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Abstract

Across multiple settings, individuals who assume organizational leadership roles may find themselves grappling with unique opportunities to influence meaningful change. The complexities of such processes become especially apparent in a global context where multiple dynamics must be navigated simultaneously and skillfully. What variables are associated with greater or lesser effectiveness in these global leadership roles? Can such processes be measured in an ecologically valid manner? What might we learn about the cultivation of global leadership by an examination of such interacting intricacies? This dissertation sought to answer these questions by reviewing and applying existing global leadership theories and the Equilintegration (EI) Leadership Model to develop a comprehensive program analysis of an international leadership development program, the Middle Eastern Partnership Initiative Student Leaders’ Program. The MEPI program is a United States State Department initiative which brings very bright and talented young people from across the Middle East to the United States each summer for a six week leadership immersion program hosted by Georgetown University and five other university partners. The Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory (BEVI) was used to assess Time 1 / Time 2 change processes by examining participant experiences before and after completion of the MEPI program. Leadership rating and ranking forms were also developed based on the EI Leadership Model and implemented by program administrators. Program analysis results suggest that this intervention is associated with optimal changes for a substantive majority of MEPI participants. More specifically, a number of BEVI indices suggest that the MEPI program is achieving its mission and goals for a considerable majority of participants (e.g., they became more open and aware
regarding the nature of self, others, and the larger world, and less likely to see the world in “black and white terms”). However, the BEVI also yielded rich data indicating that not all participants changed in these optimal ways. Namely, individuals who entered the program with a “self structure” that was less congruent with program expectations and opportunities (e.g., in terms of how emotions are accessed or attributions made) tended to become overwhelmed from the standpoint of the BEVI and its EI theoretical framework, with a corresponding attenuation of openness to and interest in engaging with self, others, and the larger world vis-à-vis the mission and goals of the MEPI program (i.e., for this “low optimal” subgroup, the MEPI program is associated with outcomes that appear to be the opposite of what is intended by participation). Among related findings of note, higher educated students showed less optimal change than their less educated counterparts, which suggests that “education” in the Middle East may not prepare a subset of students for the intensity of the MEPI program. Moreover, data suggest that female participants tended to become more overwhelmed by the MEPI experience although they demonstrated equally optimal changes as males, which suggests that the experience of being female in the Middle East may add an additional layer of complexity to the process of identity development when faced with a “high impact learning” experience, which the MEPI program certainly is. Among other findings and recommendations, the following analysis considers why some participants responded more optimally than others and offers suggestions for program improvement over time, including deeper engagement with candidate selection and pre-program orientation processes, greater attention to the nature and form of transformative and high impact learning experiences like MEPI, the relevance of a liberal education background versus the more professional / skill based
education of many MEPI participants, and the key and interacting role of moderating variables such as gender.
MEPI, BEVI, and EI Leadership:

Implications and Applications for Global Leadership Assessment and Development

History demonstrates that the tendency to assume leadership roles perhaps is innate, or at least inevitable, in the ongoing pursuit of human activities and goals. From the earliest documentation of such endeavors, leaders ineluctably have emerged across all human communities including families, tribes, villages, religious groups, cities, and nations. At the same time, a brief scan of leaders and leadership throughout recorded history, and in the here and now, illustrates that some leaders are more effective than others, and at times, quite dramatically so. While many leaders have been integral to the constructive furtherance of the groups or movements they lead (e.g., Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.), other leaders also have led initiatives that range from the merely incompetent to the indiscriminantly destructive and demonstrably evil (e.g., Genghis Khan and Adolf Hitler). Why do leaders become “structured” as they are? That is, might it be possible to illuminate the underlying dynamics and processes that are associated with why, how, and under what circumstances leaders are “organized” at the level of affect, attribution, development, and other structures and process of “self,” which subsequently influence what these individuals actually do upon assumption of a leadership role? With complete acknowledgement that these questions are enormously complex to ask, much less answer, this study seeks to examine related issues and processes through a multi-year and depth-based approach to leadership assessment, theory, and application across three annual cohorts of aspiring young leaders from the Middle East.
Despite the long-term recognition that leaders are integral to civilization and society, attempts to formally define, theorize, and study leadership only emerged in the mid 19th century (Northouse, 2007). Since then, theorists and researchers have grappled with the construct of leadership – how is it defined, might it be measured, can it be taught, among many other related questions.

The debate about how to conceptualize and cultivate effective leadership has become even more complicated, and urgent, as travel and communication throughout the world have led to more interconnected and diverse ways of engaging one another. As a result, leaders increasingly find themselves immersed in contexts where they are leading people of various backgrounds, beliefs, and values, which may differ – quite dramatically at times – from their own. One term that seems to encapsulate this enterprise is global leadership, which includes one’s multicultural capacity, the ability to grapple with paradox, a commitment to being and becoming more human, and the ability to apprehend individual differences across cultures and contexts (e.g., Holt & Seki, 2012; see also Adler, 1997).

With this point of departure, this study begins by reviewing the literature to identify what we mean by leadership generally and global leadership in particular and how extant frameworks have informed the cultivation of such capacities and inclinations. Second, we discuss results from a comprehensive job analysis that resulted in the EI Leadership Model, which offers a systematic and data-based operationalization of the construct of “global leader,” with considerable applicability to allied frameworks such as “authentic leader” or “transformational leader.” Third, we describe the application of the EI Leadership Model within a global leadership development program and describe how
the EI Leadership Model was used to inform the assessment methodology for this program. Fourth, we offer a data-based discussion of how preexisting beliefs, values, and experiences of participants interact with the nature and goals of this leadership development program, in ways that were and were not anticipated. Fifth and finally, this study concludes with a discussion of how comprehensive and targeted leadership development and evaluation processes can identify what is working, what is not, for whom, and under what circumstances, and what to do with such information to enhance the effectiveness of leadership education and development programs for young people, both locally and globally.

**What is Global Leadership?**

Without a unifying framework to conceptualize global leadership, or a consensus about definitional matters, researchers and theorists have often focused on specific components of global leadership.\(^1\) In that regard, laudable contributions to the understanding of leadership have emerged from multiple sources including the diverse field of global leadership studies. However, much of the existing literature on leadership and global leadership has primarily focused on the *what* of global leadership, such as leadership qualities that help structure, plan, track, and control leadership processes or decisions. Although these aspects of leadership are inarguably valuable, they may either minimize the reality that leadership inevitably consists of relationships between the leader and the led or tend to focus on surface level characteristics rather than deeper human qualities that may not apply equivalently across situations, cultures, and contexts.

---

\(^1\) In the context of a larger and ongoing program of research on leadership and organizational assessment and development as well as usage of the Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory or BEVI and EI model, aspects of this dissertation are adapted from or informed by Dyjak-LeBlanc, Brewster, Grande, White, & Shullman (2016), Shealy (2012, 2016, in press), and two initial MEPI Program Assessments developed by Shealy and Giesing (see Appendices A and B).
(e.g., see Chin & Trimble, 2015; Dyjak-LeBlanc, Brewster, Grande, White, & Shullman, 2016; Wheatley, 2006).

Take for example, a leader with the administrative abilities to manage an organization, but who lacks the interpersonal capacity to communicate her knowledge and skills to those she leads, and thus is experienced by “the led” as incompetent. This brief anecdote illustrates that an effective leader must not only possess organizational knowledge and abilities, but the capacities and inclinations to apprehend and navigate deeper themes that are integral to all human relationships (e.g., conflict, love, loss, hope, etc.). Attempts to simplify leadership models by prioritizing a few specific and preeminent traits may make it easier to conceptualize, measure, and train leaders, but substantially underestimate 1) the depth-based mind and heart of effective global leaders, 2) the complexity of the relationships between leaders and the led, and 3) the fact that different settings, contexts, and cultures may call for different forms of leadership (e.g., Chin & Trimble, 2015; Dyjak-Leblanc et al., 2016; Wheatley, 2006).

Given these interacting complexities, effective global leaders must – from our perspective – have the capacity and inclination to encounter and engage not only what they think and feel about self, others, and the larger world, but why they think and feel as they do. As may be evident, delving into the what and why of global leadership also requires an understanding of how such tendencies evolve for each human being who assumes a leadership role. To understand such matters – of what, why, and how – we have to assess in an ecologically valid and comprehensive manner (e.g., Wandschneider et al., 2015) in order to have a passing chance of understanding complexities such as the
etiology of self-structure and how such processes play out on a daily basis in a leadership context (e.g., Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016; Wheatley, 2006).

Fortunately, an increasing number of scholars are focusing on such models and methods not only to understand these complex processes, but to translate their perspectives and findings into programs and interventions for global leadership development (e.g., Burke, 2008; Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2007; Chin & Trimble, 2015; Detert & Burris, 2007; Ford, Ford, and D’Amelio, 2008; George, 2004; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Gostick & Elton, 2012; Gundling, Hogan, & Cvitkovitch, 2011; Henson, Fulkerson, Caliguiri, & Shealy, in press; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Kets de Vries & Balazs, 2005, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Mobley, Li, & Wang, 2011; Morton, 2013; Shullman, White, Brewster, Grande, & Bhuyan, in press; Wheately, 2006; White & Shullman, 2010, 2012). To illustrate, it may be helpful briefly to highlight some exemplars from the literature.²

Global Leadership Theories

As a construct, “global leadership” requires ways of knowing, being, and doing that may be quite distinct from leaders who are functioning in non-globalized settings and contexts. According to Adler (1997), global leadership is “a process by which members of the world community are empowered to work together synergistically toward a common vision and common goals resulting in an improvement in the quality of life on

² Because this study builds on Shealy (2012) and Dyjak-LeBlanc et al. (2016) – and to remain thematically consistent across different but related studies – the literature presented below has been adapted from these sources. Such a review is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather provides a backdrop for understanding the EI Leadership Model and Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory, which inform core aspects of the leadership assessment approach adopted in the current analysis.
and for the planet” (p. 174). Furthermore, global leadership differs from domestic leadership in that it requires several major developmental shifts for leaders: (a) developing multicultural effectiveness (MCE), (b) becoming adept at managing paradoxes associated with global work, (c) cultivating the “being” dimension of human experience, and (d) appreciating individual uniqueness in the context of cultural differences (Holt & Seki, 2012, p. 197).

Dyjak-LeBlanc et al. (2016) highlight eight dimensions that are highly resonant with the “global leadership” construct, including assessment, awareness, care, complexity, culture, depth, transformation, and vision. These eight facets of global leadership are highlighted below.

**Assessment**

Effective global leaders successfully navigate intercultural differences between themselves and those they lead to minimize cultural misunderstandings, which are often the result of value conflicts (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016). In order to avoid value conflicts, leaders must assess their own values and the values of those they lead with accuracy, persistence, and depth. Failure to engage in such self-assessment may mean that leaders lead from cultural assumptions that are not congruent with those they lead, causing conflict within the organization and attenuating effectiveness (Chin & Trimble, 2015; Hofstede, 2001; White & Shullman, 2010). Thus, in addition to informal and ongoing self-assessment, it is recommended that assessment instruments purporting to measure global leadership should move beyond unidimensional trait-based assessments to include leaders’ capacities and inclinations to apprehend and navigate the diverse
situations and states that they routinely face (Judge et al., 2002; Wheatley, 2006).

**Awareness**

According to Dyjak – LeBlanc et al. (2016), awareness in global leadership refers to “deep and sophisticated understanding of self, others, and the larger world, including why we feel, think, and behave as we do” (p. 539). Similarly, Burke (2008) argued that effective leadership requires “leader self-examination.” Effective self-examination can help to illuminate cognitive biases that are often outside of conscious awareness (Kahneman, 2011) while facilitating a greater understanding for how and why we experience, express, and regulate our emotions (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 2005). Unawareness of or disinterest in one’s emotional processes and cognitive biases can interfere with effective leadership, especially in a context where leaders are faced with high levels of ambiguity and cultural diversity that may be affectively loaded (White & Schullman, 2010). Therefore, global leaders should seek to better know their own internal processes because “without sufficient awareness of self, others, and the larger world, leaders may continue to operate within models that are both ineffective and inflexible, leading to the same errors of judgment and decision making time and again” (Dyjak – LeBlanc et al., 2016, p. 539).

**Care**

Caring leaders are keenly attuned to how their work impacts individuals, the organization, and the larger world (e.g., Cultivating the Globally Sustainable Self, 2017; Kelly, Holt, Patel, & Nolet, 2016; McKeown & Nolet, 2013; National Action Plan for Educating for Sustainability, 2014). By listening to others, showing empathy, putting the needs of others above their own, and adopting an empowering approach with those over
whom one has power, caring leaders earn the trust of those they lead, which ultimately leads to more honest and effective organizational processes (e.g., Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Novogratz, 2010; Shealy, 2012; Weiner, Kanki, & Helmreich, 1993).

**Complexity**

Good leaders are able to apprehend, hold, and manage complexity, a capacity that is especially relevant within a global leadership context, a point that is emphasized strongly in the literature (e.g., Caligiuri, 2006; Caligiuri & Tarique, 2009; Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2012; Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009; Javidan, Dorfman, De Luque, & House, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007; Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007; Osland & Bird, 2013; Wheatley, 2006). Therefore, effective global leaders are able to tolerate and sit with ambiguity, which often is uncomfortable and creates disequilibrium (Dyjak – LeBlanc et al. 2016; Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012; White & Shullman, 2010, 2012). Similarly, global leaders tend to embrace complexity, effectively integrating rather than denying paradoxical information (Martin, 2009).

**Culture**

According to House and colleagues (2004), culture is defined as “shared motives, values, beliefs, identities and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives that are transmitted across generations” (p. 15). Perhaps the most distinctive difference between domestic and global leadership is the likelihood that global leaders inevitably lead others from multiple cultures. As such, Dyjak – LeBlanc et al. (2016) argue that effective global leaders “need to develop the capacity to move beyond their own preconceptions of the ‘right way to do things’ and cultivate openness to the potential effectiveness of different beliefs,
perceptions, and behaviors” (p. 541). Such cultural adaptability requires leaders to learn about cultures different from their own and act in ways congruent with the culture (Dorfman et al., 2012). In reality, as our world becomes increasingly interconnected, an argument may be made that all leaders must inevitably become global leaders, since the capacity of leaders of all stripes to engage diversity is only becoming more paramount (Chin & Trimble, 2015). As such, Fouad and Arredando (2007) recommend that leaders become adept at apprehending and navigating sociocultural dynamics that are inherent in all organizations, regardless of the “local” or “global” setting or context in which they manifest.

**Depth**

Leaders engage in dynamic relationships with the led that parallel all interpersonal processes (Dyjak–LeBlanc et al., 2016). Therefore, effective leaders need to possess a deep appreciation for and understanding of human dynamics. Doing so allows leaders to understand their own motives and experiences as well as those with whom they work in order to understand and accurately interpret why we humans do what we do. To do so requires an awareness of core human processes, especially core needs and the formative variables that contribute to why we are organized as we are (e.g., our beliefs and values, affective tendencies, life histories, etc.). In the final analysis, to lead with depth, leaders must demonstrate the capacity and inclination to ascertain, hold, and manage the deepest aspects of who they and “the led” actually are in all their complexity. Among other reasons for doing so, an appreciation for depth allows leaders to attribute motives accurately and help themselves and others to learn and grown in organizational
contexts that often are highly socially and emotionally fraught (Gostick & Elton, 2012; Wheatley, 2006).

**Transformation**

Many leadership scholars and practitioners (e.g., Bass, 1997; Burns, 1978; Keys, 2013; Kouzes & Posner, 2012) have observed that the most effective leaders ultimately are engaged in transformative work vis-à-vis those they lead. According to Burns (1978), transformative leadership is facilitated by charismatic leaders who inspire those they lead by engaging in conduct that is worth emulating – they walk the talk in their lives and work. Likewise, transformative leaders “deal with others as individuals; consider their individual needs, abilities, and aspirations; listen attentively; further their development; advise; teach; and coach” (Bass, 1997, p. 133). To take one example, Judge and Bono (2000) found that those who were led by leaders they described as “transformative” were more satisfied and motivated and expressed greater commitment to their organizations than those who described their leaders as less transformative. Thus, transformational leadership appears to be more effective than transactional leadership in that the latter form of leadership regards the relationship between the leader and their subordinations as an exchange in which leaders reward good performance and penalize poor performance.

**Vision**

Finally, effective global leaders possess and exhibit a vision of how, where, and why an organization or initiative should advance. Not only do effective leaders possess vision, they also share their vision with those they lead, while remaining open to evolutions and modifications over time. Without the active articulation and sharing of vision, organizations may suffer from a lack of direction as well as insufficient
motivation and inspiration by those who are charged with actualizing this vision on a daily basis. Integral to such processes, leaders also must ensure that their vision is shared and embraced, which requires them to “exemplify and communicate a shared understanding of beliefs and values” in order to promote “unity throughout an organization” (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016, p. 545).

**Cultivating Global Leaders**

Thematic observations such as those above are helpful not only for understanding what effective leadership is or may be, but also provide guidance for translating scholarship into applied form. Such translation is necessary to help cultivate these important capacities in burgeoning leaders. Many formal programs exist to train potential leaders to become good leaders or to improve the leadership abilities of those already in leadership positions. However, it is not as simple as that, since the effectiveness of such programs may depend upon the recognition that not all leaders approach such training experiences from the same point of departure, since our life histories greatly affect how, why, and to what degree we are able to benefit from such educational and training experiences (e.g., Wandschneider et al., 2016).

Similarly, to cultivate effective leaders, it is important not only to focus on the acquisition of knowledge or skills, but also on the “being” aspects of leading and leadership. As Holt and Seki (2012) explain, the “being” aspect of leadership is the “energetic presence based on who we are,” (p. 206), and includes self-awareness, access to emotional experiences and basic needs, and authenticity. To develop the “being” part of leaders, Bennis (1989) suggested that these deeper aspects of human nature should be included in our approaches to leadership development interventions.
Along these lines, many researchers and theorists argue that effective leadership training includes transformative or crucible experiences (e.g., Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Caligiuri & Tarique, 2012). According to Giber, Lam, Goldsmith, and Bourke (2009), leadership development that involves “a signature experience… has an impact on both the heart and the mind” that “challenges and alters thinking and embeds itself in the memory and behavioral repertoire of the participant” (p. xvi). Likewise, when interviewing more than 40 leaders in business and the public sector, Bennis and Thomas (2002) found that all the leaders they interviewed described a “crucible experience” that they attributed to transforming their identity and developed their leadership abilities. Crucible or transformative experiences in leadership have been described as difficult, intense, and complex experiences that stimulate emotional affect, self-reflection, and examination of values that result in deep and meaningful change (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Dirkx, 2012).

