The Theory and Practice of Case-in-Point
Teaching of Organizational Leadership

Robert M. Yawson
Quinnipiac University

Leadership Education and Development programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels are implemented with an overall objective to prepare students for the dynamic 'complex global working' environment. Case-In-Point teaching in leadership education is an emerging pedagogy that is gaining ascendancy and relevance both in theory and practice. The pedagogy is predicated on the conception that leadership is a function of self-awareness and knowing oneself, ability to articulate one's vision, capacity to create a community of trust among colleagues, and the ability to take effective action to realize one's own potential; and that linear epistemology as a dominant and prevailing epistemology in leadership education can no longer be the dominant epistemology. This paper discusses how Case-In-Point Pedagogy can be used in teaching organizational leadership. The discussions are based on Ron Heifetz' Case-In-Point Pedagogy as situated in the realist ontological frameworks of teaching leadership outlined in Sharon Parks' Leadership Can Be Taught. The paper takes a look at the epistemological and conceptual framework of the Case-In-Point Pedagogy, the theory and practice of Case-In-Point Teaching, and how it could be incorporated into leadership courses. The themes and issues related to the adoption and use of Case-In-Point are outlined.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF STUDY

There seems to be an emerging universal acknowledgement that leadership learning activities "need to be grounded in the complex, difficult realities facing those who choose to exercise leadership and relevant to their developmental needs" (Johnstone & Fern 2010, p.98). What has been contentious is as to whether leadership can be taught and whether it can be learned. These complex and difficult realities Johnstone and Fern (2010) described are borne out of what Senge, Smith, Kruschwitz, Laur and Schley (2010) also described as the need for 'the necessary revolution' (p. iv). Senge et al. (2010) have contended that we are at the end of the industrial age and a new revolution is emerging out of the industrial 'bubble' and the people leading this revolution demonstrate mastery of three core areas that undergird organizational learning: learning how to *see the larger systems*; understanding the importance of *collaborating across boundaries* "that previously divided them from others within and outside their organizations"(p.44); and, "moving away from reactive problem solving mode to *creating futures they truly desire*"(p.44).

New leadership roles and perhaps models *are needed in this* transition from the bubble bust and mindset of the industrial age to the age of dynamic, complex, non-linear, interdependent environment of disequilibrium and turbulence. This is important whether developing or transforming, including effective leader/follower strategies that draw in a true diversity of voices and require leaders to maintain

intellectual flexibility and open-mindedness in the new 'necessary revolution'(Senge et al, 2010; Sherman & Peterson, 2009). This 'new' leadership should be a collective process in which no single form or concept of leadership should be sacrosanct (Hickman, 2010).

To this end, leadership education has become even more crucial than ever. It helps secure our future in a global marketplace by providing students with leadership skills and personal growth opportunities. Leadership education not only enables students to become effective leaders, but also to examine and understand the philosophical and moral reasoning component of both leadership and followership (Davis, 2010). Leadership is a lifelong skill which prepares students to improve their decision-making (Davis, 2010). Most often than not undergraduate students are in a constant state of flux in their lives; a stage in life where they are thrust into making their own decisions and are in the quest for the place in the world and also developing their goals in life (Brungardt, Greenleaf, & Arensdorf, 2006). Leadership education therefore offers a unique and valuable tool that enables uncertain students to investigate their personal values, strengths, talents, and shortcomings, and to choose a direction for their lives and their place in the world.

This paper takes a look at the epistemological and conceptual framework of the case-in-point teaching (CIPT), its previous use in other programs and the lessons learned in the adoption of the approach. The themes and issues relevant to the adoption and use of CIPT are outlined. The uniqueness of the CIP pedagogy is that it takes into account the epistemology of practice in the field of leadership and does not flinch from theory. It recognizes that there is no division between theory and practice, and students learn to blend theory and practice in real-time and in an appealing finesse (Yawson, 2012). The CIPT as pedagogical framework uses the full balance of existing and emerging pedagogical features such as reflective writing, reviews and discussions, anecdotes, case studies, annotated reading, references to popular films and documentaries, critical thinking assignments all designed to help students understand what they need to do as learners, broaden their outlook about the themes and concepts outlined and to achieve expected learning and development outcomes. The use of these existing pedagogical features should necessarily attract the following questions: What is CIPT? How different is CIPT from other teaching methods and existing pedagogies? And why do we need CIP approach in teaching leadership in HRD programs. Before describing the 'why' and 'how', I will first delve into the 'what is'.

