

9-28-2020

## Training and Development of Instructor-Leadership: An Instructional Systems Design Approach

Paul T. Balwant

*The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine*, paul.balwant@sta.uwi.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/jhstrp>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Training and Development Commons](#)

Tell us how this article helped you.

---

### Recommended Citation

Balwant, Paul T. (2020) "Training and Development of Instructor-Leadership: An Instructional Systems Design Approach," *Journal of Human Services: Training, Research, and Practice*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 1 , Article 3. Available at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/jhstrp/vol6/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Human Services: Training, Research, and Practice* by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu](mailto:cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu).

### **Abstract**

A body of research on instructors' use of leadership behaviors in higher education teaching, often called instructor-leadership, is gaining momentum. Despite the field's growth, the practical recommendations emerging from empirical investigations of instructor-leadership remain largely underdeveloped. In particular, the most popular practical implication – training and development of instructor-leadership – is given fleeting attention. In light of this, the present paper aims to provide detailed guidelines on the training and development of instructor-leadership by drawing from both the instructor-leadership and training and development bodies of literature. In so doing, this paper utilizes the instructional systems design approach to provide guidelines according to assessment, design, implementation, and evaluation.

## **Training and Development of Instructor-Leadership: An Instructional Systems Design Approach**

Leadership can be defined as a process of intentional influence over others to direct them towards a goal (Yukl, 2006). Leadership researchers have examined this influence process in various contexts, e.g., corporations, military, politics, and education (Judge et al., 2004; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Wang et al., 2011). In the education context, researchers have examined a concept referred to as instructor-leadership (Balwant, 2016; Dawson et al., 1972). In this paper, I focus on one perspective of instructor-leadership in which instructors act as leaders of students in a higher education course context. I describe the literature on this perspective of instructor-leadership and bridge the gap between that field of research and the training and development literature. In so doing, I outline a training and development program that can be utilized by higher education institutions (HEIs) to enhance the instructional leadership of their faculty.

### **Literature Review**

Instructor-leadership (sometimes referred to as teacher-leadership) is rooted in educational reform initiatives in the 1980s (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Varying definitions of instructor-leadership exist, and these can be tied to the evolution of the concept across four waves (Silva et al., 2000). In the first wave, instructor-leadership focused on enhancing the functioning of educational institutions (Evans, 2001). Here, instructors were regarded as leaders only when they occupied formal roles such as department head, dean, professor, course/program coordinator, union representative, etc. These formal leadership roles placed instructors in ‘managerial’ positions to enhance the effectiveness and efficiencies of the educational system (Silva et al., 2000). However, this limited view of instructor-leadership was borne out of an era that emphasized centralization of authority to formal policymakers rather than the empowerment

of instructors, and thus tended to ‘neuter’ instructors’ creativity and motivation (Frymier, 1987). The importance of such formal leadership in the first wave has been increasingly de-emphasized in the second and third waves.

The second wave of instructor-leadership regarded instructors as leaders when they possessed instructional expertise (Silva et al., 2000). In this wave, instructor-leaders were those who assumed positions that harnessed their instructional knowledge, e.g., staff developers, staff mentors, and curriculum developers (Silva et al., 2000). Therefore, this wave represented a shift away from formal power (i.e., ‘managerial’ positions) to expert power (i.e., pedagogical expertise) (Silva et al., 2000). But, instructor-leaders who held these specialist roles did not necessarily work full-time in the same institution of those whom they were influencing (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Moreover, these leaders created generalizable pedagogical packages (e.g., texts and manuals) for classroom educators, which led to the ‘remote controlling’ of instructors (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Overall, in this second wave, instructors' formal roles are not the focus, but instructor-leaders still had some level of control and influence via their expertise in curriculum development and instructional design (Pounder, 2006).

The third wave of instructor-leadership describes instructors as creators of a collaborative school culture that promotes continuous learning. This third wave diverges significantly from formal roles, and instead advocates instructors as contributing meaningful cultural changes to their institutions' goals, structure, and norms (Silva et al., 2000). In other words, instructor-leadership here is seen as ‘anti-hierarchical’ because leadership responsibility is distributed across educators (Cooper, 1993; Silva et al., 2000). Some specifics of this third wave include exemplary classroom instruction and pedagogical practice (Harris & Muijs, 2003; Sherrill, 1999), mentoring and coaching of colleagues (Berry & Ginsburg, 1990; Harris & Muijs, 2003;

Sherrill, 1999), decision making at the school-level (Berry & Ginsburg, 1990), modelers of learning and teaching (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Harris & Muijs, 2003), and involvement in professional development (Berry & Ginsburg, 1990; Harris & Muijs, 2003). These characteristics of the third wave suggest that an instructor-leader is someone who guides and structures administrative and educational tasks and, in so doing, intentionally influences institutional processes and student achievement (Witziers et al., 2003). Furthermore, in the third wave of instructor-leadership research, instructor-leaders' exemplary teaching quality is regarded as positively influencing colleagues' teaching practices via the mentoring of colleagues, encouraging colleagues to experiment with powerful learning activities to improve students' knowledge and understanding, and/or leading colleagues through professional growth activities (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Wasley, 1991). Therefore, instructor-leaders 'slide the doors open' to facilitate collaboration with their colleagues, and thus colleagues are regarded as the instructor-leader's followers (Silva et al., 2000).

