

2014

# An Investigation of Characteristics Associated with Student Leadership

Aseret Gonzalez

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Counseling and Student Development](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Gonzalez, Aseret, "An Investigation of Characteristics Associated with Student Leadership" (2014). *Masters Theses*. 1259.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1259>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

An Investigation of Characteristics Associated with Student Leadership

(TITLE)

BY

Aseret Gonzalez

**THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in College Student Affairs

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2014

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

[REDACTED]

6/4/14

THESIS COMMITTEE CHAIR

DATE

[REDACTED]

6/30/14

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL CHAIR  
OR CHAIR'S DESIGNEE

DATE

[REDACTED]

June 4, 2014

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

[REDACTED]

6/4/14

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

COPYRIGHT © 2014  
ASERET GONZALEZ  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

This study was constructed to examine characteristics associated with student leadership.

Participants were 261 students who were involved in a Registered Student Organization in the fall of 2013. The researcher completed a quantitative approach to gain students' perceptions of their student leadership characteristics. Results suggested that students' overall perception of their leadership characteristics was positive, with males and females perceiving their leadership characteristics similarly as well did those who reported to be general members and officers in registered student organizations. Future recommendations for student leadership development are included.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words cannot express how grateful I am to have had a supportive committee. Their continued support and encouragement throughout my thesis process was truly valued: Dr. Nadler, my thesis advisor, Dr. Davidson, and Mr. Hencken. The wisdom imparted during individual meetings will always be treasured. I offer my sincere appreciation for all your support.

The completion of my thesis could not have been accomplished without the love and support of my family: Teresa, my mom, and Ashley, my sister. Thank you mom for providing me the strength and optimism during the difficult times. I hope that I can continue to support you through your educational journey as you have done for me. Ashley, I dedicate this thesis to you, I hope that you will continue to follow your dreams and take advantage of all the opportunities mom has provided for us.

Finally, to my loving, supportive, best friend, David Loveland: I extend my deepest gratitude. Your encouragement when times got rough helped me persevere. Your advice and mentorship provided me with the support to grow as a professional and accomplish my goal to complete my master's degree. I would not be where I am today without your love and support. Thank you for always making me laugh. I can't wait to see all the great things we will accomplish together. Love you always & forever.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER I.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Research Questions .....	4
Significance of the Study .....	5
Limitations of the Study.....	6
Operational Definitions.....	6
Summary .....	9
CHAPTER II.....	10
Review of Literature .....	10
Benefits of Student Leadership .....	10
Student Organizations impact on Leadership Development.....	13
Positional Roles Influence Leadership Capacity .....	14
Self-Confidence .....	15
Self-Efficacy .....	16

Benefits of Involvement Outside of the Classroom.....	18
Peers in relation to leadership development .....	18
Role Modeling .....	19
Extraversion .....	20
Differences in Leadership between Males and Females.....	20
Individual leadership experience .....	22
Summary of Literature.....	22
CHAPTER III .....	23
Methods.....	23
Design of the Study.....	23
Site Description.....	23
Participants.....	23
Instrument .....	24
Data Collection .....	26
Analysis of the Data.....	27
Limitations .....	28
Summary of Methods.....	28
Chapter IV.....	29
Results.....	29
Demographics .....	29

Research Questions .....	34
Summary .....	44
Chapter V .....	45
Discussion .....	45
Limitations .....	48
Recommendations.....	49
Conclusions .....	50
References .....	52
Appendix A .....	59
Appendix B .....	65



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographics of Study Participants	32
2	Frequencies, Measures of Tendency, and Dispersion for Student Leadership Sub-Scales	33
3	Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between Males And Females	34
4	Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between General Members and Officers	36

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Studies of college impact suggest that there are significant gains for students who pursue co-curricular activities (Astin, 1999; Gellin, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007). As a student seeks out extracurricular opportunities there is no question that they are attaining leadership skills in an informal way. Research suggests that leadership development programs provide many positive outcomes for college students (Astin, 1999; Dugan, 2012; Nadler, Newman, & Miller, 2011; Komives & Smedick, 2012; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Intellectually, students who take on co-curricular involvement and leadership opportunities develop the ability to think analytically with application of knowledge areas that particularly interest them (Terenzini, Springer, Pascarella, & Nora, 1995; Saiz, & Rivas, 2011; Lambert, Terenzini, & Lattuca, 2007). Professionally, the experience of an involved undergraduate student offers the skill set that can be transferable (Dugan et al., 2011; Gellin, 2003; Lizzio, & Wilson, 2009). Regarding personal development, co-curricular participation has also been linked to self-efficacy (Astin, 1999; Lizzio & Wilson, 2009) and purpose in life (Dewitz, Woolsey, & Walsh, 2009).

Provided that students take advantage of leadership opportunities, student affairs professionals have the opportunity to enhance their advising skills by utilizing the standards and guidelines developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education (CAS, 2012). One way of establishing a uniformed leadership development program is referencing the CAS standards as a credible foundation to create one (Komives & Smedick, 2012). The CAS standards outline the following learning outcomes for leadership programs: knowledge acquisition, integration, construction, and application; cognitive complexity; intrapersonal development; interpersonal competence; humanitarianism and civic engagement;

and practical competence. Utilizing these learning outcomes provide a foundational framework to assess if students are preparing themselves to be productive and global citizens (Haber, 2011; Komives & Arminio, 2011). *The CAS standards contextual statement* connects the role of leadership programs for students, reference that during the 1970s, many colleges refocused their energies to leadership develop due to events such as the Watergate scandal caused multiple institutions to reevaluate how they practiced ethics, leadership and social responsibility (CAS, 2006).

Assessing learning outcomes and development of college students is the primary focus of the various learning domains offered under the CAS standards. With these standards, educators and student affairs professionals are provided with guidelines and relevant variables that relate to a specific learning domain (Creamer, 2003). The field of student affairs is a growing profession which is continuously encouraging assessment. Dialogue by the Department of Higher Education has been centered around commitment and accountability that is placed on higher education institutions (Miller & Malandra, 2006). Addressing the importance of learning assessments that define students' experience in measuring the skills and learning for anyone who attends a postsecondary institution should have is a critical aspect to consider especially for student affairs professionals (Creamer, 2003; Young & Janosik, 2007). The lack of assessment in all sectors of student affairs is detrimental, especially when it comes to justifying programs and effectiveness such as a leadership development programs (Dugan, 2012; Nadler, Newman, & Miller, 2011). Acknowledging and utilizing assessment is especially critical for new professionals who are entering this field (Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008).

**Statement of the Problem**

Today the value of higher education is ever increasing. The National Commission on the Future of Higher Education (2006), has estimated that 90% of the growing jobs in the American economy will require a postsecondary education. Additionally, as other nations continue to improve their education systems, U.S. postsecondary institutions are not delivering the learning that is expected (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). For instance, employers report that many new graduates do not exemplify readiness for the work world. The commission's call to action on this issue is to begin taking steps towards accountability and commitments to improve student learning. Literature in student leadership development has noted that there is a lack of evidence that defines leadership and the skills gained from it as an outcome of the college experience (Bowen, 1977; Dugan, 2012). Over time, leadership skills have been critical variables that employers are seeking in potential employees. For instance, some variables outlined by CAS include ability to set goals and engagement in teamwork. Therefore, it is worthwhile to assess how students perceive their leadership capacity and how they perceive their abilities will prepare them for the workforce.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between peer influence, self-efficacy, self-confidence, extraversion, role model influence and support to gain insight into the differences between males and females. In addition, this study aims to determine if there is a difference in how students rate these characteristics in relation to their role within an organization. Meaning whether or not a student's positional leadership role or non-positional membership are a factor to consider when developing leadership programming.

## Research Questions

The research hypotheses for this study are:

*RH1: How do registered student organizations members rate role modeling as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument?*

*Statistical Hypothesis I: Is there a statistical difference between male and female Registered Student Organization members in the area of role modeling?*

*Statistical Hypothesis II: Is there a statistical difference between general members and officers in the area of role modeling based on the number of leadership positions held?*

*RH2: How do registered student organization members rate peer influence as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument?*

*Statistical Hypothesis I: Is there a statistical difference between male and female Registered Student Organization members in the area of peer influence?*

*Statistical Hypothesis II: Is there a statistical difference between general members and officers in the area of peer influence?*

*RH3: How do registered student organizations participants rate their level of self – confidence as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument?*

*Statistical Hypothesis I: Is there a statistical difference between male and female Registered Student Organization members in the area of self-confidence?*

*Statistical Hypothesis II: Is there a statistical difference between general members and officers in the area of self-confidence?*

*RH4: How do registered student organizations participants rate their level of self – efficacy as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument?*

*Statistical Hypothesis I:* Is there a statistical difference between male and female Registered Student Organization members in the area of self-efficacy?

*Statistical Hypothesis II:* Is there a statistical difference between general members and officers in the area of self-efficacy?

*RH5:* How do registered student organizations participants rate their personality as extroverted as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument?

*Statistical Hypothesis I:* Is there a statistical difference between male and female Registered Student Organization members in the area of rating oneself as extroverted?

*Statistical Hypothesis II:* Is there a statistical difference between general members and officers in the area of rating oneself as extroverted?