Such experiences also are integral to global leadership development models, including The Chattanooga Model of Global Leadership Development and Global Leadership Expertise Model (GLEB) (Mendenhall et al., 2013). Both models contend that global leadership development begins first by understanding a set of individual characteristics including, but not limited to, existing competencies and personality traits, which interact further with transformative or crucible experiences. Along similar lines, the concept of “high impact learning” – which denotes particular types of intensive learning experiences (e.g., study abroad, capstone experiences) – also appears to be associated with a greater degree of learning, growth, and development (Wandshneider et al., 2015). Importantly all such transformative, crucible, or high impact learning
experiences may be mediated and moderated – that is to say, influenced or determined – by a wide range of individual and external variables (e.g., Cummings, Davies, & Campbell, 2002).

For example, if an experience is too conceptually complex or emotionally laden to tolerate, such individuals may feel “disequilibrated” – that is, overwhelmed and unable to hold, reflect upon, or internalize the experience. That sort of process may lead to outright rejection or dismissal of the experience altogether through any number of means (e.g., stereotypic thinking, inaccurate attributions, projection and denial). In other words, such rejection or dismissal may be due to how one’s own “self” is structured (e.g., affectively mediated beliefs about self, others, and the larger world), which is further mediated by a life history and background variables in ways that may be relatively unknown or unconsidered (Shealy, 2005). The dilemma here for leaders – particularly those functioning in a global context – is that leadership actions, practices, and policies may largely be determined by these interacting variables without the leader’s awareness (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016; Mendenhall et al., 2013).

The good news is, abundant evidence indicates that “change” in self / other access or belief / value structure may demonstrably occur as a result of exposure to specific learning experiences, including those that are designed to cultivate leadership growth and development (Wandschneider et al., 2015). From this perspective, at least seven variables – the “7 Ds” – appear to be associated with the amount of “change” that individuals experience as a result of exposure to specific educational or training interventions:
1) **duration** (i.e., how long an international, multicultural, or transformative education experience occurs);

2) **difference** (i.e., how different the experience is from what the “self” of the experiencer is accustomed);

3) **depth** (i.e., what is the capacity of the learner to experience all that the intervention is able to convey);

4) **determine** (i.e., through formal and informal assessment, how well does the intervener understand his / her audience);

5) **design** (i.e., based upon knowledge of the audience and careful deliberation and development, what is the quality of the intervention);

6) **deliver** (i.e., how able is the intervener to fulfill the transformative potential of the intervention);

7) **debrief** (i.e., before, during, and after the intervention, how deeply does the intervener assess the nature of the learning experience, and use such feedback to improve future interventions) (Shealy, 2016, p. 475).

It also should be noted that exposure to effective transformative, crucible, or high impact experiences may occur via formal leadership development programs as well as professional or life experiences. For example, Pless, Maak, and Stahl (2011) found that individuals who participated in international service learning programs demonstrated increased competencies across several domains related to effective global leadership, such as cultural intelligence, global mindset, and self-development. Likewise, Gregersen, Morrison, and Black (1998) demonstrated that leadership development activities including work-place training, transfer, teamwork, and travel all fostered global
leadership development, and that transfer or international assignments were particularly facilitative, a conclusion which is highly consistent with the high impact learning literature on study abroad (Wandschneider et al., 2015). Kets de Vries and Florent-Treacy (2002) likewise identified foundational experiences associated with global leadership development, including intercultural experiences in one’s family of origin (e.g., exposure to other cultures, multiple languages, etc.); early education that exposed children to international and multicultural experiences (e.g., via travel, summer programs, or international schooling); later education including study abroad; and family and social supports that are adventurous, adaptable, and mobile.

As a final exemplar – and presaging findings and discussion later in this study – it should be recognized that leadership cultivation also occurs as an added benefit from a liberal arts education. That is because liberal arts emphases are consonant with global leadership competencies including multicultural awareness and sensitivity, critical thinking, creative problem solving, and ethical citizenship (Barker, 2000; King, Brown, Lindsay, & Vanhecke, 2007). For these reasons, Barker (2000) has argued that a liberal arts education is extremely relevant to today’s leaders. In fact, some research has linked liberal arts education to the cultivating of leadership skills. For example, a study of the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education found a relationship between leadership and liberal arts exposure. Specifically, researchers collected data from 708 students from four different universities (a research university, a regional institution, a liberal arts college, and a community college) regarding their level of liberal arts experiences and liberal arts outcomes. Outcome variables included intercultural effectiveness, inclination to inquire and lifelong learning, psychological well-being,
leadership, moral reasoning, and effective reasoning and problem solving (Seifert et al., 2008). Overall, results suggested that liberal arts education and experiences “promoted the development of students’ intercultural effectiveness, inclination to inquire and learn for a lifetime, psychological well-being, and leadership” (p. 123). Specifically related to leadership, participants who reported a greater level of liberal arts experiences scored significantly higher than those who reported lower levels of liberal arts experiences across all subscales of the Social Responsibility Leadership Scale, including Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility, Citizenship, and Change.

Edward J. Ray (2013), the president of Oregon State University, also has emphasized the importance of a liberal arts education to leadership effectiveness in a globalized society noting that one third of Fortune 500 CEOs have liberal arts degrees. Likewise, according to a 2013 survey of employers by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, 93% of employers reported that that “a demonstrated capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems is more important than [a candidate’s] undergraduate major” and 95% say they find it important for their employees to “demonstrate ethical judgment and integrity; intercultural skills; and the capacity for continued new learning” (Humphreys, 2013, p. 1). All such skills are deliberately emphasized through liberal arts education. As a final example, 80% of employers stated that they prefer their employees to have received liberal arts education regardless of their major of study (Humphreys, 2013).

In short, despite an accelerating prioritization of STEM fields vis-à-vis higher education (science, technology, engineering, math) fields – and a corresponding retreat
from the liberal arts and humanities – many researchers, educators, administrators, and leaders argue that the value of liberal arts education is more relevant than ever as it fosters adaptability, critical thinking, creative problem solving, and multicultural awareness and sensitivity (e.g., Barker, 2000; Cech, 1999; Humphreys, 2013; King et al., 2007; Ray, 2013, Seifert et al., 2008). Because these competencies are especially salient for individuals assuming global leadership roles, the role and value of a liberal arts education is one paradigm through which global leaders and leadership may be cultivated.

**Measuring Global Leadership**

While many leadership development programs exist today, there is little consensus about measuring their effectiveness. Most evaluation approaches to leadership training have been measured by “reaction criteria” – what participants report about the training experience. Although useful, “reaction criteria” are much more likely to measure participant satisfaction than any changes in actual leadership effectiveness (Riggio, 2008). Other programs assess “learning criteria,” which measure the amount of content participants retain following completion of the program. While retention of information is important to leadership development, global leadership likely consists of more than acquired knowledge. As Riggio observes, by solely focusing on learning criteria as a means to measure global leadership development, a vital part of global leadership development is neglected.

More promisingly, some programs have opted to measure programmatic success by examining changes in observed behavior, such as empathic responses, empowerment, and so forth. Similarly, programs have also been examined in terms of how effectively
leadership changes are associated with organizational change. While focusing on leadership behavior and results may be a more effective means to measure the success of leadership development initiatives than learning criteria or reaction criteria, such approaches still do not measure how leaders change in their sense of self and other – that is, their sense of identity as a leader (Riggio, 2008). As such, the present approach focuses on these core aspects of identity: who a leader “is” and why; their beliefs and values about self, others, and the large world; the role of formative variables such as gender and education; and how core aspects of self (e.g., affective / attributional styles) all interact before, during, and after a leadership development program. To do so, we draw upon Equilintegration or EI Theory and the Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory – described next – in the context of a highly diverse cohort of young people from the Middle East, who are participating in a leadership development program in the United States.

**EI Leadership Model:**

**EI Theory, the EI Self, and the BEVI**

If core aspects of self (e.g., affective / attributional style, life history, acquired beliefs and values about self, others, and the larger world) are integral to being and becoming a global leader, then effective leadership training must provide opportunities to apprehend the meaning and impact of such variables before, during, and after the leadership education experience. Equilintegration Theory, or EI Theory, provides such a framework by explaining “the processes by which beliefs, values, and 'worldviews' are acquired and maintained, why their alteration is typically resisted, and how and under what circumstances their modification occurs” (Shealy, 2004, p. 1075). Derived from EI
Theory, the Equilintegration, or EI Self explains the integrative process of how one’s beliefs and values are acquired, maintained, and transformed across the lifespan. As a needs-based and life-span theory, the EI Model (EI Theory and EI Self) specify that beliefs and values develop in response to formative variables (e.g., life history, culture) interacting with core needs (e.g., attachment with caregivers, activation by learning experiences) throughout the lifespan. That is, the beliefs and values we hold to be good and true or bad and false about self, others, and the larger world are the culminating result of an interaction between core need being expressed into the world of “formative variables” (e.g., our parents, culture, gender, language, religion, etc.) which shape the nature and form of beliefs and values that are internalized by the self and expressed out into the external world (e.g., Cozen, Hanson, Poston, Jones, & Tabit, 2016).

Designed in part to evaluate and refine the core precepts of EI Theory, the Beliefs Events and Values Inventory or BEVI is a comprehensive and mixed methods assessment tool that measures what individuals believe and value and why. With development beginning in the early 1990s, based on a collection of belief value statements in the U.S. and internationally, the BEVI has been extensively studied via multiple projects and analyses over the past 25 years, including the six-year Forum BEVI Project, which sought to understand how the BEVI could best be used as an assessment tool across multiple institutions, organizations, and populations. Findings from this project demonstrated that the BEVI is a valuable assessment tool for evaluating and understanding the processes and outcomes of international, multicultural, and transformative learning (Wandschneider et al., 2015).
The BEVI has been used in a wide range of applied settings, evaluative contexts, and research projects to understand who a person is prior to engaging in an experience and how they change upon completing the experience (e.g., Cozen et al., 2016; Iyer, 2013). The BEVI also identifies factors that encourage and/or impede growth and learning. More specifically, the BEVI assesses processes including basic openness to alternative or new ideas and ways of thinking, tendencies to stereotype in particular ways, self and emotional awareness, preferred strategies for making sense of behaviors of other people and cultures, global resonance (e.g., receptivity to different cultures, religions, and social practices), and worldview shift (e.g., changes to beliefs in values in response to specific experiences). The BEVI consists of four interrelated components including demographic/background items (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, countries visited), a life history/background questionnaire, two validity and seventeen "process scales," and three qualitative "experiential reflection" items (Shealy, 2016).

The BEVI provides valuable information at multiple levels. First, it helps answer questions such as "who learns what and why, and under what circumstances." Secondly, it allows for the examination of complex processes that are associated with belief/value acquisition, maintenance, and transformation. Thirdly, it analyzes the impact of specific experiences that are implicitly or explicitly designed to facilitate growth, learning, or change. Finally, the BEVI is a globally-friendly measure for assessing beliefs, values, and events with individuals of various nationalities, cultures, and backgrounds.

Among other applications, EI Theory and the BEVI provide a framework and measurement tool for understanding and assessing core aspects of effective leadership and leadership training. This model and method may be used to appraise the capacities of
leaders as well as the “complex interaction among core needs (e.g., for attachment, affiliation) and formative variables (e.g., life history, culture)” that lead to the beliefs and values we hold to be true and further impact “how and why we experience self, others, and the larger world as we do.” (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016, p. 534). As such, EI theory and BEVI data offer a complimentary emphasis to traditional ideas about what leadership is (e.g., who good leaders are and what good leadership is) by examining “why leaders differ as they do in their experience of self, others, and the larger world as well as how to translate such understanding into effective strategies for leadership and organizational development.” (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016, p. 534).

The Development of the EI Leadership Model

Drawing upon EI Theory and EI Self, the EI Leadership Model was developed to shed light on how effective global leadership can be evaluated and understood from this perspective (Shealy, 2012). In doing so, the EI Leadership Model sought to answer the following five questions:

First, how do the beliefs and values of leaders impact their leadership (e.g., why do leaders experience and respond to self, others, and the larger world as they do)?

Second, are there common beliefs and values among leaders who are deemed to be most effective?

Third, how do we evaluate the meaning and impact of interactions between the beliefs and values of leaders and the led?

Fourth, how best do we understand the extraordinarily complex variables that influence leadership on a daily basis in the real world?
Fifth, which models of leaders and methods of leadership development are most likely to have meaning and relevance across cultures and contexts? (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016, p. 532).

In order to answer the above questions, an in-depth literature review was conducted prior to a two-year job analysis of global leaders and leadership, all of which informed the EI Leadership Model. Participants consisted of 20 domestic and international subject matter experts (SMEs) who represented 14 different countries and were well balanced in terms of age span and gender. SMEs were chosen based on four criteria: 1) reputation as an admired leader; 2) experience in multiple leadership roles; 3) diversity across subject matter experts in areas including gender, nationality, education, cultural backgrounds, etc. to ensure external validity across cultures; and 4) capacity and willingness to address the goals of the study.

SMEs participated in four job-analysis workshops where they were asked to “identify, develop, and evaluate the work behaviors (WBs), knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs), and personal characteristics (PCs) of “best” and “worst” leaders” (Dyjak-LeBlanc, 2016, p. 547). From this job analysis, the EI Leadership Model was developed (see Figure 1), which has utility for theory, research, and practice by assisting in selecting and screening leaders, assessing the effectiveness of leaders, and illuminating what foci may be most helpful in the development and implementation of leadership development programs. To evaluate the relevance and applicability of the EI Leadership Model, Dyjak-LeBlanc et al. (2016) engaged leaders in a real-world organizational context with the goals of assisting “participants in their own growth and development while increasing organizational productivity, quality, innovation, and morale” (p. 552).
Participants consisted of forty-nine leaders throughout the organization who completed the BEVI and EI Leadership Model Grading Form (a tool that asked participants to rate themselves across KSAs, WBs, and high optimal – “best” – and low optimal – “worst” – PCs using a Likert scale). Participants then participated in three workshops: 1) a presentation and discussion that used EI theory to emphasize the role of beliefs and values on leadership and organizational dynamics as well as how worldviews are developed by formative variables and core needs; 2) a review of the BEVI, what BEVI scales measure, and how BEVI scores were similar and different across leadership in the organization and the resulting implications present in relationships in the organization; and 3) a review and discussion of the EI Leadership Model and ratings on the EI Leadership Model Grading Form that helped identify areas of strengths and growth.

Overall, the application of the EI Leadership Model demonstrated that the model is efficacious in several ways. Firstly, it is a useful tool to help identify what is and is not working in regards to leadership in an organization. Secondly, it explains how beliefs and values of leaders and the led interact to influence leadership efficacy. Thirdly, it provides a framework for leaders to understand how and why they and others believe and value what they do, and the impacts of such worldviews on organizational and group processes. Finally, the EI Leadership Model promoted depth-based dialogue between leaders and the led about how to further working relationships and organizational goals (Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016; Shealy, 2012).
## MEPI, BEVI, EI LEADERSHIP

### I. MUST
1. Demonstrate integrity
2. Demonstrate understanding and awareness of self and others
3. Demonstrate critical thinking and reflective decision making
4. Communicate effectively
5. Understand and value the organization and its people
6. Embrace complexity
7. Facilitate constructive and effective group processes
8. Inspire and motivate others
9. Facilitate growth and development

### II. SHOULD
10. Understand and care for the larger world

### A. DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. MUST</th>
<th>II. SHOULD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrate integrity</td>
<td>10. Understand and care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding and awareness of self and others</td>
<td>for the larger world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrate critical thinking and reflective decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communicate effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Understand and value the organization and its people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Embrace complexity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Facilitate constructive and effective group processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspire and motivate others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Facilitate growth and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. KNOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. MUST</th>
<th>II. SHOULD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How to communicate honestly,</td>
<td>5. About the organization and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>openly, effectively, and</td>
<td>its people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persuasively</td>
<td>9. About management and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How to make decisions</td>
<td>11. About human nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efficiently and in a</td>
<td>13. About group processes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thoughtful, fair, and informed</td>
<td>their facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>14. How to manage and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>administer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How to establish trusting</td>
<td>15. About leaders and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships and a</td>
<td>leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>healthy work environment</td>
<td>16. About the larger world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>About the nature, process,</td>
<td>17. About complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and impact of decision</td>
<td>18. How to solicit honest and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>making</td>
<td>valid feedback from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How to communicate in</td>
<td>19. How to experience and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writing and orally</td>
<td>express a wide range of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How to facilitate growth and</td>
<td>20. How to respond to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>and opportunities within the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>larger world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How to facilitate growth and</td>
<td>21. About different ethical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>moral, and value-based systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and codes of conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How to promote moral and</td>
<td>22. About human growth and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethical conduct</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How to reflect with depth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and accuracy about self,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others, and the world at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How to reflect with depth and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accuracy about self, others,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the world at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>How to reflect with depth and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accuracy about self, others,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the world at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>About effective processes of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication in multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forms, technologies, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>About group processes and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>How to manage and administer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>About leaders and leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>About the larger world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>About complexity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>How to solicit honest and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>valid feedback from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>How to experience and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>express a wide range of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>How to respond to needs and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities within the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>larger world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>About different ethical,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral, and value-based systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and codes of conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>About human growth and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. The EI Leadership Model

The MEPI Student Leader Program:

A Model Global Leadership Development Program

Informed by the above literature and perspectives, we turn to our main focus: how the EI Leadership Model and BEVI method facilitated a program analysis of the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) Student Leaders Program (see https://mepi.state.gov/about-mepi/). As an annual six-week exchange program for
undergraduate and graduate students from the Middle East and North Africa regions, approximately 120 student leaders are invited to live and learn in U.S. each year and are assigned to one of six universities (Georgetown University, Benedictine University, Montana State University, Portland State University, Roger Williams University, and the University of Delaware). Each cohort of participants is fairly gender-balanced, and consists of students between the ages of twenty and twenty-four from Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, and West Bank/Gaza who have never traveled to the U.S. and are interested in “pursuing leadership opportunities and demonstrate a desire to deepen their civic engagement” (The U.S. –Middle East Partnership Initiative, n.d.). During the six-week program, students engage in activities that cultivate knowledge, skills, and processes of effective global leaders. Experiences include meeting American peers, engaging in service activities, observing and participating in local, state, and federal government processes, completing academic coursework, and touring multiple areas of the U.S.

