3

Leadership Development and Language Learning: A Foundational Framework

Sheri Spaine Long
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

LeAnn Derby
United States Air Force Academy

Lauren Scharff
United States Air Force Academy

Jean W. LeLoup
United States Air Force Academy

Daniel Uribe
United States Air Force Academy

Abstract

The ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map (2011) proposes incorporating "leadership and responsibility" into language learning (LL). This study offers a foundational framework for combined LL and leadership development (LD) and contains a snapshot of the presence of LD in the language curriculum and observations and attitudes regarding LD in LL courses (using feedback forms and focus groups) at the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) in 2012. Results suggest a two dimension structure to inform LL (a) generic vs. discipline-specific LD, and (b) implicit vs. explicit incorporation of LD. Lower frequency of explicit, discipline-specific types of LD led to a department-wide exploration of LD and LL integration. These results can inform all levels of language instruction across myriad educational settings that seek to incorporate leadership.

Background

From Des Moines to New Delhi, there is an intentional focus on leadership development (LD) to prepare future generations. The mantra for leadership alongside knowledge of multiple languages and cultures is present in popular culture as well as in employment sectors such as business, education, government, health and human services, and legal and military institutions (Air Force Culture, 2012; American Academy, 2013; ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map P-21, 2011; Committee for Economic Development, 2006; Western, 2011). Profiles of effective future leaders typically include skills and traits such as knowledge of multiple languages and cultures, adaptability, flexibility, ability to listen and communicate clearly, ability to work collaboratively, and open mindedness (Yeatman & Berdan, 2007). Frequently language educators in general, including those at the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA), are charged with transforming a new generation of students into global

citizens and leaders. In response to the societal mandate, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) introduced another broad objective for language instructors across all languages and levels in the ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map (2011). The skills map identifies *leadership and responsibility* as a component of language education, and it has left some language instructors experimenting with ways to incorporate this new objective into the language curriculum in a tangible and meaningful way. To move beyond anecdotal and often random efforts, in fall 2012 the language faculty of USAFA's Department of Foreign Languages (DFF) embarked on the task to assess the integration of languages and leadership focused on the central mission of USAFA–to develop leaders of character.

Recent trends in the research and practice of LL undergird this study. These include ACTFL's (2011) directive to embed leadership and responsibility into language education, the Modern Language Association's appeal to broaden the traditional language and literature curriculum toward interdisciplinarity (2007), efforts in Languages for Specific Purposes instruction to focus on transferable workplace skills (Crouse, 2013; Long, 2013), the Content-based Instruction movement to expand beyond the meta-focus on language learning (CARLA, 2012; Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010; Stryker & Leaver, 1997), and the work to situate global citizenship within the domain of language education (Wurr & Hellebrandt, 2007). These trends helped connect pedagogy with the mission of USAFA's DFF to prepare leaders with a global perspective by providing instruction and fostering learning in foreign languages and cultures (Department of Foreign Languages, 2011).

Therefore, the goals of the present study were to document and evaluate the presence of LD and the teaching of leadership within the language curriculum and its courses. The assessment of the state of LD in LL was used to inform future directions in leadership integration in the DFF that currently instructs in eight languages (Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish) at beginning through advanced levels. Subsequent efforts in leadership integration following from the present study are briefly described later in this paper. A final goal of this study was to inform other military and civilian language programs that have LD as a core value or component. Since this study, ACTFL (2014) launched its advocacy campaign branded *Lead with Languages* in a video that emphasizes the connection between leadership and languages. This campaign is an added indication that LL and leadership education will be converging in mainstream language curricula in the near future.

Leadership is defined in theory and practice in a wide variety of ways. For purposes of this study the researchers assumed a relatively broad definition of leadership to increase the generalizability of the findings and not limit them to military educational settings. However, two widely studied aspects of leadership were emphasized due to their applicability to the study of leadership across cultures. First, a trait-centered definition was considered useful when contrasting leaders and leadership across foreign cultures. Second, an emphasis was placed on a more process-based definition of LD in which leadership is described by the pattern of interactions between a leader and a follower or followers (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Kotter, 1990; Maxwell, 1998; Northouse, 2013).