WHAT IS CASE-IN-POINT TEACHING?

Leadership education programs have over the years experimented with all kinds of approaches to teaching and the incorporation of different activities including simulations, action research, problem-based learning, cohort groups, and case studies into the pedagogy (Cox, 2007). Case studies for example are used widely in teaching leadership and although they are presented in semblance to reality; they are not true reality in the practical sense. Case studies in most instances tend to over-generalize and students may not appreciate their significance in their own lives (Cox, 2007). Avolio and Luthans (2006) have contended that although pedagogical features like simulations, action research, problem-based learning, cohort groups, and case studies contribute to learning there should be more building adaptive reflection and more development in context. Case-in-point teaching helps to capture the "moments that matter" that eventually leaders create when they become cognizant of how important they are (Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

CIPT is based on Ron Heifetz's teaching approach succinctly described by Sharon Parks' in her book *Leadership Can be Taught* on how to "prepare people to exercise the judgment and skill needed to bring that knowledge into the intricate systems of relationships that constitute the dynamic world of practice" (Parks 2005, p.5). CIPT approach therefore rests on the teacher's ability to create an ambience in the classroom analogous to the real world setting that the students will be working in, ones that are chaotic, where the primary lesson is to facilitate the understanding of how adaptive leadership works by actually experiencing it "in the moment." Corno, (2008) has described it as education occurring "within a sociocultural context where even tasks targeting individuals have a wider influence. Both teachers and

students need to engage in reflection and analysis in this problem-filled, dynamic classroom environment" (p.165).

The uniqueness of the CIPT approach is that each class is different but with similar results. This is because, what is learned in every class is co-created by the teacher and the participants present in real-time and the issues that arise in the moment of learning cannot be the same for different dimensions of space and time. In every classroom the degree of reality and aliveness gives students and faculty materials to work with (Johnstone & Fern, 2010). The commonality of CIPT classrooms is that participants are taught the skills of getting on the 'dance floor' and 'getting on the balcony' as well as how to learn from leadership failures in real-time (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). The pedagogical setting involves joggling of the classroom, small groups and other learning spaces, so as to place participants in a realm where they can better understand themselves by reflecting on how they are interacting in each of these different spheres. The CIP is a pedagogical approach where any living situation can be used as a case to observe, interpret and intervene. This approach facilitates students' to learn *in situ* and in real time the experience of exercising leadership. This dynamic is structured and spontaneous. Every week has defined moments to debrief what had happened in the previous moments, and it always open the possibility to intervene with an interpretation.

It can be argued that by virtue of the fact that Heifetz' work at Harvard was focused on graduate level and professional students it is an andragogical in its approach and therefore to adapt it as pedagogy for undergraduate students is in itself a challenge. However, the emphasis here is that leadership can be taught and that case-in-point is an efficient and emerging approach to doing that. CIPT is situated within four foundational dimensions described by Parks (2005), namely Authority Verses Leadership; Technical Problems Verses Adaptive Challenges; Power Verses Progress; and, Personality Verses Presence.

Authority Verses Leadership

Authority and leadership are two distinct functions whereas "providing orientation and direction, setting norms, resolving conflict, and, when necessary, providing protection (p.9)" are the functions and attributes of authority; leadership is about "mobilizing people… to address their toughest problems" (p.9) which according Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky (2009) requires adaptive change. Authority and leadership have been described, compared and contrasted in several literature and treatises with some placing traditional management as a form of leadership by authority (Yawson, 2012). Parks (2005, p. 9) argued that authority is an essential part of adaptive leadership, but just one component of the attributes required from leaders in today's complex conditions "to move people beyond the edge of familiar patterns, into the unknown terrain of greater complexity, new learning, and new behaviors, usually requiring loss, grief, conflict, risk, stress and creativity" elements which also come to play in CIP classrooms and which "authority only becomes one resource".