Following their return to their home countries, students are mentored and encouraged to implement leadership projects that promote positive social and community change.

The MEPI Student Leaders Program first began in 2003, but due to inadequate existing measures to assess leadership development had not engaged in a comprehensive program analysis before now. As such, a core leader and coordinator of the MEPI program requested that a program analysis be completed via the BEVI and its EI framework. This method and model were seen as well suited to the assessment and facilitation of the overarching MEPI Student Leaders Program goal, which envisions “pluralistic societies where diversity is reflected in social organizations, politics,
business, media and government, and where all citizens have equal standing, protected by
guaranteed rights and by independent and effective courts of law” (see
=8&ved=0ahUKEwjKnICSvujVAhWl5yYKHx_AAIQFggvMAE&url=https%3A%2F%2Fmepi.state.gov%2Fmission%2Fpluralistic-societies&usg=AFQjCNFzVeSjXSpXK195VStVJ_IZO4SUYg). Such values-based
aspirations are deeply worthy, even as their pursuit is contingent upon leaders who have
the capacity and inclination to imagine and realize them through their individual and
collective actions.

From the perspective of the current program analysis, we needed to assess not
only whether prospective leaders change in the context of this leadership development
program, but what the underlying processes and factors of such change were. Without
valid and reliable measurement – which has the demonstrable ability to measure these
highly complex interactions, and translate subsequent findings into actionable terms in
the real world – we had no way to evaluate whether our good intentions are anything
more than that, much less how to use data to improve how we achieve our goals over
time. To explain our approach in more detail, we first discuss the methodology for
measuring global leadership transformation followed by an in-depth review of program
analysis results. Finally, we discuss how such findings may inform our understanding
about the measurement and development of global leadership programs in other settings
and contexts.

**Program Analysis Process**
Beginning in May of 2014, and continuing in successive waves of assessment until the spring of 2017, the BEVI was administered to a volunteer sample of MEPI program participants prior to program matriculation and at approximately five months after field-based experiences concluded in the United States. This Time 1 / Time 2 (or T1 / T2) approach was applied to three cohorts of MEPI participants. In 2014 and 2015, T1 completion rates were over 90 percent, and the final N of matched T1 / T2 pairs was 54 for 2014 and 58 for 2015. In 2016 the program analysis concluded with a final follow up that was not meant to be as comprehensive, but rather to serve as an reliability check for years 1 and 2, thus resulting in 17 matched T1 / T2 pairs.

Although the BEVI was described in greater detail above, it is important to note also that this measure is web-based, requiring approximately 30 minutes to complete. Participants typically completed the BEVI in their country of origin before or soon after arriving in the United States. Also, the BEVI is a mixed methods measure with both quantitative and qualitative components, thereby providing a rich array of scales and indices by which group and program processes may be analyzed and understood, along with an applied individual, group, and organizational report system that helps to further program objectives. In 2015, project leaders from Georgetown University also piloted the EI Leadership Model Rating and Ranking Forms, which allowed for further appraisal of participant leadership competencies following completion of the on-site program. In this current analysis, the focus is on Time 1 / Time 2 scale comparisons across three separate cohorts (2014, 2015, and 2016) for a total N of 135. As described below, all of these indices appear highly related to leadership capacities and inclinations in general as well as the specific goals and objectives of the MEPI Student Leaders Program. Overall,
and as described below, our findings are strikingly similar across the three cohorts that comprised this program analysis.

Scores on group profiles were reviewed to understand trends in overall changes across participants as a result of the MEPI experience. Within group differences also were examined to better understand how the program impacted subgroups of participants differently. Annual feedback also was offered to supervisors of the MEPI Student Leader’s Program through written reports, presentations, and workshops. Below is a comprehensive discussion about these program analysis results.

Assessment Results and Interpretations

Aggregated Findings

To begin understanding T1 / T2 changes among MEPI participants, it is useful to examine overall changes across the entire group of participants prior to investigating within group differences. Upon examination of aggregate BEVI data from the amalgamated report of all three years, several salient scales emerged that highlighted overall changes among participants (see Figure 2 for details). For example, one of the most elevated scales at Time 1 and Time 2 was Sociocultural Openness, which suggests that students were very open to, and interested in the experience of different sociocultural beliefs, values, and practices. Specifically, MEPI participants scored very highly on Sociocultural Openness prior to beginning the program (88th percentile) with little change in scores following the program (89th percentile). Thus, selection and screening processes for this particular leadership competency appear to be effective. But, the program “had them at hello” (i.e., they already “got it” to a very high degree and did not “get it” much more since Sociocultural Openness is very high at Time 1 and Time 2).
Given the obvious importance of sociocultural openness on effective global leadership, elevation of this scale would have been expected if the extensive vetting process engaged in prior to selection and U.S. entry was valid. Thus, although a valuable attitude for global leaders, as a predictor or outcome variable, “openness to different cultures” was not especially discriminating when understanding program effectiveness. Therefore, additional variables needed to be assessed to understand the program’s impact.

Furthermore, our analysis strongly suggests that the most important findings actually had more to do with other aspects of leadership functioning, which are described below.

Although very open to other cultures, such tendencies were initially the opposite regarding thoughts, feelings, and needs about self, as measured by the Basic Openness scale on the BEVI. As highlighted in the EI leadership model literature described above, effective leaders optimally exhibit awareness, sensitivity, and acceptance of their own thoughts, feelings, and needs (as measured by Basic Openness). Therefore, it was important to assess how MEPI participants’ basic openness changed following the program. BEVI results from Time 2 demonstrated a small overall increase on the Basic Openness scale (29th to 33rd percentile), which although still low at T2, suggests that students may have progressed in this functional area.

Likewise, initial Self Certitude scores on the BEVI indicated that MEPI participants tended to evidence a relatively strong sense of will (e.g., the idea that one can overcome obstacles through sheer effort, and may be impatient with excuses for difficulties by self or others). Although Self Certitude may be associated with resiliency to a degree – which many of these young leaders certainly exhibited through what is a rather intensive screening and application process – from an EI Leadership Model
perspective, such tendencies also may impede empathy, tolerance, patience, and the ability to facilitate growth and development in self and other, thus attenuating an individual’s effectiveness as a leader. Potentially auguring well, therefore (but with other program implications noted below), Self Certitude dropped substantially over the course of the program (falling from the 73rd to the 63rd percentile from T1 to T2), suggesting that the MEPI program may have provided effectual opportunities for participants to develop greater patience, empathy, and tolerance toward self and others.

Overall, participants demonstrated a moderate tendency to attend to the emotional needs of self and other at the outset of the MEPI program (Emotional Attunement was 50% at Time 1). At Time 2, participants increased to a small degree in their openness toward the “emotional world” of self and others (Emotional Attunement was 54% at Time 2). From an EI Leadership perspective, Emotional Attunement is associated with a leader’s ability to accurately acknowledge and attend to their own emotions as well as those they lead, so even small increases on this scale may indicate a potentially positive trend.

The EI Leadership Model also contends that global leadership effectiveness depends upon tolerance and support for beliefs and values other than one’s own including (but not limited to) religious values and parity aspirations between the genders. For this reason, the current study was interested in students’ scores on the scales Religious Traditionalism and Gender Traditionalism on the BEVI, which measure the extent that an individual understands self, others, behaviors, and events through traditional religious and gender role values. Although high scores on these scales are not judged to be “bad,” individuals with very high scores on Religious Traditionalism and Gender Traditionalism
may experience difficulty when working with individuals with different beliefs about religion and gender. Overall, across all three cohorts, it is notable that Religious Traditionalism was assessed to be moderately high prior to engaging in the MEPI Student Leader’s Program (67th percentile) and decreased overall following completion of the program (61st percentile). Scores on Gender Traditionalism were relatively low at Time 1 and decreased substantially at Time 2 (42nd percentile to 32nd percentile).

At this overall and aggregated level of analysis, participants in the MEPI Student Leader’s Program appear to have made changes in a direction that would be considered optimal from the standpoint of global leadership capacities that appear integral to MEPI program objectives. Specifically, participants became more open to their own basic thoughts, feelings, and needs (higher Basic Openness); more inclined toward self / other patience and understanding (lower Self Certitude); more likely to attend to and value emotion in self and other (higher Emotional Attunement); less likely to endorse simple concepts of gender and gender roles (lower Gender Traditionalism); and greater openness toward beliefs and values that differ from their own religious beliefs (lower Religious Traditionalism). Although correlation / causation confusion should be avoided (i.e., this project was not “experimental” but based upon a convenience sample of participants), it seems likely that the MEPI program played a causal role in such changes, which would appear congruent with the basic mission and purpose of this leadership program. That is, from these analyses, evidence suggests that the MEPI program appears to be accomplishing objectives that are fundamental to its overarching design and goals.
Figure 2. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 BEVI Report 2014-2017

Within Group Differences

Although examination of aggregate (i.e., averaged) T1 / T2 data are useful in identifying overall trends in scores, to interpret what such aggregate tendencies may imply at a deeper and more nuanced manner, it typically is helpful to examine other BEVI profiles that illuminate within group differences. To start, consider Decile Profile on the BEVI, which breaks down each of the scale scores by deciles (i.e., the dispersion
of the larger group is illustrated across each of the scales in increments of 10 percent, from those who score in the lowest 10 percent of the scale to those who score in the highest 10 percent of each scale). Typically, even groups that seem relatively homogenous show different dispersions across scales, which is why measurement of this nature should not consist only of aggregated data, mainly because important variation that actually exists within a group may be “washed out” when scores are averaged. In short, Decile Profile can help illuminate areas of difference and similarity within groups. A cursory review of Figure 3, Decile Profile, highlights that indeed MEPI participants vary greatly in how they experience self, others, and the larger world, both at the beginning and end of the MEPI program. Consider the following summary findings.

First, Decile Profile sheds light on how and why MEPI participants developed the belief / values systems that they did. Recall from the above discussion that from an EI perspective, beliefs and values are the functional result of an interaction between formative variables (e.g., life history, culture) and core needs (e.g., attachment with caregivers, affiliation), which results in how and why individuals experience self, others, and the larger world as they do (see Figure 4). As Decile Profile illustrates, MEPI participants entered and exited the program very differently at this level. For example, on the Negative Life Events scale, which measures difficult childhood experiences, family conflict, and other life struggles, participants’ scores spanned across all ten deciles, demonstrating that some participants report very difficult and conflictual life experiences prior to and at the conclusion of program entry whereas others fell at the opposite end of the continuum and everywhere in between. Likewise, Needs Closure essentially measures the degree to which core needs (as discussed above) were or were not met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deciles:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Negative Life Events (T1)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Negative Life Events (T2)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Needs Closure (T1)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Needs Closure (T2)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs Fulfillment (T1)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs Fulfillment (T2)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identity Diffusion (T1)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identity Diffusion (T2)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Basic Openness (T1)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Basic Openness (T2)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self Certitude (T1)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self Certitude (T2)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Basic Determinism (T1)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Basic Determinism (T2)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socioemotional Convergence (T1)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socioemotional Convergence (T2)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical Resonance (T1)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical Resonance (T2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Emotional Attunement (T1)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Emotional Attunement (T2)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self Awareness (T1)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self Awareness (T2)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meaning Quest (T1)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meaning Quest (T2)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious Traditionalism (T1)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious Traditionalism (T2)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (T1)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (T2)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (T1)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (T2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ecological Resonance (T1)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ecological Resonance (T2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Global Resonance (T1)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Global Resonance (T2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Decile Profile*
High scores are associated with unmet needs, whereas low scores suggest that basic needs were well met. Despite the almost even dispersion across the entire Negative Life Events scale, half of participants scored in the lowest two deciles for Needs Closure, indicating that even with possible exposure to negative life events, their experience is that these basic needs were mostly met. From the standpoint of the BEVI, such a contrast – high Negative Life Events but low Needs Closure – is one way to operationalize the construct of resilience, which certainly seems to characterize many of these unique and talented individuals. Nonetheless, the other 50% of participants scored between the third and tenth deciles, with 20% of participants scoring at or above the 70th percentile on Needs Closure, meaning that many participants reported significant unmet needs. Finally, the Needs Fulfillment scale measures participants’ openness to experiences, needs, and feelings as well as deep care and sensitivity for self, others, and the larger world. Over 40% of participants scored in the top 30%, demonstrating great openness, care, and sensitivity. However, almost 40% scored in the lower five deciles. Overall, such data illustrate substantial differences between participants’ life experiences and how they experience themselves, others, and the larger world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Negative Life Events (T1)</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Negative Life Events (T2)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Needs Closure (T1)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Needs Closure (T2)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs Fulfillment (T1)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs Fulfillment (T2)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Decile Profile: Negative Life Events, Needs Closure and Needs Fulfillment Scales*
Decile Profile also helped to identify how participants varied and did not vary in their scores on BEVI scales. For example, while Aggregate Profile showed that participants scored relatively low on Basic Openness, Decile Profile demonstrates that while over 40% of participants scored at or below the 20\textsuperscript{th} percentile at T1, the other participants spanned the top eight deciles with a significant number of participants being quite open to basic thoughts, feelings, and needs, which is one more reason why averaged data may be misleading, since they obscure the variability that is inherent in a given group (see Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Basic Openness (T1)</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>24%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Basic Openness (T2)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Decile Profile: Basic Openness Scale

For example, Aggregate Profile suggested that overall, participants initially scored relatively high on Self Certitude, which indicates a strong sense of will / determination but also impatience toward excuses and difficulties from self and others; recall that scores on Self Certitude decreased overall at Time 2 (see Figure 2). Decile Profile allows us to hone in more closely on where such changes are occurring as it appears that greatest drop is among those with very high Self Certitude scores at T1 (see Figure 6). More specifically, at Time 1, 52% of participants scored in the top 30% on Self Certitude, whereas at Time 2, only 37% scored in the top 30%. In other words, upon completion of the MEPI Student Leader’s Program, fewer participants fell in the least optimal range of functioning on this scale, which suggests an increase in tolerance, empathy, and patience toward themselves and others when experiencing difficult or challenging circumstances.
Likewise, examination of deciles for the Self Awareness scale also reveals change that is not visible when looking only at aggregated data. According to Aggregate Profile, there was no change in Self Awareness scores from T1 to T2. However, when looking at Self Awareness decile scores, it was clear that scores changed in both directions (see Figure 7). For instance, substantially more individuals scored in the top 30% for self-awareness following completion of the MEPI Student Leader’s Program (62% scored in the top 30% at T2 whereas only 53% of participants scored in the top 30% at T1). At the same time, whereas only 3% of participants scored in the bottom two deciles on the Self Awareness scale at Time 1, 10% scored in the same range at Time 2. Therefore, overall, examination of deciles reveals that following completion of the Student Leader’s Program, some participants became very self-aware while a smaller subset of participants became less self-aware, a point that we will return to again, as it is among the most important findings from this analysis.

Consider another example via Sociocultural Openness scores, which were high overall. However, examination of decile scores shows that while most participants scored highly on Sociocultural Openness (90% scored in the top five deciles at Time 1), some participants did not show this pattern (see Figure 8). Furthermore, while aggregate
data demonstrated a very slight increase in Sociocultural Openness scores (88% to 89%), decile data revealed that some changes from a subset of MEPI participants actually were in the opposite direction at T2. Specifically, only 4% of participants scored in the bottom three deciles on the scale at Time 1, but 12% scored in the same range at Time 2. So while overall, participants began very high on sociocultural Openness and tended to remain quite open, some participants were quite closed to sociocultural experiences prior to engaging in the MEPI program, while others became more closed to sociocultural experiences upon program conclusion. Furthermore, on a related but factorially different scale, Global Resonance – which measures not just openness to other cultures, but rather a person’s investment in learning about and encountering others different from themselves – a similar trend was evident on Decile Profile (see Figure 8). Specifically, while many participants scored highly on Global Resonance at T1 and became more interested in “making a difference in the world,” other MEPI participants were much less invested in such matters to begin with and even less so at the program’s conclusion (4% scored in the bottom two deciles at Time 1 and 12% in the bottom two deciles at Time 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Sociocultural Openness (T1)</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (T2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Global Resonance (T1)</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>36%</th>
<th>13%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Global Resonance (T2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Decile Profile: Sociocultural Openness and Global Resonance Scales

While aggregate data show an overall reduction in Religious Traditionalism, examination of deciles reveal a more textured analysis regarding this change (see Table 9). In particular, there was a significant reduction in the number of participants who
scored as very religiously traditional (i.e., 13% fewer participants scored in the top three deciles at Time 2). Likewise, 9% more participants scored in the first decile at Time 2, meaning that a substantially greater number of participants developed more complex and open attitudes toward gender roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Religious Traditionalism (T1)</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>18%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious Traditionalism (T2)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (T1)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (T2)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Decile Profile: Religious and Gender Traditionalism Scales

Overall, decile data were particularly useful in illustrating that although patterns did emerge that were characteristic of this population of students (e.g., as a group, they were very high on Sociocultural Openness), participants actually were quite heterogeneous in the beliefs and values they held before, during, and after the MEPI program. Thus, from the standpoint of the BEVI and MEPI program, it is important to appreciate the quite extraordinary variability among these individuals who all come from the “same” region of the world – the Middle East and North Africa. At the same time, other BEVI indices reveal striking functional patterns that tend to distinguish subgroups within the larger sample. In other words, as a group, participants enter the MEPI program with quite different “self structures” (e.g., emotional capacity, attributional tendencies, etc.). Some MEPI participants appear highly ready / able to experience and metabolize the intensive nature of the MEPI program whereas there is a real question as to the readiness of others to be able to manage this experience, which may help account for why some MEPI participants have struggled more than others both during and after the program. As a basis for this observation, it is necessary to review several other BEVI
indices including Aggregate Profile Contrast, Aggregate Profile by Gender, and Aggregate Profile by Education.

