

TEACHING LEADERSHIP USING THE BALDRIGE LEADERSHIP CRITERIA

Diane Bandow, Troy University

Tish Matuszek, Troy University

ABSTRACT

The nature of leadership studies has changed relatively little within the last fifty years, with little innovation of teaching approaches toward improving knowledge and application of leadership history, nature, and skills. Graduate leadership curricula in schools of business have traditionally focused on leadership theories, but literature points to a lack of results to indicate this approach is successful, based on the lack of quantity and quality of effective leaders and those demonstrating leadership abilities. Calls to improve the curricula emphasize the need to focus on organizational goals, develop employees to be empowered contributors, and focus on processes and integration instead of individuals as unique leaders, with characteristics possessed by few. Toward addressing this issue, the use of the Baldrige National Quality Award Leadership Criteria (1.1) has been shown to be an effective way to introduce graduate students to both the study of quality and the study of leadership within an integrated and systematic approach to assessing organizational effectiveness. This paper outlines the Baldrige Leadership framework as well as the advanced approach to leadership that specifically addresses vision and values, promoting legal and ethical behavior, creating a sustainable organization and communication.

Keywords: Leadership, Teaching, Baldrige, Development, Quality

INTRODUCTION

Senge (1990) identified the need for a new type of leadership when leading a learning organization. A traditional view of a leader is deeply connected to a view of the world which is highly individualistic and not systemic. In the West, leaders are traditionally viewed as heroes, mostly great men with a few women who rise to the challenge in a time of crisis. Prevailing myths focus on examples such as a captain leading a cavalry charge to save settlers in the Western US from an Indian attack. This view of individuals as heroes is problematic, because it “..... focus[es] on short-term events and charismatic heroes rather than on systemic forces and collective learning” (p. 340). This traditional view of leadership assumes people are powerless and are unable to manage change and that such events require a few great leaders.

Senge (1990) posits that the new view of leadership must focus on leaders building organizations, and leaders should be stewards, teachers and designers. Leadership should be responsible for allowing people to learn and expand their capabilities so employees can understand complexity and a shared vision, and leadership must be able to “breathe life” into their organizations. The leader as a designer actually goes back thousands of years, and Senge (1990) paraphrased Lao-tzu: “The good leader is he who the people praise. The great leader is he who the people say, ‘We did it ourselves’” (p. 341). With this challenge to create learning organizations towards improving

them, what has been done to address this need? Based on a review of the available literature, we have not done much in graduate business education.

Despite the increase in students and graduates choosing management education over the last 10 years, there are remaining shortages regarding the quantity and quality of those who possess leadership abilities (Hay & Hodgkinson, 2005). Periodically, there are calls for restructuring business school curricula to provide better student preparation, yet little has been done to change the approach to delivering leadership education (Hobson, Strupeck, Griffin, Szostek, & Rominger, 2014). Gosling and Mintzberg (2004) emphasize there have been no changes in the MBA curriculum since the 1950s. This should be of interest to schools of business, as the MBA represents a popular graduate business degree, providing a breadth of experience in the various aspects of the business environment.

The MBA represents the standard for graduate business programs because of breadth of knowledge provided by the numerous aspects of business but with limited exposure to leadership and a prevailing focus on systems control (Hay & Hodgkinson, 2005). Collinson and Tourish (2015) point to failures to turn students into inspirational leaders and growing criticism of business schools. This “failure” also supports the argument that a leadership crisis exists which requires a stronger focus on leadership education in terms of quality leadership (Hay & Hodgkinson, 2005). Emulti, Minnis and Abebe (2005) question if education even has a role in the developing of leadership skills, focused on MBA programs. Doh (2003) and Hayes and Hodgkinson (2005) believe that leadership can be taught, but practical experience is a necessary element.

The authors of this paper propose that education plays an important role in developing leadership skills, but the approach to developing leaders through curriculum and application has not been updated to the extent necessary to provide guidance to school of business in an environment where collaboration and empowerment have become important not only for leaders, but for members of the organization. The purpose of this paper is to present the current state of graduate leadership education and propose a more systematic and integrated approach to develop skills and abilities necessary for leadership based on the Baldrige Framework (NIST, 2017). This paper examines the literature and current trends in graduate business education to develop effective leadership and proposes a different focus and approach to teaching leadership, moving away from traditional methods which focus on the individual and toward improving organizations with a systems approach based on processes. Issues as defined by literature will be presented with a proposal to refocus in a more effective way for academia to deliver of leadership education. Recommendations are presented followed by a conclusion.

ISSUES IN LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

Emulti et al. (2005) and Collinson and Tourish (2015) question the value and efficacy of current approaches to developing leaders in business programs. This is only one of many issues identified by the literature and should be considered by academia as a call for improvement. Muenjohn, Pimpa, Motague and Qin (2016) confirm practical learning is an important aspect of leadership education, and curriculum is key to addressing the need for more effective leadership and better leadership education; also, available literature suggests there has been a struggle with the issue of

teaching leadership in business schools and designing curriculum that helps graduates develop into more competent leaders (Hay & Hodgkinson, 2005; Hobson et al., 2014).