### **Significance of the Study**

Astin and Astin (2000) offer an important point on how “higher education plays a major part in shaping the quality of leadership in modern American society” (p.1). However, research on the use of CAS standards in leadership programming remains limited (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Most of the existing literature on integrating CAS standards and leadership programming is developing under the Multi-Institutional Study for Leadership (MSL), the professional student affairs organizations such as, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and American College Personnel Association (ACPA). There is limited literature and data to whether students perceive student leadership skills as outlined by CAS. This study will contribute to the literature and general practice of the use of CAS standards, specifically the use and importance of CAS standards in outlining leadership learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the results from this study may influence the type of training and benefits from participation. By looking at CAS student leadership programming variables student affairs professionals may discover this study's variables can play a key role when reaching out to students. The results may provide better insights on how students are developing as individuals and how their development as leaders are impacted by external influences.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are limitations to note of the proposed study. This study is not applicable to other post-secondary institutions. This study does not have an expected sample respondents to answer. Creamer (2003) states that the first and most notable issue with studying student outcomes is "that learning and development occurs naturally whether institutions intervene with programs and services or not" (p.113). In addition, respondents do not accurately reflect genuine responses of their extracurricular involvement. Findings in one study suggest that when students are asked to self-assess their performance they are likely to underrate their skills (Turrentine, 2001). The study was conducted over one semester; therefore, leadership skills develop over time, and one semester may not be an accurate reflection of how and when leadership abilities develop. In addition, the results of this study was dependent on the individuals' perceptions of their leadership skills and abilities. The setting posed problems since it took place at a single medium-sized, Midwestern, public state institution. Participants were selected based on their involvement in a co-curricular activity on-campus. Some students did decline to be surveyed.

### **Operational Definitions**

A number of terms used in this study have varying definitions across the relevant literature. This section provides operational definitions for this study.

**CAS Standards and Guidelines.** “Published criteria and related statements designed to provide college and university support service providers with established measures against which to evaluate programs and services. A standard uses the auxiliary verbs ‘must’ and ‘shall,’ while a guideline uses the verbs ‘should’ and ‘may.’ Standards are essentials, guidelines are not” (CAS, 2006).

**Leadership development.** “Leadership development involves self-awareness and understanding others, values and diverse perspectives, organizations and change” (CAS, 2006, p.320).

**Leader.** Based off Komives and Wagner’s (2012) work on leadership, “leader is used without regard to a specific role in a group- whether as a positional leader or a participant engaging in the leadership process as a group member” (p. xvii).

**Formal leadership role.** A leadership position in a campus organization. This can include being a President, Committee Head, or Team captain.

**Leadership.** "Leadership" is concerned with effecting change on behalf of others and society.

... Leadership is collaborative.

... Leadership is a process rather than a position.

... All students (not just those who hold formal leadership positions) are potential leaders (HERI, 1996, p.10).

**Student Involvement.** This definition adopts Astin’s (1999) definition, stating that student involvement refers to “the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience. Thus, a highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes to the academic experience. Thus, a highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, and participates actively in student organizations” (p.519).



**Co-curricular Activity.** Pertaining to activities contributing to the academic learning experience; especially activities that provide students with opportunities to learn and develop skills through active participation. Co-curricular activities and programs may be led by faculty or staff, or by students themselves, but they must have stated goals and measured outcomes (Purdue University, 2011).

**Registered Student Organization.** Eastern Illinois University defines co-curricular activities as “A “registered” student organization which is defined as any student organizational group that meets the following criteria:

- Primary officers and membership consists of students enrolled at Eastern Illinois University
- Established in order to contribute to the students’ personal interests and development
- Meets all registration requirements as outlined in RSO and Advisor’s Handbook
- Annually registered with the Student Life Office
- Understands and adheres to university policies and procedures

**Peer Influence.** A peer group, according to Astin (1993), is “any group of individuals in which the members identify, affiliate with, and seek acceptance and approval from each other” (p. 401).

**Role Model.** For the purpose of this study, “role model” is defined as an adult individual who supported or encouraged student leadership involvement (Lloyd, 2006) .

**Self-Efficacy.** This study adopts Bandura’s (1977) definition, stating that self-efficacy refers to “an individual’s judgment of personal capabilities to execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes” (p.79).

**Summary**

Chapter one contained a detailed introduction of the proposed study. Chapter two contains a detailed account of the literature that has been developed in regards to the conceptual framework used, CAS and student involvement. Chapter three contains the methods that were used in the study. Chapter four outlines the results of the study. Chapter five contains the conclusion and recommendations.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **Review of Literature**

This chapter provides a detailed review of the literature; this review includes the benefits of developing student leaders as well as student organizations impact on leadership development. The chapter will then provide information on several components related to student leadership; self-efficacy, peer influence, role model influence and support. Furthermore, this chapter will discuss some of the difference in leadership between males and females.

#### **Benefits of Student Leadership**

When considering the term student involvement it is important to define what involvement means first and foremost. Regarding to this body of literature, Astin's definition of student involvement offers a better bit for the collegiate environment. Astin (1999) defines student involvement as the "amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p.518). Hence, a student devoted to out-of-classroom involvement is one who, for example, dedicates a generous amount of time and energy to studying and participates actively in student organizations (Astin, 1999). Some factors that are considered the strongly influence students' perceptions on leadership are interactions and experiences with faculty, administrative support staff, and peers. Some significant categories that contribute to leadership development and opportunities that carry over to societal equivalencies include internships and athletics (Thompson, 2006).

Utilizing Astin's student involvement theory to gain a better of the developmental process of the student is essential. Astin defines his involvement theory to consist of five basic postulates. The first of the five refers to the investment of physical and psychological effort in

various objects. The objects could be defined as either highly specific, such as studying for a specific exam, or highly generalized, such as the college experience. The next point is that involvement occurs along a continuum. Students will devote time and energy at different degrees in a given organization while devoting exemplifying different degrees of involvement within a given organization. In addition, Astin (1999) defines involvement as having both quantitative and qualitative features. For instance, student's involvement in an organization can be measured quantitatively by counting how many hours the student spends preparing for meetings or engaging with their peers. As far as qualitative measures are concerned, one can measure whether the student effectively plans for an upcoming meeting or simply attends a meeting and daydreams. The last postulate suggests that educational policy effectiveness impacts the practice of increasing student involvement; that is, faculty members who promote on-campus involvement will relate to students' ability to be aware of the significance of involvement.

Findings from one study suggest that programmatic and faculty influences are indirect in encouraging or discouraging certain kinds of student experiences; thus, students who choose to get involved may be impacted by the faculty presentation (Lambert, Terenzini, & Lattuca, 2007). In addition, the degree of faculty interaction, specifically a mentoring relationship, a student has influences their leadership capacity (Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, & Wagner, 2011). However, there is limited research of what aspects of these interactions directly influence leadership development. If faculty impacts student's decision to get involved, it is worthwhile to observe the university's mission to develop the student holistically.

Literature suggests that student involvement develops the students' ability to take on more responsibility, group dynamic skills and analytical ability (Dugan, et.al., 2011; Flores, Burbach, Quinn, & Harding, 2012; O'Dell, & Hwang, 2008). General membership in student

organizations provide group interaction and similar experiences that a positional role would offer, so general membership should not be discounted (Dugan, & Komives, 2007). One thing to consider when studying student involvement is to not equate leadership skills, such as analytical skills, to their involvement because these skills are independent from the student's degree of involvement (Wehmeyer, 1998). Another benefit from student involvement is the leadership efficacy gained from a positional role (Komives et al., 2006).

The development of leadership skills and where students gain exposure to leadership opportunities is complex. Research suggest that there are multiple variables that increase student's capacity to gain leadership skills (Salisbury, Pascarella, Padgett, & Blaich, 2012; Astin, 1993; Kuh, 1995). One study by Salisbury, et.al, (2012) examined the effects of work, specifically off-campus work on the development of leadership capacity among first-year college in a national longitudinal study and found that work had an overall positive effects of the development of leadership skills. This brings into question if institutions should encourage off-campus work to increase professional success and leadership capacity. Contrary to Astin (1993) and Kuh (1995) research on co-curricular involvement and the influence it has on student learning and personal development, such as on-campus organizations, faculty interaction, and volunteering are important to consider.

Research on student leadership often emphasizes its importance of supplementing the academic learning that takes place in the classroom. With the promotion of student leadership, students are provided an enhanced educational experience. A variety of benefits come along with the student participation in leadership positions. For instance, participation in college extracurricular activities influences cognitive and emotional growth (Astin, 1993; Pascarella, &

Terenzini, 1991). Overall, the mission of all institutions is to enhance student learning and development outcomes inside and outside the classroom.

### **Student Organizations impact on Leadership Development**

The importance of student organizations has been examined in many studies. Birkenholz and Schumacher (1994) research suggest that there is a significant positive relationship between leadership skills and participation in student organizations. For instance, residing in a fraternity/sorority or residence hall while in college was related to higher leadership scores of graduates (Birkenholz, & Schumacher, 1994, p.7). This research suggests that the most important activity related to the development of leadership skills was membership in a fraternity/sorority. Thompson (2006) research found consistent evidence with previous research which identify students' involvement in campus opportunities and programs as contributing to leadership formation and development. Since the use of assessment is encouraged, Thompson (2006) suggest that an examination of the outcomes of co-curricular activities towards leadership may serve institutions well especially when assessing program effectiveness.

Nonetheless, student engagement in activities is an important practice to implement when helping students to develop the capacity to integrate what they are learning in the classroom into outside activities. Kuh (2009) describes involvement in educational activities as opportunity to "level the playing field, especially students from low-income family backgrounds and others who have historically underserved" (p.698). Student affairs professionals have the opportunity to influence student's college experience by promoting different student organizations and leadership opportunities that increase their skill set. As student affairs professionals begin to differentiate the various opportunities offered to students, it may worth noting that research

depicts that academic involvement (e.g., hours spend studying and doing homework, studying with other students) plays a greater role than other type of involvement (Astin, 1999).

Student organization involvement and formal leadership roles within these organizations offer a foundational framework when determining what factors contribute to student development, especially in the realm of student leadership development (Astin, 1999; Salisbury, Pascarella, Padgett, & Blaich, 2012). Since students are exposed to working various personalities' involvements in these organizations they provide an opportunity to develop their leadership style and capacity. Additionally, research suggests the positive outcomes that come with associating with a student organization involvement. As students look to get involved, they choose to get involved with more than one organization. This may pose some issues as some research suggests that the number of organizations in which a student chooses to get involved influences outcomes (Astin, 1997; Dugan, & Komives, 2007). This in turn brings into question of what conceptual model can provide a framework to assess what leadership outcomes students express gaining from their involvement.