**Aggregate Profile Contrast and the Full Scale Score**

Aggregate Profile Contrast illustrates how different and similar the group is across all 17 BEVI scales via the lowest 30%, middle 40%, and highest 30% of Full scale scores. On the BEVI, the Full Scale Score represents or captures the "core essence" of what the BEVI measures, including basic openness; receptivity to different cultures, religions, and social practices; the tendency (or not) to stereotype in particular ways; self and emotional awareness; and preferred but implicit strategies for making sense of why ‘other’ people and cultures ‘do what they do.’

All 17 BEVI scales are clustered under seven separate domains: I. Formative Variables; II. Fulfillment of Core Needs; III. Tolerance of Disequilibrium; IV. Critical Thinking; V. Self Access; VI. Other Access; and VII. Global Access (Wandschneider et al., 2015; Shealy, 2016). Scales under Domain I are not used to calculate the Full Scale Score. To calculate the Full Scale Score, 11 of these 17 scales are used for both empirical (e.g., correlation matrix; factor analysis) and theoretical (e.g., the EI Model) reasons. The specific scales, as well as their directionality in terms of contributing to a higher or lower Full Scale Score are as follows (i.e., in addition to the scale number and name, the designation of "higher" means that a higher score on this specific scale contributes to a higher Full Scale Score, while the designation of "lower" means that a lower score on this specific scale also contributes to a higher Full Scale Score): Scale 3, Needs Fulfillment (Higher); Scale 5, Basic Openness (Higher); Scale 6, Self Certitude (Lower); Scale 7, Basic Determinism (Lower); Scale 10, Emotional Attunement (Higher);
Scale 11, Self Awareness (Higher); Scale 13, Religious Traditionalism (Lower); Scale 14, Gender Traditionalism (Lower); Scale 15, Sociocultural Openness (Higher); Scale 16, Ecological Resonance (Higher); and Scale 17, Global Resonance (Higher).

Overall, a higher or lower score on each of these specific scales results in a higher or lower Full Scale Score. For any given group who has taken the BEVI, the highest 30 percent of Full Scale scorers are understood, for interpretive purposes, as "High Optimal" scorers; the middle 40 percent of Full Scale scorers are understood as "Middle Optimal" scorers; the lowest 30 percent of Full Scorers are understood as "Low Optimal" scorers.

The Full Scale Score is used to calculate the “Profile Contrast” and “Aggregate Profile Contrast” indices on the BEVI. In this regard, it should be noted, particularly from a T1 / T2 perspective, that “Profile Contrast” allows individuals to move across different scales on the BEVI from T1 to T2. “Aggregate Profile Contrast” follows the same individuals at T1 to T2 to see how changes may occur at T2 for the same group of individuals at T1. In other words, unlike “Profile Contrast” which allows individuals to fall wherever they will at T2, “Aggregate Profile Contrast” compares the same group of individuals at T1 and T2. Profile Contrast and Aggregate Profile Contrast are very important from an interpretative and educational / intervention perspective as they illustrate fundamental differences within the group in terms of how individuals are “organized” at the level of “self” from the standpoint of the BEVI and EI framework vis-à-vis “the self” (e.g., affectively, attributionally, developmentally, beliefs about self / others / the larger world).

Because we are interested in how specific individuals responded from Time 1 to Time 2, our focus will be on Aggregate Profile Contrast for the MEPI participants. What
did we find? First, highest optimal participants reported substantially more negative life experiences than the middle or lowest optimal groups (see Figure 10). However, the highest and middle optimal groups reported that their core development and life needs were met relatively well (see Needs Closure scale in Figure 10; low scores are associated with a higher degree to which individuals report that core needs were met well). Furthermore, despite apparent exposure to a significant degree of negative life events, this high optimal group still reported their core needs were well met. From the standpoint of the BEVI, that is an operational definition of resiliency, particularly because a number of analyses indicate that a high degree of negative life events tend to be associated with lower optimal functioning overall (Wandschneider et al., 2015; Shealy, 2016). In other words, when the Negative Life Events scale is high, Needs Closure also tends to be high.

Augmenting this finding of “resiliency,” high optimal scorers also show a relatively high degree of openness to their own experiences, needs, and feelings, while caring deeply and sensitively for self, others, and the larger world, as illustrated by the relatively high score on Needs Fulfillment. Likewise, the middle optimal group actually showed an increase in Needs Fulfillment at Time 2. However, in contrast to the middle and highest optimal groups, the lowest optimal group scored moderately low at Time 1 on Needs Fulfillment, and scored even lower at Time 2, accompanied by slight but similar increases on Negative Life Events and Needs Closure, a pattern than was opposite of either the middle or high optimal groups (see Figure 10).
With some interesting variations, these overall trends continue to prevail across other BEVI scales. Consider Basic Openness, for example, which measures the ability and willingness to acknowledge the existence of basic human thoughts and feelings. As Figure 11 illustrates, the lowest optimal group was lowest on Basic Openness at T1 and T2 compared to the middle or high group. A couple caveats are necessary, however. First, from a normative perspective, Basic Openness was lower overall for MEPI participants than many other cohorts in the United States and elsewhere, which may have sociocultural origins (e.g., although requiring more research, perhaps there is less emphasis overall and/or greater prohibitions on accessing these basic thoughts and
feelings such as “I sometimes feel angry” or “I have felt jealousy toward someone I loved”). Second and importantly, although starting out lower on Basic Openness than either the middle or high optimal groups, the lowest optimal group does show an increase on Basic Openness from T1 to T2, which could bode well in terms of leadership capacity over time (e.g., as noted above, openness to thoughts and feelings in self and other are among the attributes associated with effectiveness leadership).

Additionally, relative to other cohorts in the United States and internationally, MEPI participants scored quite high on Self Certitude at Time 1, which indicates that while they have a strong sense of “will” (e.g., a belief that they and others can and should overcome all obstacles without complaint), they correspondingly also tended to have less tolerance for difficulties or excuses in themselves and others. Again, such capacity may be associated with a greater degree of resiliency on the one hand, but also a degree of vulnerability to perceived or actual weakness, particularly when faced with events or circumstances that simply cannot be surmounted. As such, from a global leadership perspective – which emphasizes the value of apprehending the complexities and ambiguities of the world, and caring for vulnerabilities in self and other – it perhaps is promising that these relatively high degrees of Self Certitude decrease across all three groups. In short, following the MEPI program experience, participants would appear to have a greater capacity for empathy, tolerance, patience, and the ability to facilitate growth and development in relationship with self and others.

Returning to the overarching pattern among the groups, consider next Emotional Attunement, which measures “receptivity and attitude toward a range of feelings, emotional experiences/behaviors, and affect in general, for oneself and others” (Shealy,
2005, p. 100), and is yet another indice of effective global leadership as noted above. Here again, there are quite striking differences between the three groups, with the lowest optimal group scoring quite low (30th percentile), the middle group scoring moderately (50th percentile), and the highest optimal group scoring quite high (73rd percentile) on Emotional Attunement at Time 1. It is important to reflect upon such differences, as they indicate strikingly different self-structures in terms of the inclination and capacity to value access to and reflection upon emotional experiences in self and other. It is quite possible that the low versus high optimal groups would be confused if not irritated by the way in which the “other group” deals with the world of emotion in self and other. At the same time, both of these groups show an increase in Emotional Attunement at Time 2, with the greatest increase for the lowest optimal group, which potentially bodes well over the long term vis-à-vis global leadership competencies.

Finally, since global leadership also requires openness and tolerance regarding beliefs, values, and practices different from one’s own, it would seem that a high degree of Religious Traditionalism and Gender Traditionalism would not be optimal in that regard, mainly because it could be more difficult for such individuals to accept or relate to individuals who were less sure of or committed to strong convictions in this regard. Here again we see substantial differences between the low and high optimal groups on both scales, ranging from 76 (low optimal) to 48 (high optimal) on Religious Traditionalism and 58 (low optimal) to 22 (high optimal) on Gender Traditionalism. That said, as Figure 11 illustrates, on both scales the trends for all three groups – low, medium, and high – are a decrease on both scales from Time 1 to Time 2. Although correlation / causation confusion should be avoided (i.e., we can’t say for sure that the MEPI program
“caused” these changes, that would seem to be the most parsimonious explanation given that there was no other differential intervention that these groups experienced between Time 1 and Time 2).

Figure 11. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile Contrast: Basic Openness, Self Certitude, Emotional Attunement, and Religious and Gender Traditionalism
In the next set of scales on Aggregate Profile Contrast, similar patterns continue in that the low optimal group is differentiated quite dramatically from the high optimal group (see Figure 12). For example, the lowest and highest optimal groups scored in the moderate range on Identity Diffusion, a scale which measures the degree to which individuals feel either relatively free or relatively constrained by historic / family experiences regarding their own life and relational trajectories. The highest optimal group’s scores decreased and suggest that following the program, this sub-group developed more clarity about who they are and greater hope in the positive trajectories of their own life. In contrast, the lowest optimal group increased in Identity Diffusion at Time 2, which means they may have felt less certainty about who they are and where they are going in life upon concluding the program. The lowest optimal group also scored higher than the other groups on Basic Determinism, a scale that measures an individual’s tendency to prefer simple explanations for differences and behavior and a belief that individuals do not change, which from a global leadership perspective, likely is undesirable. Importantly, while the middle and highest optimal groups’ scores decreased at Time 2, the lowest optimal group’s scores increased on Basic Determinism. On a related scale, Socioemotional Convergence, which measures the degree to which individuals tend to see the world in shades of gray rather than black and white, the lowest optimal group scored moderately low at Time 1 and lower at Time 2, while the middle and highest optimal groups scored highly both at Time 1 and Time 2 (see Figure 12).

The lowest optimal group also scored much lower at Time 1 than the other groups on Meaning Quest, or one’s tendency and inclination to persist in a search for meaning in life, a trend which was even more pronounced at Time 2, where their scores dropped
Figure 12. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile Contrast: Identity Diffusion, Basic Determinism, Socioemotional Convergence, Meaning Quest, and Global Resonance Scales
even more (although the middle optimal group also drops to a degree, they remain much more invested in “Meaning Quest” than the low optimal group at T1 and T2). Finally, the lowest optimal group began the program less invested in learning about individuals different from themselves and engaging in change-oriented advocacy as measured by the Global Resonance scale. While the middle and highest optimal groups scored much higher at Time 1 and Time 2 on Global Resonance, the low optimal group actually dropped in this inclination from the beginning to the end of the MEPI experience.

Overall, the above results suggest a number of interrelated findings, with three emphasized here. First, the lowest optimal group appears overall substantially less prepared emotionally and in terms of cognitive reflective capacity to be able to manage the intensive rigors of the MEPI leadership program. Second, all groups – including the lowest optimal group – show a pattern of change from Time 1 to Time 2 that suggest the MEPI program is having a positive impact in several key areas (e.g., lower Self Certitude, lower Religious and Gender Traditionalism) related to global leadership. Third, for the lowest optimal group, these “positive” changes may be exacting a relatively greater toll in terms of disequilibration from an EI perspective (Shealy, 2016), which shows up at multiple levels (e.g., higher Identity Diffusion, lower Socioemotional Convergence, lower Global Resonance), and may be due to a relatively lower capacity to manage the “high impact” nature of the MEPI program than the other two groups. The challenge of such trends is that from the standpoint of the MEPI program, approximately 70 percent of the participants do show results that are in keeping with its mission and goals. The remaining 30 percent, represented by the low optimal group, also do show “positive” outcomes, but would appear to pay a higher price emotionally and otherwise, which may
lead to a rejection of core MEPI principles (as illustrated by lower Global Resonance, for example), although long-term outcomes exceed the scope of the current analysis (e.g., it would be necessary to conduct a Time 3 assessment to evaluate such change-processes over the long-term).

**Education as a Moderator**

At another level of analysis, the BEVI Group Report also provides profiles that help assess within group differences in terms of how similarly or differently individuals from different demographics and backgrounds score on BEVI scales. Such information can be very useful as it illustrates how different moderators (e.g., classification variables that differentiate individuals within specific categories, such as gender, education, family income) may impact beliefs and values prior to a program intervention, such as MEPI, as well as how the intervention itself interacts with these moderators to facilitate or impede change over time. For example, in the MEPI program, there are clear scale-based differences between the 30% of participants with the highest (N = 40) and lowest (N = 40) levels of higher education, even though this difference is only about one year on average between the two groups. For MEPI participants, the variable of education appears to function in a counterintuitive manner at least in comparison to different cohorts in different parts of the world, as the following findings illustrate.

First, participants with more education reported substantially more negative life experiences (70% on Negative Life Events) than those with less education (49%) prior to engaging in the leadership program; they also appeared to become more aware of negative life experiences after returning to their home countries following the leadership program (Highest education group increased 6% at Time 2 for Negative Life Events) (see
Figure 13. Moreover, for the highest educated group, the greater number of negative life experiences also was associated with the experience that one’s core needs were not as well met. Highly correlated with a greater amount of negative life experiences, the more educated group reported that their core needs were not as well met and that they were less open to thoughts, feelings, and needs in self and other. In contrast, the lesser educated group reported that their needs were relatively well met as well as a greater openness to experiences, needs, and feelings. Furthermore, while the lesser educated group demonstrated little change on Needs Closure and Needs Fulfillment, the more educated group reported lower fulfillment of their own core needs at Time 2.

Figure 13. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Education: Negative Life Events, Needs Closure, and Needs Fulfillment Scales

At the same time, the higher educated group appeared to be more able to tolerate disequilibrium as suggested by Basic Openness and Self Certitude scores (see Figure 14).
Specifically, more educated participants appear to have been more open about basic thoughts, feelings, and needs than less educated participants. In addition, lesser educated students seem to have a stronger sense of will but greater impatience toward excuses for difficulties, while more educated participants demonstrated greater empathy for difficulties in themselves and others (see Self Certitude). While both the highest and lowest educated groups became more empathic toward difficulties in self and others, with greater Basic Openness following the program, the highest educated group’s scores remained more optimal than the lowest group’s. Therefore, as global leadership requires an ability to accept and work within vague and challenging contexts, the more educated group may be somewhat more equipped in this domain.

| 5. Basic Openness (Lowest 30% T1) | 28 |
| 5. Basic Openness (Lowest 30% T2) | 32 |
| 5. Basic Openness (Highest 30% T1) | 44 |
| 5. Basic Openness (Highest 30% T2) | 52 |
| 6. Self Certitude (Lowest 30% T1) | 73 |
| 6. Self Certitude (Lowest 30% T2) | 63 |
| 6. Self Certitude (Highest 30% T1) | 61 |
| 6. Self Certitude (Highest 30% T2) | 59 |

*Figure 14. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Education: Basic Openness and Self Certitude Scales*

While the highest educated group was relatively more open and honest about basic human needs, thoughts, feelings, and difficulties (Basic Openness), they also showed a greater tendency to engage in stereotyping about who humans are and how they should function (e.g., how men and women should be; what causes us to do what we do).
This seemingly paradoxical finding emerged on more than one occasion, and suggests that greater amounts of education are not necessarily associated with lesser degrees of stereotypical or black and white thinking, even though the capacity for such thinking (as demonstrated by higher Socioemotional Convergence scores) would appear to be present (see Figure 15). Participants with more education scored more than twice as high than less educated participants on Basic Determinism, which is associated with a preference for simple explanations and beliefs that people and behaviors do not change. Likewise, the highest educated group was much more likely to see the world in black and white whereas the less educated group demonstrated a greater propensity to understand the world with more complexity and in shades of gray (see Socioemotional Convergence scale in Figure 15). On the Basic Determinism scale, both higher and lower educated groups scored lowered at Time 2, which is considered optimal in terms of global leadership. However, after returning home from the leadership program, the less educated group scored slightly lower (3%) while the higher educated group scored 8% lower on Socioemotional Convergence, which demonstrates a reduction in one’s tendency to see the world in shades of gray.
**Figure 15. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Education:**

**Basic Determinism and Socioemotional Convergence Scales**

Generally, less educated participants tended to show greater Self Access, including Emotional Attunement, Self Awareness, and Meaning Quest than their higher educated counterparts prior to entering the Student Leader’s Program (see Figure 16). However, higher educated students demonstrated substantial increases across these scales at Time 2. For example, while higher educated students entered the MEPI Student Leader’s Program with relatively low levels of Emotional Attunement, at Time 2 they demonstrated a high level of Emotional Attunement. Furthermore, while higher educated students scored substantially lower than less educated students on Self Awareness at Time 1, the more educated group’s scores increased to match the less educated group at Time 2. In addition, less educated participants scored substantially higher on Meaning Quest at Time 1, which reflects a greater tendency to search for meaning in life, to persist, feel deeply, and have concern for others. However, at Time 2, while the less educated group decreased somewhat on Meaning Quest, the higher educated group increased.
At a complementary level, scales that measure beliefs and values relative to religion, gender, and culture also show interactions with the moderator of education. However, such trends again appear paradoxical, particularly when juxtaposed with findings from other cohorts in the U.S. and internationally. For example, the highest educated participants in the MEPI program scored substantially higher on Religious and Gender Traditionalism and significantly lower on Sociocultural Openness at Time 1 and demonstrated no change on Gender Traditionalism, a slight increase on Religious Traditionalism, and a significant decrease on Sociocultural Openness at Time 2. A similar trend was observed on the related scale of Global Resonance, which measures interest and investment in encountering and learning about individuals, groups, and cultures different from one’s own. More specifically, less educated students entered the program with high Global Resonance, a finding that remained high at Time 2. However,
the highest educated group of participants entered the program with moderate scores on Global Resonance, and following the program, demonstrated lesser interest and investment in learning about and encountering others different from them (see Figure 17).