Although the third wave of instructor-leadership is considered to be the current line of thinking, it is sensible to extend such leadership to higher education course/classroom interactions. In this view, students are regarded as followers to instructors. In all three waves of instructor-leadership research, none of the conceptualizations of instructor-leadership explicitly state that students are followers (Silva et al., 2000). However, the third wave of instructor-leadership alludes to the notion that instructors' behaviors can impact student outcomes (Silva et al., 2000). As described by Leithwood and Duke (1999), instructor-leadership "typically focuses on the behaviors of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students" (p. 261, emphasis added). These behaviors may entail the effective use of pedagogical techniques to influence student-related outcomes (Silva et al., 2000).

Building on this pedagogical aspect of the third wave, Pounder (2006) asserts that a fourth wave of instructor-leadership should showcase instructors using leadership approaches in their classroom interactions with students. Therefore, the fourth wave of instructor-leadership extracts a component of the third wave and changes the perspective from an instructor's colleagues as followers to students as followers. In higher education courses, instructors influence students primarily in classroom interactions (sometimes referred to as 'classroom leadership') but may also influence students in other course-related interactions, e.g., office meetings and informal discussions after class. While the third wave of instructor-leadership research gradually replaced the first and second waves, this fourth wave of instructor-leadership research continues alongside the third wave. As such, the third wave can be considered a vertical shift in perspective that succeeded the first and second waves, whereas the fourth wave is a horizontal shift in perspective that exists concomitantly with the third wave of research e.g., Balwant, 2016; Wenner & Campbell, 2017).

From this fourth-wave perspective, instructor-leadership can be defined as "a process whereby instructors exert intentional influence over students to guide, structure and facilitate activities and relationships" (Balwant, 2016, p. 21). Research on instructor-leadership has focused primarily on transformational leadership with an emerging body of research on destructive leadership (Balwant, 2016, 2017). Transformational instructor-leadership refers to an instructor "who guides students towards a [course's] learning objectives, stimulates students intellectually and pays attention to the differences between students" (Balwant et al., 2018, p. 2). Destructive instructor-leadership refers to "an instructor's sustained and volitional use of harmful behavior that involves the (a) use of harmful methods of influence in the process of leading

students toward a goal and/or (b) encouragement of students towards a goal that is contradictory to the HEI's interests" (Balwant, 2017, p. 16).

Studies of transformational and destructive instructor-leadership have generally examined antecedents and consequences of instructor-leadership behaviors (Balwant, 2016; Balwant et al., 2019). Some studies even investigate mediators and moderators in the instructor-leadership causal chain, thus indicating that the field is beginning to mature (Balwant et al., 2018). However, even with the maturity in the instructor-leadership literature, little has been said about how to train and develop instructor-leadership behaviors. Specifically, studies of instructor-leadership often conclude with either a closing note that researchers need to determine how to implement such leadership in the classroom (e.g., Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009) or brief general guidelines for training or 'un-training' specific leader behaviors (e.g., Balwant et al., 2018, 2019). The reason for these broad suggestions is that these studies empirically examine relationships between instructor-leadership and other concepts, and thus detailed training and development (T&D) guidelines go beyond the scope of these works. In light of this superficial treatment of T&D in the instructor-leadership literature, this paper aims to connect the literature on training and development to that of the instructor-leadership literature to provide specific and clear guidelines for training and developing instructor-leadership.

### **Description of the Instructor-Leadership T&D Program**

The instructor-leadership T&D program is based on the Training and Human Resource Development Process Model by Desimone and Werner (2006). The model is often described as the instructional systems design (ISD) approach. The ISD approach is the basis of almost all system models of training and is the most widely used approach for developing a systematic training program (Allen, 2006). I use the ISD approach to develop the instructor-leadership T&D program because the application of this approach has led to consistent improvements in the quality and effectiveness of instruction, delivery-time efficiency, and cost (Allen, 2006; Dick et al., 2005). The ISD approach is divided into four phases, including assessment, design, implementation, and evaluation. In this section, I describe the general literature for each phase of the ISD approach, and, for each phase, I outline practical guidelines for HEIs concerning the proposed T&D program.