### **Positional Roles Influence Leadership Capacity**

Leadership identity development (LID) theory supports the way students perceive leadership. According to LID, when a student transitions from awareness to exploration/engagement to a hierarchical view of leadership (i.e., leader identified) they begin to view leadership as non-positional and as a process (Campbell, Smith, Dugan, & Komives, 2012). In addition, Kouzes and Posner (2008) propose that "leadership is an observable set of skills and abilities" (p.145). With their research, they have discovered that many individuals believe that leadership can't be learned which inhibits those who have want to learn the skill set of a leader, but are inhibited by this myth. Dugan (2011) suggests that the quality of research that looks into

student's leadership capacity should be grounded using a theoretical context such as authentic leadership or socially responsible leadership. An examination of leadership capacity requires a review of what is already known about college student leadership. One thing that has been studied is that positional roles influences leadership efficacy (Komives et al., 2006). Leadership efficacy employs Bandura's (1997) enactive mastery which states that when an individual takes on opportunities that allow for numerous performances on something it provides the individual the motivation and perception that they are fully competent in something.

### **Self-Confidence**

Self-confidence plays an important role in how others perceive one's ability to make decisions and gaining other's trust. Not only expressing self-confidence is important for a leader to project it, but so is how others perceive it. Often leaders who possess self-confidence portray a more assertive and decisive approach, which gains others' confidence in their leader. Emotional intelligence is integral to how a leader conveys their self-confidence in their work.

It is important to know the difference between self-confidence and self-efficacy especially when looking at leadership traits. Self-confidence "is the ability to be certain about one's competencies and skills" (Northouse, 2001, p.19). It considers how one perceives their strengths and self-awareness. Ultimately, self-confidence deals with the belief about one's abilities. According to Bandura (1997), "self-efficacy refers to belief in one's agentive capabilities that one can produce given levels of attainment" (p.382).

Possessing confidence influences student's ability to take on leadership positions and their effectiveness to work with peers. Tavani and Losh's (2003) study found gender differences in self-confidence levels. In their study, they discovered males had higher levels of self-confidence than females in professional and social situations. Having leadership experiences



allow students to perceive they are capable possess self-confidence and feel empowered.

Researchers Shertzer and Schuh (2004) performed a study on how college students perceived leadership. Several themes emerged from interviews, including: “leadership is an individual possession, leadership is positional, leaders possess particular qualities and skills, and leaders act from internal motivations” (p.116). Furthermore, students shared having a lack of confidence or encouragement were reasons why they did not assume leadership roles. Students reported peers and advisors play an influential role in one’s confidence to feel confident in a leadership role.

### **Self-Efficacy**

Capacity and efficacy have been differentiated in previous studies and have provided evidence that indicate they are intertwined (Bandura, 1997; Komives et al., 2011). For example, students may be knowledgeable of what the skill set related to leadership, but research indicated that students are likely to enact on these skills based on their internalized belief system about their capacity (Komives et al., 2011).

### **Sources of Self-Efficacy**

Bandura hypothesized (1986, 1997) that self-efficacy beliefs stemmed from individuals who interpret information from four sources, the powerful being *mastery experience*. After a student completes a task, they interpret and evaluate the results obtained and determine their understanding with judgment based on their experience and knowledge. When students feel as if they completed something successfully, their confidence to accomplish something similar is heightened because they were able to produce the desired effect after completing the task at hand.

Another source that can expose students to leadership development is through role modeling better known through vicarious experiences. Bandura (1997) describes vicarious

experience as a method in which one observes a role model, perhaps someone with a similar background to that individual and watching them succeed at completing a task. Listening to stories in which their role models share how they successfully performed a challenging task. While this is another critical source of enhancing a student's self-efficacy, it is ultimately up to the student's willingness to take on leadership opportunities.

Fletcher's (2012) study found that participating in collaborative relationships in study groups, planning campus activities, community initiatives, and student protests were noted to be influential to increasing Black men's self-efficacy and persistence in college in a Hispanic serving institution. It is critical that college environments and student affairs professionals are providing supportive and challenging experiences for students.

### **Self- Efficacy and Its Relation to Leadership**

Dugan and Komvies (2010) discovered that self-efficacy can explain up to 13% of the differences in students' capacities to engage in socially responsible leadership. Therefore, this finding brings to question how leadership education programs are designed to build capacity and often rely on concrete experiences (i.e. positional leadership) as a way to increase efficacy. Although this may be seen as one way to increase efficacy, it is certainly not the only way. Building leadership efficacy requires a plethora of opportunities where one can reflect and discuss their concrete experiences. Bandura (1997) discusses that the cultivation of efficacy usually occurs through vast opportunities that allow individual's observe the modeling of effective leadership by others (i.e. Vicarious experience), significant affirmation of one's capacity and sponsorship (i.e. social persuasion ). Komives et al. (2011) suggest that individual experiences should be linked with capacity and efficacy- building opportunities such as mentoring relationships, experimental learning to promote growth in both dimensions.

**Benefits of Involvement Outside of the Classroom**

There a great deal of literature that looks at the benefits of the outcomes associated with students' nonacademic experiences, with the focus on psychosocial development. However, there is a growing body of research that is looking at how students develop holistically. Parcella, Terenzini, and Blimling (1996) describe holistic development in the way "change in one area of a student's growth is accompanied by changes in other aspects of that student's being" (p.149). Exposure to different experiences outside the classroom can help a student develop, but Astin (1993) argues that "the students' peer group is the single most important source on growth and development" (p.398).

Astin (1993) defines peer group as "any group of individuals in which the members identify, affiliate with, and see acceptance and approval from each other" (p. 401). Peers begin to identify with those who have similar backgrounds and values. For example, a student who is deciding whether to get involved in extracurricular activities is more inclined to do so, if they have associated with peers that are driven to get involved. Peers can influence others to take involvement opportunities, but they also serve as support systems.

**Peers in relation to leadership development**

Research by Komives and Dugan (2007) found that about 70% of students reported being mentored by peers or by faculty. They stress students must work with others to truly learn leadership. Another way to consider the importance of peer influence is looking at how students of color are influenced to take on leadership roles. Miley (2003) found that African Americans experienced positive learning outcomes when they were exposed to close friends of their own race. However, for African American students to fully benefit from diversity, they must have contact with diverse peers as well as interaction with same race peers. There is a negative

influence as well. Allen (1992) discovered that historically Black universities provide a positive social and psychological environment compared to those who attended a predominately White university. Research by Harper (2006) found African American students to repeatedly cite student organizations and clubs as the venues through which they can find same-race peer support college achievements and leadership. As African American students became increasingly engaged in student organizations, they noted that peer support for their pursuit of leadership also escalated.

### **Role Modeling**

Mentors are incredibly important for college student leadership efficacy. There is only so much an individual can do for themselves when it comes to developing leadership skills, but role models can promote reflection and meaning making. In the Leadership Identity Development model, Komives et al. (2006) describe the complexity of student development in which students define leadership identify themselves as leaders. As they describe each stage, developmental influences are cited repeatedly with suggestions of how role models and peers can assist in meaning making. The LID model includes six total stages. Each stage integrates one of many student development theory families. For instance, Chickering's psychosocial student development theory describes the fifth vector as establishing identity, which closely aligns in the LID model with the achievement of Stage Four, Leadership Differentiated (Komives, et al., 2009).

As students explore and discover in leadership opportunities, role models play an influential role in encouraging and supporting their involvement. In the third stage as mentioned in the LID model (Komives, et al., 2004), adults serve as mentors that help students process situations and past experiences by encouraging them to reflect on their personal development and

leadership style. Although role models initially influence students' involvement in leadership roles but continue serve as mentors to support their leadership role.

### **Extraversion**

The way we think and personality preferences have been essential in understanding the way we adapt to the world. Carl Jung (1923) introduced four core function of human temperament types. One of the four typologies he identified involves how we get our energy and we prefer to relate to the world around us. The two combination is known as extravert and introvert. Extraverts are observed to prefer the outer world of people and things. Introverts prefer their inner world of feelings and ideas (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007).

With personality trait theory there are certain characteristics that tend to be associated with leadership. Digman (1990) found in his research that a structure of personality traits has emerged into five-factor model of personality. Analysis of these five factor personalities' traits has revealed that personality traits can be categorized into five main factors: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Using the five-factor model of personality as an organizing framework, Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002) meta-analyzed studies examining the relationship between personality and leadership and found that extraversion, was positively related to leadership. A recent study suggests, of the Big Five, extraversion was the most strongly related to leadership. However, their results revealed extraversion was significantly related to leadership only when observer ratings or both self and observer ratings were used to assess extraversion (Colbert, Judge, Choi, & Wang, 2012).

### **Differences in Leadership between Males and Females**

The way gender influences leadership has been a demographic that has been investigated by leadership researchers. The literature that investigates how gender plays a role is heavily

dependent of how it is defined. Leadership capacity is one that is worth noting. One research using a meta-analysis approach discovered that women's leadership styles depicted more as democratic when compared to men (Eagly, & Johnson, 1990). In another study, Dugan (2006) found that the performance gap between men and women specifically when looking at leadership behavior and how it impacts leadership effectiveness. For instance, women combat is the stereotype that women do not have the ability to lead. When looking at men's leadership development the study suggests that student affair professionals should actively engage men in more leadership discussions, programs and developments. Contrary to previous studies, one study found that women and men students were equally self-critically about their leadership skills (Turrentine, 2001). It is important to consider the key areas that both groups need to assistance for developmental growth. These findings present an opportunity where professionals can support and market peer leadership roles and interaction to increase leadership development, capacity and self-efficacy between men and women. The next step is to further assess what should be considered to enhance or promote leadership education for both groups.