Just as there are a variety of definitions of leadership, students learn about leadership in diverse contexts. For instance, in mainstream U.S. undergraduate educa-

tion LD is often taught separately from academic content as an extracurricular activity or training. However, the field of leadership studies can also be centered on the academic content and, in such cases, is typically found as a separate course, minor or major. At USAFA, LD permeates daily life in military exercises, athletic activities, and extracurricular activities. For example, the military mission element coordinates daylong leadership training events explicitly designed for each class year. Within the academic realm, LD is a mix of a core course requirement and idiosyncratic inclusion within other individual courses. The academic core course is *Foundations for Leadership Development*, taught in the Behavioral Sciences and Leadership Department for third-year students. Other courses containing LD include intentional course design efforts as well as informal exchanges where leadership connections are made with the subject matter. An example of an intentional course design effort is Professor Bradley Warner's integration of LD and instruction in the field of mathematics (Warner, 2011). Part of the rationale of having many officers with Master's degrees instructing at USAFA is so that they can bring their real operational experiences into the classroom. These include their leadership experiences in the field. However, although there have been increasing efforts to coordinate all these LD efforts across USAFA, they largely remain unconnected and independent, especially within the academic realm. Thus, efforts to integrate LD into traditional academic content areas have occurred slowly both inside USAFA and beyond.

More specific to the focus of this paper, evidence of curricular design and classroom activities that explicitly relate the field of foreign languages (FL) and leadership has been limited until recently. However, there is now a small collection of published efforts. For example, former high school Spanish teacher Cristin Bleess created the first documented course titled "Spanish for Leadership" in 2012 (Crouse, 2013). Under the umbrella of Languages for Specific Purposes, LD has made inroads into Spanish for Business courses at many institutions (Doyle & Fryer, 2013). Harvard Business School's Joseph Badaracco (2006) developed an approach to teaching character and leadership through selections of foreign literature in translation to MBA students. And, there has been an ongoing series of efforts to examine the interaction between leadership and language development at USAFA. In addition to the study described in this paper, during spring 2013 a faculty learning community (FLC) in the DFF (USAFA) detailed the processes, discussions and reflections of the group as well as formulating a working definition of leadership and practical strategies for its incorporation in the language curriculum (Long, LeLoup, Derby, & Reyes, 2014). A related study documents a general overview of LD and language education at the introductory, intermediate, and advanced levels of Spanish instruction at USAFA (Uribe, LeLoup, Long & Doyle, 2014). Long (Long & Rasmussen, 2014) describes efforts she has made in taking the lessons learned at USAFA into Spanish literature courses at UNC Charlotte. Despite the variety of recent initiatives outlined above, there has been no clear set of guidelines developed about how to provide the integrated development of languages and leadership.

This study attempts to provide some foundational questions, definitions, and directions that language instructors might consider if they desire to integrate LD and LL. In military LL settings, integration of language training and LD has assumed that the language learner brings one's leadership background to the language educa-

tional experience (Western, 2013). While this assumption might work in some cases beyond military settings (e.g. for upper-level students who are working on a degree concentration in leadership or who bring with them external leadership experiences), it may not be useful across a broader range of language courses, especially lower-level courses where students might be less likely to have leadership experiences. Thus, this study focuses on two dimensions along which leadership might be incorporated within a broad range of language courses. The first dimension describes how discipline-specific the LD efforts might be. If the efforts are generic, they could be used across a wide variety of disciplines (e.g. the incorporation of oral presentations in order to develop public speaking skills). If they are discipline-specific, they are not broadly applicable (e.g. a review of the Japanese language and culture for examples of different types of leadership approaches used within Japan). The second dimension describes the explicitness with which the LD efforts are communicated to students. If an implicit approach is used, there is no explicit connection being communicated (e.g. an instructor might role model how to form and monitor teams within her class). Implicit development might also underlie a classroom activity whose primary goal is cultural/linguistic (i.e., role play an air attaché[1] in a foreign country), but the link between the activity and leadership is not explicitly acknowledged or discussed. In contrast, explicit approaches directly point out to students (or have students self-discover and share or write about) connections between activities and students' personal development of leadership skills (e.g. the instructor clearly states that one of the goals of the oral presentation assignment is to help students develop public-speaking skills that will serve them well as leaders).

These dimensions, summarized below, provide a useful framework for the design of courses in which LD and LL are integrated.

1a. Generic: Approaches or strategies for LD that may occur in any discipline (i.e., team/group work, presentational assignments).

1b. Discipline-Specific: Approaches or strategies for LD that are particular to the field due to FL's unique access to insider cultural perspectives (i.e., learning about cultural differences through scenarios, learning about foreign leaders and how they may appear different across cultures).