#### ***Needs Assessment***

A needs assessment is a critical component in the success of any leadership training program (Alimo-Metcalfe & Lawler, 2001). Need “refers to a discrepancy or gap between what an organization expects to happen and what actually occurs” (DeSimone & Werner, 2006, p. 130 original emphases). For instance, regarding instructor-leadership, a discrepancy exists if an instructor is expected to give feedback on set work, but instead returns students' assessments with a mark and nothing else. A discrepancy or performance deficiency forms the basis for training or human resource development needs. Needs can exist at three levels, including strategic/organization, task, and person.



***Strategic/Organization Analysis.*** Organization analysis is a "'whole system' view of the organization and what it is trying to accomplish" (DeSimone & Werner, 2006, p. 132). There are two factors of an organizational analysis that should be identified. First, an awareness of organizational resources that can be directed towards human resource development efforts is useful. Such resources include money, materials, and facilities. Most HEIs (barring online-only HEIs) have access to classroom facilities and training materials such as projectors or printing paper. Second, the organizational climate should be considered beforehand to determine potential issues that may arise in training. For instance, level of trust between the different ranks, including principal, deans, heads of department, and professors. The climate can affect whether instructors transfer training back to the classroom (Lim & Morris, 2006).

The methods of conducting an organization analysis depend on the organization and its availability of data sources (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). In the higher education context, one can consider the following data sources.

1. *HEI's goals and objectives.* Link the human resource development program to the HEI's strategy and mission and ensure that this link is communicated to deans, heads of department, and instructors. This link can make instructors aware of their connection to the organizational goals, thus fostering support for human resource development efforts.
2. *Human resource inventories.* If an HEI maintains human resource inventories, it can provide a demographic database for the scope of training required.
3. *Student feedback surveys.* Many HEIs use some form of student feedback to gauge instructors' effectiveness in the classroom. Instructor-leadership questions can be incorporated into these feedback instruments to gauge instructors' use of transformational

instructor-leadership in the classroom. Also, the use of open-ended questions may identify students' complaints that may be indicative of destructive instructor-leadership.

**Task Analysis.** Task analysis is a “systematic collection of data about a specific job or group of jobs ... to determine what an employee should be taught to perform the job at the desired level” (Moore & Dutton, 1978, p. 533). Task analysis for the instructor-leadership T&D program can be conducted in two steps. First, identify teaching tasks of instructors through a job description and/or other task identification methods such as time sampling, job inventory questionnaires, etc. Second, describe teaching standards based on the behaviors established in the instructor-leadership literature, i.e., three transformational leadership dimensions and three destructive leadership dimensions which are explained later on (Balwant et al., 2018, 2019).

**Person Analysis.** Person analysis focuses on “the training needs of the individual employee” (DeSimone & Werner, 2006, p. 146). For the instructor-leadership T&D program, an instructor's person analysis should consist of two components: a summary person analysis and a diagnostic person analysis. Summary person analysis entails an overall evaluation of the instructor's teaching performance and provides output regarding whether or not they are using transformational instructor-leadership or destructive instructor-leadership behaviors. Instructors who use transformational instructor-leadership behaviors can generally be regarded as successful performers, whereas those not using transformational instructor-leadership and/or using destructive instructor-leadership behaviors can be regarded as unsuccessful performers. Diagnostic person analysis determines why instructors' behaviors occur. A primary source for both components of person analysis is performance appraisal.

Performance appraisal of instructors' teaching is typically based primarily on students' perceptions of instructors' teaching practices. As such, student feedback surveys can provide a

useful benchmarking instrument from which to evaluate transformational instructor-leadership behaviors. The use of a benchmarking instrument results in a profile of the instructor's strengths and weaknesses with regards to transformational instructor-leadership. As mentioned in the organization analysis, a subset of these surveys can be re-designed at the organizational level to incorporate the question items from established instructor-leadership questionnaires. Destructive instructor-leadership behaviors may also be uncovered in these questionnaires but can also be sourced from heads of department or other instructors who receive students' complaints.

Given that destructive instructor-leadership behaviors are likely to go unnoticed (Boice, 1996), trained and/or independent observers may need to be used to uncover such behaviors. The use of observers is essential for external evaluation of instructors because these observers can note instructor behaviors in a fairly unbiased manner (Boice, 1996). Trained and/or independent observers are typically implemented in HEIs via three models: an evaluation model, a developmental model, and a peer-review model (Gosling, 2002). For the evaluation model, a senior faculty member can observe an instructor engaging in destructive instructor-leadership behaviors, and then provide a report on teaching performance (Gosling, 2002). For the developmental model, the only difference to the evaluation model is that an educational developer or expert instructor can be used as the observer, i.e., expert power rather than position power (Gosling, 2002). While both the evaluation and developmental models may be appropriate for uncovering destructive instructor-leadership behaviors, these strategies can lead to resistance by academic staff if they question the objectivity of the observer and/or believe that such observation limits academic freedom (Keig & Waggoner, 1995).