Technical Problems Verses Adaptive Challenges

These foundational dimensions have been described in detail later in this paper. Technical problems are ones that are solved with current knowledge and skills, and what economists prefer to call technical-knowhow; whereas adaptive challenges are of dynamic complexity in nature and demands "changes of heart and mind – the transformation of long-standing habits and deeply held assumptions and values" (Parks, 2005, p. 10).

Power Verses Progress

Parks (2005) succinctly described these foundational dimensions as when leadership is understood as an activity. An activity which results in progress in addressing adaptive challenges in which "there is less attention to be paid to the transactions of power and influence and more attention given to the question of whether or not progress is being made on swamp issues" (p.10).

Personality Verses Presence

Personality is not a factor when it comes to dealing with adaptive issues. In this postmodern era of adaptive leadership, charisma and personality are not the defining realities of leadership, rather it is "the quality of one's capacity to be fully present, comprehend what is happening, hold steady in the field of action, and make choices regarding when and how to intervene from within the social group in ways that help the group to make progress on swamp issues" (Parks, 2005, p.11). Presence forms a major part in all CIP classrooms and students are made to appreciate and recognize that 'presence' is not just about being physically present in class.

CONCEPTUAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF CIPT

Historical and contemporary approaches to leadership programs appear to have linear epistemology as the dominant epistemology and as such undergird a majority of leadership models and pedagogy. This is also true for business and management education in general. In an editorial in *Human Resource Development Review*, Yorks and Nicolaides (2006) for example made an important observation that much Human Resource Development (HRD) theory and research treat organizational systems as complicated linear systems instead of nonlinear dynamic, interdependent systems. Most HRD theory and practice follows the normal science approach. Normal science, as defined by Kuhn (1962) is the routine work of disciplinary scientists "puzzle solving" in their paradigm. Normal science research espouses the facts of the established theory but does not necessarily challenge it or test its assumptions (Batie, 2008). "Although a linear epistemology's usefulness is implicit in its widespread impact on models and on their use, a linear epistemology has several limitations, including a tendency to privilege particular Western cultural and masculine worldviews and short-term measures" (Jayanti, 2011, p.101). What Jayanti (2011) referred to as 'linear epistemology' is borne out of normal science and what underlies most of the theories and practices in leadership education.

Giles & Morrison (2010) have also contended that in the realm of linear epistemology "priority in educational leadership programs is given to academic traditionalist objectives involving increased knowledge and understandings in the first instance and the development of particular skills deemed pertinent to the topic in the second" (p. 64). Giles & Morrison (2010) further explained that as a result, "strategic planning, capacity-building, leadership development and other leadership responsibilities are objectified towards linear, albeit conceptual, understandings devoid of the problematic, contextual, and experiential nature of leadership" (p.64). The implication of the linear epistemology orientation towards organizational leadership programs is "the privileging of rationalist argument, understanding, and skill development at the expense of other contemplative and deliberative approaches to learning" which are critical to understanding the nature of dynamic complexity of adaptive problems confronted by 21st Century leadership.

Heifetz (1994) categorized problems into three types. He described situations where there are no obvious definitions of the problem or the solution as Type III situations or adaptive problems. Type II as situations where the problem is apparent but the solution is not. Type I situations, as technical problems, where the problem can be defined and can be solved with technical know-how and skills. Heifetz (1994) further explained that Type II and III situations are increasingly becoming problems that organizations face and thus calls for "new leadership skills and competencies, a dynamic process that emphasizes the need for quality, flexibility, adaptability, speed, and experimentation" (Beinecke, 2009, p. 2). Type II and III situations are complex, multi- framed, cross-boundary, and hard to solve. Type I problems or tame or technical problems can also be very complex but are not messy. For example, heart surgery is a very complex situation, but it is technical and needs technical solution (Heifetz et al., 2009). Heifetz (1994) has contended that linear epistemological approach to leadership cannot be used to address adaptive challenges and therefore the need for a new approach to leadership education programs.