2a. Explicit: Approaches or strategies for LD that are directly stated to students (i.e., an explanation of Air Force officer responsibilities; pointing out how leaders can make wiser decisions if they have a better understanding of the local culture in which they are operating).

2b. Implicit: Approaches or strategies for LD are indirect (i.e., role modeling, mentoring) and the link between the activity and leadership is not explicitly acknowledged or discussed.

Through these dimensions, the study provides an original initial framework for practical implementation and a foundation on which to elaborate theory that addresses LD in LL.

The Study

The present study offers a snapshot of the integration of language teaching/learning and LD in the DFF at USAFA using the dimensions of explicitness and discipline specificity as well as examining both faculty and student perceptions. A triangulation strategy solicited data from (1) a syllabus review across all languages and levels, (2) an anonymous, voluntary feedback form made accessible to all DFF faculty and students enrolled in languages, and (3) input from DFF faculty and student focus groups. The feedback form collected responses regarding the current perception of LD and opinions about whether or not it should be incorporated into language classes. These collective responses were subsequently used to develop and fine-tune the focus group questions.

The objectives of the research study were as follows:

1. To determine the presence and extent of generic and discipline-specific LD in FL education at USAFA.

2. To determine the presence and extent of implicit and/or explicit LD in FL education at USAFA.

3. To consider future directions for more explicit and systematic intertwining of leadership and language development within the DFF.

This study was conducted using the following assumptions: (1) the teaching/learning of languages and cultures are inseparable, and (2) 90% plus of instruction in the FL classroom should be done in the target language as advocated by ACTFL (2010). For the purposes of the study, LD embedded in language teaching/learning was categorized using the dimensions of explicitness and discipline specificity as described above. This two-dimensional structure informs LL through the incorporation of LD alongside more traditional elements in the language curriculum. This research also served to reinforce a common belief held by many language educators: knowing multiple languages and cultures helps produce good leaders.

Methods

Syllabus Review

Syllabi Included. Thirty-four syllabi were reviewed, which included all languages and levels with the exception of independent study courses for fall semester 2012. The purpose of the analysis was to create a snapshot of the visibility of LD within current syllabi as it related to the teaching/learning of languages in the department.

Procedure. Electronic versions of every departmental syllabus for all fall semester language courses (Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish) were gathered. Two of the researchers independently reviewed each syllabus and noted examples of leadership or leadership-related activities, placing each example into a discipline-specific vs. generic dimension. Discipline-specific examples were particular to LL due to the access to internal cultural perspectives that only knowledge of the language can provide, (e.g. readings related to leadership in the target language and culture). Generic examples could occur in any educational setting or academic discipline and pertained to behaviors and/or activities

that might develop skills that would be useful for leaders, (e.g. teamwork and oral presentations).

Feedback Forms

Materials. Both the faculty and student feedback forms collected descriptive information on the specific course language and level the respondent taught or was taking, and faculty were also asked how long they had been teaching with only three available options from a dropdown menu (< 4 semesters, 4-8 semesters and > 8 semesters). Faculty members were likewise asked if they were civilian, military or prior military. In addition, students reported on participation in a variety of international programs.

Both faculty and students were asked two questions, each followed by space to explain the response and give examples. The first question was similar for the two groups, except for the faculty vs. student perspective. Faculty were asked, *Do you incorporate leadership in your classroom?* while students were asked, *Does your instructor incorporate leadership in class?* The second question for both groups was, *Should leadership development be more explicitly and systematically integrated in foreign language teaching at USAFA?*

Participants. Twenty-five faculty members (representing 58% of the total FL faculty) responded to the voluntary feedback forms, with three faculty members responding a second time for a second course, resulting in a total of 28 responses. Respondents represented all eight languages, although there were fewer than six respondents in every language with the exception of Spanish, which had 11 respondents. Faculty participants represented every course level, with 15 out of the 25 having taught more than 8 semesters. They were also equally divided between civilian and military (or prior military).

Three hundred and twenty students (representing 32% of the students enrolled in the courses eligible to participate in the feedback at that time) responded to the feedback forms. Although the responses from Spanish students outnumbered the other languages, there was student representation of between 12 to 37 students for all other languages in the department with the exception of Chinese. Of the students who responded to the feedback forms, 61% were enrolled in a 200-level foreign language course, and 39% were enrolled in a language course at the 300-400 level. The 100-level students were not asked to participate because they had only been in class for three weeks. According to one of the questions on the feedback form, only 13% of the student respondents had previously participated in an international program abroad offered at USAFA.