The third peer-review model involves instructors observing each other in a reciprocal process, and thus minimizes power differences and potential resistance from academic staff

(Siddiqui et al., 2007). The peer-review model aims to provide a safe space to engage in discussions about teaching and provide an opportunity for self-reflection (Gosling, 2002). Peers can provide non-judgemental feedback on instructors' leadership behaviors in the classroom (Gosling, 2002). While the peer-review model can minimize resistance to the use of observers, the peer-observers need to be (a) debriefed on how to identify destructive instructor-leadership behaviors via the use of an instrument for the observation session(s) and (b) trained in peer observation techniques (Siddiqui et al., 2007; Sullivan et al., 2012). For further guidelines on implementing peer review observation of teaching in a meaningful manner that encourages questioning, reflection, and teaching improvements (e.g., Siddiqui et al., 2007). Empirical research shows that the peer-review model of observation is viewed as non-threatening and valuable, encourages instructors to change their teaching, improves the quality of teaching, and enhances professional development (Bell & Mladenovic, 2008; Donnelly, 2007; Kohut et al., 2007; Sullivan et al., 2012).

To supplement peer observation of teaching, instructors with teaching deficiencies can be interviewed to obtain their perspective on what needs to be learned. This strategy can motivate instructors to direct efforts towards learning (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). Such interviews also provide valuable insight into the reasons for instructors' discrepancies in behaviors. Practically, interviews can be conducted by the instructor's department head (typically the immediate supervisor in a corporate context) because it is the head's responsibility to do so (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). For a comprehensive person assessment, the department head must then incorporate interview data with other sources of data, e.g., student feedback surveys, to determine instructors' developmental needs (DeSimone & Werner, 2006).

For any identified discrepancy in instructor-leader behaviors, information from organization, task, and person analysis should be integrated to determine why the discrepancy exists (Herbert & Doverspike, 1990). Discrepancies in behavior may result from internal factors such as a motivational deficiency or a deficiency in knowledge, skills, and/or abilities or external factors such as lack of support, outdated or inadequate equipment, adverse conditions, or obstructive work rules (Herbert & Doverspike, 1990). If deficiencies are due to internal factors, especially knowledge; skills; and/or ability deficiencies, then training and development should proceed to the other stages of the process.

### **Design and Implementation**

The design and implementation of the instructor-leadership T&D program should adhere to certain key activities including setting objectives, selecting the trainer or vendor, selecting training methods and media, and scheduling the training program (DeSimone & Werner, 2006).

### ***Setting Objectives***

An objective is a collection of words intended to inform trainees what the trainer intends to achieve (Mager, 1997). Objectives should be outcome-based and depend on discovered deficiencies from the needs assessment phase. Instructors' deficiency in their use of transformational instructor-leadership may range from one dimension to all three dimensions. However, it is unrealistic to expect that all instructors can adopt all constructive instructor-leadership behaviors. A reality that has to be faced is that instructors are limited in the breadth of their repertoire of teaching methods (Bourner, 1997). In recognition of this challenge, the three transformational instructor-leadership dimensions and three destructive instructor-leadership dimensions are divided into short courses in this program. The use of separate courses allows for instructors to attend training where needed, rather than pushing their teaching repertoire beyond

their natural limits by training or un-training a combination of dimensions simultaneously. For each of the six short courses below, the objectives are created using (a) Mager's (1997) suggestions for preparing instructional objectives and (b) the extant literature and surveys used in the instructor-leadership literature (Balwant, 2016; Balwant et al., 2019).

*Course 1: Idealized influence and inspirational motivation.* Idealized influence and inspirational motivation refer to communication-oriented behaviors that are exceptionally articulate and persuasive, and such behaviors are used to direct followers towards a future that is presented as appealing (Balwant et al., 2018; Yukl, 2006). Objectives include:

1. Earn students' respect by using behaviors that make them proud to be associated with you.
2. Show genuine concern for students' progress.
3. Share enthusiasm about the subject with students.
4. Display power and confidence when teaching.
5. Reflect on the moral consequences of decisions made in the course.
6. Talk optimistically to students about their future so that they look forward to applying course material when the course has been completed.
7. Display confidence that the course's objectives can be accomplished.

*Course 2: Intellectual stimulation.* Intellectual stimulation involves the use of behaviors that enhance followers' ways of thinking so that they can better analyze problems and develop solutions and strategies to deal with these problems (Balwant et al., 2018; Yukl, 2006).

Objectives include:

1. Use verbal and nonverbal communication to acknowledge students' opinions for solving course-related problems.

2. Show students how to see a problem from different angles.
3. Talk about various approaches to completing course-related assignments.
4. Teach in a manner that helps students to think about the evidence underpinning different views.
5. Encourage students to rethink their understanding of certain aspects of the subject for which they may have preconceived misconceptions.