Current Approach to Teaching Leadership

The current approach to teaching leadership, “what” we teach and “how” we approach leadership often develops around the discussion in differences related to the theoretical approaches, often accompanied by a discussion of ethics in leadership. Such leadership theories include, but are not limited to, trait theory, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, charismatic leadership, and situational leadership. The use of cases serves to provide applications to leadership situations (i.e., Yawson, 2014). Hobson et al. (2014) confirm that teachers often employ these approaches that are already well established, and in the US, there are few sources such as communities of practice to offer opportunities to develop and share best practices which may provide more practical and situational knowledge.

Development of Practical Skills

Hay and Hodgkinson (2005) and Muenjohn et al. (2015) propose that business schools need to improve the development of practical leadership skills and application of those skills; this suggests the need to develop a new approach to teaching leadership, as the current focus on leadership is traditionally based on these theoretical approaches - and this has remained unchanged for over 50 years (Gosling & Mintzberg, 2004). One of the issues with teaching theoretical leadership approaches is that it leaves students unprepared for practical application in a work situation. Another challenge is that much of the literature focused on teaching leadership tends to be somewhat dated with limited research available since 2010. A few exceptions are noted such as Hobson et al. (2014) and Muenjohn et al. (2015). As such, it is unclear how business curricula can be developed to improve leadership in students where there is such a clear lack of approaches, discussions, concepts and empirical information available to support the current business environment.

TEACHING LEADERSHIP THROUGH THEORY

A common approach to teaching leadership in curriculum is through theory. There are many leadership theories. Some of these theories may include but are not limited to trait theory, situational theory, transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, servant leadership and transactional leadership. For example, charismatic leadership and transformational leadership are popular approaches to the concept of leadership development, and although they are central to the field of study, they do little to support the skills and abilities needed to lead.

Inspiring a shared vision represents only one approach to leadership, whereas another approach is systems control thinking, which promotes a mechanistic view and focuses on designing and controlling work. This also implies that a manager works as an expert, controlling and motivating employees. (Hayes & Hodgkinson, 2005) This concept of leader as expert is a common approach, as are the myths about leadership being a unique ability that only a few possess. Many of the theories suggest that leadership may be based on manipulation, control and coercion to some extent and that good leaders are highly educated, yet none of these are necessarily true (Emulti et al,

2005). Ronald (2014) summarizes the “great man” concept which was at the beginning of trait theory in which individuals were determined to be natural born leaders, possessing unique traits others did not have. This was still supported by some scholars well into the 20th century, but those who believed leadership and leadership skills are naturally occurring traits in a few lucky individuals contradicts the basic assumption that people can be trained and learn (Emulti et al, 2005).

Because of the increasing gap in the demand for qualified and globally knowledgeable leaders, the current curricula and leadership focus which emphasizes concepts and theory does not work well. Emulti et al. (2005, p. 1022) describes this as “...fragmented functional based training” which lacks the holistic approach supported by Hayes and Hodgkinson (2005). An important element of the traditional approach to teaching leadership revolves around leadership theory. A few of these theories are discussed in the paper for purposes of comparison and to provide examples of traditional approaches to teaching leadership. These include trait theory, transformational theory, transactional theory, charismatic leadership, and situational leadership (Deluga, 1988; Kaul, 2013; McCleskey, 2014; McKnight, 2013) Each of these approaches has advantages and disadvantages.

For example, McCleskey (2014) notes the lack of internal consistency, inherent ambiguities and some contradictions in the concept of leadership, while also noting that no particular leadership style is universally effective. Differences in transformational and transactional leadership styles are explained by Deluga (1988) by defining transactional leadership as a bargaining process. Conversely, the process in transformational leadership emphasizes the cultivation of employee acceptance and the creation of inspiration. McKnight (2013) sees transformational leadership as the best approach to building consensus, uniting for a purpose, and maintaining sustainability. Dartley-Baah (2015) and Kaul (2013) bring mixed possibilities, because Kaul (2013) indicates there are positive and negative aspects to charismatic leadership, and Dartley-Baah (2015) proposes that a mix of transformational and transactional leadership theories may produce the best results. Kaul (2013) posits that charismatic leadership theory suggests that few individuals possess the necessary charismatic talents, thus implying that this is not a skill that can be developed. Taken together, these studies indicate a lack of consistency when discussing leadership.

Situational leadership (McCleskey, 2014) requires analysis and understanding of the situation followed by an appropriate response. More recently, servant leadership has emerged as another approach to leadership (i.e., Spears, 1996; Winston & Fields, 2014), which encompasses some aspects of transformational and transactional behaviors as well as other skills. Although charismatic leadership, as an example, is assumed to create low conflict, high consensus and high internal cohesion, Hayes and Hodgkinson (2005) suggest that the assumptions may be in question, because there is no consideration for the potential of conflicting goals, beliefs and purposes organizational members really hold and serious questions may exist about consensus and cohesion.