Procedure. The principal investigator emailed a request to all language faculty members to voluntarily fill out an online feedback form for each course that they currently taught. Faculty members for all language courses above the 100-level were asked to incorporate five minutes within a two-week time frame into their lesson plans for making the online student feedback form available during class. Students were clearly told that completion of the feedback form was voluntary. Two follow-up emails were sent as a reminder to participate.

Focus Groups

Participants. Thirty-three faculty members participated in the three faculty sessions; one of the sessions was specifically for department leadership/supervisors ($N = 5$). Twenty-four students from all languages and class levels participated across five student sessions.

Procedure. Recruitment of faculty participants was achieved via an email message that requested voluntary participation, while voluntary student participation was solicited via flyers posted in the classroom area and through announcements in class. Cookies were used as the only incentive to participate. Both the faculty and student focus groups were scheduled for 50 minutes each and facilitated by a faculty member from outside the language department.

All sessions began with a welcome and an explanation that participant responses would be identified by the numbers shown on folded table tents on the table in front of each participant. Thus, their responses would not be associated with their names. A brief description of the project was then presented. Questions for both the faculty and student focus groups were created based upon trends noted in the feedback form responses.

Prior to their focus group meetings, the faculty members were sent a copy of the initial starting question in order to provide an opportunity to reflect before the session, *What might be the distinctive leadership development value-added from our department for our students who will ultimately interact globally? In other words, what might we offer to LD that our students would not be likely to receive or experience via their other courses and training experiences?* A hard copy of this question was available during the focus group session, along with a brief summary of the data from the faculty and student feedback forms regarding the number of examples given that fell within the two dimensions, generic vs. discipline-specific and implicit vs. explicit examples of leadership. After participants shared their responses to the first question, the discussion was allowed to flow to any related topics or examples.

The student focus group questions started with a clarification question, *What comes to your mind when you hear that leadership will be developed in your foreign language courses?* This question allowed students to plainly share their initial reactions about LD, which then provided a foundation for the facilitator to explicitly clarify the intent of the effort. Specifically, the facilitator explained that the intent was not to replicate, in the language of study within the FL course, other LD programs and courses that are mandatory for USAFA's military students. Rather, the intent was to focus on discipline-specific development that included current and historical scenarios within the cultures being studied and other activities unique to FL learning. This opening was chosen because responses on the student feedback form had indicated that only 32% agreed that LD should be incorporated in the language classroom, with many students expressing the opinion that plenty of LD already occurred in their other classes and activities. Following this discussion and clarification, students were asked, *What are some unique ways you think foreign languages could contribute to your development as leaders? In other words, what could you get from foreign language classes or experiences that you wouldn't likely get from other departments that would help you become a better leader?*

For both faculty and student focus groups, the facilitator wrapped up the conversation by highlighting a few trends in the responses and asking if there were any last *burning* contributions someone wanted to make. Participants were then thanked for their time and their contributions. Handwritten notes were taken for all sessions that were then typed for analysis by non-language department staff.

Results

Syllabus Review

For each course level (100, 200 or 300-400), all examples of leadership-related activities, assignments, readings, etc., as well as explicit references to leadership were categorized as either generic or discipline-specific. Generic examples included text that reminded students of standards of behavior or general expectations of officers, and activities that would develop skills that would be useful for officers (e.g. oral presentations, team/group work). Discipline-specific examples included readings that specifically focused on leadership in other cultures. Although the researchers thought it might be possible to find examples of text within syllabi that explicitly spoke to the leadership benefits of understanding other cultures, no such examples were found. (See Table 1 for a summary.) Note that the few discipline-specific examples only occurred in the most advanced/upper-level courses.

Table 1

Leadership Development Syllabi Examples by Course Level.