*Course 3: Consideration.* Consideration involves supportive and encouraging behaviors in which followers' needs are sometimes given special attention (Balwant et al., 2018; Yukl, 2006). Objectives include:

1. Treat each student as an individual entity with unique personal needs, abilities, and aspirations in learning, rather than using a broad-brush approach.
2. Show a willingness to provide students with help outside of class
3. Be patient in explaining course content that appears difficult for students to grasp.
4. Give students feedback on set work so that it clarifies things they may not fully understand.
5. Give students feedback on set work that can help to improve their ways of learning and/or studying.

*Course 4: Callous communication.* Callous communication describes harmful communication actions used by the instructor (Balwant et al., 2019). Objectives include:

1. Refrain from using hostile, rude, aggressive, intimidating, arrogant, or harsh words or actions towards students in all settings, e.g., in the presence of other students, when students do not know the answer to a question, private meetings, etc.

2. In giving directions to students, avoid using too many words with negative connotations, e.g., threats and words like 'don't'.
3. Refrain from using facial expressions that indicate disinterest in students.
4. Refrain from giving students the silent treatment.

*Course 5: Victimization.* Victimization describes instructor behaviors that involve harassing or picking on students (Balwant et al., 2019). Objectives include:

1. Refrain from invading students' privacy.
2. Do not blame students to save yourself embarrassment.
3. Do not express anger at students, especially when angry for another reason.
4. Avoid rude behavior toward students.
5. Avoid making negative comments about students to others.

*Course 6: Irresponsibility.* Irresponsibility refers to behaviors that are unscrupulous and deceptive (Balwant et al., 2019). Objectives include:

1. Refrain from using threats toward students.
2. Do not mislead students.
3. Avoid unethical situations.

The un-training of destructive instructor-leadership behaviors should be accompanied by replacement behaviors where necessary. Hence, for destructive instructor-leadership training, components from transformational instructor-leadership training should be included. For instance, in training instructors not to use too many negative words like 'don't', the transformational leadership dimension of consideration proposes the use of constructive feedback as an alternative.



### *Selecting the Trainer or Vendor*

The development and delivery of the program can be carried out using a combination of the HEI's resources with external assistance. Universities are likely to have the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to implement the training, but may require external vendor assistance particularly during the needs assessment. While assessment of transformational instructor-leadership needs can be a relatively straightforward process (e.g., use of the instructor-leadership questionnaires in a subset of student feedback questionnaires), the assessment of destructive instructor-leadership may require resources for conducting interviews (e.g., time is taken by the department head) or training faculty to be observers (as described earlier). For the evaluation of instructor-leadership, considerable time and effort may also be required. Therefore, Human Resources (HR) departments have to consider whether they have the resources to dedicate towards these efforts or if evaluation should be outsourced.

Within higher education, skills and talents are abundant and should be utilized as a part of an in-house training program. Furthermore, in house-training (a) can be tailored to suit the HEI's situation and strategy, (b) may lead to stronger buy-in from employees, (c) can be treated as an investment that can be evaluated rather than a cost, and (d) allows HEIs to keep sensitive information from 'leaving the building' even with the use of confidentiality agreements when outsourcing (Crumpton, 2011). Therefore, HEIs should consider keeping such core training in-house (Crumpton, 2011). However, in so doing, DeSimone and Werner (2006) suggest that the training staff should possess two specific competencies. First, the training staff must be competent at developing, implementing, and evaluating training programs. Second, trainers should be subject matter experts regarding pedagogy. To meet these requirements, a team comprising of training experts and pedagogy experts can be used.

### *Selecting Training Methods and Media*

The trainer(s) should select the appropriate training methods. In leadership training, classroom training methods are widely used (Yukl, 2006). Two classroom-type training methods that can be used in the instructor-leadership T&D program are discussion and behavior role modeling.

*Discussion.* The discussion method is centered on active participation. The discussion involves feedback and sharing of different views and perspectives (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). This method may be useful for un-training destructive instructor-leadership because instructors can share their views on such behaviors and receive feedback on why such behaviors can be harmful to students' success. The trainer can focus on asking direct questions related to the objectives of the program. For instance, a discussion course on callous communication may involve asking trainees, "Why do instructors sometimes use hostile actions towards students?" This can then stimulate trainees' thinking as to why they use such behaviors. Then, the trainer should adopt a therapeutic approach and show empathy while explaining why such behaviors are harmful (Roupnel et al., 2019). In so doing, the trainer should also suggest alternative and more effective substitute behaviors. Training instructors to develop these substitute behaviors is likely to be more effective through the use of experiential methods such as behavior role modeling (Taylor et al., 2005).

