations (Johnson, 2011). To be successful in these areas, repletion and practice is not the answer. It must be learned through study because subordinates tend to follow those who emphasize knowledge in what they are doing (David & Anthony, 2012).

**Doing (Skills)**

An inability to apply is one of the main factors which causes leaders to fail is practicality. Adequate knowledge and requisite attitude do not ensure that the leader can perform under pressure (David & Anthony, 2012). According to Katz (1955), an effective leadership consists of three different skills which are encompassing technical skill, interpersonal skill, and conceptual skill/ Therefore, leadership-training program should also require student to practice the three different skills. Those skills should serve as an equipment for student to use them regardless of the setting.

**A Multilevel approach**

It is common that educational leadership program has no clear statement about the level of focus apply to their curricula. According to Day (2001), this can be described as a failure to distinguish between leadership development and leader development. This concept is further explained by Yammarino, Dionee, Uk Chun, and Dansereau’s (2005) four interrelated *levels of analysis*:

1. The Person level focuses on traits, skills, abilities, and behaviors
2. The Dyad level focuses on the interpersonal relationships between the leader and the subordinates
3. The Group/Team level focuses on both team with different rankings or a social team with no hierarchy
4. The Collective/System level focuses on the environmental factors of leadership; namely, systems, communities, and society.

Therefore, in many cases, leadership educators tend to extend their curricula to ensure that the training/program is covering the necessary aspects of leadership. This cooperation of different skills within a leadership course can be described as a multilevel approach (David & Anthony, 2012).

**Objectives of this study**

As it can be agreed from the evidences, leadership education can be educated. Therefore, this study contains three purposes:

1. To collect the empirical evidence on the practical framework leadership education.
2. To point out the common practice applied in leadership education.
3. To identify the issues of leadership education that can possibly lead to future study.

**Method**

To precisely reach the objectives of this study, a systematic review is employed to capture and analyze the pre-existing body of knowledge in regard to the aforementioned subject. The general understanding of leadership is deemed necessary for this study. Therefore, literature reviews were initially made to lay down the basis of the subject. It emphasizes concrete argument to the objectives of this study. For instance, an understanding towards leadership education, the existing body of knowledge regrading leadership education, and the existing practical framework of leadership education.

Hence, this systematic search involves the collection of both qualitative and quantitative documents which have close relations towards how leadership education is being provided. Those data were analyzed to capture the significance within the common practices of leadership education. Three stages of this study were carried out:

* Firstly, an intensive searching and storing the related documents using Google Scholar, ERIC, EBSCOhost, Emerald Insight, and Microsoft Academic. The keywords for searching are educational leadership, teaching leadership, leadership pedagogy, and studying leadership. 30 related literatures were stored. The relation of documents towards the objective was determined by the heading of that documents.
* Secondly, a period of exploratory open-ended reading, skimming and scanning through the stored literatures to carried out the relevant documents and discard the rest. This stage left the related-literatures number at 16.
* Thirdly, those documents were gathered together for analysis.

**Result** **& Discussion**

Within the analysis process, the data were arranged and recorded into a table format based on the reviewed practical framework of leadership education. The recorded components are document number, year of publish, type/name of the leadership education, learners, evidence indicating the employment of attitudestraining*,* evidence of knowledge training, evidence of skillstraining, or a multilevel approachtraining*.* Then the common practices of leadership education were captured which can be declared into four sections:

1. Uncommon leadership education practices.
2. Common leadership education practices.
3. Leadership education in educational settings.
4. Influence of social context towards leadership education.

**Uncommon leadership education practices**

As shown in Table 1, only 10 out of 16 gathered documents have any emphasis towards attitude-based leadership education. Due to the fact that the gathered documents where published between the year of 2009 to 2017, at this period of time, it can be assumed that the leadership trend was already leaning towards the transformational leadership. Hence, the practices toward attitude-based leadership education can be perceived as a trait-based leadership theory which can be infancy for the modern leadership education principles. However, it is also important to look at the rationality and objective of these attitude-based leadership programs. Ferguson (2010), a pastor who was involved with designing the leadership education for high school and college in the community. He established the particular leadership program for the university graduate. The program is heavily an attitude-based leadership program, precisely solely focusing on building new attitude. The author stated the need of deconstruction of attitude. The objectives of the program emphasize how most university students were capable of knowledge and skills, but their attitudes are stopping them from their accomplishment. Bayless (2014), in document number 3 (see table 1) used class-based activities to induce attitude-based leadership in a class of engineering students. Students were asked to create an autobiography of themselves and brought it with them on the first day of the class. It is claimed that this exercise allows students to enhance self-awareness, develop emotional intelligence, and be able to handle their thoughts. Then this course continued by embracing the team mentality throughout.

While 7 of the collected documents are the multilevel approach with the included attituded-based method combined with other methods. There is only 1 out 16 documents (Ferguson, 2010) that had only adopted an attitude-based paradigm in their leadership program. The paper only presents the structure of the program. However, the effectiveness or the outcome of the program was not declared. Relatively, this suggests there is a room for research which emphasize towards practicality of leadership education from attitude perspective. For instance, a methodological model towards developing the inner qualities, the effectiveness of the attitude-based leadership practice, or even the importance of it determining by the outcome of the attitude-based leadership education.