In one study looking at college women's leadership aspirations, Boatwright, and Edgidio (2003), found that traditional feminine gender characteristics and connectedness were two predictors for women's leadership aspiration. The study also found that women perceived leadership as a male endeavor. Results from this study suggest the need for student affairs professionals to empower women students to decrease their strong psychological feminine traits that negatively influence their desire to seek leadership roles.

Carol Gilligan (1993), *In a Different Voice* discusses the difference in psychological development for men and women. She suggests that there is a difference in how men and women experience relationships and issues of dependency. For instance, she states,

For boys or men, separation and individuation are critically tied to gender identity since separation from the mother is essential for the development of masculinity...masculinity is defined through separation while femininity is defined through attachment, male gender identity is threatened by intimacy while female gender identity is threatened by separation. Thus males tend to have difficulty with relationships, while females tend to have problems with individuation (p. 8)

Gilligan's perspective on men and women's psychological development provides insight on how men prefer to lead through an individual process whereas women find relationships and collaboration more valuable.

### **Individual leadership experience**

Much of the research in student leadership development focuses on student involvement, but not on individual experiences. One study found that when individuals self-assessed their leadership skills they tended to underrate themselves compared to what peers assessed (Turpentine, 2001). Based on another study, researchers found that students tended to hold a hierarchical perspective of leadership during the first year of college (Komives, Longbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006).

### **Summary of Literature**

Reviewing literature provides a background of research that indicates what characteristics and influences impact student leadership. The literature on characteristics and influences is still growing. Studying what key characteristics influence students the most when it comes to student leadership development is worth considering when proposing or enhancing a leadership program.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **Methods**

Chapter provides a review of the quantitative methods that was used. It also describes the design of the study, site description, participants, and the instrumentation. The chapter then provides information on the data collection, data analysis along with the study's limitations.

#### **Design of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the differences between male and females in relation to five independent variables. In addition, this study looked to gain insight into the differences between general members and officers when looking at how peer influence, self-efficacy, self-confidence, role model influence and support, and extraversion played a role. Determining whether or not positional leadership role or non-positional membership are a factor to consider when developing leadership programming.

#### **Site Description**

A medium sized, public, four-year university in the Midwest in a rural location will be the selected site for this study. University records from 2012-2013 indicated that the university enrolled approximately 10,417 students. The institution currently offers 47 undergraduate degree programs. In addition, the institution recognizes approximately 195 registered student organizations.

#### **Participants**

The population for this study included traditional-aged undergraduate college students involved in a Registered Student Organization (RSO) that are recognized through the institutions student life office. Student participants may vary in gender, ethnicity, and level involvement. The population consisted of all undergraduate students. Participants included freshman,



sophomore, junior and senior status. The year of school that participants reported was based on the number of semesters attended the university. For the purpose of this research, only students in a registered student organization were considered for this study. The reason for this is because each registered student organization must meet a certain criteria to be recognized through the Student Life Department. Participant selection was based on two criteria areas- (a) all students must be undergraduates; and (b) students must currently participate in a registered student organization.

Registered student organizations were identified using the *Registered Student Organization Listings* (student life, 2013) and met the criteria to be included in the listing and study. Participants were invited to take the survey at their organizational meeting. There were two options for participants to complete the survey. The researcher provided hard-copies of the survey to the president and/or advisor to distribute during or after the meeting for completion. In addition, the RSO advisor and president were also asked to send the survey via email. The researcher included in the email to confirm that the survey was sent.

### **Instrument**

This study used a survey to collect quantitative data from participants. A noncommercial “published” instrument provided a cost-effective way of gathering descriptive data from a random sample approach (Patten, 2000). Random samples typically afford the greatest generalizability of findings to practice (Komives et al. 2011, p.63). Patten (2000) discusses the advantage of proposing published instruments and the benefits of spending less time to develop or refine the instrument. Most commercially created instruments are used towards a specific purpose of study. Since commercially instruments tend to charge for its use, it was important to find an instrument that was not costly, with it tested for reliability and validity. Since most

commercial instruments charge for use, the researcher looked for a free instrument. The instrument used for this study was the *Lloyd Leadership Instrument*. Content validity was established by the researcher by faculty and doctoral students familiar with experience working with student leaders (Lloyd, 2006). The researcher tested for reliability by piloting the study and statistically analyzed the data using SPSS. The Cronbach alpha rating for the role model scale was .86. The peer influence scale was .69, which resulted in dropping one of the statements in order to increase the reliability to .80. The self-efficacy scale was .87 and the self-confidence scale was .92. The extraversion scale was .77 but after dropping three statements it increased the reliability for this scale to .85. The use of this instrument in the study allowed the researcher to analyze the results as it is compared to other studies that looked at student leadership.

The *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* originally consisted of 42 statements that comprised of 9 statements for peer influence scale, 10 statements for the self-confidence scale, 6 statements for the self-efficacy scale, 8 statements for the role model scale, and 9 statements for the extraversion scale (Lloyd, 2006). The instrument uses a Likert-type scale where 1 represents “strongly disagree”, 2 represents “disagree”, 3 represents “slightly disagree”, 4 represents “slightly agree”, 5 represents “agree”, and 6 represents “strongly agree.” The researcher did not contain any neutral scoring because they wanted students to make a choice.

In addition, the final section of the instrument includes six demographic questions. Questions include: participant’s gender, number of leadership positions held in college, *ethnicity*, *class standing*, role in current organization (officer or general member) and *current college GPA*. Overall, the final instrument consisted of a total of 37 statements with 8 statements for the peer influence scale, 10 statements for the self-confidence scale, 6 statements for the self-efficacy scale, 8 statements for the role model scale, 6 statements for the extraversion scale and 7

demographic questions. Statements 1 through 5 correspond to the self-efficacy scale; statements 6 through 11 correspond to the extraversion scale; statements 12 through 19 correspond to the peer influence scale; statements 20 through 27 correspond to the role model scale; statements 28 through 37 correspond to the self-confidence scale. The researcher confirmed instrument statements corresponded to its respected scales by the publisher.

### **Data Collection**

Data from the participants was gathered in October after approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). To ensure confidentiality of participants throughout the data collection phases, the researcher created a password to lock the computer and kept all paper copies. The online and paper survey data did not ask for an identification number, name or address besides an email address. Anonymity was preserved by blind copying email addresses once the survey was distributed. In addition, participants were asked to insert completed paper copies in a manila folder with a clasp. The advisor was asked to deliver manila folders to the address of the researcher's mailbox.

There were 193 RSOs eligible for this study. Fourteen RSOs were contacted to participate in this study. The researcher used a purposive sampling technique in which they selected two RSOs that were classified as: academic, governing, Greek, multicultural, religious, service, social that had a large membership. Contact with participants were dependent on what registered student organizations were listed to have the greatest membership within the category listed. The researcher requested membership data to determine what top two RSOs within each category were invited to participate in the study. Furthermore, the researcher asked the president of each organization for permission to attend a weekly meeting to solicit participation and distribute the paper copy survey and send via email to those who prefer an online survey.

The researcher contacted the presidents and advisors of each selected RSO to coordinate a day and time to attend a general meeting. The researcher introduced herself, explained the purpose of the study and presented the two options for completion of the survey. In addition, the researcher collected member's emails to solicit survey participation. Participants were asked to complete the survey electronically on one's own time or complete the paper copy survey. After the researcher piloted the survey, the survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

The distribution of the survey took place in mid-October. In order to increase participation the researcher gathered emails at the RSO meetings and provided the option to fill out a paper copy. Once the researcher entered emails from meetings they were sent a consent message along with the survey outlining instructions asking to complete the survey by November 14th. Distribution of the survey was dependent on the researcher and the utilization of Survey Monkey an electronic survey service. A follow-up email was sent to individuals who did not complete the survey to increase participation rates. A final reminder was sent if needed.

Throughout the data collection process, the researcher promoted an incentive to the RSOs asked to participate in the survey. A pizza party was awarded to one student organization that had the highest percentage of participation.

### **Analysis of the Data**

**Quantitative.** Descriptive statistics was obtained from SPSS.

All survey data was entered, organized and coded in Microsoft Excel and transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for descriptive statistics. A coding form was created in order for the researcher to organize data in SPSS. This allowed the researcher to generate variable names for data items. Variable titles created in SPSS were used to address

research questions. Analyzing and comparing data allowed the researcher to distinguish trends, draw conclusions and provide recommendations.

An independent *t*-tests were conducted to compare differences amongst males and females and positional and non-positional roles based on a number of identified variables. The dependent variables were gender and positional roles. The independent variables were scale scores for 1) role modeling, 2) peer influence; 3) self-confidence; 4) self-efficacy; and 5) extraversion. Basic descriptive statistics were also generated.

### Limitations

Limitations in this study include students not filling out the survey. The researcher needed to attend student organizations to encourage participation. Self-reported questions ask participants to respond directly to what was being asked of them whether that is their capacity or experience. Therefore, their responses were dependent on the participant's developmental foundations (Komives et al., 2011). According to Komives et al., (2011), "since participants were asked directly about their levels of leadership capacity, their responses may vary based on their perception of understanding the terms or relative influence of social desirability (i.e. the perception that a particular answer is more socially acceptable versus other even if not accurately reflected to one's experience)" (p.63). However, the researcher was intentional to be specific and clear in response options. The data was a voluntary study, so data was not representative of the entire student population.