*Behavior role modeling.* Behavior role modeling is a popular method for leadership training (Yukl, 2006). For training transformational instructor-leadership, "merely presenting and demonstrating behavior guidelines is not sufficient to ensure people will learn and use behavior" (Yukl, 2006, p. 390). Instead, behavior role modeling entails active involvement and participation and can be divided into five phases (DeSimone & Werner, 2006).

1. **Modeling:** Trainees are shown a video clip in which an instructor models the target behavior. The behavior being shown should comprise of learning points that are based on the objectives of the training course.
2. **Retention:** Trainees are placed into small groups to discuss components of the modeled behavior. Trainees should also be encouraged to identify the learning points and the rationale underlying the learning points.
3. **Rehearsal:** Trainees are asked to role-play the desired behavior with another trainee, perhaps with someone from their group.
4. **Feedback:** Each trainee receives feedback on the behaviors used in the role-playing exercise and, if necessary, suggestions for improvement are given. Also, if resources permit, trainees can be videotaped during role-play and then asked to evaluate themselves as well.
5. **Transfer of training:** Trainees are encouraged to practice the learned behaviors in the classroom and/or in their general interactions with students.

Meta-analytic findings show that behavior modeling is not only effective for training new job behaviors but also leads to considerable increases in declarative and procedural knowledge and skills and attitudinal changes (e.g., self-efficacy) (Taylor et al., 2005). Moreover, newly learned behaviors and skills from behavior modeling training programs are likely to be maintained or even increase over time after training has been conducted (Taylor et al., 2005). In using behavior modeling, trainees should be exposed to both positive and negative models reflective of transformational instructor-leadership and destructive instructor-leadership respectively to enhance transfer (Taylor et al., 2005). The use of destructive instructor-leadership models can help trainees ‘unlearn’ harmful behaviors (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). Behavior

modeling activities can take considerable time to execute, but the use of separate courses for each dimension/classification, as recommended earlier, may help to alleviate this time issue.

### ***Scheduling the Training Program***

Each of the six courses described earlier can be scheduled to take place over two to three hours and the lesson plan can be prepared accordingly. Given the variation in schedules for instructors, flexible scheduling may be appropriate (e.g., the use of Doodle.com). Recall from the needs assessment phase that instructors should only be required to attend courses for which a deficiency has been identified (Brown, 2002). Furthermore, regarding Bourner's sentiment that the teaching repertoire of academic staff is limited to a few methods (Bourner, 1997), instructors may be required to attend only those courses aligned with their largest deficiencies. The required courses to be attended and scheduling of such courses can be communicated through an HEI's email/intranet. Once the training program has been designed and implemented, it should then be evaluated.

### **Evaluation**

Evaluation is "the systematic collection of descriptive and judgmental information necessary to make effective training decisions related to the selection, adoption, value, and modification of various instructional activities" (Goldstein, 1980, p. 237). Evaluation can assist in determining the extent to which a program is meeting its objectives, the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and the cost-benefit ratio of the program (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). For evaluation of the instructor-leadership training program, I propose the most widely used approach by Kirkpatrick (2004) because most evaluation frameworks are based on his approach (DeSimone & Werner, 2006). According to Kirkpatrick (2004), training can be evaluated according to four criteria, including reaction, learning, behavior, and results.

***Reaction***

Measures of trainees' reactions try to gauge their satisfaction with the program. This is important because trainees are not likely to attend other training courses if they are dissatisfied. Trainees may also communicate dissatisfaction with their colleagues, thus discouraging others from attending. For measuring reaction, trainees can be given a brief questionnaire at the end of the program. This instrument can be used to capture the extent to which trainees thought the program was useful. The instrument can also measure whether trainees liked or enjoyed the program (e.g., Weatherby & Gorosh, 1989, p. 76).

***Learning***

Evaluation of learning involves collecting data about the extent to which trainees have learned the objectives set out at the beginning of the program. Measuring learning does not necessarily have to be at the 'end' of the program, especially when using the behavior modeling technique. Using this technique, learning can be measured or evaluated during the program by giving trainees feedback during their rehearsal(s).

***Behavior***

Behavioral evaluation measures the extent to which trainees transfer their learning from the training program back to the classroom. Behavioral changes can be measured using the same approaches from the assessment stage, i.e., a subset of student feedback questionnaires that incorporate the instructor-leadership question items, interviews with students, or peer observation of classroom practice. Using these measures, pre-training and post-training results can be compared to determine whether there are changes in instructor-leader behavior as expected.