Course Level					100	200	300-400	Total
Number of Syllabi					9	8	17	34
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Generic								
Cadet expectation/ future AF officer responsibilities	6	66	4	50	6	35	16	47
Team/group work	5	55	6	75	10	58	21	62
Presentational projects/reports	7	77	6	75	16	94	29	85
Discipline specific								
Leadership development implied in materials studied	0	0	0	0	4	24	4	12

Feedback Forms

Faculty and student responses to the two feedback questions are summarized in Table 2. In general, faculty believed that they incorporated leadership more so than students in their courses perceived them to do so. A Chi-Square analysis sup-

ported this conclusion ($\chi^2 = 6.38$; p < .01). A Chi-Square analysis also indicated that faculty agreed significantly more often than did the students that language courses should incorporate LD ($\chi^2 = 12.26$; p < .01). The difference between whether the course did and should include leadership was significant only for the students ($\chi^2 = 5.56$; p < .05).

Table 2

Faculty and Student Responses to Feedback Questions.

	Faculty ($N = 28$)	Students ($N = 320$)
Does class incorporate leadership	86%	55%
Should class incorporate leadership?	68%	32%

While the syllabi review indicated generic vs. discipline-specific examples of leadership, the examples reported in the feedback forms captured a second dimension, implicit vs. explicit incorporation of leadership examples. Open-ended responses for each of the two questions were separately categorized into discipline-specific or generic categories for faculty and students. Overall, student examples of observed incorporation of LD were similar to those given by faculty members. In many cases, the incorporation could either be explicit or implicit depending upon how the instructor implemented leadership in class. Table 3 indicates a summary of faculty responses denoting implicit and explicit examples.

Table 3

Faculty Leadership Development Implicit/Explicit Examples and Times Mentioned.

Generic	Times Mentioned
Designates group (team) work/leader	10
Incorporates the role of class monitor	10
Instructor is a role model/mentor/leads by example*	7
Assigns presentations/public speaking	6
Instructor encourages accountability/standards of behavior of officers**	6
Praises student leadership**	3
Pushes students to think critically	1
Discipline specific	
Discusses/studies leadership in target culture/in AF career**	8
Assigns role plays/hypothetical leadership scenarios	3
Encourages experiential learning abroad to experience leadership	1

* Clear Implicit examples, ** Clear Explicit examples

Students and faculty differed qualitatively regarding why LD should or should not be included in language courses. Table 4 summarizes faculty explanations, while Table 5 summarizes student explanations. Faculty shared twice as many supportive reasons as non-supportive explanations, while students shared the opposite—almost twice as many non-supportive explanations. More than 50% of the students' non-supportive comments indicated that they did not see a connection between LD and LL, while none of the faculty indicated that particular explanation for their non-supportive attitude.

However, when student explanations were broken down by course level, we observed that the number of non-supportive comments decreased as course level increased. Over 70% of the comments from 200-level students were non-supportive, but only 54% of comments from the 300-400 level students were non-supportive.

Table 4

Faculty Leadership Development Examples and Times Mentioned.

Supportive	Times Mentioned
Leadership development should be in every learning experience to enhance career preparation.	13
Teach leadership development through a foreign language and culture lens.	9
Depends on class level/more leadership development at higher levels.	1
Non-supportive	
Prefer status quo (no motivation for change).	4
Don't want to detract from content/not at the expense of language instruction.	3
Prefer no "lesson-planned" leadership.	3

Table 5

Student Explanations for Including Leadership and Times Mentioned.

Supportive	Times Mentioned
Incorporated to enhance career preparation.	37
Communication/confidence is key.	26
More leadership to know how to lead in foreign language and culture.	14
Depends on class level.	6
Helps critical thinking.	2
Non-Supportive	
Leadership development is incompatible with foreign language.	88

Prefer status quo.	34
Focus on language/culture first.	15
Shouldn't be a goal in the foreign language department.	6
No time/already too much leadership development.	6

Focus Groups

As we saw in the feedback forms, most of the faculty comments during the focus groups were supportive of incorporating LD within their FL courses (80%). Those faculty members who offered non-supportive comments stressed the challenges of meaningfully developing leadership as well as language and culture. One faculty member commented "No time to reflect on leadership in a foreign language class" and another faculty member stated "Integrate leadership development without going overboard."

The supportive comments again fell into the generic and discipline-specific dimension. Generic comments comprised 24% of the supportive explanations; an illustration is *Lead by example*. The remaining 76% of supportive comments gave discipline-specific examples of how leadership could be more systematically integrated into the FL classroom. Faculty members stated, "Use scenarios (military/cultural) to highlight leadership across cultures," and "Share how to teach leadership (practices, strategies, techniques) at lower and upper levels and for experiential learning." Another faculty member revealed a foundational belief, "Knowing target culture(s) is essential for good citizens and good leaders to develop more cultural sensitivity," which suggests a future direction for integration. Table 6 describes examples of this dimension of supportive faculty comments.