### Summary of Methods

This chapter provided an overview of the quantitative methodology and purpose of the study. It outlined information on the site, participants, instrument, data collection as well as the limitations. After data was collected, data was assessed in order to answer research questions

## **Chapter IV**

### **Results**

This chapter looks at the statistical analysis of the study. Information regarding mean scores will provide answers to the research questions that address the purpose of the study. This chapter reviews demographics of participants, and concludes with a chapter summary.

A total of 261 students completed the Lloyd Leadership Survey. Demographic data was collected from the survey. Students participated in the study by allowing the researcher to attend their registered student organization (RSO) meeting. Resulting data was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20, a statistical analysis tool.

#### **Demographics**

Table 1 shows the breakdown of the participants by gender, number of organizations, ethnicity semesters hours currently enrolled, grade point average (GPA), number of community agencies involved, role in student organization, and type of registered student organization (RSO). Table 1 shows the demographics for participants ( $n = 261$ ). There were 48% ( $n = 125$ ) general members and 52% ( $n = 136$ ) officers.

There were 72 males and 186 females, and of those participants, 52.2% ( $n = 97$ ) females were student officers and 47.8% ( $n = 89$ ) were general members. As for males, 62.5% ( $n = 45$ ) were officers and 37.5% ( $n = 27$ ) were general members. Since there were three participants reported themselves as “other”, the researcher felt as if it did not accurately report the percentage of students that reside on campus and researcher removed them from data analysis. Therefore, in order to accurately report the difference between male and females throughout the research, it allowed the researcher to run  $t$ -tests rather than ANOVAs.

Regarding ethnicity, the majority of participants were White, non-Hispanic 71.6 % (n = 187) followed by, Black, non-Hispanic 20.3% (n = 53), Hispanic 3.8% (n = 10), Asian 3.4% (n = 9), American Indian or Alaska Native 0.8% (n = 2), and none for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Of those ethnicities, 10.3% (n = 27) of students within the overall sample reported that they were black as a general RSO member whereas, 10% (n = 26) of students within the overall sample reported to be a Black officer in their RSO. Within the overall sample, 33% (n = 85) of participants reported to be a general member who was white and 39% (n = 102) reported to serve as an officer who was white. Of the other ethnicities, 2.7% (n = 7) of students reported to be a general member who was Hispanic, whereas 1.2% (n = 3) reported to serve as an officer, who was Hispanic. Of the other participants, 2.3% (n = 6) students reported to be a general member who were Asian, while 1.5% (n = 3) reported to serve as an office who was Asian.

Table 5 also shows the breakdown of the participants by grade point average (GPA) and semester hours currently enrolled. Students with a GPA of 3.5 – 3.75 represented 18% (n = 47) of the overall sample followed by 3.75-4.0, 14.6% (n = 38), 3.25-3.50, 12.6% (n = 33), 3.0-3.25, 10% (n = 26), 2.75-3.0, 10.7% (n = 28), first year students 9.6% (n = 25), and 1<sup>st</sup> semester transfer 6.9% (n = 18).

Regarding number of semesters currently enrolled, the majority of participants reported 3-4 semesters 31.8% (n = 83) and 5-6 semesters 28.4% (n = 74). In addition, participants who reported 1-2 semesters accounted for 19.2% (n = 50), followed by 9 or more 11.9% (n = 31) and 7-8 semesters 8.4% (n = 22).

In regards to the diversity of participation in student organizations, participants shared the number of registered student organizations in which they were involved, number of community

agencies with which they are associated, and type of registered student organization affiliated.

The majority of participants reported being involved in 2-3 registered student organizations 41.4% (n = 108), followed by 0-1 organizations 28.4% (n = 74), 4-5 organizations 21.8% (n = 57), and 6-7 organizations 8.0% (n = 21). For number of community agencies, 75.5% (n = 197) are associated with 0-1 community agencies. In addition, participants reported 2-3 agencies 18.0% (n = 47), 4-5 agencies 6.5% (n = 17), and none of the participants were associated with 6-7 agencies.

The researcher sought diverse populations and recruited from different affiliated groups, as a result, of the participants, 54 (20.7%) were affiliated with a service; 43 (16.5%) were affiliated with a governing RSO; 41 (15.7%) were affiliated with a multicultural RSO; 40 (15.3%) were affiliated with a Greek RSO; 38 (14.6%) were affiliated with an academic RSO; 23 (8.8%) were affiliated with a social RSO; 21 (8.0%) were affiliated with a religious RSO.



Table 1

*Demographics of Study Participants (n = 261)*

<b>Demographic Variable</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	72	27.6
Female	186	71.3
Other	3	1.1
<b>Number of Organizations</b>		
0-1 Student Organizations	74	28.4
2-3 Student Organizations	108	41.4
4-5 Student Organizations	57	21.8
6-7 Student Organizations	21	8.0
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White, non-Hispanic	187	71.6
Black, non-Hispanic	53	20.3
Hispanic	10	3.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	0.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0
<b>Semesters Currently Enrolled</b>		
1-2	50	19.2
3-4	83	31.8
5-6	74	28.4
7-8	22	8.4
9 +	31	11.9
<b>Grade Point Average</b>		
New Freshman	25	9.6
1 <sup>st</sup> Semester Transfer	18	6.9
Under 2.0	7	2.7
2.0 – 2.25	4	1.5
2.25 – 2.50	12	4.6
2.50 – 2.75	23	8.8
2.75 – 3.0	28	10.7
3.0 – 3.25	26	10.0
3.25 – 3.50	33	12.6
3.50 – 3.75	47	18.0
3.75 – 4.0	38	14.6

Table 1 continued

*Demographics of Study Participants (n = 261)*

<b>Demographic Variable</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Number of Community Agencies</b>		
0 – 1	197	75.5
2 – 3	47	18.0
4 – 5	17	6.5
6 – 7	0	0
<b>General Member or Officer</b>		
General Member	125	47.9
●fficer	136	52.1
<b>Type of RSO</b>		
Academic	38	14.6
Governing	43	16.5
Greek	40	15.3
Multicultural	41	15.7
Religious	21	8.0
Service	54	20.7
Social	23	8.8

Table 2

*Frequencies, Measures of Tendency, and Dispersion for Student Leadership Sub-Scales*

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Variance	Range	Min	Max
Peer Influence	256	4.83	0.58	0.34	4.25	1.75	6.00
Self- Confidence	255	5.04	0.60	0.36	3.60	2.40	6.00
Self- Efficacy	259	5.11	0.75	0.56	5.00	1.00	6.00
Role Model Influence	257	4.62	0.84	0.70	5.00	1.00	6.00
Extraversion	258	4.99	0.68	0.47	4.17	1.83	6.00

## Research Questions

There were five research questions, each with its own sub-questions. The results for each question and sub-question are summarized in Tables 2-4 at the end of the section. Table 2 displays each student leadership sub-scales by frequency, measures of tendency and dispersion.

### Research Hypothesis 1

Do differences in role modeling scores exist between selected demographics?

*Statistical Hypothesis I:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument role modeling sub-scale scores between male and female Registered Student Organization members?

The first sub-question examined if statistically significant differences in role modeling scores, as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument, existed between males and females. Table 1 shows the mean scores and standard deviation for all participants, males and females. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument role modeling scores in males and females. There was not a statistical significant difference ( $t(252) = 1.21, p = .569$ ) in the role modeling scores for males ( $M = 4.74, SD = 0.77$ ) and females ( $M = 4.60, SD = 0.85$ ).

Table 3

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between Males and Females*

Characteristics	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>			
Role Model	4.7394	.76612	4.5997	.84787	252	1.210	.569
Peer Influence	4.9965	.50928	4.7788	.59842	251	2.705	.814
Self-Confidence	5.1221	.58203	5.0158	.61619	250	1.233	.889
Self- Efficacy	5.0789	.74946	5.1211	.76189	254	-.399	.531
Extraversion	5.0023	.64670	5.0064	.69872	253	-.043	.520

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .001$ 

*Statistical Hypothesis II:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument role modeling sub-scale score between general members and officers?

The second sub-question examined if statistically significant differences in role modeling scores, as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument, existed between general members and officers. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument role modeling scores in general members and officers. There was not a statistical significant difference ( $t(255) = -2.185, p = .083$ ) in the role modeling scores for general members ( $M = 4.51, SD = 0.91$ ) and officers ( $M = 4.73, SD = 0.76$ ).

Table 4

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between General Members and Officers*

Characteristics	<u>Member</u>		<u>Officer</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.5093	.90932	4.7371	.76168	255	-2.185	.083
Peer Influence	4.7337	.66587	4.9239	.48433	254	-2.627	.052
Self-Confidence	4.9322	.66636	5.1373	.52896	253	-2.734	.010*
Self- Efficacy	4.8640	.85028	5.3403	.56357	257	-5.347	.000**
Extraversion	4.9336	.73945	5.0064	.63350	256	-1.426	.107

\*p < .05 \*\*p < .001

## Research Hypothesis 2

Do differences in peer influence scores exist between selected demographics?

*Statistical Hypothesis 1:* : Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument peer influence sub-scale scores between male and female RSO members?

The second statistical hypothesis examined if there was a statistically significant differences in peer influence scores, as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument, existed between males and females. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument peer influence scores in males and females. There was not a statistical significant difference ( $t(251) = -0.218, p = .814$ ) in the peer influence scores for males ( $M = 4.99, SD = 0.51$ ) and females ( $M = 4.78, SD = 0.60$ ).

Table 3

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between Males and Females*

Characteristics	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.7394	.76612	4.5997	.84787	252	1.210	.569
Peer Influence	4.9965	.50928	4.7788	.59842	251	2.705	.814
Self-Confidence	5.1221	.58203	5.0158	.61619	250	1.233	.889
Self- Efficacy	5.0789	.74946	5.1211	.76189	254	-.399	.531
Extraversion	5.0023	.64670	5.0064	.69872	253	-.043	.520

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .001$

*Statistical Hypothesis II:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument peer influence sub-scale scores between general members and officers?