Likewise, knowledge-based approach to leadership education (10 out of 16 documents) are presented itself to be uncommon among the collected documents. It is fair to assume that in the collected documents; the leadership education was provided to those who were relatively capable in their fields. For instance, medical officers (document no.8) and pharmacy students (document no. 12). These recorded documents which included knowledge-based approach to their program. They had all stated that the leadership-knowledge (which is adopted and linked to their particular field of knowledge) were instructed and implemented in the program. Therefore, the knowledge-based approach is where the context of the leadership practice may vary greatly when implemented. According to Allen and Cherry (2000), leadership, in the most general sense, it refers to how leader interprets and understand the role of leadership. Knowledge of being a leader is the set of knowledge that allows the leader to establish the necessary relationship with the environment (Kezar and Moriaty, 2000). All of which cannot be achieved by doing or practicing, but to know and understand their rationales behind those actions.

As mentioned, knowledge-based method is an uncommon approach of leadership education based on the collected data. This points out the gap and questions the necessity of the knowledge-based approach, and also its effectiveness. How can programs, institutes, or organization? Should the knowledge-based leadership be taught in relevant to the program? Or how can it be implemented in the most effective way?

**Common leadership education practices**

On the other hand, as transformational leadership has been developing into its fancy in this point of time, the most common practice of leadership education is respectively skill-based and multilevel approach. The result shown that 15 out of 16 documents adopts the skills-based leadership education. According to the past literatures, throughout the past twenty years, the trend of leadership has shifted from developing leaders to developing leadership (McCauley-Smith et al, 2015; Rasmussen and Hansen 2016). While the former trend focuses on the dependency of an individual and his/her mentalities, the latter underlies the importance of decentralization of controls and powers, and relationship between individuals (Fiedler, 2006). Such trend led to an emphasis on the society and the strength which derives from group structure instead of building a key figure that is capable of leading others (Iles and Preece, 2016). The aforementioned has direct impact to the higher educational curricular-structure. Hence, the evidence is shown through numbers of related theories being applied in the higher education and its curriculum by adopting the relevant literatures (Kezar, Carducci, and Contreras-McGavin, 2016). The tendency of focusing on the skill-based approach on leadership education explains the belief of how a leader can be made. Focusing on the practicality of leadership translates into certain actions that anyone can adopt. It is hereby to be questioned: is skill-based approach in leadership education sustainable without the inducing the leader traits and knowledge?

13 out of 16 documents is evidently recorded as a multilevel approach. This emphasizes that it is common for leadership education and its program to not be absolutely extinguished in their methods. According to Day (2011), this is how the development of leader and the development leadership is distinguished. While those programs that only adopted one approach believes that that a leader can be arises by adopting one set of doctrine, the other programs with a multilevel approach relies on how leadership is an all-around process of development. Relatively with this statement, there are questions are yet to be asked: how can we put these different approaches into hierarchy in regard to their effectiveness? And what are the outcomes for each combination of approaches?

**Leadership education in educational settings**

Firstly, 11 out of 16 gathered documents presented leadership education as part of their curricular structures. This suggest that higher education institutes may consider that leadership skills allow their students to be more effective in workplaces and leadership education should be compulsory in different academic context. For instance, medical (document no.14), or engineering (document no. 3 & 7). It also begs the question of the effectiveness of leadership education, and how can the higher education and its curricular structure can apply leadership education in the most effective manner. As shown in table 1, different institutes and programs adopt different types of leadership education. Moreover, different combinations of multilevel approach are also adopted. This is an essential gap for future study to look into how the output and outcome of the different types of leadership education.

**Influence of social context towards leadership education**

In document no. 15, a document published by Ferguson (2010) described the development journey of Andrews University Leadership Program with a narrative style. The document suggested that the leadership program in this university relied heavily on the attributes-based leadership education. The author narrated how other administrators whom concerned with the leadership program were convinced towards the trait-based leadership models and which directly affected the structure of the program. Given that Andrews University claimed to be a Seventh-day Adventist institution and named after John Nevins Andrews, a Seventh-day Adventist minister (Andrews University, 2017); the influence of social context towards leadership education needs to be remarked for future research consideration. There are some important questions left to be asked in this area namely: How much influence does the society and its culture have on leadership education? Does those influence yield the relevancy towards the effectiveness of leadership education? What should be the objectives of the leadership education since the influence can derive directly from the community through its culture?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document#** | **Year** | **Type/name of the leadership education** | **Learners** | **Being  (Attitudes)** | **Knowing (Knowledge)** | **Doing (Skills)** | **A multilevel approach** |
| 1 | 2016 | Transformational leadership | Nurses | X |  | X | X |
| 2 | 2015 | Leadership Identity Development | Students in adventure education | X | X | X | X |
| 3 | 2014 | Leadership education for engineers | Engineering students | X |  | X | X |
| 4 | 2017 | The Leadership and Education Development program | University students | X |  | X | X |
| 5 | 2016 | Problem-based leadership learning | Undergraduate students |  |  | X |  |
| 6 | 2016 | Leadership curriculum for business education program | University students |  | X | X | X |
| 7 | 2010 | Engineering leadership education | Engineering students | X | X | X | X |
| 8 | 2013 | the Medical Corps leadership development | US Army Medical Corps officers | X | X | X | X |
| 9 | 2016 | Leadership development in higher education | University students |  | X | X | X |
| 10 | 2012 | Leadership education taught from an experimental  education framework | University students |  | X | X | X |
| 11 | 2013 | Clinical Leadership Competency Framework | Clinicians |  |  | X |  |
| 12 | 2009 | A Pharmacy Course on Leadership and Leading change | Pharmacy students | X | X | X | X |
| 13 | 2015 | Leadership in the capstone marketing course | Marketing Students | X | X | X | X |
| 14 | 2009 | Leadership curriculum in undergraduate medical ed. | Medical students and faculty | X | X | X | X |
| 15 | 2010 | An undergraduate leadership program | Undergraduate students | X |  |  |  |
| 16 | 2011 | Youth Leadership Conference | High school students |  | X | X | X |

***Table 1*** Gathered documents
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