One cannot address adaptive challenges without appreciating the fact that rational approach has its limits to problem solving. As Marshak (2009) explained:

Instead, other nonrational dimensions need to be accounted for, including internal politics; inspirations in the form of people's untapped values, hopes, and dreams; suppressed emotions and reactive feelings including fear, anger, and loss; implicit mindsets such as assumption sets, mind maps, and culture; and the psychodynamics associated with change, anxiety, and loss (p. 59)

The need for leadership approaches in dealing with adaptive challenges and to guide organizations in transitions from the bubble bust and mindset of the industrial age to the age of dynamic, complex, non-linear, interdependent environment of disequilibrium and turbulence required new leadership education approaches and thus the Case-In-Point Teaching. The CIP approach is important whether developing or transforming, including effective leader/follower strategies that draw in a true diversity of voices and require leaders to maintain intellectual flexibility and open-mindedness in the new 'necessary revolution'. The leadership in addressing adaptive challenges should be a collective process in which no single form or concept of leadership should be sacrosanct (Hickman, 2010). Instead, as Sharon Parks (2005) one of the main proponents of Case-In-Point Teaching described:

It is one thing to teach knowledge of the field, and it is quite another to prepare people to exercise the judgment and skill needed to bring that knowledge into the intricate systems of relationships that constitute the dynamic world of practice. It is yet another challenge altogether to prepare someone to practice leadership within the profession and the communities it serves (p. 4).

Parks further described and summed the CIP teaching as follows:

In this approach to teaching, the teacher remains the authority in the classroom – providing orientation and maintaining equilibrium in the group. But the teacher is also practicing leadership – skillfully allowing enough disequilibrium (confusion, frustration, disappointment, conflict, and stress) to help the group move from unexamined assumptions about the practice of leadership to seeing, understanding, and acting in tune with what the art and practice of leadership may actually require. In the process, the teacher must be aware of the various factions among the students in the room, the different points of view that each represents, and then must find ways of recruiting, honoring, and sustaining the attention of each of them (pp 5, 8)

The foregoing epistemological framework is the conceptual basis to the CIP pedagogy which I am contending that its practice in teaching organizational leadership is paramount in training leaders who will meet the needs, demands and challenges of the 21st century.

CASE-IN-POINT TEACHING IN LEADERSHIP EDUCATION AS AN EMERGING PEDAGOGY

The purpose of this paper is not to suggest one 'correct' way to approach teaching leadership and the CIP teaching does not follow a routine rubric or laid down rules that have to be strictly adhered to. Real life does not follow a rigid routine of occurrences and therefore CIP teaching's ultimate goal is to create adaptive leaders. The CIP as an emerging pedagogy varies in its approach and content from one institution to the other, but they all share the common goal of teaching students the skills of being reflective and adaptive leaders as well as how to learn from leadership successes and failures in real-time.

There has been an exponential increase in the last three decades in the growth of student leadership programs on college campuses in the United States (Brungardt et al., 2006). It is estimated that over 1000 of these programs can be found in all areas of the academy (Brungardt et al., 2006). However, very few of these programs are using the CIP pedagogy notably Harvard University, University of San Diego,

University of Minnesota among few others. The overall concept of CIP and the conception that the success of education depends on adapting teaching to learner differences is, however, not new. Snow (1982) has cited 1st century BC Chinese, Hebrew, and Roman texts in explaining the idea of adaptive teaching. One of Snow's favorite quotes is the one by Quintilian, who wrote this passage in the 5th century BC:

> *Some students are slack and need to be encouraged; others work better when given a freer rein. Some respond best when there is some threat or fear; others are paralyzed by it. Some apply themselves to the task over time, and learn best; others learn best by concentration and focus in a single burst of energy.* (Quintilian, trans. 1921)

The current emergence and use of CIP can be attributed to Harvard's Ron Heifetz and made even popular by Sharon Parks in her best seller *Leadership Can Be Taught.* As an emerging area of practice, conferences and symposia are being held over the country with arguably the most successful and biggest one held at the University of Minnesota in May 2011. The conference brought together a wide range of professionals and academics in the field of leadership to discuss the practice of case-in-point teaching.

The Case-in-Point Classroom
The first thing any practitioner of CIP teaching will say about the CIP classroom is the importance of the physical classroom setting. Experiences of practitioners of CIP teaching indicate a classroom with movable chairs as the most suitable; an issue which undoubtedly have been extensively discussed in education in general. The first day of class is taken very seriously by CIP practitioners as it defines how the class is built as a community. The first day of class is used to create a shared understanding on the various themes that will underlie the classroom as learning and practice community throughout the semester.