The second sub-question examined if statistically significant differences in peer influence scores, as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument, existed between general members and officers. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument peer influence scores in general members and officers. There was not a statistical significant difference found ( $t(254) = -2.627, p = 0.052$ ) in the peer influence scores for general members ( $M = 4.73, SD = 0.67$ ) and officers ( $M = 4.92, SD = 0.48$ ).

Table 4

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between General Members and Officers*

Characteristics	<u>Member</u>		<u>Officer</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.5093	.90932	4.7371	.76168	255	-2.185	.083
Peer Influence	4.7337	.66587	4.9239	.48433	254	-2.627	.052
Self-Confidence	4.9322	.66636	5.1373	.52896	253	-2.734	.010*
Self- Efficacy	4.8640	.85028	5.3403	.56357	257	-5.347	.000**
Extraversion	4.9336	.73945	5.0064	.63350	256	-1.426	.107

\*p &lt; .05 \*\*p &lt; .001

### Research Hypothesis 3

Do differences in self-confidence scores occur between selected demographics?

*Statistical Hypothesis 1:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument self-confidence sub-scale scores between male and female RS● members?

The third research question focused on how registered student organization members rate self-confidence as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument. The first sub-question looks at whether or not there is a statistical difference between male and female RS● members in the area of self-confidence. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument self-confidence scores in males and females. There was not a statistical significant difference ( $t(250) = 1.23, p = .889$ ) in the self-confidence scores for males ( $M = 5.12, SD = 0.58$ ) and females ( $M = 5.02, SD = 0.62$ ).

Table 3

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between Males and Females*

Characteristics	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.7394	.76612	4.5997	.84787	252	1.210	.569
Peer Influence	4.9965	.50928	4.7788	.59842	251	2.705	.814
Self-Confidence	5.1221	.58203	5.0158	.61619	250	1.233	.889
Self- Efficacy	5.0789	.74946	5.1211	.76189	254	-.399	.531
Extraversion	5.0023	.64670	5.0064	.69872	253	-.043	.520

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .001$ 

*Statistical Hypothesis II:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument self-confidence sub-scale scores between general members and officers?

The second sub-question focused on whether or not there was a difference between general members and officers in the area of self- confidence. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument self-confidence scores in general members and officers. A statistical significant difference was found ( $t(253) = -2.73, p = 0.010$ ) in the self-confidence scores for general members ( $M = 4.93, SD = 0.67$ ) and officers ( $M = 5.14, SD = 0.529$ ). Officers scored higher than general members in self-confidence.



Table 4

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between General Members and Officers*

Characteristics	<u>Member</u>		<u>Officer</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Role Model	4.5093	.90932	4.7371	.76168	255	-2.185	.083
Peer Influence	4.7337	.66587	4.9239	.48433	254	-2.627	.052
Self-Confidence	4.9322	.66636	5.1373	.52896	253	-2.734	.010*
Self- Efficacy	4.8640	.85028	5.3403	.56357	257	-5.347	.000**
Extraversion	4.9336	.73945	5.0064	.63350	256	-1.426	.107

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .001$ **Research Hypothesis 4**

Do differences in self-efficacy scores exist between selected demographics?

*Statistical Hypothesis 1:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument self-efficacy sub-scale scores between male and female RSO members?

The fourth research question focused on how registered student organization members rate self-efficacy as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument. An independent samples t-test was conducted to look at whether or not there is a statistical difference between male and female RSO members in the area of self-efficacy. There was not statistical difference in the self-efficacy area, when examining males and females ( $t(254) = -0.04, p = .531$ ).

Table 3

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between Males and Females*

Characteristics	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.7394	.76612	4.5997	.84787	252	1.210	.569
Peer Influence	4.9965	.50928	4.7788	.59842	251	2.705	.814
Self-Confidence	5.1221	.58203	5.0158	.61619	250	1.233	.889
Self- Efficacy	5.0789	.74946	5.1211	.76189	254	-.399	.531
Extraversion	5.0023	.64670	5.0064	.69872	253	-.043	.520

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .001$ *Statistical Hypothesis II: Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership*

Instrument self-efficacy sub-scale scores between general members and officers?

The second sub-question examined if statistically significant differences in self-efficacy scores, as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument, existed between general members and officers. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument self-efficacy scores in general members and officers. There was a significant difference ( $t(257) = -5.35, p = 0.00$ ) in the self-efficacy scores for general members ( $M = 4.86, SD = 0.85$ ) and officers ( $M = 5.34, SD = 0.56$ ). Officers scored higher than general members in self-efficacy scores.

Table 4

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between General Members and Officers*

Characteristics	<u>Member</u>		<u>Officer</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Role Model	4.5093	.90932	4.7371	.76168	255	-2.185	.083
Peer Influence	4.7337	.66587	4.9239	.48433	254	-2.627	.052
Self-Confidence	4.9322	.66636	5.1373	.52896	253	-2.734	.010*
Self- Efficacy	4.8640	.85028	5.3403	.56357	257	-5.347	.000**
Extraversion	4.9336	.73945	5.0064	.63350	256	-1.426	.107

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .001$ 

### Research Hypothesis 5

Do differences in extroversion scores exist between selected demographics?

*Statistical Hypothesis 1:* Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership Instrument extroversion sub-scale scores between male and female RS● members?

The fifth research question focused on how registered student organization members rate their personality as extroverted as defined by the Lloyd Leadership Instrument. The first sub-question looks at whether or not there is a statistical difference between male and female RS● members in the area of extroversion. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument extraversion scores in males and females. There was not a significant difference ( $t(253) = -0.04, p = 0.520$ ) in the extraversion scores for males ( $M = 5.00, SD = 0.65$ ) and females ( $M = 5.00, SD = 0.70$ ).

Table 3

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between Males and Females*

Characteristics	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.7394	.76612	4.5997	.84787	252	1.210	.569
Peer Influence	4.9965	.50928	4.7788	.59842	251	2.705	.814
Self-Confidence	5.1221	.58203	5.0158	.61619	250	1.233	.889
Self- Efficacy	5.0789	.74946	5.1211	.76189	254	-.399	.531
Extraversion	5.0023	.64670	5.0064	.69872	253	-.043	.520

\*\* p &lt; .001 \*p &lt; .05.

*Statistical Hypothesis II: Is there a statistically significant difference in the Lloyd Leadership*

Instrument extroversion sub-scale scores between general members and officers?

The second sub-question focused on whether or not there was a difference between general members and officers in the area of extraversion. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare Lloyd Leadership Instrument extraversion scores in general members and officers. There was not a statistical significant difference ( $t(256) = -1.43, p = 0.11$ ) in the extraversion scores for general members ( $M = 4.93, SD = 0.74$ ) and officers ( $M = 5.01, SD = 0.63$ ).

Table 4

*Group Differences for Leadership Characteristics between General Members and Officers*

Characteristics	<u>Member</u>		<u>Officer</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
Role Model	4.5093	.90932	4.7371	.76168	255	-2.185	.083
Peer Influence	4.7337	.66587	4.9239	.48433	254	-2.627	.052
Self-Confidence	4.9322	.66636	5.1373	.52896	253	-2.734	.010*
Self- Efficacy	4.8640	.85028	5.3403	.56357	257	-5.347	.000**
Extraversion	4.9336	.73945	5.0064	.63350	256	-1.426	.107

\*p &lt; .05 \*\*p &lt; .001

## Summary

Chapter IV contains demographic data, as well as statistical data collected for this study. After running the data through SPSS and analyzing it, findings showed how each leadership sub scale impacted students' leadership development. There were no significant differences within the leadership sub-scales between genders or leadership role except for peer influence. There was a significant difference between men and woman in regards to peer influence. Chapter V further discusses results for this study and provides limitations and recommendations for further research and leadership program development.

## Chapter V

### Discussion

This chapter reviews data that were compiled to address the research questions, conclusions and recommendations that can be drawn from the data, areas of improvement and future research are also discussed. The chapter ends with an overall conclusion of the present study.

The primary purpose of this study was to understand characteristics that are associated with student leadership. This study measured characteristics in areas of role modeling, peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and extroversion. This will contribute to student leadership literature and the relationship among these characteristics and how it influences male and female students, as well as general members and officers that are participants in registered student organizations.

Research question one examined how role model influence impacted males and females. Additionally, general members and officers were examined. A *t*-test was used for analysis to determine if there was a statistical significance in either grouping. The results, however, show that there was no statistical difference in how students reported role model influence impacted their perception based on gender or leadership role (general member or officer) within their registered student organization.

Research question two examined how peer influence impacted males and females. General member status and officer role were also examined. The results of the present study did not show significant difference between male and females in the area of peer influence ( $p = .814$ ). In addition, there is as not a significant difference found in the peer influence scores for general members and officers.

Research question three examined how self-confidence impacted males and females. General member status and officer role were also examined. There was not a significant difference between males and females. There was a difference between officers and general members. Officers scored higher than general members in self-confidence.

Research question four examined how self-efficacy impacted males and females. General member status and officer role were also examined. There was not a significant difference in the area of self-efficacy by gender. A difference was found between officers and general members in the area of self-efficacy. Officers scored higher than general members in self-efficacy.

Research question five examined how extraversion impacted males and females. General member status and officer role were also examined. The results of the present study did not show a statistical difference in participants' perception in the area of extraversion based on gender or leadership role.

In the present study's results, there was not a statistically significant difference between males and females in all areas of leadership characteristics. On the contrary, there were statistically differences found in self-confidence and self-efficacy scores between officers and general members. Officers scored higher than general members in both areas. No significant difference was discovered between general members and officers in the areas of role modeling, peer influence, and extraversion.