![Figure 17. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Education: Other Access Scales](image)

To recap, less educated students reported greater 1) fulfillment of core needs, 2) clarity about their own identity, 3) tendencies to embrace complexity, 4) attunement to emotions, 5) higher self-awareness, 6) a stronger tendency to seek meaning in life, and 7) greater openness and interest in engaging with others different from themselves in terms of religion, gender roles, and culture. However, less educated participants also showed little openness to basic thoughts, feelings, and needs and impatience toward excuses for
difficulties. In contrast, the highest educated students entered the program reporting lesser 1) fulfillment of core needs, 2) greater confusion about their identity, 3) moderate openness to basic thoughts, feelings, and needs, 4) a pronounced tendency to see and understand the world using simple explanations that are sometimes black and white, 5) lower/emotional attunement, 6) moderately high self-awareness, 7) little quest for meaning in life, 8) high religious and gender traditionalism, and 9) moderate openness and interest in engaging with others different from themselves. When this same highest educated group returned home (following completion of the MEPI program), they appeared overall to 1) experience more identity conflict and confusion but 2) also an increased openness to basic thoughts feelings, and needs; 3) a lesser tendency to prefer simple explanations for why people do what they do, but 4) a greater tendency to see the world overall in black and white terms; 5) a dramatic increase in emotionality, 6) greater self awareness, and 7) an increase in the search for meaning quest for life, but 8) a slight elevation in already quite high religious traditionalism, 9) unchanged and high gender traditionalism, and 10) a marked decline in openness to and interest in engaging with other cultures and the larger world. These complex findings continue to give us pause, for they are highly complex and potentially counterintuitive. Thus, a potential explanation for these results is provided below in the summary section of this analysis.

**Gender as a Moderator**

In addition to education, another moderator variable that appeared especially salient to this program analysis was gender. As such, we decided to investigate further how gender appeared to interact with the MEPI program through Aggregate Profile by Gender on the BEVI. Overall, examination of BEVI data by gender demonstrated that on
average, males and females demonstrated quite different Time 1 and Time 2 profiles at a number of levels. For example, females (N = 85) scored substantially higher than males (N = 63) on Identity Diffusion at Time 1 (51% for females and 32% for males), which suggests that prior to engaging in the MEPI program, females felt less clear regarding who they were with less agency to alter or control their current life trajectory as compared to males (see Figure 18). Moreover, while males seemed to become clearer and surer about their identities and trajectories following completion of the program, females became slightly less clear and sure (27% for males and 55% for females at Time 2). Although preliminary, such a finding may suggest that the MEPI program helped males substantially more than females in such identity/trajectory clarification processes, for reasons that potentially may have to do with how the genders are understood and empowered (or not) back in their home country.

In addition, males and females both scored relatively low on Basic Openness prior to the program, although females scored substantially higher (21% for males and 35% for females at Time 1) (see Figure 19). However, while females increased only slightly in their openness to basic thoughts, feelings, and needs (1% increase for females), males’ scores for Basic Openness showed a greater increase (7% increase for males), although

![Figure 18. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Gender: Identity Diffusion](image)
males continued to score lower than females. In addition, although both groups were relatively high, compared to males, females entered the program with a greater sense of certainty about the way they, others, and the world at large should be, with corresponding impatience for excuses or weaknesses in self or others (females scored 77% and males scored 67% on Self Certitude) (see Figure 19). Although still elevated, both males’ and females’ scores declined for Self Certitude following the program (12% decrease for females and 6% decrease for males), which may be associated with increased empathy / understanding / patience regarding vulnerabilities in self and other, but also can suggest a loss of certainty, which in itself may be quite difficult to experience from an emotional and attributional perspective as one’s previous “sure” sense of self may have been challenged.

![Figure 19. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Gender: Basic Openness and Self Certitude Scales](image)

On the Socioemotional Convergence scale, which measures openness and awareness regarding who one is and why as well as the inclination and capacity to think in shades of gray, females scored higher at Time 1 than males (75% for females and 57%
for males) (see Figure 20). However, while males’ scores increased somewhat (5%) on this scale at Time 2, females’ scores decreased (6%). Because Socioemotional Convergence appears to require higher order metacognitive and affective capacities, declines on this scale could be reflective of a retreat from complexity due to chronic feelings of overwhelm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Socioemotional Convergence (Male T1)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socioemotional Convergence (Male T2)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socioemotional Convergence (Female T1)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socioemotional Convergence (Female T2)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 20. MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Gender: Socioemotional Convergence Scale*

Aggregate Profile by Gender also illustrated that females entered the MEPI program 1) with a substantially greater tendency than males to seek meaning in life and to feel care and concern for those less fortunate (females scored 74% on Meaning Quest, while males scored 51%); 2) a greater propensity for Self Awareness than males (81% for females and 70% for males); and 3) much higher scores on Emotional Attunement than males at Time 1 (61% for females and 36% for males). Congruent with an overall pattern via gender, male Emotional Attunement increased 8% from T1 to T2 whereas as Meaning Quest decreased for females by 9%. Again, such a finding suggests that more than males, females may have been retreating somewhat from the intensive nature of the MEPI program at T2 whereas males experienced the opposite effect.
In terms of openness to other cultures, including those with different religious beliefs and ideas about gender roles, males and females also scored somewhat differently (see Figure 22). Overall, females also scored higher on Sociocultural Openness than their male counterparts (females scored 90% while males scored 83%), although males increased in their openness to other cultures following the program (males scored 87% at Time 2). Females also reported less gender traditionalism than males, although both groups became less traditional overall in terms of gender. However, interestingly, women scored higher on religious traditionalism than men at Time 1 and Time 2 – notably, females were 15 points higher than males at Time 1 – although both groups’ scores decreased following completion of the program. Again, these sorts of changes – although potentially congruent with greater global leadership effectiveness – may “take a
toll” on the self in that it may be quite difficult to have one’s own internal sense of these fundamental matters (e.g., of gender, religion) challenged by living and learning in a qualitatively different sociocultural milieu. As with the moderating variable of education, we will provide further interpretation of these gender findings below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Religious Traditionalism (Male T1)</th>
<th>58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious Traditionalism (Male T2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious Traditionalism (Female T1)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious Traditionalism (Female T2)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (Male T1)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (Male T2)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (Female T1)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender Traditionalism (Female T2)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (Male T1)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (Male T2)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (Female T1)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociocultural Openness (Female T2)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 22.** MEPI Student Leader’s Program T1/T2 Aggregate Profile by Gender: Religious and Gender Traditionalism and Sociocultural Openness Scales

**EI Leadership Ratings and Rankings**

In addition to using BEVI data, the program analysis also piloted the EI Leadership Rating Form for Georgetown University participants from the larger 2015 cohort. The EI Leadership Rating Form was developed based on the EI Leadership Model (Shealy, 2012; Dyjak-LeBlanc et al., 2016) and required that two student supervisors complete the rating form separately for each student after the on-site program completed. The first section of the EI Leadership Rating Form asked supervisors to rate participants on a Likert scale from 1 (Always) to 5 (Never) across four domains identified by the EI Leadership Model, which include Work Behaviors (WB); Knowledge, Skills,
and Abilities (KSA); High Optimal Personal Characteristics (PC); and Low Optimal Personal Characteristics (see Figure 23). Supervisors of the MEPI Student Leader’s Program were also asked to provide qualitative data by identifying students’ strengths and areas for improvement. Based upon these independent ratings, the two supervisors then developed an overall ranking of all students.

1. **Ratings for WBs, KSAs, and PCs:** Informed by the EI leadership model, please complete this form on the basis of your understanding of what each of the below terms / phrases means and assign a rating based on your understanding of how often the WB, KSA, or PC is / was evidenced:

   1= Always  2= Frequently  3= Sometimes  4= Rarely  5 = Never  NB = No Basis for Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Behaviors. Please rate how descriptive the following sample work behaviors are of this individual: (e.g., demonstrates integrity, awareness of self and others, critical thinking and reflective decision-making, effective communication, understanding of others’/the organization’s values; facilitates constructive and effective group processes; embraces complexity, inspires and motivates others, facilitates growth and development).</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities. Please rate how descriptive the following sample KSAs are of this individual: (e.g., recognizes the impact of one’s own behavior on others; acknowledges when one is wrong; aware and accepting of needs, feelings; strives for humility in order to create healthy, empathic, and responsive processes for pursuing and achieving goals).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Optimal Characteristics. Please rate how descriptive the following sample high optimal PCs are of this individual: (e.g., integrity, responsibility, honesty, trustworthy, ethical, knowledgeable, informed, effective, smart, open, fair, visionary, reasonable).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Optimal Characteristics. Please rate how descriptive the following sample low optimal PCs are of this individual [NOTE THAT THE RATING CRITERIA ARE REVERSED FOR THIS DOMAIN]: (e.g., incompetent, manipulative, corrupt, controlling, harassing, deceitful, dishonest, authoritarian, ignorant, obstructive).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 NB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Strengths:** Do you have any comments regarding this individual’s areas of strength as a leader?

3. **Areas for Improvement:** Do you have any comments regarding areas of growth and development for this individual as a leader?

*Figure 23. EI Leadership Rating Form*
Results revealed a statistically significant linkage between the independent leadership rankings of all participants with the Global Resonance scale on the BEVI, which measures openness to other cultures as well as an investment in learning about and encountering others who are different from us. In other words, Global Resonance scores on the BEVI at Time 1 were positively correlated \((r = .53, p < .05)\) with leadership rankings via the EI Leadership Model for the Georgetown cohort. This intriguing linkage suggests that students who most desire to learn about and engage with cultures other than their own may in fact be experienced by supervisors as more effective and promising as leaders. This empirical relationship between scale-based assessment data from the BEVI – and real world supervisor ratings and rankings from the EI Leadership Model – represents a very promising trajectory for real world application and future research. That is because in the final analysis, we seek data-based predictions regarding the competencies and conduct of future leaders. With a larger sample and expanded approach, the full relationship between these two methodologies – the BEVI and EI model – could be explicated further, which would help advance our approach to leadership assessment and development.

**Workshops and Feedback**

During the three-year program analysis of the MEPI program, there were different opportunities for feedback and engagement with faculty and supervisors in different sites through written reports, presentations, and workshops based on BEVI results. Such information included Time 1 / Time 2 Group Reports that were made available to supervisors of the program after students completed the BEVI at Time 2 in order to highlight major findings (e.g., what changes occurred, for whom, and under what
circumstances) and provide recommendations to improve program processes and outcomes. In addition, upon the conclusion of the first year of the program analysis, researchers of this project considered the importance of understanding and examining beliefs and values as part of leadership assessment and development during an on-site workshop in Morocco. The presentation and discussion highlighted program strengths, areas for growth, and within / between group differences in order to identify how different individuals were impacted differently and how programs could support students who tended to feel overwhelmed as a result of this high impact experience.

Prior to the second year of program analysis, another workshop was held to consider further the T1 / T2 findings from year one and to orient faculty supervisors about their incoming cohorts for year two across each of the separate institutions (using Time 1 findings for the beginning of the second year). In addition to group based discussion, individual meetings were conducted with representatives from each of the six participating institutions to answer additional questions and ensure sufficient facility with the BEVI reports. Overall, program faculty had the opportunity to grapple with questions of how within-group differences – and many emerged – could interact with a program’s leadership curriculum, affect group dynamics, or reveal areas that might be of particular focus during the six week leadership intervention (e.g., differences within groups about the nature of gender roles, emotional styles, attributional tendencies, etc.). Particular emphasis was placed on recognizing that different types of students may be more likely to feel psychologically activated and possibly overwhelmed as a result of the experience, which was one of the original reasons the BEVI was employed in the MEPI program (i.e., to try and understand why some students appeared to struggle more with the MEPI
program than others). In this regard, faculty discussed how to provide support to participants, particularly those who appeared from reports to be more vulnerable to feelings of overwhelm (e.g., those with lower optimal full-scale BEVI scores, women, and older / more educated participants). Overall, it was recommended that faculty integrate more process-based interventions and reflective exercises to 1) facilitate meta-level framing of their experiences in order to help them prepare for and make sense of what was happening within and between them and 2) offer scheduled and impromptu opportunities for participants to express difficult intra and interpersonal tensions that were evoked by the experience (see Tabit et al., 2016).

**Initial Observations from Qualitative Data**

Finally, the BEVI is a mixed methods measure, in that it includes both quantitative (e.g., empirically derived scales) and qualitative (e.g., free-response) items. Although our primary focus for this analysis is on quantitative scale-based and index findings, a brief review of qualitative data suggests some interesting qualitative findings. For example, 83% of individuals with the highest optimal scores completed all three qualitative questions on the BEVI, whereas only 67% and 68% completed them respectively from the middle and lowest optimal groups. Furthermore, highest optimal group participants wrote lengthier responses than those in the middle group who also wrote longer responses than the lowest optimal group.

Such findings offer the intriguing possibility that the nature and quality of qualitative responses may actually be mediated (i.e., influenced) by variables other than the experience itself. In other words, from the standpoint of the BEVI, it would appear from this preliminary analysis that individuals who demonstrate more of what the BEVI
measures at its essence or core (e.g., emotional attunement, self awareness, attributional sophistication, openness to self, others, and the larger world) have greater capacity and inclination not only to reflect upon their experiences, but to communicate such reflections in writing with greater depth and breadth.

Although further research is needed, perhaps it is the case that differences in qualitative responses have as much to do with how the “self” of the responder is structured than the “actual” experience upon which the responder is reflecting. If such trends continue to prevail in other analyses of this nature, it may be necessary to rethink how validity is understood vis-à-vis such qualitative responses. That is because it is possible that qualitative questions may lead to the measurement of respondent self-structure as much as, if not more than, the experience itself, a possibility that suggests a much more nuanced and perhaps critically-minded analysis of qualitative responses generally, from those that are provided on course evaluations to employee evaluations to open-ended survey questions in general.

**Summary of MEPI Program Analysis:**

**Implications for Leadership Assessment and Development**

The Middle-Eastern Partnership Initiative Student Leaders Program is an intensive and targeted intervention designed to work with young people in a region of the world that has considerable relevance to the United States and, quite frankly, the larger global community. As noted on multiple occasions throughout this report, evidence thus far suggests that the MEPI program is fulfilling the criteria for “crucible,” “transformative,” and “high impact” learning, growth, and development experiences. It does so via carefully integrated program components, which include highly diverse
populations, pedagogies, and field-based experiences (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Caligiuri & Tarique, 2012; Giber et al., 2009). Although the intention and design of the MEPI program are deeply commendable, such a complex and intensive program requires an assessment regimen that is sufficient to appraise what is and is not happening, and how to improve the program over time. Toward such means and ends, this program analysis provides 1) information for MEPI leaders and supervisors that is germane to the facilitation of participant processes and program outcomes as well as 2) implications and recommendations for identifying, measuring, and developing core aspects of global leadership. Hopefully, the perspective provided in this analysis, and via the below summary and implications, may help facilitate the overarching goals of this innovative and high impact program over the short- and long-term.

Global Leadership Development – What Works

Overall, aggregate BEVI data demonstrated that participants increased in basic openness and emotional attunement and decreased in self-certitude and religious and gender traditionalism following completion of the MEPI program. From these data then – which address key aspects of leadership capacity (e.g., affective and attributional processes as well as beliefs about and the experience of self, others, and the larger world) – it would appear that the MEPI program is associated directly with the achievement of very important leadership development objectives. While commendable, unsurprisingly, not all participants appeared to respond optimally. Specifically, assessment of within group differences demonstrated that 1) participants began the program with heterogeneous beliefs and values – and interrelated affective and attributional capacities
and inclinations – and that 2) changes over time emerged in ways that were and were not aligned with the putative competencies of global leaders as well as MEPI goals.

In this regard, recall that higher optimal BEVI scores are derived from the Full Scale Score, which includes 11 of the 17 scales (to take a few examples, high optimal scores are associated with higher Emotional Attunement and Self Awareness and lower Basic Determinism and Self Certitude scale scores). Overall, higher optimal scorers evidence affective and attributional capacities that are more aligned with the mission and goals of the MEPI program, and tended to move in more positive directions at Time 2. Conversely, lower optimal scorers often showed the opposite pattern of responding, which suggests less capacity (e.g., affective, attributional) to manage the intensity of the program. Specific sequelae for such participants included the tendency to become more closed and inflexible (e.g., by hardening beliefs and values that were already somewhat rigidly held prior to program entry) and less open to confusion, complexity, and possibilities within self, between others, and in perceptions about the larger world and one’s role in it.

As noted in the literature presented above, the sorts of processes and outcomes we observed are consonant with the perspective from other global leadership models. To take one example, recall that the Global Leadership Expertise Model or GLEB emphasizes the importance of understanding how transformative or crucible experiences interact with personal and societal factors, including individual competencies, personality traits, and so forth (Mendenhall et al., 2013). This perspective is strongly supported also by Equilintegration Theory and the EI Self – as well as the EI Leadership Model – which place these very sorts of “equilibration” and “integration” processes at the very core of
belief / value change and effective global leadership (Dyjack-LeBlanc et al., 2016; Shealy, 2016; Wandschneider et al., 2015). According to these models, the MEPI Student Leader’s experiences may have been too attributionally challenging or emotionally laden for a subset of participants to tolerate, which led to dysfunctional cognitive defaults such as stereotyping and inaccurate causal reasoning (Mendenhall et al., 2013) as well as increased resistance and belief / value rigidification for some.

Such results not only highlight the importance of effective selection and orientation of participants prior to program initiation, but emphasize the need for ongoing and process-based interventions that allow for the identification, expression, and integration of intensive emotional and cognitive experiences. Likewise, the benefits also seem clear of comprehensive and depth-based assessment of pre-existing worldviews – at an individual and group level – in order to understand better how they may interact with program goals, cohort dynamics, and the cultivation of global leadership competencies.

More specifically, participants from the MEPI program who were identified as demonstrating the “best” global leadership competencies by program supervisors (using the EI Leadership Rating and Ranking Forms) scored significantly higher at program entry on Global Resonance than did their peers. Although several issues would need to be considered, such a finding offers the possibility that the BEVI could be incorporated into selection and screening processes for MEPI candidates. At the very least, such a result indicates that the BEVI is able predict supervisor ratings of leadership capacities and inclinations even before the program begins. Notably, Global Resonance was predictive of supervisor evaluation of programmatic success rather than self-reported openness to other cultures (via Sociocultural Openness). Perhaps that is because Global
Resonance refers to investment in “learning about / encountering different individuals, groups, languages, cultures; seeks global engagement (e.g., *It is important to be well informed about world events; I am comfortable around groups of people who are very different from me*)” (Shealy, 2016, p. 422). In any case, the fact that such predictions may be made in advance of program matriculation is consistent with other findings in complementary studies (Wandschneider et al., 2015), and highlights the possibilities before us in terms of leadership selection, recruitment, development, and evaluation over time.