The Concept of Unitary Control

As noted earlier, traditional leadership focuses on systems control thinking as illustrated by Hay and Hodgkinson (2005). These authors argue against this approach, because this focuses primarily on leadership, thus implying a unitary organization as well as extraordinary status of the individual leader. This means others in the organization are neglected, because all the focus is on the

leadership processes and activities. Followership is not a concern in a systems control approach. This separation between leader and employees serves to elevate leadership and ignores multiple aspects of organizational life; consequently, the systems control approach as designed by leadership or management is problematic for multiple reasons.

Options to the MBA

One of the notable changes to higher business education in the last few decades includes additions of graduate business programs to include other options beyond the MBA, which offers limited exposure to leadership as noted (Hayes & Hodgkinson, 2005). The rise of specialized graduate programs in business has provided other options for leadership education as indicated by Symonds (2012), Smith-Barrow (2013), and Mellaki (2000) and offer alternatives to the MBA, for those interested for depth in specialized areas without the breadth of content typically offered by an MBA.

These other programs, such as the Master of Science (MSc), which is well known in Europe is acknowledged as a growing trend in UK business schools (Smedley, 2013) is one example; also, these programs exist in different countries and universities such as France, Germany, Spain and Italy, to include the Lyons business school in France and the Rotterdam School of Management at Erasmus University in the Netherlands. In North America, the Master of Science in Management (MSM) represents an example of a specialized degree that provides depth of knowledge in a specialized area. These more recent programs allow additional specialization and may be an integral component to developing effective leaders. As such, these should be part of the conversation about improving graduate business curriculum even though many of these programs are not yet addressed in the literature. Symonds (2014) lists a few different MSM programs in the US to include Northwestern University, Dartmouth, the University of Michigan, and Babson college as examples.

Lack of Results

Allio (2005) sees a lack of evidence that a course or program produces better leadership. This includes such well-known programs as those provided by the American Management Association, The Center for Creative Leadership and Outward Bound, as well as the National Order of Leadership School. Allio (2005) asks what these programs accomplished, and then explains that while these formal leadership programs may reinforce an individual's self-esteem and provide challenges, they do little to produce reliable, long-term change in conduct even though they may heighten the awareness of behavior in others.

Allio (2005) posits that the mastery of leadership activities requires experimentation and learning as well as practice, emphasizing that what is learned is not necessarily what is taught and educators must look at the limitations of current approaches to leadership development. Allio (2005) defines the role of competent and ethical leaders as "... Establishing and reinforcing the values and purpose, developing vision and strategies necessary to achieve vision, building the community necessary to implement strategies and initiating and managing the changes to assure survival and growth" (p. 1073). Doh (2003) sees leadership as a combination of skill and behavior, both of

which are necessary for effectiveness and can be learned; yet, there is a lack of literature and research to guide academia in curricular improvements.

Underlying Assumptions

Emulti et al. (2005) also suggest the current underlying assumption in most scholarly work is that people can grow, learn and change, and this enhances effectiveness. As previously noted, traditional management and leadership concepts contradict this concept if trait theory, charismatic theory, and aspects of other theories are supported. With the current speed of change, leaders and managers must also be engaged in continuous learning and developing themselves to stay relevant. In the years following organizations who experienced precipitous declines such as Arthur Anderson, Enron, WorldCom, and Lehman Brothers as well as other Wall Street notables, it is also appropriate to review the effectiveness of leadership based on some of these leadership failures and review how leadership education is currently developed and delivered to determine effectiveness.

Focus on the Individual

As noted earlier, traditional leadership approaches in business schools focus on the individual, as illustrated by Payette & Libertella (2011) who provide an example of a current approach to teaching in MBA programs. They offer insight and advice for emerging leaders rather than senior leadership. The authors introduce six general behavior categories, describe each in some detail, apply a behavior, and then draw conclusions. Payette & Libertella (2011) further explain the need to observe successful leaders and note what they have done to enhance their own careers, which includes but not limited to scanning company communications for clues about values and rewards to get a sense of leadership expectations. The six behaviors Payette & Libertella (2011) include: 1) get your career moving, 2) work hard to be noticed, 3) think about your decisions, 4) demonstrate broad-based knowledge, 5) ambition is good, and 6) going to work. This paper also assumes that MBAs have little to no real work experience and the approach is a self-focus, as opposed to a focus on improving the organization. A more realistic approach may assume more students in graduate school have some work experience, e.g., military students.

While this may be sound advice, such information is also very limiting in that there is little benefit to the organization involved, and focuses on the future career of the graduate rather than addressing current organizational issues relating to management and leadership. Gosling and Mintzberg (2004) support this, noting that MBA programs encourage only personal learning and that participants self-select to enter graduate programs to better develop personal talent which in turn demands a higher price. They explain that this may be why so many self-serving attitudes exist in management, as reflected in executive salaries. In contrast, NIST and The Baldrige Framework (2017) offer specific behaviors aligned with the Core values and concepts which are focused on the organization.