Table 6

Supportive Faculty Comments and Times Mentioned.

Generic	Times Mentioned
Leadership development can be less systematic.	8
Lead by example.	7
Discipline specific	
Use scenarios to highlight leadership across cultures.	21
Share how to teach leadership.	11
Enhance explicit application of leadership on immersion.	5
Use language and culture as leadership tool.	4
Students can lead by teaching.	4
Use leadership experiences of international cadets in class.	2

Following the clarification of the intent of the effort to incorporate LD into foreign language courses, 90% of the comments made during the student focus groups emphasized one overarching conclusion: that FL and LD should be intertwined, and that students wanted more experiences that did so. Of the student comments, only a small number (14%) were generic examples of how their instructors fostered LD. For example, "Presentations are in front of the class daily. Very humbling class, as none of us are fluent…   Humble leaders are important." However, the remaining comments (86%) were discipline-specific examples of LD currently used by their instructors or suggestions for activities that could be used to intertwine leadership and language. These discipline-specific examples also revealed the implicit/explicit dimension. One implicit discipline-specific student comment was, "Practice using the language is so important – maybe set up links with other schools/students to exchange emails/Skype to practice language and writing and learn about culture." Other student examples highlighted explicit discipline-specific activities. One student stated, "part of the final was a one-on-one discussion with the teacher acting as anti-U.S.," and another student shared that "My instructor makes correlations to the literature we study to our lives as students and our roles that we will have as future officers." A third student suggested that language courses include "increased focus on other countries' militaries, and ranks of all countries using the target language."

Summary of Findings and Discussion

Analyses conducted through multiple methods of data collection yielded notable trends vis-à-vis the research objectives. Coded data from the syllabi review indicated the inclusion of team and/or group work in 62% of the syllabi. Student presentations were incorporated into 85% of the courses. These teaching/learning strategies are considered generic or non-discipline specific to LD. Very few syllabi (12%) mentioned leadership directly or explicitly linked LD with foreign language/cultural learning. The explicit element missing from the vast majority of the syllabi was later communicated in the faculty and student focus groups. The idea that knowing multiple languages and cultures helps produce good leaders was expressly articulated by participants in both student and faculty focus groups.

The voluntary pre-focus-group feedback forms from both instructors and language learners produced additional insights. The vast majority (95%) of the 25 responding faculty indicated that they did incorporate LD and that it should be included. However, a qualitative analysis of the type of development showed that most was generic, with an increasing number of discipline-specific examples present as course levels increased. Interestingly, just over 50% of students believed their courses included LD, offering primarily generic examples as support and corroborating the previously mentioned finding. Faculty also expressed concern that students would respond negatively due to all the other military leadership training they experience. This concern proved founded as only 30% of students stated they felt LD should be included in FL courses.

Additionally, the eight focus groups (5 with student participants and 3 with faculty participation) allowed further exploration of possibilities for incorporation of LD in FL classes. All groups began with a clarification that the focus was to be on the unique aspects of LD that learning languages and culture could offer a future officer.

In other words, we were not trying to encourage replication of other leadership training in their languages classes. Following this clarification, both students and faculty enthusiastically engaged in discussion of current examples and new ideas for ways that DFF instructors could foster their development. Students in particular desired a larger number of language and culture specific LD-related activities rather than the generic type of LD activities. Such specificity included, for example, case scenarios, role play, panels of international visitors, community exchanges, and travel opportunities.

Finally, as indicated previously, those students enrolled in more advanced language courses seemed to be more receptive to the inclusion of LD in their courses. This could be explained by the specificity of content of the upper-level courses (e.g. one advanced Spanish course concentrated particularly on leadership examples salient in several literary works of different genres). It may also be that the more experience one has with the language and culture, the more evident it is to the learner that LD is a culturally embedded concept and that leaders, followers, and their behaviors vary widely across cultures.

In summary, the data analyses point in the direction of defining and exploring discipline-specific LD practices, strategies and activities. Some possibilities here include encouraging the sharing of strategies with DFF instructors wanting to try new approaches, the creation of a repository to facilitate said sharing, and/or the creation of a FLC to further explore leadership and languages collaboratively. This collaboration, in the end, can be seen as a zero-sum game in that language educators promulgating the notion of leadership skills as a key component of the education of 21st century students are not advocating the addition of yet another fad theme or new element in the FL curriculum nor overburdening it with irrelevant content. Rather, as this study's results indicate, LD is already implicit in the curriculum; it needs only be made more salient to and by FL practitioners.