Moreover, assessment of participants’ worldviews and life experiences prior to program initiation may help faculty leaders to better develop appropriate transformative experiences by tailoring the education and training to meet participants where they are, not where we think they should be. As we’ve learned from other long-term and in-depth assessment initiatives – such as the multi-institution and multi-Forum BEVI project – learning, growth, and change are highly complex and interacting processes that involve not only the learner, but the quality and nature of the learning experience itself (Wandschneider et al., 2015). In this regard, reflecting on the “7 Ds” as noted above may be a particularly helpful framework for understanding “who learns what and why, and under what circumstances” (Shealy, 2016, p. 475).

**Education and Global Leadership**

Perhaps one of the more surprising findings from the program analysis was that educational effects differed from other studies that have used the BEVI (e.g., Pendleton, Cochran, Kapadia, & Iyer, 2016). More specifically, the least educated MEPI students tended to enter the program with more optimal affective and attributional capacities and
attendant beliefs and values vis-à-vis leadership than the highest educated groups, whereas this trend typically is reversed on the BEVI, not only in the United States but internationally (Wandschneider et al., 2015; Shealy, 2016). Additionally, the least educated group also seemed to change in directions that would be more optimal from the standpoint of leadership competencies than their more educated peers. Although the highest educated group did evince considerable advances in self-access, they showed a reduction in their openness and interest in engaging with others and the larger world. This pattern likely suggests that as a result of engaging in the MEPI program, highly educated participants tended to retreat from external engagement, and to become psychologically activated and potentially overwhelmed by this intensive intervention. To understand these BEVI findings, it may be helpful to consider the role and nature of higher education, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) from which MEPI participants are drawn.

First, higher education in the MENA region has been criticized both in terms of quality and in regards to linkages between education and employment. To take but one instance, the Arab Human Development Report described the state of higher education throughout the Arab region as poor, recommending dramatic changes to the number of higher education institutions and the quality of curricula and programs (Bennani, Elsadda, Fergany, Jadaane, & Kubursi, 2003). One major challenge to such goals is the politicization of higher education, which has roots in this area’s history of colonization. During the 19th century, Western and Ottoman institutions used educational institutions as a means to seize and maintain power in the MENA region by controlling not only who received knowledge, but the nature of the knowledge taught. Thus, upon decolonization,
emerging states tended to use the educational systems to foster nationalism and maintain control as rulers saw fit, a process which continues to this day. For example, in the 1990s, scholarly research on social, religious, cultural, and ethical issues was severely restricted. Although some progress has occurred in terms of access to the humanities and social sciences since then, many scholars argue that censorship by state authorities continues within these “highly conservative and authoritarian settings” (Romani, 2009, p. 5). Moreover, Romani further contends that continued politicization has led to a privileging of the “exact sciences” along with a concomitant “domestication of the social sciences within a framework of social engineering” (p. 5).

In potentially hopeful trends, however, the MENA region has seen a dramatic increase in the number of universities of late, which has also brought about privatization and internationalization of higher education. In the past two decades, much of this growth has occurred in the Gulf Arabic countries where, since 1993, two-thirds of new universities in the region are private institutions; 70% of these are branches of Western universities. Since Western philosophies regarding higher education often include a focus on the liberal arts, the internationalization and privatization of education in this region may lead to a greater emphasis in these curricular areas over time. However, Romani (2009) fears that “the new campuses could be perceived as ‘run by foreigners’ and as ‘corrupting the youth,’” which may lead to concomitant efforts to “control these new concentrations of youth and these new intellectuals, again raising concerns with the respect to academic freedom” (p.5).

The above perspectives are germane mostly to historic, political, cultural factors and forces, which provide necessary context. But for present purposes, our focus really
concerns the potential impact of such educational practices on the affective and cognitive capacities – and attendant beliefs and values – of these talented young students and leaders. For the fact remains that less educated participants tended to enter – and depart – from the MEPI program substantially more equipped and more motivated to engage self, others, and the larger world not only in terms of their existing beliefs and values about gender, religion, and culture, but also due to greater attributional sophistication. Less educated participants also report dramatically lower instances of negative life events and a much higher degree to which core needs have been met in their lives. How do we explain these results?

After much contemplation, the most parsimonious hypothesis at present appears to be aligned with a small but growing and evidence-based contention that educational systems in the Middle East tend not to emphasize a liberal arts orientation, but focus instead on more technical coursework and linear occupations that are heavily grounded in science, technology, math, and engineering, which are otherwise known as the STEM fields (e.g., Gambetta & Hertog, 2016; Hodgkins & Purinton, 2017; Zakaria, 2015). The problem is, a heavy focus on STEM competencies typically does not include an emphasis on the critical thinking, affect laden, values clarification, and philosophical exploration emphases of a liberal arts education. As Hodgkins and Purinton (2017) contend,

we will be so bold as to argue that expanding opportunities for liberal arts education in the Middle East will yield a far greater return in generating jobs and countering violent extremism than the current frenzy to expand technical training programs or education in STEM fields. (para. 3)

These scholars do not dispute the need for doctors, pharmacists, and engineers.
However, they note two realities that are characteristic of education and employment in the Arab world.

The first is the oversupply of doctors, pharmacists, and engineers. In contrast to other parts of the world, Arab youth need no encouragement to enroll in STEM fields, as many have been conditioned since birth to strive for coveted spots in the numerous engineering and medical programs throughout the region. Yet given the number of engineers we meet as Uber drivers, we don’t need World Bank reports to confirm the limited capacity for firms to absorb these graduates. (para. 5)

At the core of their argument, Hodgkins and Purinton (2017) find resonance with the work of Gambetta and Hertog (2016) who, in *Engineers of Jihad: The Curious Connection between Violent Extremism and Education*, found that a disproportionate number of extremists, including Islamic, neo-nazis, and the Ku Klux Klan, are engineers as opposed to other disciplinary graduates. Why might that be? As Hodgkins and Purinton (2017) summarize, it appears that

…engineering education both inspires and attracts individuals with an affinity for cognitive closure – the dependency on formulaic procedures and top-down approaches to solving problems. In other words, engineering education provides the same hierarchical proscriptions peddled by violent extremists. We have known for a long time that those who engage in violent extremism are often lured by leaders or on-line manifestos offering black-and-white proscriptions for rectifying injustices inflicted on their religious or ethnic compatriots and restoring a righteous order to the world. These siren songs ride roughshod over the nuances of social and political life in our complicated and diverse world. However, they
are uncomfortably compatible with the linear, hierarchical, and rule-bound approaches common to fields like medicine or engineering. A liberal arts model of higher education is uniquely suited to countering these one-dimensional messages. While applied fields like engineering, medicine, and pharmacy require a certain adherence to rules, a liberal arts education provides the space in which students can explore the philosophical, ethical, or intellectual assumptions undergirding those rules. Instead of handing down a series of formulae to be applied when specified problems arise, a liberal arts education encourages students to investigate the causes to those problems, and to devise creative, independent solutions. More importantly, the central tenet of a liberal arts education is the consideration of multiple viewpoints, alternative explanations, and competing beliefs. It is through the deliberate exposure to differing paths to knowledge that students learn to contextualize conflicting opinions. In other words, a liberal arts education requires an embrace of cognitive dissonance and disallows the sort of cognitive closure in which extremism thrives. As Hertog and Gambetta’s research also shows, students of history and humanities are rarely found among the ranks of violent extremists. (para. 8-13, see http://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2017/01/11/the-liberal-arts-as-antidote-to-political-extremism-in-the-middle-east/)

In offering this hypothesis for consideration, we wish to state emphatically that we are not asserting or predicting that MEPI participants are or will be any more “extremist” than any other group of young people. To the contrary, the thoughtful and earnest qualitative responses on the BEVI, and our own engagement with these young
people, find them to be deeply engaged, passionate, and committed to the change agent ethos that is at the heart of this highly innovative and necessary program. From our perspective, the issue here is not really about MEPI participants at all, but rather, the educational offerings and programs that appear both to attract and produce graduates with profiles similar to the “highly educated” students in the current analysis. In fact, we have seen very similar BEVI profiles when contrasting a sample of first year students who are enrolled in two mirror opposite universities: one emphasizing engineering and the other liberal arts. A very similar contrasting pattern emerged in this comparison as well, with engineering-oriented students much less inclined to think in an abstract, if/then, and attributionally nuanced manner than their liberal arts counterparts (e.g., see Wandschneider et al., 2015). We hasten to add another proviso in that we are not aware of any evidence that being educated in the STEM disciplines must result in outcomes of this nature. To the contrary, if we have learned anything from this work on assessment research and practice over the past two decades, it is important to recognize individual differences both at the level of measurement and in the world in terms of how human beings are structured (e.g., affectively, attributionally, etc.).

And yet, with all these important caveats, we still are left with the reality of our findings, the basic contours of which largely were replicated over a three-year period. So unless a better explanation emerges, we are inclined to accept the following working hypothesis: The reason a higher level of education is associated with a lesser degree of receptivity to the sorts of “global leadership” outcomes that the MEPI program emphasizes may be associated with the type and nature of education that more educated MEPI participants received.
Gender and Global Leadership Development

Overall, BEVI data suggest that men and women enter the MEPI program with many beliefs and values that are integral to and facilitative of effective global leadership (e.g., openness to other cultures, gender roles, self awareness, ability to see the world in shades of gray). Sometimes, women scored more optimally, especially for their tendencies to be more emotionally attuned, open to their own and others’ experiences, needs, and feelings, and to care / engage more deeply for the world and others. At other times, on matters of identity, certitude, and religiosity, females appeared to experience greater confusion and/or inflexibility than males. Importantly, at Time 2, females also seemed to be more emotionally and cognitively activated and/or affected than males. It is difficult to say definitely why such findings emerged. One potential explanation, worthy of further research and analysis, is that females in these countries and contexts may experience the discrepancy between their own cultures / systems and those in the United States as more jarring and/or challenging, perhaps because of role restrictions back in their own home country. Presuming the validity of this observation, it could be that females simply have fewer options for self-expression and clarity, and less agency / authority in their country of origin, even though they appear to have internalized both a fierce sense of commitment to forge ahead along with less flexible notions about religion. Such a gestalt could well lead to a sense of inner conflict as previously internalized beliefs and values about “the way the world is and should be” are implicitly, and perhaps explicitly, challenged during their time in the U.S. Males too show some impacts of this process, but the point is, the road for females may be more complicated, not only in terms of what they bring into the program, but what they face upon returning home. In any
case, it is strongly recommended that such matters of gender be addressed within a process-and group-based format (in addition to any individual interventions) as the MEPI program progresses over time.

**Summary and Conclusions**

We began this analysis by discussing why and how wise and effective global leaders are more necessary than ever. However, this assertion also begged questions such as the following: What do we mean by effective global leaders? Can such leadership be understood, assessed, and cultivated in current and future leaders? To answer questions such as these, we reviewed core elements of the leadership literature, with a specific focus on global leadership. In particular, we were interested in focusing on the *how* (e.g., how global leaders experience themselves, others, and the larger world) and *why* (e.g., why would such affective and attributional capacities – and attendant beliefs and values – become internalized for such global leaders in the first place). We also reviewed the EI Leadership Model and its eight key themes, which also focus on the *how* and *why* of global leadership: 1) assessment; 2) awareness; 3) care; 4) complexity; 5) culture; 6) depth; 7) transformation; and 8) vision. In addition to reviewing other leadership models, we then turned to growth and development aspects of global leader cultivation. After reviewing key components of effective global leadership, we reviewed global leadership development models to better understand whether and how global leadership competencies may be taught and instilled. Overall, interventions that emphasize transformative, crucible, or high impact experiences appear to be most salient in this regard. At the same time, it is important to bear in mind the myriad of interacting factors which must be considered in order to understand “who learns what and why, and under
what circumstances,” an empirically-grounded contention that is at the core of the “7 Ds” (i.e., duration, difference, depth, determine, design, deliver, and debrief).

On the basis of the above literature, the current analysis sought to examine these complex and depth-based variables and processes in the context of a real-world sample of young people from the Middle East and Northern Arab regions, who were participating in an intensive leadership development program in the United States. Over a three year period, we used the Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory (BEVI) along with the EI Leadership Model to examine these processes. Overall, results reveal positive changes in terms of global leadership development including an increase in basic openness to the needs of self and others, an increase in emotional awareness and valuation, and a decrease in self-certitude as well as religious and gender traditionalism. Again, although we must avoid correlation / causation confusion (i.e., we cannot prove that the MEPI program caused these changes), the most parsimonious explanation for the results we found, which were broadly replicated over a three year period, is that the MEPI program was integral to the measured changes that emerged, particularly because there was no other systematic “intervention” to which all MEPI participants were exposed.

At the same time, an extended examination of BEVI findings also indicate that these positive trends for the majority of MEPI participants were not experienced by all. Specifically, BEVI data highlighted that individuals who entered the program with less optimal affective and attributional capacities – and attendant belief / value commitments – were more likely to experience feelings of overwhelm, which were not congruent with the aspirations and principles of effective global leadership (e.g., this subgroup showed an increase in preferring simple explanations for phenomena in self, other, and the larger
world; greater rigidity in beliefs and values related to religion and gender; and a decrease in openness to and interest in engaging those from different cultures). Furthermore, higher educated students appeared to experience more of these difficulties than their less educated peers. Finally, although males and females both demonstrated optimal changes in affective / attributional capacities and attendant beliefs and values, findings also suggest that some females may have experienced emotional and psychological overwhelm vis-à-vis the program experience. On the basis of these findings, we offer five concluding observations:

1) **Assessment Matters.** It is possible to engage in comprehensive, sustained, and depth-based assessment of highly complex programs and processes. Moreover, data emerging from such an analysis can be invaluable to program leaders to help them a) understand better who their student participants are and why they respond to the program as they do, both individually and at a group-level; b) have an empirical basis for modifying and improving program design and implementation over time; c) be able to demonstrate, empirically, the relative impact of a program, for whom, and under what circumstances; and d) be able to help participants learn, grow, and develop in a more optimal manner by understanding how they experience self, others, and the larger world as they do.

2) **The BEVI and EI Model Show Promise.** Assessing highly complex and interacting processes like those that are integral to the MEPI program requires ecologically valid assessment methods and empirically grounded conceptual frameworks (i.e., multiple variables must be evaluated simultaneously, for reasons that are theoretically defensible and derivative of real world phenomena). The
findings that emerged from this program analysis simply could not have been
derived by focusing only on assessment of “reaction criteria” (e.g., participants’
satisfaction with the program) or “learning criteria” (e.g., how much participants
retained regarding content). Although we eschew extravagant claims – and value
the inclusion of other assessment methods and leadership models – the results
obtained in this study indicate that the BEVI method and EI model illuminated
powerful and underlying mediators and moderators of leadership functioning and
change. Such information not only helps us understand who learns what and why
and under what circumstances, but provides real world perspective that can help
improve our leadership programs and interventions over time.

3) **Attend to Differences.** If we learned anything from this program analysis, it is the
stark reality that just because all program student participants are very bright,
motivated, and open to cultures other than their own, that they also must be
similar in other ways as well. They are not and need not be. In fact, our findings
strongly indictate that MEPI participants are extraordinarily diverse not so much
in standard demographic characteristics (e.g., citizenship, religious affiliations),
but in how and why they experience self, others, and the larger world as they do.
This enormous variability among participants in affective and attributional
capacities – and attendant belief / value commitments – is not just fascinating to
behold, but would appear to have a substantive impact on fundamental aspects of
learning, growth, and development. At the same time, some differences do in fact
appear to be moderated by similar variables, at least for this analysis (e.g., gender,
educational level). So, attending to those differences as well, which may show up
as patterned similarities for specific groups, is a complementary point regarding differences (e.g., there may be more or less within than between group differences, and such patterns and processes also need to be assessed and addressed). In short, whatever models and methods one employs, it is essential to account for the differences – and similarities – among participants, and use such information to meet students where they are, not where we think they should be.

4) **Process Experiences.** Undoubtedly, the MEPI program meets the criteria for what have variously been described as transformative, crucible, and high impact learning, growth, and development experiences. MEPI program developers and implementers are to be commended for creating such an innovative intervention, which appears demonstrably needed in our world, both locally and globally. However, as our findings illustrate, the more intensive the intervention, the more necessary it becomes to offer opportunities for participants to comprehend and work through their affectively and attributionally charged experiences. Offering regular and impromptu opportunities for process-based discussions – at a group- and individual level – is therefore strongly recommended, before, during, and after the MEPI program. Some of the anecdotal comments from students who return home bear out this recommendation that much more, as a sense of overwhelm and even disillusionment is not uncommon, even amidst the preponderance of feedback which is highly affirmative and supportive of the mission and values of the MEPI program.

5) **Foster Critical Thinking and Engagement.** As noted above, the principles and processes of liberal arts education may have considerable relevance to the MEPI
program, perhaps beginning even before program entry through readings, virtual discussions, and reflection exercises (e.g., the BEVI individual reports system provides one such reflective opportunity, and there are many others that could be integrated into this program). It is in everyone’s best interest that participants understand that 1) they will be asked to reflect deeply and continuously on the beliefs and values that they have internalized, whether or not they are aware of such processes as well as 2) the implications of such affectively and attributionally loaded internalizations for their functioning and futures, not only as leaders, but as citizens and human beings. By providing deep and meta-cognitive awareness to participants that such reflection is inevitable within the MEPI program – along with materials and experiences that are aligned with a liberal arts ethos (e.g., critically examining various points of view; values appraisal and clarification; considering underlying questions of what leadership matters and why, etc.) – these talented and motivated individuals should be better able to take perspective on their affective and attributional experiences, rather than “being them,” and potentially becoming overwhelmed and thus distanced or even rejecting of the program, not to mention core aspects of self and other.

In the final analysis, we find the MEPI program not only to be highly thoughtful and innovative, but demonstrably powerful in its effects. Moreover, we believe it is a model to be emulated not only in leadership development, but in other transformative, crucible, and high impact interventions. That is because the very heart of this program is all about learning, growth, development, and engagement at the deepest levels of self in order to enhance one’s capacity and inclination to engage the other, and the larger world,
in a more open, caring, and sustainable manner. It is up to all of us – as scholars, educators, practitioners, students, leaders, and citizens – to support and develop such emulatable programs if we are to cultivate globally sustainable selves over the short- and long-term. Along the way – whatever form they assume – we strongly recommend that program developers regard depth-based, ongoing, and ecologically valid assessment as integral to their interventions. For if we don’t assess, we don’t know where we are; and if we don’t know where we are, it is hard to know where to go.
MEPI Program Analysis for 2014:

Preliminary Findings and Potential Implications

This initial analysis of the MEPI program is based upon findings from a Time 1 / Time 2 Group Report of MEPI participants from May 30, 2014 to December 19, 2014 (N = 54) using the Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory or BEVI Method, which is informed further by the Equilintegration or EI Leadership Model (www.thebevi.com/index.php). It should be emphasized that these findings are preliminary. It is quite possible that different or even contrasting results may emerge from different cohorts of MEPI participants. Nonetheless, from the standpoint of beginning to understand “who learns what and why, and under what circumstances” vis-à-vis the MEPI program, the preliminary findings and potential implications that follow do provide an empirical basis for program reflection and analysis.