Product Specificity Requirement

A final challenge inherent to leadership education is the resistance within academia partly due for the demand for specific outcomes that are tangible results of leadership education. The current

curricula in leadership appears to fail in efforts to produce leadership required for dynamic business environment (Emulti et al, 2005).

THE CALL FOR CHANGES IN LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

The calls to restructure business curricula are found not only in North America and United Kingdom. Such calls are also found in Asia (Muenjohn et al. 2016). The need for change in leadership education is driven by globalization and an increasingly dynamic work environment. Emulti et al. (2005) propose a systemic approach in leadership education calling for a multidisciplinary approach, a global perspective, and strong ethics education that is integrated into functional areas. Allio (2005) also proposes a systemic approach which requires the development of leadership skills through practice to benefit organizations as opposed to focusing on the individual and the goals of the individual. This supports empowerment for employees as well as the process perspective.

Emulti et al. (2005) sees the need for a holistic approach which must have engagement and participation from employees and requires skills in analysis, oral and written communication and problem-solving. This also requires the development of interpersonal skills, developing strong business relationships, conflict management skills and cultural sensitivity. Practical business skills such as training and coaching are necessary, as are realistic experiential exercises to include case studies and real-time learning, such as using student work experiences, to develop technical, interpersonal and conceptual aspects as well as strategic thinking and decision-making. Internships and on-the-job training may be best positioned to meet this need (Emulti et al, 2005). Contrary to common assumptions, Hartman, Scott and Miguel (2015) determined that the ubiquitous use of case studies was not very effective as a personal development tool.

Hay and Hodgkinson (2005) propose that business schools need to improve in application and development of "practical" leadership skills. This may require us to conceptualize leadership differently, because leadership theories, in many ways, are of limited use for management educators and may be inconsistent with organizational goals.

An alternative way to look at leadership is proposed by the authors and that is to adopt a "process-relational" approach. This approach recognizes that everyone in organizational settings is continually seeking to make sense of conflicting purposes and goals. Looking at an organization in process and relational focus means that activity and meaning making are created by those in the organization based on their culture and their relationships. This also goes beyond the concept of managing and organizing work, and represents a way of acting and discussing organizing and managing which overall creates a larger framework and takes more into account such as subtle aspects of work behavior.

These approaches provide the concept of leadership more realistically than the approach of power and inspiration, and propose that someone focused on leadership should work alongside others. This is aligned with working through processes and moves away from a charismatic or transformational leader who may possess special insights or abilities, thus making leadership attainable for any employee (Hayes & Hodgkinson, 2005), also add how a process focus offers a

more realistic approach and focuses on leadership as emergent and including contributions of others.

Successful contemporary leadership practices focus on members of the organization as contributors, thus supporting the concept that leadership does not require an exceptional individual; instead, leadership requires a set of people who collaborate to perform leadership functions. This is a significant change from traditional leadership, whereby single individuals and their unique skills and behaviors are decision makers for an uninformed and un-involved set of followers. A leader does not have to be someone who has all these answers or the solutions. By engaging the knowledge and experience of employees, better solutions are likely to be available. Leadership should teach (Senge, 1990), and this includes learning how to ask the right questions. Such an approach moves the focus away from followers with a unitary leader and toward collaborators whose mission is to accomplish organizational goals. This means it is more effective to view leadership as a collaborative process accomplished through interaction that provides a more rational and grounded notion of leadership. Consequently, this presents additional opportunities and approaches for teaching leadership within the organization as part of the process improvement efforts.

Hay and Hodgkinson (2005) propose that the process perspective for leadership is more realistic for the challenges in today's organizations and can be far more helpful to those engaged in leadership roles and practices. This grounded concept of leadership proposes to move away from individualistic approaches on a single person who can influence followers and toward the concept where members of the organization can be contributors to the process of leadership. The long-term possibilities, where many can influence the survival of the organization to include communication, conflict resolution and other influencing and persuasive aspects, includes a focus on developing individuals through empowerment and participation. This focus of participation in an applied approach to leadership would draw on leadership experiences in the classroom, not only from the instructor but from the students, and can be reinforced through reflection and sense making.

Such an approach would require the leadership instructor to join the collaborative process of learning as opposed to remaining a part as an expert guide, helping others make sense as part of the new approach and new conception of leadership. This participative approach between the instructor and the students requires instructors to be interactive in the learning process as opposed to observers or those who only issues grades. This method involves the instructor and students sharing their experiences and observations either from practical experience or research, drawing from experience, where appropriate, to inform practices. These stories provide significant and powerful learning approaches to help with the critical examination of leadership.

Carson and King (2005) propose that leadership concepts must be better defined and understood so leaders can make positive contributions. They propose that more benefits can be attained through advancing and refining how we teach leadership and devote less time to studying traditional leadership. Carson and King (2005) also suggest we would be improving our teaching if we encouraged and used empowerment, because the 21st century has moved into flatter organizations with less hierarchy. Their proposal is to define leadership by one's ability to respond to empowered situations through self-leadership as opposed to focusing on traditional

characterizations which are historically found in hierarchical, traditional views of work in organizations.