### *Results*

Results measure tangible outcomes from the training program. Here, the aim is to justify the extent to which the HEI is better able to serve its students in terms of teaching quality, i.e., whether the improvements in instructor-leadership affect the ‘bottom line.’ To measure results, a cost-benefit analysis can be used to compare the monetary costs of training, e.g., Robinson and Robinson’s (1989) model of training costs, to the nonmonetary benefits, e.g., improvement in student satisfaction with teaching, improved student learning outcomes, and better student academic performance. Alternatively, the training program can be evaluated using a balanced scorecard approach to communicate the impact of the program on an HEI’s strategy (e.g., Willyerd, 1997).

Kirkpatrick’s (2004) evaluation framework is useful for capturing the outcomes of the proposed training program from four perspectives. In a meta-analytic study of training effectiveness in organizations, Arthur et al. (2003) showed that the effect sizes for reaction, learning, behaviors, and results were 0.60, 0.63, 0.62, and 0.62, respectively. Training programs that have an impact of such magnitude are likely to lead to considerable changes in instructor-leadership behavior and overall improvements within the organization. Furthermore, while I could find no evidence on the impact of destructive leadership training, transformational leadership training is related to all four of Kirkpatrick’s (2004) criteria. Specifically, transformational leadership training programs can increase (a) leaders’ positive affect and leadership self-efficacy (i.e., reaction) (Mason et al., 2014); (b) the frequency of the display of transformational leadership (i.e., learning and behaviors) (Mason et al., 2014; Parry & Sinha, 2005; Sivanathan et al., 2005; Vella et al., 2013); and (c) branch-level financial performance (i.e., results) (Barling et al., 1996). As a side note, research also suggests that leaders’

psychological reactions precede changes in leadership behaviors (Mason et al., 2014), thus coinciding with the hierarchical nature of Kirkpatrick's (2004) model. Even though findings reported here are largely from corporate and sports settings, they may provide a preview of what can result from a similar sort of training program in a higher education setting.

### **Outcomes & Conclusion**

The ISD or 'A DIImE' (assessment, design, implementation, and evaluation) is a holistic approach for training instructor-leadership. This approach ensures that (a) an HEI's resources are channeled to where it is needed, i.e., addressing deficiencies in instructor-leadership, (b) training is designed and implemented according to program objectives and the nature of the deficiency, and (c) evaluation is conducted according to meaningful criteria. If the evaluation of the T&D program shows that instructors are using more transformational instructor-leadership behaviors, this change is likely to enhance students' motivation, satisfaction with the instructor, perceptions of instructor credibility, affective learning, cognitive learning, and academic performance (e.g., Balwant, 2016). If the evaluation of the T&D program shows that instructors are using fewer destructive instructor-leadership programs, this change is likely to improve students' satisfaction, extra effort, perceptions of instructor's effectiveness, and overall affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions (Balwant, 2017; Balwant et al., 2019). As such, the proposed T&D program is expected to improve teaching quality, which is the most important aspect of a university's service to students (Douglas et al., 2006).

### References

- Alimo-Metcalfe, B., & Lawler, J. (2001). Leadership development in UK companies at the beginning of the twenty-first century: Lessons for the NHS? *Journal of Management in Medicine*, 15(5), 387–404. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000006185>
- Allen, W. C. (2006). Overview and evolution of the ADDIE training system. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 8 (4), 430–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422306292942>
- Arthur, W., Bennett, W., Edens, P. S., & Bell, S. T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.234>
- Balwant, P. T. (2016). Transformational instructor-leadership in higher education teaching: A meta-analytic review and research agenda. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 9(4), 20–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21423>
- Balwant, P. T. (2017). The dark side of teaching: Destructive instructor leadership and its association with students' affect, behaviour, and cognition. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(5), 577–604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1112432>
- Balwant, P. T., Birdi, K., & Stephan, U. (2019). The dimensionality and measurement of destructive instructor-leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2018.1543803>
- Balwant, P. T., Birdi, K., Stephan, U., & Topakas, A. (2018). Transformational instructor-leadership and academic performance: A moderated mediation model of student



- engagement and structural distance. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1420149>
- Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(6), 827–832. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.827>
- Bell, A., & Mladenovic, R. (2008). The benefits of peer observation of teaching for tutor development. *Higher Education*, 55(6), 735–752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-007-9093-1>
- Berry, B., & Ginsburg, R. (1990). Creating lead teachers: From policy to implementation. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(8), 616–621.
- Boice, B. (1996). Classroom incivilities. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(4), 453–486.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01730110>
- Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: Fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 36(4), 296–306.
- Bourner, T. (1997). Teaching methods for learning outcomes. *Education + Training*, 39(9), 344–348. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400919710192377>
- Brown, J. (2002). Training needs assessment: A must for developing an effective training program. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(4), 569–578.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600203100412>
- Cooper, B. S. (1993). When teachers run schools. In T. Astuto (Ed.), *When teachers lead.*: Vol. UCEA Monograph Series (p. 83). University Council for Educational Administration.