Five Promising Indicators of MEPI Program Effectiveness

Although additional factors could be emphasized, five indices of program effectiveness seemed particularly salient at this point, as the following Aggregate Profile results suggest.

---

3 Aspects of this program analysis were presented to MEPI program coordinators on March 6, 2015 in Rabat, Morocco by Craig N. Shealy, Ph.D., Professor of Graduate Psychology at James Madison University. Additional results will be presented as part of a dissertation by Whitney Giesing, M.S., which Dr. Shealy supervises. Further information (e.g., the Morocco presentation) is available upon request (craigshealy@gmail.com).
First, it should be noted that MEPI participants appeared to be answering the BEVI in a valid manner, which means interpretation is possible (e.g., the Congruency Scale on the BEVI was at the very credible 81st percentile at Time and Time 2 administration).

Second, results suggest that overall, MEPI participants are very open to, and interested in the experience of different sociocultural beliefs, values, and practices. Thus, selection and screening processes for this particular leadership competency appear to be effective. But, the program “had them at hello” (i.e., they already “get it” to a very high degree and don’t “get it” much more since Sociocultural Openness is very high at Time 1 and Time 2, at the 88th and 90th percentile respectively). Thus, as a predictor or outcome variable,
“openness to different cultures” is not especially discriminating (i.e., additional variables will need to be assessed). **Third,** although very open to other cultures, such tendencies are the opposite when it comes to one’s own thoughts, feelings, and needs, which are important leadership qualities from an EI Model perspective. Importantly, therefore, at T2 administration of the BEVI (after the program concludes), there is a meaningful increase overall (Basic Openness increases from the 26th to the 32nd percentile). **Fourth,** as their Self Certitude scores indicate, MEPI participants from this sample on the BEVI, tend to evidence a strong sense of will and be impatient with excuses for difficulties by self or other. Although associated with resiliency to a degree, from an EI Model perspective, such tendencies also may impede empathy, tolerance, patience, and the ability to facilitate growth and development in self and other. Thus, auguring well (but with other program implications noted below), this tendency drops substantially over the course of the program (Self Certitude falls from the 74th to the 61st percentile from T1 to T2). **Fifth and finally,** if global leadership effectiveness depends upon tolerance and support for religions other than one’s own, as well as aspirations of parity between the genders (as the EI Leadership Model would contend), it is notable that both Religious Traditionalism (64 – 57) and Gender Traditionalism (43 – 37) decrease overall from Time 1 to Time 2 administrations.

**Potential Implications of Findings for MEPI Program Development**

When it happens, personal change of the variety assessed by the BEVI often involves a deep encounter with core aspects of self. This process is not always easy, but may be essential for genuine transformation to occur. For this initial sample of the MEPI group, such change would indeed appear to be occurring, which may speak to the powerful nature of this program. However, it should be noted that there may be a psychological “cost” to such change, especially over the short-term. This observation seems relevant for this MEPI sample, in that the overall group reports a perception of greater Negative Life Events at the conclusion of the experience, which could mean greater willingness to report such life experience and/or greater awareness that they occurred in the first place (T1 = 44; T2 = 49); an increase in Identify Diffusion, which could mean less certainty about who one is and where one is going in life upon concluding the program (T1 = 31; T2 = 39); and a decrease in Meaning Quest, which could be due to self-exploration fatigue or withdrawal following this experience (T1 = 67; T2 = 52).

However, findings such as these are based upon aggregated scale scores, which tend to obscure what actually is happening for specific subsets of a given cohort. Thus, when we look more closely at such within-group differences (e.g., through Profile Contrast indices), we see some very striking findings, which illuminate the complexity of what actually is happening. To take just one example of many (see the Morocco PowerPoint for additional information), consider the following results from T1 / T2 assessment on
Gender Traditionalism from the BEVI, across the lowest 30%, middle 40%, and highest 30% Full Scale scores on the BEVI.

From an interpretive standpoint, such findings suggest that at least for this sample, there are substantial within-group differences regarding how MEPI participants regard matters of gender and gender relations at the outset of this experience (i.e., the lowest Full Scale responders begin the MEPI program at the 65th percentile whereas the highest Full Scale responders begin at the 25th percentile). Thus, it follows that the cohort – throughout the program – would see such matters in starkly different terms. More specifically, the lowest FS group would tend to adopt more traditional / conservative values regarding who men and women are and should be, as well as the nature of relations between them, whereas the highest FS group begins with what could be characterized as a very progressive / liberal stance on such matters. Importantly, however, all three subgroups show movement in the same direction, becoming “less” Gender Traditional by T2 assessment. Although correlation / causation confusion should be avoided (i.e., we don’t know for sure what “caused” this change), a working hypothesis could be that experience in the MEPI program played a prominent role in this regard. In any case, within-group differences such as these (and there were many as the Morocco presentation illustrates) suggest a number of potential implications for all aspects of the MEPI program, from selection and screening processes, to the nature of orientation sessions, to process-based work during the program, to debriefing components, to the need for longitudinal assessment.

Likewise, other indices (e.g., Background Domain Contrast; Full Scale Scores; Aggregate Profile by Gender) reveal other substantial differences within the group. Consider the following highlights. First, older and better educated MEPI participants showed lower Full Scale Scores at T2, whereas no such trend existed at T1. Second, higher Full Scale scores are associated with a range of “optimal” outcomes, which are especially relevant in a leadership context. Thus, it may be that some participants come into the MEPI program less (and in some cases far less) able to navigate the attendant personal and professional demands than others (e.g., older and more educated participant may show less emotional volatility, but may be less open and/or able to grow and develop). Third,
MEPI females overall seem to be more emotionally / psychologically activated and/or impacted than males, at least for this sample, which could be due to the relatively high contrast effect between their country / culture-of-origin and what they experience through the MEPI program.

Taken as a whole then and subject to further inquiry and modification, findings thus far suggest the following recommendations. **First,** develop a basic – but theoretically and empirically grounded – participant rating form, which could complement the mixed methods results of the BEVI (a draft form now has been completed, and needs to be piloted with MEPI supervisors). Used together (BEVI and Rating Form), such an assessment plan could derive rich quantitative and qualitative data upon which the sorts of findings identified above could be further illuminated, and real student / program development processes be based.

**Second,** it is recommended that a process be piloted by which BEVI scores and other indices are considered before program admittance, during orientation, and after program completion. The purpose of such a process is to determine how and to what degree BEVI scores may help illuminate underlying dynamics that influence selection processes as well as student growth and development during and after the MEPI program (i.e., although BEVI scores could potentially be used to aid in the selection process, such usage is not recommended at the outset; rather, we first need to understand what the BEVI suggests about selection processes well as how participants progress through the MEPI program).

**Third,** it is recommended that a few more targeted and process-based interventions be integrated into the MEPI program throughout (e.g., usage of individual / group reports; build in other reflective opportunities; focus on process as well as content). The purpose for doing so is to address what appear to be substantial within-group differences so that students receive a “meta-level” frame for what they will experience, while also offering an opportunity to “release” and better integrate attendant intra- and interpersonal tensions that are evoked.

**Fourth,** and related to the above points, it may be advisable to offer additional support to MEPI participants who may be likely to struggle with the MEPI program. Again, it will be necessary to conduct further analysis to determine what the association may be between BEVI scores at the outset of the MEPI program and how participants progress. Preliminary evidence suggests that some students (e.g., the lowest Full Scale responders) may experience considerable difficulty with various aspects of the MEPI program simply because they are not as well equipped (e.g., in terms of emotional capacity, self-awareness, inclination to hold complexity) to manage the intensity of this program as other students. Although further investigation will be necessary along these lines (as noted above), it seems important at least to be aware that some students may be more, or
less, able and willing to handle the demands of this rigorous program, and to at least offer the opportunity for additional process-based support as needed.

**Fifth and finally**, as discussed in Morocco, the MEPI program is characterized by a highly intensive set of learning and experiential activities for a very diverse group of young people from a global region that is experiencing considerable turmoil. Therefore, as is commendably the case already, it behooves program administrators, supervisors, and faculty to be very mindful of what we know now about why change does or does not occur, for whom, and under what circumstances (e.g., the “7 Ds” that emerged out of the Forum BEVI Project). Ongoing reflection in this regard may be profitably applied to the assessment and development of this dynamic program – and its participants – over the long-term.
Appendix B: Program Analysis Report 2015

Analysis of the MEPI Student Leaders Program

through the BEVI Method and EI Model

March 28, 2016

Craig N. Shealy, Ph.D.
Professor of Graduate Psychology, James Madison University
Executive Director, International Beliefs and Values Institute
craigshealy@gmail.com

Whitney R. Giesing, M.S.
Doctoral Student, Combined-Integrated, Clinical and School Psychology
James Madison University
giesinwr@jmu.edu

I. Executive Summary

The following document describes the results from a two year analysis of the U.S. Middle East Partnership Initiative (or MEPI) Student Leaders Program. A brief introduction to the program precedes discussion of the leadership model and assessment method that have been used for this analysis. The bulk of this report focuses on assessment results along with five working recommendations for further assessment-based development of the MEPI Student Leaders Program. More specifically, findings from two cohorts of participants (2014 and 2015) indicate that the program appears to be achieving its overarching goals and objectives for a substantial majority of participants. Based upon these and other findings, five working recommendations are proposed: 1) build upon findings through continued assessment; 2) conduct more fine grained analyses; 3) include additional sources of data; 4) consider assessment-based support; and 5) maximize the potential for learning, growth, and development by students and alumni.
II. Program Background, Goals, and Objectives

The U.S. Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) Student Leaders Program is a six-week exchange program for undergraduate students from the Middle East and North Africa regions. Students are randomly divided across six programs throughout the United States (Benedictine University, Georgetown University, Montana State University, Portland State University, Roger Williams University, and the University of Delaware). As a comprehensive leadership development program, the program aims to develop problem solving and community organizing skills, while simultaneously expanding participant understanding of civil society and the democratic process. Principles and practices of civic engagement and community development are explored through a range of pedagogical and service-oriented activities. Ultimately, the program seeks to promote greater pluralism and diversity within MEPI-country governmental and non-governmental organizations as well as through advocacy and engagement activities in domains such as business, government, and media. To implement the goals of this program effectively, an overarching goal of this program is to enhance the leadership, collaborative, and problem-solving competencies of participants. Students are encouraged to draw upon their knowledge and skills from the program to join, develop, and implement civic engagement projects in their home countries.

III. Applying Assessment to the MEPI Student Leaders Program:

BEVI Method and EI Leadership Model

In development since the early 1990s, the Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory (BEVI) is a comprehensive and mixed methods analytic measure that examines how and why we come to see ourselves, others, and the larger world as we do (e.g., how life experiences, culture, and context affect our beliefs, values, and worldviews) as well as the influence of such processes on multiple aspects of human functioning (e.g., learning processes, interpersonal and professional relations, group processes, personal growth, pursuit of life goals). Highly relevant to international, multicultural, and transformative learning, growth, and development, the BEVI assesses processes such as:

- Basic openness;

4 http://mepi.state.gov/opportunities/mepi-exchange-programs/student-leaders.html
• The tendency to (or not to) stereotype in particular ways;
• Self- and emotional awareness;
• Preferred strategies for making sense of why “other” people and cultures “do what they do”;
• Global engagement (e.g., receptivity to different cultures, religions, and social practices); and
• Worldview shift (e.g., to what degree do beliefs and values change as a result of specific experiences).

Derivative of theoretical, empirical, and applied work on the BEVI, the EI Leadership Model – and its associated rating forms – emerged from a two-year comprehensive job analysis of leaders and leadership, which was coordinated by the non-profit International Beliefs and Values Institute or IBAVI. Twenty reputed national and international leaders participated as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in a comprehensive job analysis of global leaders and leadership in order to identify, develop, and evaluate the work behaviors (WBs), knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs), and personal characteristics (PCs) of “high optimal” and “low optimal” leaders (Dyjak-LeBlanc, Brewster, Grande, White, & Shullman, 2016).

Taken together, the BEVI method and EI model are well suited to the assessment and facilitation of the overarching MEPI Student Leaders Program goal, which envisions “pluralistic societies where diversity is reflected in social organizations, politics, business, media and government, and where all citizens have equal standing, protected by guaranteed rights and by independent and effective courts of law.” Such values-based aspirations are deeply worthy, even as their pursuit is contingent upon leaders who have the capacity and inclination to imagine and realize them through their individual and collective actions. So at the outset, the real question is, how do we understand, appraise, and cultivate leadership values and competencies that are integral to the success of programs like the MEPI Student Leaders Program?

From the perspective of the current program analysis, we must assess not only prospective leaders, but the curricular and experiential aspects of our programs in an ecologically valid manner. Without valid and reliable measurement – which has the demonstrable ability to measure these highly complex interactions, and translate subsequent findings into actionable terms in the real world – we have no way to evaluate whether our good intentions are anything more than that, much less how to use data to improve how we achieve our goals over time.

Assessment-based complexities just like these have been pursued over many years through the multi-institution Forum BEVI Project (Wandschneider et al., 2015), which used the BEVI method and EI model for a range of assessment and intervention purposes, including:
• To evaluate learning experiences (e.g., study abroad; multicultural courses; service learning);
• To understand learning processes (e.g., who learns what and why, and under what circumstances);
• To promote learning objectives (e.g., increased awareness of self, others, and the larger world);
• To enhance teaching and program quality (e.g., which experiences or courses have what impact, and why);
• To facilitate growth and development (e.g., of individuals, groups, organizations);
• To conduct research (e.g., how and why do people become more “open” to different cultures);
• To address organizational needs (e.g., staff / leadership development; assess organizational climate); and,
• To comply with assessment and accreditation requirements (e.g., substantive assessment).

As the below findings illustrate, many of the above purposes are evident in this program analysis of the MEPI Student Leaders Program.

IV. Assessment Methods and Results

Beginning in May of 2014, and continuing in successive waves of assessment since that time, the BEVI has been administered to a volunteer sample of participants in the program prior to program matriculation and at approximately five months after field-based experiences in the United States. This Time 1 / Time 2 approach means that two cohorts of MEPI participants have completed the BEVI in 2014 and 2015 (T1 completion rates in both years were over 90 percent, and the final N of matched T1 / T2 pairs was 54 for 2014 and 58 for 2015).

The BEVI is a web-based inventory requiring approximately 30 minutes to complete. Participants typically complete the BEVI in their country of origin before or soon after arriving in the United States. As noted above, the BEVI is a mixed methods measure with both quantitative and qualitative components, thereby providing a rich array of scales and indices by which group and program processes may be analyzed and understood, along with an applied individual, group, and organizational report system that helps to further program objectives. In 2015, project leaders from Georgetown University also piloted the EI Leadership Model Rating Form, which allowed for further appraisal of the leadership competencies by their participants following completion of the on-site program. In this current analysis of the program, the focus is on Time 1 / Time 2 scale comparisons across two separate cohorts (2014 and 2015). All of these indices are highly related to leadership capacities and inclinations in general as well as the specific goals and objectives of the MEPI Student Leaders Program. It also should be noted that our findings appear to be strikingly similar across the two cohorts of this program analysis.
More specifically, seven separate BEVI scales emerged as quite salient for understanding change processes within these two separate MEPI cohorts (see Wandschneider et al., 2015). These scales and their measurement characteristics are as follows:

- **Needs Closure** (e.g., illustrates the relationship between difficult life history and stereotypical thinking);
- **Identity Diffusion** (e.g., illuminates how identity confusion impacts future life prospects);
- **Basic Openness** (e.g., examines one’s relative degree of openness to basic thoughts, feelings, and needs);
- **Self Certitude** (e.g., illustrates the degree to which someone is or is not inclined toward self / other analysis);
- **Basic Determinism** (e.g., measures the tendency to prefer simple versus complex explanations for phenomena);
- **Emotional Attunement** (e.g., examines the capacity and inclination to attend to emotion in self and other); and,
- **Gender Traditionalism** (e.g., examines the relative degree of preference for traditional or non-traditional gender roles).

Although there is some variability between the 2014 and 2015 MEPI Student Leader cohorts (as would be expected), the following overall scale score trends from the 2015 Time 1 / Time 2 report (N = 58) illustrate a quite striking set of findings that show a number of parallels with the 2014 cohort:

```plaintext
2. Needs Closure (T1) 31
2. Needs Closure (T2) 26
4. Identity Diffusion (T1) 52
4. Identity Diffusion (T2) 47
5. Basic Openness (T1) 31
5. Basic Openness (T2) 36
6. Self Certitude (T1) 75
6. Self Certitude (T2) 66
10. Emotional Attunement (T1) 53
10. Emotional Attunement (T2) 58
```

---

Although it is important to avoid correlation / causation confusion (i.e., we can’t be positive that these findings are “due to” the MEPI program), such results indicate, at the very least, that these participants are changing in fundamental directions from T1 administration, right before entry into the MEI program, to T2 administration, approximately 4 – 5 months after the on-site program experience has concluded across the six participating U.S. institutions. Moreover, it should be emphasized that 1) these seven scales represent the greatest degree of change on all BEVI scales as measured by the BEVI from Time 1 to Time 2 assessment and 2) all such changes are in a direction that would be considered to be optimal from the standpoint of leadership capacities that appear integral to MEPI program objectives. Specifically, participants are becoming less stereotypic in their thinking regardless of their own life histories (lower Needs Closure); clearer on who they and their own life / future prospects (lower Identity Diffusion); more open to their own basic thoughts, feelings, and needs (higher Basic Openness); more inclined toward self-analysis and understanding (lower Self Certitude); more likely to acknowledge complexity vis-à-vis people and events in the world (lower Basic Determinism); more likely to attend to and value emotion in self and other (higher Emotional Attunement); and less likely to endorse simple concepts of gender and gender roles (lower Gender Traditionalism).