Self-confidence is a factor that is incredibly important to consider when discussing student leadership and development. With this data, it is important that student affairs professionals actively engage general members in more leadership development programs and discussions, so they are more likely to get involved and become supportive of one another.

In reference to the literature for this study, Astin (1990) provides important benefits of student involvement and the development that goes along with it. In this study, it was evident that students who held an officer role had greater sense of self and strong perception of their ability to lead. Peers and role models whether parents, teachers, or mentors play a significant role in the psychological development and the perception of oneself. Parents and educators need to be aware and understand the impact of their encouragement to influence students to become involved in an organization or take on a leadership position to increase their self-confidence and self-efficacy.

According to Astin (1999) and Salisbury, Pascarella, Padgett, & Blaich, (2012), students in various student organizations find an increase in their self-confidence and self-efficacy. Although officers scored higher than general members in this study, it did not provide enough evidence on whether or not students progressed their development in “leader identified” under the Leadership Identity Development (LID) theory. Many participants rated the significance of being an officer and expressed the importance of being extroverted in order to be successful in a leadership position, therefore, they did not see leadership as non-positional and or as a process (Campbell, Smith, Dugan, & Komives, 2012). This brings the attention of an area where more focus could be directed to helping students understand that positional leadership is not the only means of taking on a leadership role. In addition, student affairs professionals should assist students to understand personality trait theory and how a variety of personality preferences can be translated into leadership capacity.

Although this data is not deemed innovative or new, it does reveal areas that student affairs professionals can be more intentional through programmatic efforts and understanding students’ perceptions of what leadership means to them. Too often students get stuck thinking



that having an extroverted personality equates to being a successful leader, but helping students to look beyond leadership as positional or personal attributes can provide students the motivation and encouragement to understand the benefits of being involved in a student organization and the reality of what makes an organization prosper.

### **Limitations**

There were several limitations in the current study that are essential to report. First of which, participants were asked to recall information of when they were in high school or the first couple of years of the college experience. This may have impacted results and how they remembered their leadership experience. In addition, participants were asked to recall how peers and role models influenced their decision to become involved. This may have explained why these variables were not found to be statistically significant.

Another limitation involved participants that were involved in registered student organizations. Although many reported to have held an officer position in a registered student organization, the researcher did not explicitly inquire what role they played. For instance, if they served in as a chair for a committee or in an executive position within the registered student organization, the researcher did not thoroughly investigate the position. It would have been interesting to collect data from participants who were not involved in a registered student organization to compare the differences between the two populations.

An additional limitation is that registered student organizations provide an environment in which students socialize with other students. With this socialization outlet, it makes sense that it supports extroverted personalities. Many of the participants reported in the present study to be extroverted and believed in order to be a leader one should be extroverted. This may have influenced the results of the study when reviewing the area of extroversion.

## **Recommendations**

The purpose of the present study was to determine the impact of five leadership characteristics between males and females as well as general members and officers. While statistically significant data was found in the areas of self-confidence and self-efficacy in the study regarding officers and general members, overall, there are recommendations for future research.

While this present study adds to student leadership literature, future research should review these findings and conduct further research on student leadership development. Since the participants were chosen based on involvement in a registered student organization, future studies could collect data of students who are not involved in student organizations. Discovering reasons why students chose not get involved may provide insight into what their true intentions are and what they plan to accomplish during their college career. This should be reviewed by student affairs professionals in order to find a way to bridge the gap of students who are not engaged or involved in a registered student organization. Reviewing variables that influence students not to get involved may assist in answering how to increase student satisfaction.

Another consideration is to continue further research studying introverted students and gain a greater understanding of what environments assist their leadership development. Student affairs should find various ways to increase students who lean towards more the introverted spectrum. This may involve various training delivery methods or facilitation pedagogies. It would be important to train students on all ends of the spectrum to find a happy medium for collaboration.

With an increase of unrepresented students entering college, it is worth researching how role modeling influences unrepresented students' decision to take on a leadership role in high

school or at the college level. It would be interesting to see the difference between males and females based on ethnic background as well. These findings could provide student affairs professionals, families, community organizations, and high school officials the ability to find ways to encourage underrepresented students to get involved in a student organization and eventually take on a leadership role.

Although the present study did not inquire if students received any leadership training, it would be beneficial to find what methods of training are most influential for development. Does experience trump over formal leadership training? Or would it be beneficial for students to couple formal training while being currently involved in a leadership role? Ultimately, finding whether self-confidence increases for those who participate in formal leadership training and if that influences them to take on more than one leadership role?

## **Conclusions**

The primary purpose of the present study was to examine characteristics associated with student leadership. The focus of the study evaluated how females and males contrasted in areas of role model influence, peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and extroversion by utilizing the Lloyd Leadership Instrument (Lloyd, 2006).

In addition, leadership role within a registered student organization was examined. The focus of these sub-questions looked at how general member and officers differed in the areas of role model influence, peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and extroversion by utilizing the Lloyd Leadership Instrument (Lloyd, 2006).

This study identified the influences and characteristics that impact students who participate in registered student organizations. In order to determine if there was a difference in the areas of role model influence, peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and extroversion,

the study utilized quantitative design. The present study found that there was a statistically significant difference in the area of peer influence based on gender. There was not a statistically significant difference in all other characteristics associated with student leadership. Gender may not play role in how males or females perceive how role modeling, self-confidence, self-efficacy and extroversion impacts their ability to develop as student leaders.

The present study did not find a statistical difference in any of the areas associated with student leadership within a registered student organization based on whether they were a general member or officer. Based on the present study's results the role a student takes on in a registered student organization does not play influence how they perceive role modeling influence, peer influence, self- confidence, self-efficacy, and extroversion.

●Overall, participants on average reported having a heightened self-confidence and self-efficacy. Participants reported on average that they believed in order to be a leader, one who has extroverted personality may be a better fit as a leader. Furthermore, participants revealed that role modeling play a strong factor in their pursuits to become a student leader. Peer influence did present itself as an area in which students reported to be a strong component of impacting one's desire to participate in a registered student organization and/or lead.

Although this study presented some limitations, it did provided specific research for the institution and student life sector in areas associated to student leadership. It is essential that student life directors, leadership facilitators and professionals associated with student leadership development that they recruit and encourage students to take on involvement opportunities to increase their self-confidence and self-efficacy. It is incredibly important for student affair professionals to understand factors that influence students' decision to get involved, as well.

### References

- American College Personnel Association and National Association Student Personnel Administrators. *Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners*. Washington, D.C.:Author, 2010.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40 (5), 518-529.
- Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Worth Publishers.
- Bowen, H. R. (1997). Investment in learning: *The individual and social value of American higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, C. M., Smith, M., Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2012). Mentors and College Student Leadership Outcomes: The Importance of Position and Process. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(4), 595-625.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2012). CAS professional standards for higher education (8th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Creamer, D. G. (2003). Research Needed on the Use of CAS Standards and Guidelines. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 22(2), 109-24.
- Colbert, A. E., Judge, T. A., Choi, D., & Wang, G. (2012). Assessing the trait theory of leadership using self and observer ratings of personality: The mediating role of contributions to group success. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(4), 670-685.

- DeWitz, J., Woolsey, L., & Walsh, B. (2009). College student retention: An exploration of the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and purpose in life among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(1), 19-34. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Digman, L. A. (1990). *Strategic management: concepts, decisions, cases* (2nd ed.). Homewood, IL: BPI/Irwin.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(5), 525-549.
- Dugan, J., Bohle, C., Gebhardt, M., Hofert, M., Wilk, E., & Cooney, M. (2011). Influences of leadership program participation on students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(1), 65-84. Retrieved from <http://journals.naspa.org/jsarp/vol48/iss1/art5/>
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership.
- Dugan, J. P. (2012). Exploring Local to Global Leadership Education Assessment. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2012(140), 89-101.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006). Explorations using the social change model: Leadership development among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(2), 217-225.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 233.

- Fletcher, S. E. (2012). Personal and Institutional Factors: Relationship to Self-Efficacy of Persistence to the Senior Year in College among Self-Identified Black Undergraduate Students in a Hispanic Serving Institution.
- Flores, K., Matkin, G., Burbach, M., Quinn, C., & Harding, H. (2012). Deficient critical thinking skills among college graduates: Implications for leadership. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(2), 213-230. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00672.x/pdf>
- Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(6), 746-762.
- Gilligan, C. (1993). In a different voice, 1982. *Cambridge*: Harvard.
- Haber, P. (2011). Peer education in student leadership programs: Responding to co-curricular challenges. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2011(133), 65-76.
- Harper, S. R. (2006). Peer Support for African American Male College Achievement: Beyond Internalized Racism and the Burden of "Acting White.". *Journal Of Men's Studies*, 14(3), 337-358.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Hoyt, C. L. (2005). The role of leadership efficacy and stereotype activation in women's identification with leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(4), 2-14.

- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765–780.
- Keeling, R. (2009). Learning as transformative: Resourcefulness and renewal in higher education. *Journal of College & Character, 1*(3), 1-4.
- Komives, S. R., & Smedick, W. (2012). Using Standards to Develop Student Learning Outcomes. *New Directions for Student Services, 2012*(140), 77-88.
- Komives, S. R., & Arminio, J. (2011). Promoting integrity through standards of practice. *New Directions for Student Services, 2011*(135), 27-34.
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., Owen, J. E., Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (2011). *The handbook for student leadership development*. Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., & Associates. (2009). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S. D., Owen, J. E., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(4), 401-418.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. (2007). *Exploring leadership: for college students who want to make a difference* (2 ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *The Journal of Higher Education, 123*-155.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 683-706.



- Lambert, A. D., Terenzini, P. T., & Lattuca, L. R. (2007). More than meets the eye: Curricular and programmatic effects on student learning. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 141-168.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2009). Student participation in university governance: the role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(1), 69-84.
- Lloyd, Jan. M. (2006). Predicting leadership: Characteristics associated with student leadership (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from University of Georgia.
- Magolda, M. (2006, January). Interview by P Crosby [Personal Interview]. Self-authorship and identity in college: An interview with Marcia Baxter Magolda. *Journal of college & character*
- Miller, C., & Malandra, G. (2006). Accountability/Assessment. Retrieved September, 15, 2006.
- Milem, J. F. (2003). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education, 126-169.
- Nadler, D. P., Newman, R. E., & Miller, M. T. (2012). Leadership Development On The College Campus: The Student Affairs Conundrum. *e-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership*, 9(2).
- Norris, S. (2008). An examination of self-leadership. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 1(2), 43-61.
- Dell, I., & Hwang, G. (2008). Teaching leadership with a global perspective: A case study. *Journal of College & Character*, X(1), 1-10.

- Patten, M. (2000). *Proposing empirical research: A guide to the fundamentals* . (pp. 75-76). Los Angeles : Pyrczak Publishing
- Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the national study of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 319-335.
- Rosch, D. M., & Caza, A. (2012). The durable effects of short-term programs on student leadership development. *Volume 11, Number 1–Winter 2012*, 51, 28.
- Saiz, C., & Rivas, S. (2011). Evaluation of the ardesos program: An initiative to improve critical thinking skills. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 11(2), 34-51.
- Salisbury, M. H., Pascarella, E. T., Padgett, R. D., & Blaich, C. (2012). The effects of work on leadership development among first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(2), 300-324.
- Shertzer, J. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal*, 42(1), 111-131.
- Tavani, C. M., & Losh, S. C. (2003). Motivation, self-confidence, and expectations as predictors of the academic performance among our high school students. *Child Study Journal*, 33(3), 141-151.
- Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1995). Influences affecting the development of s students' critical thinking skills. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(1), 23-39.
- Thompson, M. D. (n.d.). Student leadership process development : An assessment of contributing college resources. (2006). *Journal of College Student Development* , 47(3), 343-350.

- Turrentine, C. G. (n.d.). A comparison of self-assessment and peer assessment of leadership skills. (2001). *NASPA Journal*, 38(3), 361-371.
- U.S. Department of Education. *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of American Higher Education*. Report of the Commission Appointed by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2006.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., & Sands, D. J. (1998). *Making It Happen: Student Involvement in Education Planning, Decision Making, and Instruction*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., PO Box 10624, Baltimore, MD 21285-0624; Retrieved from <http://www.pbrookes.com>.
- Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods*. Sage Publications Limited.
- Wolfe, J. B., & Betz, N. E. (2004). The Relationship of Attachment Variables to Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy and Fear of Commitment. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 52(4), 363-369.
- Young, D. G., & Janosik, S. M. (2007). Using CAS standards to measure learning outcomes of student affairs preparation programs. *NASPA Journal*, 44(2), 341-365.
- Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). Leadership in the making: A comprehensive examination of the impact of leadership development programs on students. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 6(3-4), 50-66.

**Appendix A**

## Survey

# Consent to Participate in Research

## An Investigation of Characteristics Associated with Student Leadership

You are being asked to participate in a research study which seeks to examine leadership development outcomes of registered student organizations members. This is part of a degree requirement for Eastern Illinois University's College Student Affairs Program. The survey should take no longer than 5- 10 minutes to complete.

All responses will be collected in aggregate with no tracking of participant identity, and will be kept confidential. There are no foreseeable risks to your participation. However you may benefit through the opportunity to reflect on your experiences and confidence as an involved student on-campus.

Additionally your participation provides you with the opportunity to provide feedback to Eastern Illinois University's graduate assistants and student affairs professionals, in order to continue to develop future innovations to student organizations.

We ask you to take some time, reflect on your own experiences, and be as open and honest as possible.

There are no correct or wrong answers. You may withdraw at any time without repercussions.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact:

Aseret Gonzalez

Principle Investigator

Agonzalez4@eiu.edu

Daniel Nadler, Ph.D.

V.P. for Student Affairs

(217) 581-3221

nadler@eiu.edu

# Lloyd Leadership Instrument

## An Investigation of Characteristics Associated with Student Leadership

Purpose of Study: To examine if peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion influence leadership development.

Instructions: Please answer each of the following statements about yourself based on a scale of strongly disagree (SDA); disagree (D); slightly disagree (SD); slightly agree (SA); agree (A); or strongly agree (SAA). Fill in the letter on the scantron that mostly closely describes how much you agree or disagree with each item.

Definitions:

**Leadership position** is defined as a person's standing in an organization who holds a leadership title and influences a group towards a common goal.

**Role model** is defined as an adult individual who supported and encouraged your involvement.

**Peer influence** is defined as any group of individuals in which you identify, affiliate with, and seek acceptance and approval from each other.

**Extraversion** is defined as people who do their thinking out loud, who get energy from being around people and are sociable.

**Self-confidence** is defined as the ability to be certain about one's competencies and skills.

**Self-efficacy** refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainment.

- 1. I was involved in co-curricular activities in high school.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 2. I attempt to take on leadership positions in college.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 3. It is natural for me to take on leadership positions in college since I had been involved in high school.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 4. I have leadership abilities.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 5. I had successful experiences while serving in leadership positions.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 6. I am energetic.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 7. I am sociable.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 8. I get energized from being around people.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 9. Leaders are extroverted.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 10. I like to talk with people.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 11. I enjoy group discussions.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 12. Spending time with friends is an important aspect for me being involved in co-curricular activities in college.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 13. I am popular.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree
- 14. One reason I got involved in co-curricular activities was to meet people.**  
A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**15. I spend hours socializing with my friends.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**16. I trust other student leaders.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**17. Positive recognition by my peers influenced me to take on leadership positions.**

A. strongly agree B. Agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**18. My friends have held leadership positions.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**19. I associate with friends who have similar interests.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**20. I initially got involved in college because someone took the time to contact me and made me feel welcomed.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**21. In high school, I had an adult role model who encouraged me to get involved in leadership positions.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**22. In high school, I received support from an adult role model for my leadership involvement.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**23. In high school, an adult role model influenced me to get involved in co-curricular activities.**

A. Strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**24. I received a great deal of support throughout my leadership experiences.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**25. I was encouraged by others telling me I did a great job while in a leadership position.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**26. My parent(s) or guardian are active in the community.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**27. My parent(s) or guardian are important role models for me.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**28. am self-confident.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**29. I am confident in being a leader.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**30. Others perceive me as being self-confident.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**31. Others have confidence in my abilities as a leader.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**32. I am comfortable with who I am.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**33. I gain self-confidence through taking on more leadership positions.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**34. I am capable in making decisions while in a leadership position.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**35. I am capable of gaining others' trust while in a leadership position.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**36. I am even tempered while in a leadership position.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

**37. I know I can rely on my skills while in a leadership position.**

A. strongly agree B. agree C. slightly agree D. slightly disagree E. disagree F. strongly disagree

Demographic Information: **Please complete each of the following.**

**38. GENDER:** A. Male B. Female C. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**Leadership position** is defined as an individual with a leadership title (i.e. president, chair, etc.) who influences a group towards a common goal. You must have held this leadership position for at least four months. **Please indicate the number of leadership positions you held in college (even those held at previous higher education institutions) for each of the areas:**

**39. \_\_\_\_ In student organizations**

Student organization is an officially registered organization at Eastern Illinois University.

- A. 0-1
- B. 2-3
- C. 4-5
- D. 6-7



**40. Category of Registered Student Organization:**

- A. Academic
- B. Governing
- C. Greek
- D. Multicultural
- E. Religious
- F. Service
- G. Social

**41. Role in current organization:**

- A. General Member
- B. Officer (i.e. chair person, elected/appointed officer)

**42. \_\_\_\_\_ In community agencies**

Community agencies are non-profit organizations **not affiliated** with any student organization at Eastern Illinois University (including religious organizations)

- A. 0-1
- B. 2-3
- C. 4-5
- D. 6-7

**43. Number of semesters, including the current one that you have been enrolled full-time? (EIU and previous higher education institutions)**

- A. 1-2 semesters
- B. 3-4 semesters
- C. 5-6 semesters
- D. 7-8 semesters
- E. 9+semesters

**44. \*\*Current College GPA: (If your answer is K, please mark it below)**

- A. New Freshman – No GPA
- B. 1st Semester Transfer Student
- C. Under 2.0
- D. 2.0-2.25
- E. 2.25-2.5
- F. 2.5-2.75
- G. 2.75-3.0
- H. 3.0-3.25
- I. 3.25-3.5
- J. 3.5-3.75
- K. 3.75-4.0

**45. Ethnicity:**

Please mark all that apply

- A. Black or African American
- B. Asian
- C. White/Caucasian
- D. American Indian or Alaska Native
- E. Hispanic/Latino
- F. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

**Appendix B**

## Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a research study which seeks to examine leadership development outcomes of registered student organizations members. This is part of a degree requirement for Eastern Illinois University's College Student Affairs Program. The survey should take no longer than *5 to 7* minutes to complete

All responses will be collected in aggregate with no tracking of participant identity, and will be kept confidential. There are no foreseeable risks to your participation. However you may benefit through the opportunity to reflect on your experiences and confidence as an involved student on-campus. Additionally your participation provides you with the opportunity to provide feedback to Eastern Illinois University's graduate assistants and student affairs professionals, in order to continue to develop future innovations to student organizations.

We ask you to take some time, reflect on your own experiences, and be as open and honest as possible. There are no correct or wrong answers. You may withdraw at any time without repercussions.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact:

Aseret Gonzalez

Principle Investigator

Agonzalez4@eiu.edu

Daniel Nadler, Ph.D.

V.P. for Student Affairs

(217) 581-3221

nadler@eiu.edu