Conclusions and Future Directions

The triangulation approach to data collection for this study proved useful in capturing information and knowledge that might not have surfaced under less rigorous and extensive methods of investigation. Despite the finding that very few DFF syllabi explicitly mention leadership directly or explicitly link LD with language/cultural learning, other data provided clear evidence that faculty members do see value in team/group work and presentational skills and do consider these activities examples of LD. Such activities are firmly embedded in the language curriculum in DFF. The missing piece vis-à-vis the syllabi is the aforementioned explicit statement that knowing multiple languages and cultures helps produce good leaders. Thus, the FL discipline can specifically offer a developing leader the tools of linguistic and cultural knowledge, an essential component of a successful future leader.

Data culled from participant responses on the feedback forms and during the focus groups show that there is, indeed, a link between deeper cultural knowledge/learning and LD. Responses from faculty and students alike point to using level-appropriate scenarios, simulations, case studies and role plays to provide additional cultural learning and LD. Students also desired more cross-cultural/multiple-culture education, stating that they would probably be stationed in various and most likely differing cultural areas throughout their career.

Finally, both faculty and students suggested more focused and/or creative ways to enhance LD and cultural learning both inside and outside the classroom. Examples were cross-cultural panels, linking to community groups, or enhancing the leadership component during participation in language immersion opportunities abroad. An interesting suggestion was to imbue the study-abroad experience with more intentional observations and reflection on what leaders and leadership look like abroad. Implicit here is the recognition that the concept/construct of leadership is not the same across cultures.

The present study represents the first attempt to measure, analyze, categorize, and define LD in the LL context. Therefore, it inspired subsequent interest in the incorporation of LD in the language courses at USAFA. The aforementioned FLC explored the notions of LD and LL more in depth. One outcome of the FLC was the development and collection of a repository of materials (e.g. language and cultural scenarios related to leadership) that could be incorporated into language classes to facilitate LD (Long et al., 2014). As a natural segue from the FLC and its work, in the fall of 2013 several DFF researchers conducted a study on LD in four language courses at the 100-, 200-, and 300 levels and in four different languages (French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish). Results from that study confirm that explicit and implicit examples of LD can be successfully introduced into language classes (Derby, LeLoup, De Souza & Rasmussen, 2014). As a result, such LD examples are being included in an expanded set of LL courses in DFF.

In the military LL setting and beyond, students will encounter an increasingly global environment, so there is merit in redesigning FL courses. Suggested changes will develop not only language abilities but also, through an exploration of related culture(s), develop (1) awareness and understanding of cultural difference in leadership, and (2) skills that will be useful for future citizens and leaders. Given how language curricula (P-16+) has been traditionally designed and taught, students (and teachers) may not expect or understand a connection between LL and LD. Thus, the two dimensions (explicitness and discipline specificity) provide a useful framework by which instructors and program directors can examine courses and focus their efforts on effective ways to intentionally incorporate LD within the curriculum. Many teachers might hesitate to *add something else* to an already full curriculum. But, there may be *low hanging fruit* with respect to incorporating LD: there are likely already many generic types of assignments and activities that instructors incorporate into their language courses (e.g. presentations, essays about culture) that could be easily (slightly) modified so that they more explicitly develop leadership. The simple shift from implicit to explicit (low "add on" load for the instructor) can lead to meaningful impact and also support the directions recommended by the ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map (2011).

However, incorporating implicit, generic LD activities is not enough! Without explicit instruction, most students will not automatically figure out how such activities/assignments might help them become better leaders and global citizens. They will focus on the LL, even if they report that *knowing a language* in and of itself might help them become better global citizens. This is supported by the vast difference in our students' and instructors' perceptions of how LD was incorporated into the language courses. Once the explicit connection is made for students, they will

likely have many ideas about how a language course might help them become global citizens and responsible leaders. Even our students, who were initially resistant due to the pervasive LD climate at the USAFA, became excited about the opportunities and reported wanting more discipline-specific, explicit LD in their language courses.