- Crumpton, M. A. (2011). Making the case for in-house training. *The Bottom Line*, 24(3), 167–172. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08880451111186008>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 6–11.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597.
- Dawson, J. E., Messe, L. A., & Phillips, J. L. (1972). Effect of instructor-leader behavior on student performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(5), 369–376. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033436>
- DeSimone, R. L., & Werner, J. M. (2006). *Human resource development* (4th edition). SouthWestern.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th edition). Pearson.
- Donnelly, R. (2007). Perceived impact of peer observation of teaching in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 19(2), 117–129.
- Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(3), 251–267. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880610678568>
- Evans, R. (2001). *The human side of school change: Reform, resistance, and the real-life problems of innovation* (1st paperback ed). Jossey-Bass.
- Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(1), 9–14.
- Goldstein, I. L. (1980). Training in work organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31(1), 229–272.

Gosling, D. (2002). Models of peer observation of teaching.

Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2003). Teacher leadership: A review of the research.

<http://www.teachers.org.uk/node/8139>

Herbert, G. R., & Doverspike, D. (1990). Performance appraisal in the training needs analysis process: A review and critique. *Public Personnel Management*, 19(3), 253.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 36–51.

Keig, L. W., & Waggoner, M. D. (1995). Peer review of teaching: Improving college instruction through formative assessment. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 6(3), 51–83.

Kirkpatrick, D. (2004). A T+D classic: How to start an objective evaluation of your training program. *T+D*, 58(5), 1–3.

Kohut, G. F., Burnap, C., & Yon, M. G. (2007). Peer observation of teaching: Perceptions of the observer and the observed. *College Teaching*, 55(1), 19–25.

<https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.55.1.19-25>

Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. York-Barr and K. Duke (2004), *What Do We Know about Teacher Leadership?*

Lim, D. H., & Morris, M. L. (2006). Influence of trainee characteristics, instructional satisfaction, and organizational climate on perceived learning and training transfer.

- Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 17(1), 85–115.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1162>
- Mager, R. F. (1997). Preparing instructional objectives: A critical tool in the development of effective instruction. Center for Effective Performance.
- Mason, C., Griffin, M., & Parker, S. (2014). Transformational leadership development: Connecting psychological and behavioral change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(3), 174–194. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2012-0063>
- Moore, M. L., & Dutton, P. (1978). Training needs analysis: Review and critique. *The Academy of Management Review*, 3(3), 532–545. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257543>
- Parry, K. W., & Sinha, P. N. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resource Development International*, 8(2), 165–183.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13678860500100186>
- Pounder, J. S. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(4), 533–545.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143206068216>
- Robinson, D. G., & Robinson, J. (1989). Training for impact. *Training & Development Journal*, 43(8), 34.
- Roupnel, S., Rinfret, N., & Grenier, J. (2019). Leadership development: Three programs that maximize learning over time. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 18(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.12806/V18/I2/T1>
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1998). *Supervision: A redefinition* (6th ed). McGraw-Hill.
- Sherrill, J. A. (1999). Preparing teachers for leadership roles in the 21st century. *Theory into Practice*, 38(1), 56–61.

- Siddiqui, Z. S., Jonas-Dwyer, D., & Carr, S. E. (2007). Twelve tips for peer observation of teaching. *Medical Teacher, 29*(4), 297–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590701291451>
- Silva, D. Y., Gimbert, B., & Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding the doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record, 102*(4), 779–804.
- Sivanathan, N., Turner, N., & Barling, J. (2005). Effects of transformational leadership training on employee safety performance: A quasi-experiment study. *Academy of Management Proceedings, 2005*(1), N1–N6. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2005.18780756>
- Sullivan, P. B., Buckle, A., Nicky, G., & Atkinson, S. H. (2012). Peer observation of teaching as a faculty development tool. *BMC Medical Education, 12*(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-12-26>
- Taylor, P. J., Russ-Eft, D. F., & Chan, D. W. L. (2005). A meta-analytic review of behavior modeling training. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(4), 692–709. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.692>
- Vella, S. A., Oades, L. G., & Crowe, T. P. (2013). A pilot test of transformational leadership training for sports coaches: Impact on the developmental experiences of adolescent athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 8*(3), 513–530. <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.8.3.513>
- Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management, 36*(2), 223–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111401017>

- Wasley, P. A. (1991). Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice. In J. York-Barr and K. Duke (2004), *What Do We Know about Teacher Leadership?*
- Weatherby, N. L., & Gorosh, M. E. (1989). Rapid response with spreadsheets. *Training & Development Journal*, 43(9), 75.
- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134–171.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316653478>
- Willyerd, K. A. (1997). Balancing your evaluation act. *Training*, 34(3), 52–58.
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398–425. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03253411>
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255–316.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations* (6th ed.). Prentice Hall.