From these data then – which address key aspects of leadership capacity (e.g., affective and attributional processes as well as beliefs about and the experience of self, others, and the larger world) – it would appear that the program is associated directly with the achievement of very important leadership development objectives, at least for these two cohorts of students.

Moreover, a pilot study from Georgetown University provides additional evidence along these lines. Using the EI Leadership Model Rating Form, completed by two MEPI supervisors at Georgetown University, a statistically significant linkage emerged between the independent leadership rankings of all participants with the Global Resonance scale on the BEVI, which measures openness to other cultures as well as an investment in learning about and encountering others who are different from ourselves. In other words, Global Resonance scores on the BEVI at Time 1 were positively correlated ($r = .53, p <$
.05) with leadership rankings via the EI Leadership Ranking Form among the Georgetown cohort. Although needing further study, it may be that students who desire to encounter and learn about other cultures thereby demonstrate a propensity to engage more deeply and successfully in the MEPI program.

V. Working Recommendations for the MEPI Program

The following five working recommendations are based upon the findings discussed above from the 2014 and 2015 MEPI Student Leader cohorts. Although subject to further modification over time, these recommendations may offer an initial blueprint for how assessment-based analysis and practice with the program might proceed from this point forward.

1. **Build upon findings through continued assessment.** As illustrated above, assessment results thus far suggest that for a substantial majority of its participants, the program is achieving its fundamental goal of leadership learning, growth, and development through an intensive and coordinated curriculum, which exemplifies “high impact learning.” However, additional assessment will be needed to determine if the above findings are replicated for subsequent cohorts, and to determine how assessment-based program improvements may be advanced over time, particularly for participants who may experience greater challenges meeting the goals of this program. So, the first and most basic recommendation simply is to continue this T1 / T2 assessment protocol mainly to determine if our findings thus far over two cohorts of MEPI participants reliably manifest with subsequent cohorts. If similar patterns emerge, we will have further confidence that the effects that have been observed thus far are substantially attributable to program activities. Likewise, if our current findings differ significantly from subsequent cohorts, we should be able to investigate what variables may be associated with these differences, which can further help us identify interactions between the MEPI program and the characteristics of individuals within the program (e.g., who is learning what, and why, and under what circumstances).

2. **Conduct more fine grained analyses.** In addition to continuance of the T1 / T2 assessment approach, there are a number of additional analytic possibilities that could be examined in greater detail. These include, but are not limited to, the following. 1) **Full Scale Score Analysis.** Some very intriguing findings are emerging regarding similarities and differences among MEPI sub-cohorts via the Full Scale Score of the BEVI, a composite score, which is based upon multiple scale scores, and assesses the essence or core of what the BEVI measures. More specifically, Profile Contrast divides any given cohort into three groups, based upon the highest 30 percent, middle 40 percent, and lowest 30 percent of Full Scale Scores. This demarcation is referred to as High Optimal, Medium Optimal, and Low Optimal, and is quite illuminating when trying to understand the fundamental capacities and inclinations of individuals who are participating in or facilitating particular learning, growth, or development experiences, such as the MEPI leadership program, which has further applied implications (e.g., how do
we ensure that the differences in leadership capacity / inclination are addressed before, during, and after the U.S. exchange program). 2) **Qualitative Analysis.**
As a mixed methods measure, the BEVI contains three qualitative questions which respondents may elect to complete after the quantitative items. Many participants have provided such responses, both at Time 1 and Time 2 administrations. A preliminary review of responses is both highly intriguing as well as illuminating of how these young leaders are “making sense of” the experiences they are having, which further helps explain the quantitative (scale-based) results that are emerging. For example, there appears to be a relationship between Full Scale scorers and the amount and type of qualitative data that is produced (e.g., although subject to more systematic inquiry, it may be that higher Full Scale scorers produce written responses to the three qualitative questions on the BEVI that is of greater depth than lower Full Scale scorers). 3) **Analysis of Other Indices.** As with the Full Scale Scores and qualitative data, a number of other indices also warrant further analysis in order to understand more fully what we have observed thus far in terms of T1 / T2 changes. For example, the Worldview Convergence index on the BEVI suggests that respondents are become much more divergent at Time 2 than they were at Time 1 (i.e., the overall cohort is becoming much more different than similar in response patterns over time), a phenomenon that warrants further examination. Moreover, in the 2014 cohort, female participants appeared to experience a greater diversity of challenge than did their male counterparts, a finding that was not replicated in the 2015 cohort. As a final example, it appears that for some participants, a higher degree of Religious Traditionalism actually may be interacting with the sorts of evaluative processes faculty and supervisor engage in, both implicitly and explicitly, with these students (e.g., a higher degree of Religious Traditionalism may actually provide an evaluative buffer for particular subsets of students).

These sorts of moderator (e.g., gender, ethnicity, income) and mediator (e.g., Religious Traditionalism, Emotional Attunement) indices should be examined in greater detail in order to understand better what factors are influencing the findings we have observed thus far, and how to translate such information into practical interventions and program improvements over time.

3. **Include additional sources of data.** The BEVI provides a rich array of variables to examine at multiple levels of analysis, which may be augmented even further by juxtaposing BEVI results with other MEPI program and institutional data (i.e., it would be helpful to review other sources of information that may already be gathered on MEPI participants to see if such data could be included in subsequent program analyses). As noted above, one option piloted already is the EI Leadership Rating Form, which could be replicated and expanded to other MEPI sites on a voluntary basis. By doing so, we would be able to examine linkages between various scales and indices on the BEVI to the evaluations of leadership capacity by the supervisors and teachers of these students. Moreover, it would be interesting to examine whether additional sources of data could be included as part of the overarching analytic process. For example, it would be relevant to consider how MEPI candidates are evaluated in the first place (i.e., prior to
program selection), mainly to see how, whether, and to what degree such on-site and in-country evaluations ultimately are associated with BEVI scores and supervisor ratings, among other indices (e.g., linkage to age, gender, education level, program satisfaction, etc.). Such data would not necessarily be used to aid in selection processes, but rather to evaluate the effectiveness of initial screenings while also helping to meet the unique needs of students who ultimately are admitted into the program.

4. **Consider assessment-based support.** It also is recommended that targeted and process-based interventions be considered for integration into the program via participating institutions on a voluntary basis (e.g., usage of BEVI individual / group reports; build in other reflective opportunities; focus on process as well as content from a pedagogical and group development perspective). The purpose for doing so is to address what may be substantial within-group differences so that students receive a “meta-level” frame for what they will experience, while also offering an opportunity to “release” and better integrate attendant intra- and interpersonal processes (e.g., inevitable emotional and cognitive disequilibrium). Although further investigation will be necessary along these lines, it seems important to be aware that some students may be more, or less, able and willing to handle the demands of this rigorous leadership and exchange program, and to at least offer the opportunity for additional process-based support as needed. By making such processes explicit in a developmentally and programmatically appropriate manner, a fuller potential for learning, growth, and development may occur in a manner that is congruent with best practices and the overarching goals of the MEPI program (e.g., Tabit, Legault, Ma, & Wan, 2016).

5. **Maximize the potential for learning, growth, and development by students and alumni.** The program is characterized by a highly intensive set of learning and experiential activities for a very diverse group of young people from a global region that is in considerable turmoil. Therefore, as is commendably the case already, it behooves program administrators, supervisors, and faculty to be very mindful of what we know now about why change does or does not occur, for whom, and under what circumstances (e.g., the “7 Ds” that emerged out of the Forum BEVI Project). Ongoing reflection in this regard may profitably be applied to the assessment and development of this dynamic program – and its participants – over the long-term (see Wandschneider et al., 2015), which should benefit former, current, and future program participants (e.g., by offering longitudinal assessment and debriefing opportunities before, during, and upon completion of the program, to include program alumni).

VI. **In Conclusion**

The MEPI Student Leaders Program is an intensive and targeted program designed to work with young people in a region of the world that has considerable relevance to the United States and, quite frankly, the larger global community. As noted on multiple occasions throughout this report, evidence thus far suggests that the program is fulfilling
the criteria for “high impact learning” at multiple levels, not only in terms of its carefully integrated program components, but because of the highly complex populations, pedagogies, and field-based experiences that are integral to program design. Although the intention and design of the program are deeply commendable, such a complex and intensive program requires an assessment regimen that is sufficient to appraise what is and is not happening, and how to improve the program over time. Hopefully, the above perspective, findings, recommendations, and approach to assessment may help facilitate the overarching goals of this innovative and intensive program over the short- and long-term.
Appendix C: EI Leadership Rating Form

**EI Leadership Model Rating Form – Short Version:**

**Background and Context**

Developed under the auspices of the non-profit and 501(c)(3) organization – the International Beliefs and Values Institute or IBAVI (www.ibavi.org) – this EI Leadership Model Rating Form is derived from a two year, comprehensive job analysis of 20 leaders around the world. From the standpoint of the IBAVI, this model was developed in order to ascertain answers to five interrelated questions:

1. How do the beliefs and values of leaders impact their leadership (e.g., why do leaders experience and respond to self, others, and the larger world as they do)?
2. Are there common beliefs and values among leaders who are deemed to be most effective?
3. How do we evaluate the meaning and impact of interactions between the beliefs and values of leaders and the led?
4. How best do we understand the extraordinarily complex variables that influence leadership on a daily basis in the real world?
5. Which models of leaders and methods of leadership development are most likely to have meaning and relevance across cultures and contexts?

On the basis of the above questions, and an attendant review of literature, the methodology of job analysis was selected for model development. Among the many benefits and usages of a comprehensive job analysis are its ability to inform the development of materials and procedures for selection and screening, education and training, certification and credentialing, benchmarking and development, and strategic planning and goal setting. In short, rather than relying on ad hoc or idiosyncratic approaches or perspectives regarding leaders and leadership, a systematic job analysis provides a theoretical, empirical, and applied basis and foundation upon which short- and long-term processes of assessment, development, planning, and tracking may productively be pursued (e.g., Center for Business, 2013; Fine & Cronshaw, 1999; Prien, Goodstein, Goodstein, & Gamble, 2009; Shealy, 1995, 2012).

Twenty national and international subject matter experts (SMEs) participated in a comprehensive job analysis of global leaders and leadership in order to identify, develop, and evaluate the work behaviors (WBs), knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs), and personal characteristics (PCs) of “best” and “worst” leaders. An initial list of possible

---

participants was developed by members of the IBAVI board based upon four overarching criteria: 1) **reputation** (e.g., degree to which the individual has been recognized and experienced as aware, caring, transformative, visionary, etc.); 2) **experience** (e.g., served with distinction in leadership roles across different sectors such as NGO, academic, business, etc., both in one’s own country of origin and in other countries); 3) **diversity** (e.g., to ensure balance and representation across a range of variables including gender, cultural background, educational background, language, etc.); and 4) **alignment** (e.g., to what degree were participants able and willing to address the fundamental goals of this project). The final roster of participants appeared highly congruent with these criteria (e.g., well regarded; drawn from 14 different countries; served in over 90 leadership roles; gender balance of 9 females and 11 males; average age of 46, with a range of 27 – 68).

Through four job analysis workshops, subsets of SMEs developed the initial WBs, KSAs, and best and worst PCs as well as accompanying “critical incidents” (e.g., real world examples of behaviors, knowledge areas, characteristics, etc.). All SMEs participated in the final editing, review, rating, and ranking processes through the Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ). For purposes of orientation, an example of a WB that emerged from this job analysis includes “Inspires and motivates others,” which is defined in part as “…empowering and persuading others; sharing values, beliefs, and ideals; by personal example; through story telling in order to pursue a vision and mission and lead change processes.”

All four of these job components were analyzed by all SMEs across four JAQ criteria in order to ascertain the degree to which each component of the job analysis was essential to leading and leadership: 1) “Rank” (i.e., highest to lowest); 2) “Importance” (i.e., not at all important to crucial); 3) “Frequency” (i.e., demonstrated hourly to yearly); and 4) “Necessary at Entry” (i.e., not important at entry to “definitely” must demonstrate at entry). Data were entered and analyzed via Excel software in order to finalize the EI Model of Leadership, which has been adapted as the following EI Leadership Model Rating Form. To understand this form, and ensure its proper usage, the following seven points are especially salient.

- **First, be informed.** Before engaging in a rating process, learn about the nature of the rating system and its underlying model and method.

- **Second, be specific.** To enhance the reliability and validity of judgements regarding the attributes, performance, or aptitude of others, it is important to be specific regarding particular aspects of leadership to be rated (e.g., providing sufficient descriptive and definitional information so that a rater understands what is to be rated).

- **Third, assess comprehensively.** As the attached form indicates, ratings should be derived across multiple areas of functioning (e.g., behaviors, knowledge, skills, abilities, personal characteristics).
Fourth, mix methods. In addition to the attached form, raters are encouraged to rely upon additional quantitative and/or qualitative measures to obtain complementary information regarding the individual to be rated.

Fifth, be reliable. As a construct, “leadership” is a complex phenomenon to apprehend and appraise, which is a main reason for the development of the EI Leadership Model through a theoretically informed, empirically grounded, and methodologically systematic approach, which is designed to address the issue of validity (i.e., we wish to measure what we say we are measuring, in a way that is contextually relevant). That said, even with an ecologically valid model and method, if the actual usage of such a rating system is not reliable (e.g., if raters differ dramatically in their ratings of the same individual), those responsible for usage are obliged to engage in necessary training with the system to establish greater inter-rater reliability. In that regard, although ever-mindful of the possibility of “group think” (e.g., excluding disconfirming evidence for a potential rating due to political factors, group dynamics, etc.), it may be helpful, when appropriate, to conduct such ratings by more than one individual who has had sufficient exposure to the individual to be rated.

Sixth, be honest. Among other findings from this job analysis, the “worst personal characteristics” may have a lower base rate than the best PCs (i.e., not occur as often), but when they are evident, group and organizational processes often become highly dysfunctional due to the manifestation of such PCs. In particular and for example, SMEs were clear that although it may be difficult to acknowledge the “arrogance” of a current or prospective leader, avoiding such acknowledgement – when doing so could substantially harm group / organizational processes – is not in itself good leadership. So, if you have a basis for offering a rating, it should be offered. If you do not have a basis for offering a rating, select NB (No Basis) as your response.

Seventh, be constructive. Mindful of the above points, it is especially important to approach the process of rating through a growth-oriented spirit of good will. That is, the overarching purpose of such ratings should be to help the rated individual develop greater awareness of self (e.g., how they are experienced by others), by emphasizing the positive, but not ignoring areas for additional growth and development. By extension, information from such ratings should be dealt with in a highly sensitive and confidential manner. If any feedback to the rated individual is provided, every effort should be made to do so in a way – insofar as possible – that is kind, honest, appropriate, and clear. Of necessity, sensitive or challenging feedback often is simultaneously the most difficult and most important for the growth and development of the individual receiving it. In short, the purpose of the EI Leadership Model, and its associated rating form, is to help those in positions of leadership become more explicit and systematic regarding the gathering and usage of data in order to help individuals and organizations constructively achieve their full potential over time.
EI Leadership Model Rating Form and Ranking

Directions: Begin by reading the Background and Context form. Then, as a group, please complete the Individual Rating Form for each student. After completing the Individual Rating Forms for all students, please sort the students into Top 30%, Middle 40%, and Bottom 30% according to your perception of their overall leadership qualities. Finally, as a group, complete the Ranking Form to organize students from highest to lowest in terms of overall leadership qualities.
**EI LEADERSHIP MODEL EVALUATION FORM: SHORT VERSION**

This form allows you to provide evaluation information regarding the leadership attributes of the individual rated. For the Work Behaviors, Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities, and Best Personal Characteristics, please rate on how well you think the individual you are rating demonstrates these leadership components. For the Worst Personal Characteristics, please rate on how well you think this individual does not demonstrate such leadership components. Please answer the other questions on the basis of the below instructions. Although this form may be used as one basis for appraising leader / program effectiveness, ratings and other information should be treated with discretion (e.g., individual names should not publicly be linked to ratings; any feedback should be coordinated appropriately by a direct supervisor).

1. **Ratings for WBs, KSAs, and PCs:** Informed by the EI leadership model, please complete this form on the basis of your understanding of what each of the below terms / phrases means and assign a rating based on your understanding of how often the WB, KSA, or PC is / was evidenced:

   **1= Always 2= Frequently 3= Sometimes 4= Rarely 5= Never NB = No Basis for Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Behaviors. Please rate how descriptive the following sample work behaviors are of this individual: (e.g., demonstrates integrity, awareness of self and others, critical thinking and reflective decision-making, effective communication, understanding of others'/the organization’s values; facilitates constructive and effective group processes; embraces complexity, inspires and motivates others, facilitates growth and development).</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities. Please rate how descriptive the following sample KSAs are of this individual: (e.g., recognizes the impact of one’s own behavior on others; acknowledges when one is wrong; aware and accepting of needs, feelings; strives for humility in order to create healthy, empathic, and responsive processes for pursuing and achieving goals).</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Optimal Personal Characteristics. Please rate how descriptive the following sample HIGH OPTIMAL PCs are of this individual: (e.g., integrity, responsibility, honesty, trustworthy, ethical, knowledgeable, informed, effective, smart, open, fair, visionary, reasonable).</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Low Optimal Personal Characteristics. Please rate how descriptive the following sample LOW OPTIMAL PCs are of this individual [NOTE THAT THE RATING CRITERIA ARE REVERSED FOR THIS DOMAIN]: (e.g., incompetent, manipulative, corrupt, controlling, harassing, deceitful, dishonest, authoritarian, ignorant, obstructive). | 1 2 3 4 5 NB |
2. **Strengths**: Do you have any comments regarding this individual’s areas of strength as a leader?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. **Areas for Improvement**: Do you have any comments regarding areas of growth and development for this individual as a leader?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D: EI Leadership Ranking Form

**EI LEADERSHIP MODEL RANKING FORM**

After completing the Individual Rating Form, please work as a team to sort the students into Top 30%, Middle 40%, and Bottom 30% according to your perception of their overall leadership qualities. Then rank order the students according to their overall leadership qualities on this form. The individual listed on the top line should indicate your highest ranked student in terms of leadership. If possible, avoid ranking multiple individuals as “tied.”
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