There are many artifacts that are brought to the CIP classroom to create that 'learning in a moment' environment. These may include things like memes, grading contract, rituals like moment of silence, inspirational quotes; and activities for physically being accountable for community building. CIP teachers use their experience to form flexible groups for learning. CIP teaching is intellectual as well as technical, requiring quick response to learner variation (Corno, 2008). "CIP teaching creates a symbolic area at the center of the teaching ground, a space for easiest teaching, and aims to keep the most number of students within that center to capitalize on skills across the class, challenge students to share experiences, and develop aptitude" (Corno, 2008, p. 161). Schon (1987) maintains that professional education should build the skill of "reflection in action (the 'thinking what they are doing while they are doing it') that practitioners sometimes bring to situations of uncertainty, uniqueness, and conflict." (p. 40).

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing undergraduate leadership education is what Raelin (2009) referred to as the epistemology of practice. The translation of theory to practice in a way that is immediately salient to students. "Let us search, instead, for an epistemology of practice implicit in the artistic, intuitive processes which some practitioners do bring to situations of uncertainty, instability, uniqueness and value conflict" (Schön 1982, p. 49), in our teaching of leadership. Historically, undergraduate leadership education has relied on three (mostly) disparate approaches to achieve this: theory content, simulations, and personal reflections (written, small group, dyads, etc.). However, the real challenge is to give young adults the lived experience of being able to apply theory and self-reflection in the midst of the stress of applied leadership. As Heifetz & Linsky (2002) have suggested: "No one learns by staring in the mirror. We all learn –and are sometimes transformed—by encountering differences that challenge our own experience and assumptions" (p.101). What has often been used to teach undergraduates is akin to staring in a mirror. Articles are given to be read, discuss them in class, and then they are asked to go home and stare into a mirror, what is generally referred to as reflective writing. However, there is a critical step missing between the classroom and their critical writing. CIP teaching helps in supplying this missing step. CIP helps students connect theory to practice in a visceral way while

reinforcing the critical leadership skill of moving between the "balcony and the dance floor" (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

Heifetz and Linsky (2002) have explained the balcony metaphor using the example of the dance floor. Navigating the dance floor, concentrating on your partner, getting carried away by the music and immersing in the moment and the ambiance is where most of the attention is placed. "Your description of the band afterwards will be that the band played great, and the place surged with dancers" (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p.53). However, you may give a different assessment and description of the band if you had left the dance floor and stayed and observed from the balcony for some time. Perhaps you may have noticed that the band was too loud and most people had concentrated away from the corner the band is playing. "Achieving the balcony perspective means taking yourself out of the dance, in your mind, even if only for a moment" (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p.53). This is the surest way to prevent misdiagnosis and subsequent "misguided decisions about whether and how to intervene" (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p.53).

Heifetz and Linsky (2002) cautions however, that one cannot stay on the balcony forever and doing that is as worse as never moving to the balcony in the first place. It should be an iterative and dynamic process and not static. One has to move in and out of the dance floor with the aim of getting as close as possible to being at the dance floor and balcony simultaneously. Playing the almost simultaneous dual role of observer and participant is a skill CIP classroom tries to let students learn.

Sometimes what occurs in the CIPT classroom is intentional. As a CIP practitioner you should be able to orchestrate conflict. However, orchestrating conflict requires courage and practice. In orchestrating conflict in the classroom, you should also be mindful to create a holding environment to provide safety and structure for students to be able to discuss the particular values and display their emotions (Heifetz et al., 2009). The goal is to challenge the mindset, to get beyond opinions and perspectives to the point of transformation (Daniels, 2011). Creating a holding environment should be a mutual exchange between the teacher and the class as a community. Creating a holding environment will help you regulate the heat as a result of orchestrating conflict. "To orchestrate conflict effectively, think of yourself as having your hand on the thermostat and always watching for signals that you need to raise or lower the temperature in the room" (Heifetz et al., 2009, p.160). In my own teaching I have used race, gender, tuition, globalization, disability, and colonialism, to benign topics such as innovation, beauty pageant, Olympics, among others as issues to orchestrate conflict.