Gosling and Mintzberg (2004) provided the structure around which updated curriculum should consider when reevaluating and developing new management education, and this includes seven tenants, some of which are discussed here. Gosling and Mintzberg (2004) suggest it should be focused on practicing managers, partly because the creation of managers does not occur in a classroom, but in the workplace. In addition, management education, while recognizing the importance of theory in cases, is still limited, and the focus should be on leveraging work and life experience. The emphasis should not be on teaching, but on learning.

Gosling and Mintzberg (2004) also emphasize that one of the most important aspects of learning is reflection. There is a need to reflect on experience which can be accomplished in a university setting. Finally, developing leadership abilities in employees should result in the development of organizations because of the organizational impact participants in these programs by diffusing what they learn into the organization and thus create change based on what they learned in the program. For education to create an impact such as this requires a significant departure from the way leadership and management are currently taught, and through all this education must be an interactive process through which reflection, theory and experience are engaged in the learning process.

Allio (2005) proposes that effective leadership programs focus on skill building to include rhetoric, critical thinking, communications and negotiation. He believes that these skills may be taught even though translating these into competent skills requires practice. Leadership also requires an understanding of the industry context market and economy as well as an understanding of the organization in which they work to include competencies, weaknesses, cultural biases and strengths. Cognitive processing is required to develop self-knowledge which can also be enhanced through feedback from others and personal reflection as well as learning from the experience of peers. As a result, leadership skills must be developed through positions like those of apprentices which provide opportunities to gain experience in a leadership role, learn from others and acquire the knowledge necessary for successful leadership. Mentoring and continuing feedback on performance must be provided, but this goes beyond case studies of hypothetical situations. In graduate education, it is not unusual for students to already have work experience which can be the basis of scenarios and analysis in the course curriculum.

INTEGRATING THE BALDRIGE FRAMEWORK INTO LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

Latham (2012) provides a framework based on the Baldrige Framework (National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], 2017) that allows for collaborative design of systems and processes which integrate appreciative inquiry, systems thinking, systems design and sustainability. The Framework has been updated and refined continually since its inception over 25 years ago and represents best practices and lessons learned from the various Malcom Baldrige National Quality Award recipients. By focusing on an applied, grounded approach to learning leadership through a process orientation, the Baldrige Excellence Framework (NIST, 2017) provides a systems approach that integrates leadership into the organization and places leadership and responsible and accountable roles for all the organizational processes through senior

leadership responsibilities, governance, societal responsibilities and the development and implementation of organizational strategy. These areas represent the first two Criteria of the processes and frame the key functions necessary for the rest of the Criteria to work effectively. The remaining Criteria include: Customers, Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management, Workforce, Operations, and Results. As suggested by Hayes and Hodgkinson (2005) and Allio (2005), a systematic process approach directly involves leadership in all aspects of the organization as well as requires participation from organizational members. This is an integral aspect of the Baldrige Framework, thus allowing opportunities to develop leadership skills for all members, experience in organizational processes and opportunities to contribute, thus providing additional opportunities to experience empowerment.

From a leadership perspective, the Framework (NIST, 2017) directs not only senior leadership behavior through the organizational governance system and the evaluation of senior leaders in the governance board, but it also focuses on legal and ethical behavior as well as societal responsibilities. The Strategy Criteria, which follows the Leadership Criteria, is driven by senior leadership and focuses on strategy development, the strategic planning process, work systems, core competencies, key strategic objectives and innovation. When using the Baldrige Framework as a leadership tool, the responsibilities and the Framework directs behavior by detailing key components necessary for process improvement, strategy development, workforce engagement and empowerment, operations and customer focus.

By examining the Baldrige Framework, Latham (2012) suggests that aspects of multiple leadership theories are integrated into the Framework, and may include elements of situational leadership, transformational leadership, servant leadership, and transactional leadership. Because the Framework is an applied model, this allows for application an organization in which students may be employed by examining different areas of the Framework and using work experiences to analyze and apply the model. Most importantly, the Framework allows for collaborative design of systems and processes between leadership and employees (Latham, 2012), thus providing opportunities for employees to develop and demonstrate leadership skills and abilities.

Participation in the processes allows employees to develop an understanding of the capabilities of empowerment, the processes in the organization as well as developing meaning and creating autonomy (Voegtlin, Boehm and Bruch, 2015). As Voegtlin et al. (2015) acknowledge, in a training environment, empowerment has an important psychological aspect that can make a positive contribution to employee development. Finally, Prybutok and Cutshall (2004) endorse the use of Baldrige as a leadership model, because their research clearly demonstrates the relationship between the executive leadership system and the Criteria in the Malcom Baldrige National Quality Award.