Beyond the foundational work at USAFA, the FL profession is continuing to advocate for LD primarily through the ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map (2011) and promotes classroom experimentation and instructional materials development that are tracked at the ACTFL website. (See ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map, Leadership and Responsibility.) It is a commonly held belief in higher education that today's teachers are preparing undergraduates to become responsible and responsive global citizens. Therefore, language educators are positioned to be in the vanguard by re-framing the FL curricula with the systematic and intentional intertwining of language, culture, and leadership. While a small but growing number of practitioners in the language profession make claims about teaching leadership in their languages classes, there will be a need to develop goals and objectives for LD and LL that are measureable (at all levels, across languages, at both military and civilian institutions) to promote the meaningful and concrete inclusion of LD in the LL environment.

Acknowledgements

References

Air Force Culture and Language Center. (2012). *The language enabled airman program (LEAP)*. Available from, http://culture.af.mil/leap/index.aspx#

American Academy of Arts & Sciences, Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences. (2013). *The heart of the matter. The humanities and social sciences for a vibrant, competitive, and secure nation*. Available from, http://humanitiescommission.org/

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2010). *Position Statement on Use of the Target Language in the Classroom*. Available from, http://www.actfl.org/news/position-statements/use-the-target-language-the-classroom-0

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2011). *ACTFL 21st Century Skills Map P-21*. Available from, http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/21stCenturySkillsMap/p21_worldlanguagesmap.pdf

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2014). *Lead with languages*. [Video file]. Available from, http://vimeo.com/77166262

Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills. (2013). *What are 21st century skills?* Available from, http://atc21s.org/index.php/about/what-are-21st-century-skills/

Badaracco, J. L. (2006). Questions of Character: Illuminating the Heart of Leadership through Literature. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008) *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* (4th ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA). (2012). *Content-based second language instruction: What is it?* Available from, http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/cbi.html

Committee for Economic Development. (2006). *Education for global leadership: the importance of international studies and foreign language education for U.S. economic and national security*. Washington, DC: Author.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Crouse, D. (2013). Languages for specific purposes in the 21ˢᵗ century. *The Language Educator*, 8(3), 32-35.

Department of Foreign Languages. (2011). *Department of foreign languages strategic plan 2012-2017*. Unpublished report. U.S. Air Force Academy, CO.

Derby, L., LeLoup, J. W., De Souza, I., & Rasmussen, J. (2014, April). *Using cultural scenarios to develop leaders in foreign language courses at USAFA*. Presentation at the Second Annual Symposium on Language for Specific Purposes, Boulder, CO.

Doyle, M. S., & Fryer, T. B. (2013). *Exito comercial: Prácticas administrativas y contextos culturales. (6th* ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Long, S. S. (2013). The *unexpected* Spanish for specific purposes professor: a tale of two institutions. In L. Sánchez-López (Ed.), *Scholarship and Teaching on Languages for Specific Purposes*, (pp. 88-98). Birmingham, AL: Stern Library. Available from the University of Alabama-Birmingham Digital Collections Portal: http://contentdm.mhsl.uab.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/faculty/id/161/rec/1

Long, S. S., LeLoup, J. W., Derby, L., & Reyes, R. J. (2014). Fusing language learning and leadership development: Initial approaches and strategies. *Dimension,* 11-30.

Long, S. S., & Rasmussen, J. (2014, November) *Integrating leadership development and literary studies in German and Spanish: towards a sustainable model of advanced foreign-language literary instruction.* Presentation at the 86ᵗʰ meeting of the South Atlantic Modern Language Association, Atlanta, GA.

Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership.* Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world.*

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership. Theory and practice.* (6th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stryker, S. B., & Leaver, B. L. (Eds.) (1997). *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Uribe, D., LeLoup, J. W., Long, S. S., & Doyle, M. S. (2014). Spanish at the United States Air Force Academy: Developing leaders of character as an LSP curricular model. *Cuadernos de ALDEEU,* 28, 188-221.

Warner, B. (2011, November). In math it all counts. *Scholar Brief: A Publication of the Center for Character and Leadership Development, USAFA*, 1-19.

Western, D. J. (2011). How to say 'national security' in 1,100 languages. *Air and Space Power Journal*, 48-61.

Wurr, A. J., & Hellebrandt, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Learning the language of global citizenship*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Yeatman, C. P., & Berdan, S. (2007). *Get ahead by going abroad: A woman's guide to career success*. New York: William Morrow.

Endnotes

[1] An Air Force officer, typically as high-ranking officer, who serves part of a diplomatic mission.