> *The goal is to keep the temperature – that is, the intensity of the disequilibrium created by discussion of the conflict - high enough to motivate the students to arrive at creative next steps and potentially useful solutions, but not high enough that it drives them away or makes it impossible for them to function.* (Heifetz et al., 2009, p.160)

Although, sometimes what occurs in the CIPT classroom is intentional, often actions and reactions are not planned or purposeful (Homan, 2011). Yet even in these cases there is an effect on both you the teacher and the entire class. Managing this relationship effectively is one of the hallmarks of case-in-point classroom. However, as a practitioner, you should be able to capitalize on both the actions and reactions as cases-in-point. It is important to reflect on the activity soon after it takes place (Dalton, 2009). Begin with questions that keep students close to the experience itself and then move the discussion to questions of interpretation and application (Dalton, 2009). Ultimately, the CIP pedagogy is aimed at building an adaptive culture in the workplace by developing an adaptive workforce and this is challenge for organizational leadership scholars and practitioners to lead.

A Case for Case-in-Point in Teaching Organizational Leadership
The adoption and use of CIP in 'teaching organizational leadership will not be without issues and challenges and these issues may differ from program to program and even between individual instructors. This is the reason why I am not advocating for a wholesale use of CIP as practiced by other programs or wholesale borrowing of Ron Heifetz's approach. However, CIP can serve as a pedagogical concept as

well as practice of a particular form of teaching needed to effectively educate students for leadership in the 21st century work place.

Teaching leadership programs has a long history dating back to the very beginning of management education as a field or discipline. Traditionally, it would appear that the pedagogy within business schools' leadership programs has been largely transactional, didactic and generic, with the academic content being determined and delivered by faculty perceived to be theoretical experts. This type of approach is situated in the industrial view of leadership (Rost & Barker, 2000). This approach has been profitable, and therefore has been the approach that is still dominant in business school curriculum. But, leadership education in the 21st century should be structured to address the fundamental issues of the emerging social paradigms and this is what CIP offers.

CIP teaching reflects the social dynamics of classrooms to explain what practicing teachers do to address student differences related to learning and this cannot be adequately represented by linear models, by correlation coefficients, or simple descriptive terms like charismatic leadership or transformational leadership (Rost & Barker, 2000). In CIP pedagogy, teachers respond to learners as they work (Corno, 2008). "Teachers read student signals to diagnose needs on the fly and tap previous experience with similar learners to respond productively" (Corno, 2008, p. 161). This is what is needed in the business school classrooms. Inculcating CIP pedagogy into organizational leadership training is important.

Higher education like all aspects of national life is in a state flux, anxiety and facing unprecedented challenges as a result of budget short-falls. Among the most important and challenging dimensions of consideration for colleges and universities is their ability to continuously attract, retain and graduate students even in the face these challenges. An academic program which fails to do that is in danger of becoming extinct as result of budget prioritization. Anecdotal evidence from the Leadership Education Undergraduate Program at the University of Minnesota suggests that the introduction of case-in-point pedagogy positively affect students' retention, graduation rate and higher rates of employment by the alumni of the program (Personal Communication, 2011).

One of the most pressing requirements for 21st Century workforce is to develop a framework for theory and practice of professional development which results in the attainment of professional competencies suitably robust for a lifetime's practice (Howe, 2002). The nature of dynamic complexity of challenges of leadership of the 21st century workplace lends itself to a whole new paradigm of approach to how future leaders are trained (Yawson, 2013) and the case-in-point teaching is one of such new paradigms.

CONCLUSION

The nature and dynamic complexity of adaptive challenges lends itself to a whole new approach to how leaders are developed and trained. The CIP pedagogy and teaching approach as laid out in this paper describes this new approach to leadership education. The emphasis on non-linear epistemology and the concept of adaptive leadership, however, should not be interpreted as advocating the total demise of linear epistemology. The usefulness of linear epistemology in addressing technical problems is not in contention. The contention is that linear epistemology cannot be the dominant epistemology in leadership education and that the dynamic complexity of adaptive challenges and "today's increasingly complex, dangerous, and challenging world demands more and more better leaders than ever before" (Parks, 2005). This demand is the reality in the 21st century, and requires a new approach to leadership education, a non-linear epistemology of practice, rather than reductive or linear thinking or processes of normal science. CIP attempts to fulfill this demand.