Of particular importance to leadership education is the Baldrige requirement for continuous feedback. Executives who lead companies that have received the Baldrige Award indicated they were especially pleased with the feedback they received (Hamilton, 2003). The expectation for feedback is one of the criteria that Conger (1992) gave as essential to leader education. Continuous feedback throughout a leadership education program is essential to successful education. In the table below, methods of deploying the Baldrige criteria in a meaningful manner to guide leader education are suggested. These examples indicate how Conger's expectations for leader

development can be met while taking advantage of the Baldrige framework. The Baldrige Leadership criteria are presented in italics while examples of student assignments are in the adjacent column. These examples were chosen, because they can be used in most leader education courses.

Table 1: Application of Baldrige Leadership Criteria 1 to provide a framework for higher education leadership programs to enact the Baldrige Criteria.

Criteria	Criteria Expectations	Student actions to enact Baldrige criteria
<p>1.1 (a 1) Setting Vision and Values</p>	<p><i>Promote the vision and values with the workforce frequently and consistently; connect the values with day-to-day activities for employees at all levels.</i></p>	<p>Students are required to study and assess vision and values or organizations in operations as a segue to writing both visions and values as part of a larger plan for change. Mission development includes integration of values while vision provides focus for strategy development. Personal missions support personal growth in students (Hartman, Allen, & Miguel, 2015) and support internalizing values of individuals. The assignment meet’s Conger’s (1992) expectation for personal growth.</p>
<p>1.1 (a 2) Promoting Legal and Ethical Behavior</p>	<p><i>Be a consistent role model for legal and ethical behavior; expect the same of the employees and remind them frequently. Consistently support a code of conduct (behavior) and ethical standards so these become common knowledge, and have processes to review noncompliance incidences to learn what needs to be further addressed; include these in future training. Recognize employee examples of ethical behavior and share the stories.</i></p>	<p>Students are given a working code of conduct which guides all actions throughout the educational program. Values are clearly stated, and students give examples of how they play out the values. Because lecture and case studies are not associated with personal growth (Hartman et al., 2015) , any lecture must be short and well developed, providing focused knowledge. Talking about being a model is less effective than being a model. This assignment speaks to Conger’s (1992) leader development expectation of personal growth.</p>

<p>1.1 (b) Communication</p>	<p><i>Establish and encourage direct conversations with employees at all levels to hear their ideas; involve them in decision-making, use their ideas to improve the organization at all levels; encourage them to share comments, especially about how to improve customer satisfaction. Share the rationale for decisions especially as it relates to organizational values, goals and mission.</i></p> <p><i>Be the voice of change, and remind employees about the reason change is needed; invite them to be part of the change. This include changes to all areas of the organization not limited to policies, guidelines, procedures, and processes. Reinforce change as a necessary effort to align mission, goals, and values. Develop systems of obtaining feedback from customers, employees and all stakeholders to help inform decision-making and strategic planning.</i></p> <p><i>Become directly involved to motivate the workforce, encouraging high performance focused on the customer; participate in reward and recognition programs personally, making sure these are aligned with organizational values, the mission, and the goals.</i></p>	<p>Role play provides students an opportunity to experience different perspectives. One such role play, “China From the Inside,” can be found at Merlot.org as a learning object. This assignment speaks to Conger’s (1992) leader development expectation of conceptual understanding.</p> <p>To enact the “voice of change” expectation for leaders, students complete a change plan for an organization currently in operations. The plan includes a comprehensive analysis of both internal and external environments, and includes a fully developed implementation plan. The plan is fully aligned with organizational mission, values, and goals. This plan focuses on building leader knowledge and skills.</p> <p>To internalize the leadership challenge of motivating others, students read historical leaders and discern the approach used by those leaders to motivate others, all within context. This provides a background for essays that address specific questions about the nature of leadership. This assignment addresses Conger’s (1992) leader education expectation of conceptual understanding.</p> <p>Students work in teams to complete improvement plans that address teams that are currently in operations. This assignment includes team contracts, improvement plan, communication plan, and presentation of written work.</p>
-------------------------------------	--	--

<p>1.1 (c1) Mission and Organizational Performance</p> <p>Creating an Environment for Success</p>	<p><i>Create an environment in which the organization can be agile and achieve the mission. Support employee learning and development; encourage intelligent risk-taking and support efforts that lead to innovation. Do not punish failure; instead, support efforts that align with the mission and the goals to encourage employee participation.</i></p> <p><i>Establish a culture in the workforce that encourages employees to engage with customers in positive ways and learn how to satisfy customers.</i></p> <p><i>Develop and train employees to be leaders regardless of what they do in the organization; prepare employees to take over leadership positions by encouraging them to make positive contributions to the organization in all areas.</i></p>	<p>Developing a full bodied quality initiative grounded in the Baldrige framework for an organization currently in operations allows students to move from the classroom to the workroom. This assignment requires a well aligned approach to problem solving. These assignments also create a link between school and work when they are forwarded, after corrections, to the operations. This speaks to Conger’s (1992) expectation for feedback, both giving and receiving. This also provides a significant source for service learning (Hartman et al., 2015).</p> <p>Assessing culture of an organization currently in operations using a tool such as Johnson and Scholes’s (1997) Cultural Web contributes to a deep understanding of the complexity of culture.</p> <p>Both presentations and small group work are beneficial to develop skill building and personal growth (Hartman et al., 2015) toward preparing a leader to develop and train others.</p>
<p>1.1 (c 2) Creating a Focus on Action</p>	<p><i>Provide a clear focus on actions that improve organizational performance; identify the necessary actions, create value, balance the needs of customers and stakeholders. Demonstrate personal accountability for organizational actions.</i></p>	<p>Completing a comprehensive strategic plan enacts this criterion. At the heart of this assignment is a comprehensive set of diagnostics that includes both internal and external analysis. This is not a simple SWOT analysis. This is a full bodied analysis built on Daft’s (1995) model of the external environment as well as the use of multiple tools to assess internal structure, technology, paradigm, culture, and organizational functions. This is not a small piece of work. This assignment goes to Conger’s 1992) leader development expectation of skill building.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS

The literature is clear on recommendations, and the authors of this paper strongly recommend that we act on these recommendations. To summarize, addressing the issues currently in graduate leadership education requires a focus in multiple directions. This means changing not only what we teach, but also how we approach the concept of developing effective leaders – moving from a traditional systems control perspective and a focus on the individual to one of process improvement from an organizational systems perspective. Underlying assumptions on which traditional leadership approaches are based, to include leadership effectiveness as defined by Senge (1990), call for leadership to be teachers, designers and stewards.

The teaching required in organizations also assumes that employees are capable of learning, participating and learning how to act with empowerment. This implies the need to minimize theory that separates leadership from employees. This also implies unique abilities or traits can be developed and makes the argument for a collaborative approach to leadership. This does not eliminate the need for organizational leadership as indicated by the Baldrige Framework (2017), but, instead, emphasizes the critical nature of leadership functions at the highest level through teaching, designing and strong stewardship to the organization. This also supports the need to develop employees, so they can meet the demands necessary to participate in leadership and be empowered to make contributions to organizational processes and life.

At an application level, and to provide the practice necessary for effective leadership, faculty need to develop ways to practice, rather than relying on hypothetical cases that are commonly used for teaching purposes. We recommend contacting businesses in the community to offer help as one way to further the impact of a leadership program. At the same time, faculty need to provide continuous feedback to both students and program directors about the impact of such programs. The holistic approach called for in the literature not only applies to developing leadership, but it applies to improving organizations. Increasing opportunities to practice and apply leadership skills benefits students as well as employers, and this holistic approach is explained and detailed in the Baldrige Framework (2017).

Perhaps unique to graduate education is the work experience that many students bring with them, as the numbers of non-traditional students continues to grow. This work experience provides significant opportunities to reflect on those work experiences and apply leadership concepts and analysis which are more meaningful, because the students have experienced the advantages, questionable outcomes and, sometimes, abject failures of leadership that can serve as important discussions in the course and as lessons for others as well as opportunities to understand what went well, what could have been better, and why.

While we must begin immediately, it is unlikely everything that needs to be done can be accomplished initially. Two key areas mentioned in the literature that are necessary for good leadership involve how to empower employees and how to use reflective approach to improve leadership. Aleksic (2016) draws attention to the role of followers as part of the organizational leadership process, and the need to adjust leadership styles and develop the roles of followers so they can actively participate in the leadership process. This would mean moving employees away from the traditional “follower” approach to providing opportunities to exert influence and

participation in the leadership process. This supports the servant leader approach, and supports the achievement of mutual trust and developing a relationship with the leader.

This also opens possibilities for creativity and taking initiative. Aleksic (2016) also explains that leadership processes are not permanent structures but represent a temporary balance of power connected with specific situations and should imply rotation of roles, but more literature is needed to address how these relationships develop and can be implemented. Muenjohn et al (2015) propose that curriculum is the basis for success and that curriculum design is not yet developed to properly use reflective practice of knowledge. Introducing reflection as part of the leadership process to consider what went well, and what can be improved is part of a continuous improvement cycle supported by the Baldrige Framework (2017). If we do not reflect and learn from what we have accomplished, it's not clear how we can make improvements going forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The time is now for higher education to explore and implement new ways to approach leadership education in colleges of business. Theory alone is inadequate, and students are lacking skills and abilities necessary to be effective leaders, because education often leaves them without experience, practice, application and reflection. Without changes in the way we approach leader education and allied concepts, we cannot realistically expect changes. Because organizations and researchers have asked for change, it behooves academia to answer this call. The development of new graduate business programs is ongoing to address specific needs, and the authors of this paper argue that leadership is necessary across all the programs and should be part of the consideration for every new program. Until organizations can demonstrate effective leadership, this effort should continue as will the myriad problems that result from poor leadership. Along with this call for improved leader education, we also, like others, want to emphasize the importance of developing criteria and measures related to what constitutes effective leadership based on organizational needs. Without goals that clearly specify what must be accomplished, goal attainment is unlikely to be met.

While some graduate business students can reflect on their personal experiences, and these experiences can be integrated into the classroom to provide learning opportunities for everyone, it is especially important to provide such opportunities for students who have yet to establish a career and gain the experience necessary to understand why effective leadership is so important, what effective leadership looks and feels like, and what it takes to be an effective leader. If we cannot step up and meet this challenge, our organizations will continue to suffer from underperformance. Because the Baldrige Framework (2017) provides a roadmap to an organizational focus through process improvement, we can develop practitioners with useful knowledge, skills and abilities toward improving organizational lives for all when lead by those who can apply this powerful perspective.

REFERENCES

- Aleksic, V. S. (2016). Followers in the organizational leadership process: from attribution to shared leadership. *Ekonomski Horizonti*, 18(2), 135-148.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.troy.edu/10.5937/ekonhor1602139S>

- Allio, R. J. (2005). Leadership development: Teaching versus learning. *Management Decision*, 43(7), 1071-1077.
- Carson, C. M., & King, J. E., Jr. (2005). Leaving leadership: Solving leadership problems through empowerment. *Management Decision*, 43(7), 1049-1053.
- Collins, J., & Powell, S. (2004). Spotlight: The characteristics of level 5 leadership. *Management Decision*, 42(5), 709-716.
- Collins, J. (2005, July). Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review*, 83, 136-146.
- Collinson, D., & Tourish, D. (2015). Teaching leadership critically: New directions for leadership pedagogy. Published online before print January 12, 2015. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 14(4), 576-594. doi: 10.5465/amle.2014.0079
- Conger, J. (1992). *Learning to Lead: The Art of Transforming Managers into Leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Daft, R. L. (1995). *Organizational Theory and Design*. Eagan, MN: West Publishing Corp.
- Dartey-Baah, K. (2015). Resilient leadership: A transformational-transactional leadership mix. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 6(1), 99-112.
- Deluga, R. J. (1988). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies. *Group & Organization Studies*, 13(4), 456.
- Doh, J. (2003). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives from management educators. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(1), 54-67. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2003.9324025
- Gosling, J., & Mintzberg, H. (2004). The education of practicing managers. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 45(4), 19-22.
- Hartman, N. S., Scott, S. J., & Miguel, R. F. (2015). An exploration of teaching methods used to develop leaders: Leadership educators' perceptions. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 36(5), 454-472.
- Hay, A., & Hodgkinson, M. (2006). Rethinking leadership: A way forward for teaching leadership? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(1), 144-158.
- Hobson, C. J., Strupeck, D., Griffin, A., Szostek, J., & Rominger, A. S. (2014). Teaching MBA students teamwork and team leadership skills: An empirical evaluation of A classroom educational program. *American Journal of Business Education (Online)*, 7(3), 191-n/a.

- Holten, A., Bøllingtoft, A., & Wilms, I. (2015). Leadership in a changing world: Developing managers through a teaching and learning programme. *Management Decision*, 53(5), 1107-1124.
- Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (1997). *Exploring Corporate Strategy* (4th ed.) Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Kaul, N. (2013). Charismatic leadership: Blessing or curse? *International Journal on Leadership*, 1(2), 11-17.
- McKnight, L. L. (2013). Transformational leadership in the context of punctuated change. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 10(2), 103-112.
- Mellahi, K. (2000). The teaching of leadership on UK MBA programmes: A critical analysis from an international perspective. *The Journal of Management Development*, 19(3), 297-308.
- Muenjohn, N., Pimpa, N., Montague, A., & Qin, J. (2016). Developing Leadership Curriculum for Business Education Program in Asia. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 50(5), 443-451.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (2017). *Baldrige Excellence Framework*. The US Department of Commerce, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA. Retrieved from <https://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/baldrige-excellenceframework/businessnonprofit>
- Payette, D. L., & Libertella, A. F. (2011). Nascent leadership behaviors. *American Journal of Business Education*, 4(6), 19-34.
- Prybutok, V., & Cutshall, R. (2004). Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award leadership model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 104(7), 558-566.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.
- Smedley, T. (2012). Fast Masters. *People Management*, p. 49-52.
- Smith-Barrow, D. (2013, April 25). Decide Between an MBA and a MS at business school. Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/top-business-schools/articles/2013/04/25/decide-between-an-mba-and-ms-at-business-school>
- Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(7), 33-35.
- Symonds, M. (2012, October 8). The Big Thing: Specialized Business Degrees. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2012-10-08/the-next-big-thing-specialized-%09business-degrees>

- Symonds, M. (2014). The rise and fall of the Masters in Management. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mattsymonds/2014/05/20/the-rise-and-rise-of-the-masters-in-management/#6faeb9f86fae>
- Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413-434.
- Yawson, R. M. (2014). The theory and practice of case-in-point teaching of organizational leadership. *American Journal of Management*, 14(1), 72-81.

QRBD

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF BUSINESS DISCIPLINES

November 2017

Volume 4
Number 3



A JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF BUSINESS DISCIPLINES
SPONSORED BY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
ISSN 2334-0169 (print)
ISSN 2329-5163 (online)