CIP is however, not a dogma, it is an adaptive practice which is evolving and I believe will serve as a very useful approach to teaching organizational leadership. What has been described in this paper is to serve as a guide and contribute to the evolving conversation on a new paradigm shift in leadership education. The integration of CIP pedagogy into all aspects of Business School curricula especially organizational leadership programs and workforce development will help to produce graduates ready for the 21st century leadership challenges at the workplace.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B., & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader: Moments matter in accelerating authentic leadership development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Batie, S. S. (2008). Wicked Problems and Applied Economics. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 90*(5), 1176–1191.

Beinecke R. H. (2009). Introduction: Leadership for Wicked Problems. *The Innovation Journal, 14*(1), 1-17.

Brungardt, C., Greenleaf, J., & Arensdorf, J. (2006). Majoring in leadership: A review of undergraduate leadership degree programs. *Journal of Leadership Education, 5*(1), 4–25.

Corno, L. (2008). On teaching adaptively. *Educational Psychologist, 43*(3), 161-173.

Cox, D. W. (2007). Leadership Education using Case-in-Point Teaching. *Academic Exchange, Summer*, 154-158.

Dalton, K. (2009). The center/margin leadership dance: Integrating experience in education and formation. *Journal of Religious Leadership, 8*(2), 117–133.

Daniels, N. (2011). *Facilitating Class Discussion: A Personal Perspective. Engaged Teaching and Learning: Bethel Faculty in Action Video Series*. St. Paul, MN: Bethel University.

Davis, K. (2010). Facilitating undergraduate leadership learning through scholarly research and writing. *Undergraduate Leadership Review*, *II* (II), 8–10.

Giles, D., & Morrison, M. (2010). Exploring leadership as a phenomenon in an educational leadership paper: An innovative pedagogical approach opens the unexpected. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 22*(1), 64-70.

Heifetz, R. A, & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Hickman, G. R. (2010). *Leading change in multiple contexts: Concepts and practices in organizational, community, political, social, and global change settings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hillison, J. (1993). The role of Virginia in the development of the FFA. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 34*(2), 37-45.

Homan, M. S. (2012). Promoting community change: Making it happen in the real world. (5th Edition). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole

Howe, A. (2002). Professional development in undergraduate medical curricula--the key to the door of a new culture? *Medical education, 36*(4), 353–359.

Jayanti, E. B. (2011). Through a different lens: A survey of linear epistemological assumptions underlying HRD models. *Human Resource Development Review, 10*(1), 101– 114.

Johnstone, M., & Fern, M. (2010). Case-in-point: An experiential methodology for leadership education. *The Journal Kansas Leadership Center, 2*(2): 98 – 117.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Marshak, R. J. (2009). Reflections on Wicked Problems in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 18*(1), 58-59.

Parks, S. D. (2005). *Leadership can be taught: A bold approach for a complex world*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.

Raelin, J. (2009). Seeking conceptual clarity in the action modalities. *Action Learning: Research and Practice, 6*(1), 17-24.

Rost, J. C., & Barker, R. a. (2000). Leadership Education in colleges: Toward a 21st century paradigm. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 7*(1), 3-12.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Senge, P. M. (2006). The leader's new work: Building learning organizations. In, J. Gallos, (ed.), *Organization development: A Jossey-Bass reader.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., & Schley, S. (2010). *The Necessary Revolution*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.

Sherman, J., & Peterson, G. 2009. Finding the win in Wicked Problems: Lessons from evaluating public policy advocacy. *The Foundation Review, 1*(3), 87–99. doi:10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-09-00036.1

Yawson, R. M. (2012). Leadership and management development: Developing tomorrow's managers. *Human Resource Development International*, *15*(1), 131-134.

Yawson, R. M. (2013). Systems Theory and Thinking as a foundational theory in human resource development--a myth or reality? *Human Resource Development Review*, *12*(1), 53-85. doi:10.1177/1534484312461634

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT