PREDICTING LEADERSHIP: CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH STUDENT LEADERSHIP

by

JAN M. LLOYD

(Under the Direction of Diane Cooper)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between peer influence, role model influence, extraversion, self-confidence, and self-efficacy and the number of leadership positions a college student holds. The study also examined the impact each independent variable had on the number of leadership positions held. The final purpose of the study was to examine the relationship of peer influence, role model influence, extraversion, self-confidence, and self-efficacy, both collectively and individually, on the number of leadership positions held based on gender.

The Lloyd Leadership Instrument was developed, which measured students on the five constructs. It was piloted on a group of students and proved reliable. The Lloyd Leadership Instrument was disseminated to 331 students at various student organizational meetings. Simultaneous multiple regression analyses and partial correlations were analyzed to answer the research questions.

Peer influence, role model influence, extraversion, self-confidence, and self-efficacy were statistically significant indicating these characteristics and influences describe student leaders. Results also showed that self-efficacy or previous leadership experience is the best

predictor for college student leadership. Although not significant, the next strongest predictors for college student leadership for males were role model influence and extraversion. For females, the next strongest predictors for college student leadership were self-confidence and extraversion although they were not statistically significant.

Allowing students to take on leadership roles is important in developing college student leaders. Implications also show the importance for providing leadership opportunities in high school. Previous leadership experiences provide students with a level of self-confidence and an indication of their success as a student leader. It is vital for student affairs administrators to mentor and guide students while in a leadership role so they are successful. One suggestion is to rotate leadership responsibilities rather than having a few positional leaders so that students get an opportunity to serve in a leadership capacity.

INDEX WORDS: Leadership, Self-confidence, Self-efficacy, Extraversion, Peer influence, Role model influence

# PREDICTING LEADERSHIP: CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH STUDENT LEADERSHIP

by

JAN M. LLOYD

B.A., University of Central Florida, 1990

M.A., University of Central Florida, 1996

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2006

# PREDICTING LEADERSHIP: CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH STUDENT LEADERSHIP

by

JAN M. LLOYD

Major Professor: Diane Cooper

Committee: Rodney Bennett
Merrily Dunn
Christine Langone

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2006

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people that I need to acknowledge for their help and support throughout my dissertation and graduate process. First, I want to recognize my dissertation committee. My main advisor, Merrily Dunn served as my support system who encouraged me when I questioned myself. She gave me the "motherly" support I needed in moving to a new town, in meeting new people, and completing my doctorate. Diane Cooper provided the direct feedback that I needed and was instrumental in helping me with the methodology of my study. Rodney Bennett's attention to detail and consistent feedback was helpful in making my revisions. Christine Langone served as my "leadership" mentor by understanding the field of leadership and giving me feedback that caused me to reflect on the field.

Secondly, I want to acknowledge my parents for their continuous support. Their unspoken confidence showed me how much they knew I could complete this degree and how proud they were of their daughter. In the times that I questioned myself, my parents told me to "show them you can do it." And I did.

I have a plethora of friends that I have to acknowledge. First, I want to recognize my colleagues in my cohort who made it a memorable experience; Alicia Caudill Colburn, Brandon Frye, Bobby Woodard, Wanda Gibson, Sheri King, Andy Wilson, Jon Coleman, Dianne Timm, and Michael Shutt. My memories of this experience will revolve around the relationships we were able build with one another.

Amy Raphael, my roommate for two years, was like a big sister helping me with my questions and providing me the "how-to" advice that I needed. Sheri King stepped in as my part-

time roommate during my last year and quickly became part of the family. I enjoyed the laughter and conversations with Sheri as some of those discussions revolved around trying to figure out what we were talking about.

In my cohort group, I lived and breathed graduate school with Bobby Woodard, Wanda Gibson, and Andy Wilson. Wanda Gibson, my roommate throughout the process, has taught me that two seemingly opposite people can easily be friends. Bobby, my buddy from UCF, made me laugh and taught me that regardless of the process we went through, we would still end up with a Dr. before our name. An incredibly loyal friend; it's funny to think that we had to move to Athens to get to know one another. Andy Wilson and I share a lot of special memories because of not only the program but our three weeks together in Africa for a study abroad program. You are an inspiration and I admire you for what you've overcome and accomplished. Bobby, Wanda, and Andy – I look forward to building our friendships after we graduate.

I have several other friends in Athens who helped me along the way as well. Charlie Mathies and Chris Mazur were my "non-program" friends whom I could talk about anything and everything else besides class assignments and research. My other set of friends is from Orlando, Florida. After moving for the first time to Athens, I found that my connection to my friends helped me remain sane. Gigi Dodge, Jasmin Johnson, Brandi Barone, April Flontek, and Martin VonPaleske reminded me what true friends are and made me realize how much I need them in my life. Two of my UCF colleagues, Patti MacKown, and Micki Pannozzo, were my cheerleaders and kept reminding me that I made the right decision in getting my doctorate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

Page

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of leadership has been around since the early 1800s, but the process of how one becomes a leader has changed dramatically over the decades. It was believed that only certain people could be leaders based on certain characteristics or traits (Northouse, 2001). These characteristics are what distinguish a leader from a follower. Stogdill (1948) did a review of literature from 1904-1933 looking at the characteristics associated with leadership, and found that certain physical characteristics, social backgrounds, intelligence and ability, personality, task-related characteristics and social characteristics influenced leadership. Although leaders may have these characteristics, one of the criticisms of the trait theory is that traits are difficult to measure and difficult to define. Another concern is that leadership may change in certain situations. Although a person is a leader in one situation, he/she may not be effective in a different situation despite having certain characteristics (Bass, 1990).

Because leadership was viewed from a situational perspective, it began to focus on the behavior of leaders and followers. The behavior focused both on group effectiveness as well as task orientation (Chemers, 1994). Effective leaders balanced maintaining the relationship aspect of the group and accomplishing the established task or goal. But the concept of leadership continued to evolve, believing that leaders acted differently based on the situation. Certain traits or characteristics were needed depending on the type of situation. More recently, Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) developed a relational leadership model that takes into account the relationship between the leader and the follower.

Some literature now states that anyone can learn to become a leader through experiences and education (Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 1998; Swatez, 1995). Student organizations provide a means for students to learn and practice leadership. There are numerous benefits that come from being involved in student organizations, including persistence and educational satisfaction (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). In addition, there are many ways in which students grow and develop because of their involvement. Examples of such growth are cognitive development, intrapersonal and interpersonal development, practical competence, and communication skills (Baxter-Magolda, 1992; Holzweiss, 2004; Huang & Chang, 2004; Kuh, 1995; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Although involvement in student organizations is beneficial to students, research also shows that taking on leadership positions provides students with greater gains than mere involvement. Cooper, Healy, and Simpson (1994) looked at student development over a period of three years. They tested students as freshmen and again as juniors. Students in leadership positions scored higher than nonleaders on developing purpose, educational involvement, career planning and life management at the time of matriculation. After three years, leaders showed significant growth in all previously mentioned areas as well as cultural participation. Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, and Burkhardt's (1991) longitudinal study showed that leadership participants who took part in leadership development and training programs grew in civic responsibility, leadership skills, multicultural awareness, understanding of leadership theories and personal and societal issues. After college graduation, these participants reported greater gains in decision making, dealing with ambiguous situations, and willingness to take risks.

Students who take on leadership positions appear to gain more in skills and development than nonleaders because of their level of involvement. Astin's (1984, 1999) theory of

involvement reinforced the notion with the belief that the "amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program" (p. 528). Beeny (2003) found that student leaders in student organizations have perceptions of higher levels of learning than nonleaders. Despite the benefits and personal growth related to leadership involvement, not all students take on leadership positions.

Typologies by Astin (1993a), Holland (1966), and Kuh, Hu, and Vesper (2000) categorized students based on distinctive characteristics. These typologies differentiated students who take on leadership roles based on a variety of characteristics. Typologies "emphasize relatively stable differences among individuals and categorizes individuals according to these distinctive characteristics. These type models focused on differences in the way individuals perceive their world and respond to it" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005, p. 45). Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) believed that typological models can be useful in understanding differences among students such as student leaders. Since not all students take on leadership positions, are there distinctive characteristics that define student leaders? Are there certain variables that contribute to their level of involvement?

Some of the literature on leadership today discussed what skills are needed to be an effective leader (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 1998). These skills can be seen as characteristics or traits that are needed by leaders; so the concept of trait theory has evolved into something different where anyone can possess these skills rather than a select few (Northouse, 2001). But having these traits alone does not make someone a leader. A person must take certain actions in order to be a leader so simply possessing these characteristics or traits is not sufficient.

## Statement of Problem

Despite the benefits of getting involved in leadership positions, not all students become student leaders and are missing out on the interpersonal and cognitive development associated with student leaders (Baxter-Magolda, 1992; Holzweiss, 2004; Huang & Chang, 2004; Kuh, 1995; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Characteristics, such as self confidence, self-efficacy and extraversion describe student leaders (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). External influences, such as peer and role model influence, provide a foundation in understanding why students take on leadership positions (Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2004). But little empirical evidence is available to determine the impact these characteristics and influences have on the number of leadership positions students hold. By examining the relationship between identified characteristics and influences and the number of leadership positions students hold, student affairs professionals can build training for nonleaders and can enhance training for current student leaders.

The existing literature on leadership development is vast. Information regarding definitions of leadership, descriptions of leadership theories and models, the impact of leadership development on students and how the styles of leadership vary based on ethnicity and sex are prevalent in the literature. The leadership field has a difficult time agreeing on key components of a leadership curriculum or program because of the amount of disparate literature (Lloyd, 2004). This study will contribute to the literature because it will examine the relationship between identified characteristics and influences and the number of leadership positions that students hold.

## Purpose of the Study

Student leader typologies based on Astin (1993a), Holland (1966, 1997), Kuh, Hu, and Vesper (2000) and qualitative studies by Felsheim (2001), Komives, Casper, et al (2004), Ouellette (1998) and Shertzer and Schuh (2004) showed there are several characteristics and influences that contribute to students taking on leadership positions. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion and the number of leadership positions that students hold. The following literature supports these characteristics and influences as worthy of research.

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) houses the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The CIRP is a national longitudinal survey that assesses the American higher education system focusing on the characteristics and patterns of incoming freshmen (CIRP, Retrieved March 14, 2005 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.hml). Originally established with the American Council on Education in 1966, the CIRP has been disseminated to over 1800 institutions and has a database with approximately 11 million students (CIRP, Retrieved March 14, 2005 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.hml).

Astin (1993a) analyzed the CIRP data using a subsample of 2,595 students from 1971 and then followed up nine years later. In his analysis, he developed several typologies based on characteristics of the various groups. Astin (1993a) identified a group he called leader that was characterized by high self-ratings on popularity, social self-confidence, leadership ability, and public speaking ability. Leaders also perceived themselves as being popular, sociable and

outgoing. They were also more likely than other students to have been elected president of a student organization.

Similar to these characteristics, Holland's (1966, 1997) theory on vocational choices described an enterprising type. This type is characterized by being persuasive, extraverted, self-accepting, self-confident and energetic. People in this type prefer being in social roles and engage in more activities than any other type. They have self-perceptions of being dominant, sociable, cheerful, impulsive, high positive self-evaluation and rate themselves high on speaking skills, popularity, leadership and self-confidence.

Kuh, Hu, and Vesper (2000) developed a set of typologies as well based on information collected from the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) from 51,155 students. The CSEQ is a national longitudinal survey that assesses student's college activities, college environment, and an estimate of gains based on a variety of skills and knowledge. It has been used since 1979 at more than 400 participating institutions, generating approximately 300,000 student records. They believe one of the types, collegiate, is similar to Astin's (1993a) leader type. The collegiate group is most influenced by their level of cocurricular involvement, which was higher than any other typology. They were also influenced by faculty interaction, social peer interaction, and substantive peer interaction. The collegiate group reported the highest gains in college in personal development area and vocational preparation. Both personal development and vocational preparation included skills in decision making, organization and preparing one's self for postcollege employment.

In his qualitative study, Felsheim (2001) studied why students become involved, and what impact this involvement had on their university experience. Felsheim (2001) interviewed seven students who were involved in student organizations either as a member or a student

leader, and interviewed five students not involved in student organizations to determine causes of this choice to be uninvolved. He found the influence of parents, previous involvement, and peer influence were predictors of college involvement.

In looking at how leadership develops for students using a grounded theory approach, Komives, Casper, et al (2004) discussed the importance of adults and peers serving as role models, mentors and support systems. Both adults and peers are integral to student growth through a variety of stages in the authors' leadership identity model. Ouellette's study (1998) found similar results when she interviewed 21 students to identify the characteristics, experiences and behavior of university student leaders. Previous experience, role model support, and peer groups were main sources of influence for students' initial interest in leadership. Through previous leadership experience in high school, student's gained self-confidence to continue their leadership involvement in college.

A final article reported a study of college student perceptions of leadership by interviewing 24 student leaders and five disengaged students who are not involved in leadership positions (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Students reported that support from others and the opportunity to take on leadership positions in high school contributed to them attaining leadership positions in college. Shertzer and Schuh (2004) also identified that one of the reasons they got involved was to meet people and make friends. In addition, the study revealed reasons why students do not become leaders. The perceptions are that students do not have the capabilities to lead, the confidence to lead, or have not had the opportunities and support to lead. The seven research articles described above provide a foundation regarding characteristics and external influences of student leaders.

The most frequent variables mentioned in the literature include peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy through a student's previous experience with leadership while in high school, role model influence and support, and personality. While other variables such as socio-economic and academic majors are mentioned, these five variables appear to have a greater influence on student involvement in leadership positions.

In the review of literature, no study was found to determine the relationship between such characteristics and influences and the number of leadership positions held by students. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the following independent variables 1) peer influence, 2) self-confidence, 3) self-efficacy through previous experience, 4) role model influence and support, and 5) extraversion and the number of leadership positions that students held. In this study, students were asked to respond to statements associated with these variables using a paper copy survey. This study also analyzed which of the variables, if any, had the greatest impact on the number of leadership positions held. It also determined any differences based on sex.

## Research Questions

The research questions (RQ) for this study are:

RQ1: What is the impact of peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion on the number of leadership positions held?

RQ2: How does each of the independent variables (peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion) contribute to the number of leadership positions held?

RQ3: How do peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explain the number of leadership positions held in college based on sex?

## Operational Definitions

### *Leadership Position*

Defining leadership is a difficult task since there are numerous leadership theories and models (Northouse, 2001). Northouse (2001) defined leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3). Rost (1993) defined leadership as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes and outcomes that reflect their shared purposes" (p. 102). Bolman and Deal (2003) believed "leadership is a subtle process of mutual influences fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values embraced by both the leader and the led" (p. 339). All of these definitions have several items in common. Each recognizes that leadership is relational and involves other people, that there is a common purpose or goal, and that there is a level of influence. Although leadership has evolved into a relational model (Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 1998), students view leadership as an individual position (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Despite the development of leadership to be more inclusive, students view leaders as having a title or being in a formal leadership position. Because of this belief, this study focused on formal leadership positions. For the purpose of this study, "leadership position" was defined as a person's standing in an organization who holds a leadership title and influences a group towards a common goal. Students needed to be in the leadership position for at least four months in order for it to be considered for this study.

*Peer Influence*

A peer group, according to Astin (1993b), is "any group of individuals in which the members identify, affiliate with, and seek acceptance and approval from each other" (p. 401). Astin (1993b) believed that students identify with other students based on similar beliefs. One could assume that students who take on leadership positions affiliate with other students who have that same interest. Astin (1993) described a concept he calls "progressive conformity." Students' values, beliefs, and aspirations change based on their peer group. This type of peer influence could impact the number of leadership positions that students hold. For the purpose of this study, "peer influence" was defined as any group of individuals in which students identify, affiliate with, and seek acceptance and approval from each other.

*Role Model*

Another operational definition focuses on the influence of role models. Role models could be peers, parents, coaches, or teachers. In the review of literature, there was not a well-defined definition for role model. Two characteristics that were continuously mentioned in the literature were supportive and encouraging (Felsheim, 2001; Levine & Cureton, 1998; Romano, 1996; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Since peers can also serve as a role model, it is important to differentiate between peer influence and an adult who supported the student's leadership involvement. For the purpose of this study, "role model" was defined as an adult individual who supported and encouraged a student's leadership involvement.

*Extraversion*

Finally, in looking at personality, another variable that was mentioned in the literature describes leaders as outgoing, sociable and extroverted. Myers (1980) described extroverts as those who do their thinking out loud, who get energy from being around people and are sociable.

Introverts, on the other hand, get energy from their inner world of thoughts and ideas. They prefer to process internally and to reflect on things. One is not better than the other, but people generally fall on a scale between the two dimensions. Saklofske and Eysenck (1994) believed that the levels of extraversion and introversion fall on a continuum. An individual contains both aspects of extraversion and introversion but has a tendency toward one over the other. For the purpose of this study, "extraversion" was defined as a student who does his/her thinking out loud, who get energy from being around people, and are sociable.

*Self-Confidence*

Self-confidence "is the ability to be certain about one's competencies and skills" (Northouse, 2001, p. 19). It includes a sense of self-esteem and self-awareness. It deals with the strength of belief about ones abilities. For the purpose of this study, "self-confidence" was defined as the ability to be certain about one's competencies and skills.

*Self-Efficacy*

"Perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainment (Bandura, 1997a, p.3). It relates to people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over how they function and over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy is built through previous experience, role modeling and observations. According to Bandura (1997b), there is a difference between self-confidence and self-efficacy. "Perceived self-efficacy refers to belief in one's agentive capabilities, that one can produce given levels of attainment. A self-efficacy assessment, therefore, includes both an affirmation of a capability level and the strength of that belief" (p. 382). For the purpose of this study, "self-efficacy" was defined as belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainment.

## Significance of Study

The results of this study showed the relationship between peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion and the number of leadership positions held. By considering the effect of these variables, the results of this study will influence the type of training and recruitment needed for developing future student leaders. In addition, it will also provide the field of leadership a standard set of outcomes that predict leadership positions. As an example, if extraversion has a significant impact on the number of leadership positions held, then training could be provided for students on improving communication skills and group dynamics. Results regarding self-efficacy may show the importance of providing leadership training at an earlier age; possibly in high school. This study can discover some of the external influences, such as peer influence and role model influence, as well as characteristics of student leaders, such as extraversion and self-confidence. The results stress the importance of not only developing individuals as leaders but also looking at how their involvement is impacted through external influences.

## Limitations of Study

There are several limitations to this study. The first was that the data was self-reported. While Pace (1984) says that self-report is a reliable method for gathering data, one could question the authenticity of the responses based on students responding to how they think they are rather than responding to how they actually are. Another limitation is that students were asked to recall information from previous years in college and high school. Some of them may not remember the number of leadership positions held and had to estimate the amount, which may impact the results of the study.

A third limitation was that this study is not examining the quality or extended length of leadership positions that students hold. A student may have held a leadership position for only a few months and another for more than a year. The type of influences and variables may vary depending on the level of commitment needed for the leadership position. The purpose of this study was not to determine what students have learned or gained from their experiences, but rather what variables influence them to take on leadership positions regardless of their level of commitment.

A fourth limitation was that this study was not considering freshmen students. There is an assumption that freshmen will not have had the opportunity to serve in a leadership position for four months at the time of data collection. The last limitation was that this study surveyed students who were involved in student organizations. As members of a student organization, the students sampled are interested in extracurricular involvement and excludes students who may take on leadership positions but are not actively engaged in student organizations. As an example, a student may serve in leadership positions only through their community church. This student was not considered since he/she does not participate in a student organization on campus.

## Chapter Summary

Current literature has discussed why students take on leadership positions (Astin, 1993a; Felsheim, 2001; Komives, Casper, et al 2004; Kuh, Hu & Vesper, 2000; Ouellette, 1998; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Identifying what variables influence students will allow student affairs professionals to provide better recruitment strategies, developmental opportunities and training for students on campus. This study helped determine what variables will predict leadership positions and can contribute to strategies to recruit and develop nonleaders.

# CHAPTER 2

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a foundation of knowledge based on the development of leadership. First, it will review the history and development of the field of leadership and some of its theories. It will also describe some of the benefits of leadership in order to establish the importance of the field. The chapter will then provide information on each of the five factors; peer influence, self confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion, as it relates to leadership. In addition, this chapter will denote some of the differences in leadership between males and females.

## The Development of Leadership

Bass (1990) describes the beginning of leadership as an ancient art. In his book, *Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership*, he discusses how leadership can be found in Plato and Caesar as well as in Chinese and Greek classics and Egyptian history. Despite its early beginnings, the author states the word "leadership" did not appear until around 1850. This section begins with a review of the leadership theories. It will then expand on the growth of leadership in higher education and discuss the benefits for students who participate in leadership opportunities.

### *History of Leadership Theories*

The concept of leadership has been around for quite some time although the process of how one becomes a leader has changed over the decades. Bass (1990) stated that the Great Man Theory, developed by Francis Galton, looked at the hereditary background of great men and believed leadership was inherited. Only a select few were able to serve as leaders. The Great

Man Theory proposes that leaders have natural abilities of power and influence and is based on Darwinistic principles (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998).

After this theory, Luther Lee Bernard developed the trait theory because it was believed that people who had certain traits or characteristics were leaders (Bass, 1990). This theory implies, as well, that leadership is given to a select few people who possess those characteristics. One of the criticisms of trait theory, however, was that it did not take into account the situation or environment where leadership took place. Because of this, environmental theories and situational theories evolved in order to address the role of a leader in a given situation.

Environmental theories believe leaders are a result of the time, place, and circumstance while situational theories look at the interaction between the leader, the followers, and the situation (Bass, 1990). Because leadership was viewed from a situational perspective, it began to focus on the behavior of leaders and followers. The behavior focused both on group effectiveness as well as task orientation (Chemers, 1994). Effective leaders balanced maintaining the relationship aspect of the group and accomplishing the established task or goal. But, the concept of leadership continued to evolve believing that leaders acted differently based on the situation. Certain traits and/or characteristics are needed depending on the type of situation and the relationship between the leader and the follower. Some literature now states that anyone can learn to become a leader through experiences and education (Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 1998; Swatez, 1995).

*Development of Leadership in Higher Education*

"The philosophical conception of the aims of higher education emphasizes the role of institutions in democratizing society through an educational process which allows individuals to become all they are capable of being" (Caruso, 1981, p. 8). In 1976, the American College

Personnel Association (ACPA) commission IV developed a leadership task force to focus on investigating leadership programs in higher education. This task force determined that one of the central purposes of higher education is the preparation of citizens for positions of leadership (Roberts & Ullom, 1990). After four years of work on the task force, the *Student Leadership Programs in Higher Education* was written (Caruso, 1981). This book describes the importance of leadership programs in higher education and provides the first higher education leadership program model.

The justification of leadership development programs is warranted as higher education institutions continue to focus on the development of its students as citizen agents and developing the "whole" student. Astin, Astin, and Associates (2001) state:

> if the next generation of citizen leaders is to be engaged and committed to leading for the common good, then the institutions which nurture them must be engaged in the work of the society and the community, modeling effective leadership and problem solving skills, demonstrating how to accomplish change for the common good (p. 2).

Currently, according to the *Leadership Education Source* book (Schwartz, Axtman & Freeman, 1998), there are nearly 700 leadership programs and leadership courses offered at a variety of institutions. At each institution, the leadership development program may be housed in different departments and may be grounded in different leadership theories or models. While leadership programs at higher education institutions provide different programs, services, and purposes, they contribute to the development of students in a global society (Astin, Astin & Associates, 2001).

*Benefits of Leadership Involvement*

Some faculty and academic administrators may question why we should study out-of-class experiences, including leadership development. In their book, *Involving Colleges*, Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbiel and MacKay (1991) explain the importance since students spend most of their time out of class. In addition, they discuss how students' peer groups influence one another and provides students the opportunity to develop skills not associated with class while also building a sense of community. They believe the key to learning is involvement.

Astin (1984) defines student involvement as the "amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 297). He believes to bring out desired learning and development students must invest their effort (quantity) and energy (quality) into it. In his research, there are five basic assumptions related to involvement.

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects.
2. Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum; that is, different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.
3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features.
4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.

5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement (p. 298).

The review of literature related to outcomes for involvement in leadership roles is vast. Students who participate in leadership roles gain in social adjustment (Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 1994), gain in personal development and vocational preparation (Kuh, Vu & Vesper, 2000), improve communication skills (Romano, 1996; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004), perceive themselves to learn more (Beeny, 2003), matriculate (Littleton, 2002), improve cognitive skills (Huang & Chang, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) and increase self confidence (Felsheim, 2001; Judge, Ilies, Bono & Gerhardt, 2002; Ouellette, 1998; Romano, 1996). These are only a few of the benefits of leadership involvement as there does not appear to be one outcome most associated with leadership.

Research by Cooper, Healy, and Simpson (1994) looked at student development over a period of three years. They tested them as freshmen and then again as juniors. They found that students who participated in student organizations scored higher than nonmembers on educational involvement, career planning, lifestyle planning, cultural participation, academic autonomy, life management, and developing purpose. Membership in student organizations showed the most significant change over the three-year period than any other variable. Although this study discussed developmental growth associated with student organizations, there is other literature related to learning outcomes. In the review of literature, there were four reoccurring learning outcomes that include interpersonal and intrapersonal skills, cognitive development and communication skills.

Intrapersonal skills include the development of self-concept, self-awareness, and autonomy. Interpersonal skills are the interactions between people and include examples as

group dynamics and understanding differences among people. Kuh, Douglas, Lund and Ramin-Gyurmek (1994) found that student gains in interpersonal competence were associated with peer interactions, leadership responsibilities, and institutional culture. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) also found that extracurricular involvement had a strong positive impact on social self-concept. In interviewing 149 seniors from 12 different institutions, Kuh (1995) reported that students described the largest growth in interpersonal skills from their out-of-class experiences. Although involvement in student organizations has been associated with positive gains, Fitch (1991) found students who were highly involved seemed to value relationships that are more self-serving in nature. Those students who were moderately involved showed a pattern of interdependence and a greater concern for others in their organization. Finally, students at Texas A&M reported that interpersonal skills was one of the top five skills in terms of development that they gained from their leadership experiences (Holzweiss, 2004).

Cognitive development is an outcome that many may attribute to learning in the classroom. Several studies mentioned the intellectual and cognitive development from out-of-class experiences. Baxter-Magolda (1992) found that peer relationships, organizational involvement, living arrangements, and employment contributed to students' intellectual development. Organizational involvement impacted absolute, transitional, and independent knowers. As an absolute knower, organizational involvement influenced their learning by taking on responsibility in student organizations. It continued to influence transitional knowers through the leadership positions that students held. Independent knowers learned independent functioning through their organizational involvement.

Huang and Chang (2004) looked at cognitive development including problem-solving skills, analytical skills, and ability to learn new things and how it relates to students' level of

involvement in academic and co-curricular activities. Students highly involved in both academic and co-curricular involvement rated the highest in cognitive skills development. Those who rated high in academic involvement and low in co-curricular involvement did not show as strong as gains. This phenomenon matches what Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) state in regards to cognitive skills and intellectual growth. They believe there needs to be a wholeness that includes various types of involvement, both academic and co-curricular, in order for students to have the largest impact on cognitive development.

Interacting with others is an unavoidable aspect of being involved with student organizations. Students must learn to communicate with one another in order to accomplish tasks and goals. Although communication skills can be easily divided into oral and written skills, some of the studies reported that listening skills was one of the highest rated for those involved in student organizations (Beeny, 2003; Holzweiss, 2004). Beeny (2003) also found that students who were involved in student organizations rated themselves high on learning oral communication skills.

Leadership opportunities allow students to learn from one another and from their experiences. If building strong citizen leaders is a focus for higher education institutions, then leadership development and programs is an essential part of a college campus. Unlike other typical areas of student affairs, leadership is multidisciplinary and can impact every student, regardless of major or interest. Leadership can be found in universities, businesses, non-profits, K-12 schools, government, and many other areas. What students learn from their experiences can be used in their careers.

## Peer Influence

Astin's book, *What Matters in College* (1993b), states "the students' peer group is the single most potent source of influence on growth and development during the undergraduate years" (p. 398). In this study, conducted in 1989 with over 24,000 responses, he looked at various input and environmental variables using the CIRP data and how that impacted students' development in college. The results showed that "students' values, beliefs, and aspirations tend to change in the direction of the dominant values, beliefs, and aspirations of the peer group" (p. 398). He calls this *progressive conformity*. Students make and change their decisions and behaviors based on the values and beliefs of the peer group.

A peer group is "any group of individuals in which the members identify, affiliate with, and see acceptance and approval from each other" (Astin, 1993b, p. 401). Peers identify with those who have similar beliefs and values. As an example, a student who is inclined to get involved in extracurricular activities will most likely associate with peers involved in comparable activities.

### *Peers and Its Relationship to Leadership*

Felsheim (2001), Ouellette (1998), and Shertzer and Schuh (2004) found that students initially got involved in leadership opportunities in high school through their friends. Sohn's (2003) study, however, found an opposite result. Students did not report their friends as a reason for participating in extracurricular activities. But, the results did show spending time with their friends was the most important aspect of being involved. Although peers did not seem to influence initial involvement in her study, they played an important role in sustaining their participation in those activities. Peers can influence others not only as instigators of involvement but also as sustainers and support systems.

Research by Komives, Casper, et al. (2004) and Romano (1996) found peers also serve as support systems and role models. Student leaders sought out support from other leaders in their organizations under difficult times. As supporters, peers reward and recognize one another. Ouellette (1998) found students who are rewarded and recognized by peers are positively influenced to take on other leadership activities. Peers also serve as role models and influence peers to get involved and/or take on leadership roles. Both of these examples explain what Bandura (1994, 1997a, 1997b) describes as social persuasion and vicarious experiences. Through verbal encouragement and observing others, people can influence others to believe they are capable of leadership roles.

Armino, Carter, Jones, Kruger, Lucas, Washington, Young, and Scott (2000) found students of color took on leadership roles because of their peer group instead of for personal benefit. But this peer group can have a negative effect as well. Research by Littleton (2002) discovered African American students felt peer pressure from their African American community for taking on leadership roles at a predominately White college. Their peers felt they were doing things outside the expectations of African Americans. While peers can positively influence leadership and learning, they also have the potential to be a negative influence as well.

*Peers and Learning*

In looking at how college affects students, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) state peers influence student development in regards to sociopolitical attitudes and values, identity and ego development, academic and social self-concepts, intellectual orientation, moral development, general maturity and personal development, and educational aspirations, persistence, and attainment. Astin (1993b) found peer interaction had its strongest positive influence with self-reported growth in leadership abilities. It also had influences on public speaking skills,

interpersonal skills, overall academic development, analytical and problem-solving skills, and critical thinking skills.

Students learn from one another outside the classroom by continuing conversations and reinforcing what happens in the classroom. Pascarella & Terenzini (2005) report that this type of interaction has positive and significant gains for students with writing, thinking skills, and understanding the arts. Overall, this improves their knowledge acquisition and their academic skills.

Kuh (1995) found gains in humanitarianism, interpersonal competence, and practical competence was attributed to peers. This includes gains in self-awareness, self-esteem, reflective thought, and a concern for the welfare of others. With the concept of progressive conformity, peers can influence one another in many ways. Peers can encourage one another to get involved on campus or not. They can influence their values and beliefs including their perceptions of leadership. Through peer support, they encourage each other to take on other leadership roles.

## Self Confidence

As mentioned previously, the trait theory of leadership believed that leaders held certain qualities or characteristics. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) believe there are certain core traits that relate to a business leaders' success. Business leaders must possess drive, a desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business in order to be successful. According to the authors, self-confidence plays an important role in leadership through decision making and gaining others' trust. A person who is self-confident will be able to make decisions whereas a person who is not self-confident may not feel comfortable with the decisions that need to be made. Similarly, if a leader appears to be confident, others will believe in them because they appear to be competent. This is important in gaining others' trust and

having a committed group of followers. One of the problems with trait theory is that there is no agreed upon list of traits or characteristics that are needed (Northouse, 2001).

A typological model provides distinctive but relatively stable characteristic differences among individuals. These models categorize individuals into groups based on their characteristics. "Typology theories reflect individual differences in how students approach their worlds" (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 204). There is a similarity between typological models and the trait theory. Each looks at characteristics that describe a certain type of person, including a student leader. Unlike trait theory, where there is not an agreement on traits needed for a leader, research developing typological models demonstrate certain characteristics of student leaders. One of those characteristics is self-confidence (Astin, 1993a; Holland, 1966, 1997).

Self-confidence "is the ability to be certain about one's competencies and skills" (Northouse, 2001, p. 19). It includes a sense of self-esteem and self-awareness. It deals with the strength of belief about ones abilities. According to Bandura (1997b), there is a difference between self-confidence and self-efficacy. "Perceived self-efficacy refers to belief in one's agentive capabilities, that one can produce given levels of attainment. A self-efficacy assessment, therefore, includes both an affirmation of a capability level and the strength of that belief" (p. 382).

*Self-Confidence and Its Relationship to Leadership*

Stodgill (1948) looked at traits of leadership in a review of literature from 1904-1933. There were no agreed upon traits across the literature but all studies reported a positive and significant relationship between self-confidence and leadership. When Bass (1990) completed

another review of literature from 1948-1970, the only similarity was the continued positive relationship between self-confidence and leadership.

Self-confidence is an important part of leadership development. Ouellette's (1998) study found that students gained confidence by taking on leadership roles, which allowed them to experiment and try other activities. Students reported that because others had confidence in their leadership abilities they were more inclined to meet those expectations and take on more responsibilities. Having confidence allowed the students to deal with people, delegate responsibilities, organize oneself, and assist an organization in meetings its goals (Ouellette, 1998).

In similar research by Felsheim (2001), students reported self-confidence was an important characteristic but there were differences between males and females perceptions of self-confidence. Males communicated confidence as having initiative or taking charge of a situation. Females discussed confidence in terms of getting along with and motivating others. Both of these responses relate to Kirkpatrick and Locke's (1991) description of why self-confidence is important to business leaders. A final study by Shertzer and Schuh (1994) found students reported having a lack of confidence as one reason why they did not assume leadership roles. Specifically, the students discussed a lack of confidence within a peer group because they felt they did not fit in with one. Others responded a lack of confidence in their abilities as another reason why they did not take on leadership roles.

Having confidence impacts a student's effectiveness as a leader through decision making and working with peers. This one trait seems to be the one consistent characteristic of leaders throughout the literature (Bass, 1990; Felsheim, 2001; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Ouellette, 1998; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004; Stodgill, 1948).

## Self-Efficacy

Albert Bandura (1994, 1997a, 1997b) developed the self-efficacy theory from the social cognitive theory, which focuses on how humans learn. After researching social cognitive theory and social learning theory, he realized that an important part was missing from both theories; the concept of self-beliefs. Rather than viewing people as reactive organisms shaped by their environments, Bandura believed that people are self-regulating and are shaped by not only their environments but also personal and behavioral influences (Pajares, 2002; Retrieved on April 1, 2005 from http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html).

"Perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainment (Bandura, 1997, p.3). It relates to people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over how they function and over events that affect their lives. "Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave" (Bandura, 1994, p. 71).

In a study looking at the effects of leadership efficacy and optimism on military cadet leaders, Chemers, Watson, and May (2000) found that leadership efficacy had a significant influence on leadership perceptions by military instructors and peers. Cadets rated their leadership skills on a scale and also rated their confidence in their general leadership abilities. Cadets were then rated by military instructors for their potential for military leadership and were also rated by peers during a six-week camp. Those cadets who had high self-efficacy were perceived as having the greatest potential for military leadership.

### *Sources of Self-Efficacy*

According to Bandura (1994, 1997a, 1997b), there are four ways to build self-efficacy. The first he calls mastery experiences and is the most effective way of developing self-efficacy.

It deals with previous experience. If a person attempts to do a task and is successful at it, they are more likely to attempt it again. For people who have to overcome obstacles during a task, they are able to test their abilities and gain a better understanding of their competence toward that task. If people have easy successes, they may be discouraged by any failures by not fully understanding their capabilities (Bandura, 1997b). A key component with building self-efficacy is the ability to reflect on their successes or failures.

Role models through vicarious experiences, also called social modeling, provide a second source. By observing someone similar to you, a person can build self-efficacy by watching him or her succeed at a certain task. Likewise, if the role model fails, then a person will believe they are not capable of doing the same task. The impact on self-efficacy depends on the perceived similarity to the role model. Vicarious experiences are strongest when a person has not had any experience in an area in which to judge their abilities so they rely primarily on observing others.

Another way to build self-efficacy is through social persuasion. Verbal feedback and encouragement from someone who is believed to be credible can increase or decrease self-efficacy through positive or negative feedback. Negative feedback has a greater impact on perceptions of capability than positive feedback. By providing negative feedback before a person has a chance to test their capability, the person will believe they are not capable of succeeding at a certain task. Positive encouragement in unrealistic situations also results in low self-efficacy. However, if a person can structure situations that result in success and provide positive encouragement and feedback, then the result is higher self-efficacy.

A final way to build self-efficacy is through perceiving and interpreting emotional and physical reactions in a situation. Feelings of anxiety or depression and physical reactions such as fatigue and pain may indicate to someone they are not capable of accomplishing a certain task. A

person with high self-efficacy, however, will see these states as energizing rather than debilitating. The physiological and affective states are most relevant for tasks related to physical accomplishments.

*Self-Efficacy and Its Relationship to Leadership*

The concept of self-efficacy impacts leadership in a number of ways. First, research has shown that students who had previous leadership experiences are more inclined to take on leadership roles in the future (Felsheim, 2001; McCormick, Tanguma & Lopez-Forment, 2003; McCormick, Tanguma, & Lopez-Forment, 2002; Ouellette, 1998; Shertzer &Schuh, 2004; Sohn, 2003; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 1994). This relates to the source of mastery experiences. Students, who have the opportunity to assume a leadership role, can learn their capability of being a leader. Research by McCormick, Tanguma, and Lopez-Forment (2002) found that students with high leadership self-efficacy attempted to take on more leadership roles than students with low leadership self-efficacy. They also found the number of previous leadership roles held predicted high leadership self-efficacy.

In their qualitative study, Shertzer and Schuh (2004) found that student leaders believed that if they took advantage of one leadership opportunity that others would follow. Students who were not involved in leadership roles believed they were not given the opportunity to lead and subsequently did not feel they had the capability to be a leader. Both of these findings reinforce the importance of mastery experiences in building self-efficacy and for students assuming leadership roles.

Another way that self-efficacy relates to leadership is through vicarious experiences. Young children learn from observing and watching their parents. As they reach a certain age and begin to attend school, they learn and watch from their peers. Bandura (1997b) believes that

children choose friends based on similar interests and values. This concept appears to continue with students' involvement in student organizations on a college campus. Students in Felsheim's (2001) qualitative study reported meeting people with similar interests as a benefit of their membership in student organizations. Ouellette (1998) found that students were influenced to take on leadership roles by their peers who held leadership roles.

A final aspect of how self-efficacy impacts leadership is through social persuasion. Many studies show the effect that family members and role models had on students' initial and continued involvement in leadership roles (Armino, Carter, Jones, Kruger, Lucas, Washington, Young & Scott, 2000; Felsheim, 2001; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Guernek, 1994; Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella & Osteen, 2004; Levine & Cureton, 1998; Ouellette, 1998; Romano, 1996; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Through positive feedback, encouragement and support, family members and role models can play an important role in students' leadership development.

## Role Model Influence

Through a review of literature, how students become leaders seem to divide into two distinctive stages. The first stage is before they have taken on leadership roles. In this stage, there are intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for a student to get involved in leadership roles (Felsheim, 2001). An extrinsic motivation of this stage is the support, encouragement, and influence of a role model. After taking on an initial leadership role, there are certain characteristics that influence continued leadership involvement. Examples of this include confidence in one's abilities to be a leader, being sociable, the opportunity to interact with friends as well as wanting to build specific leadership skills. Role models play an important part in this stage as well by serving as mentors and/or meaning makers (Komives, Casper, et al., 2004).

*Role Model Influence with Initial Involvement*

In the *Leadership Identity Development Model* (LID), Komives, Casper, et al. (2004) discuss the first stage called awareness, which addresses leadership development in young students. Students in elementary school begin to recognize and distinguish people they believe to be leaders. They find these leaders in the news media, at school, and at home. Role models, at this young age, serve as affirmers when children express an interest. They also serve as a behavior model. Similar to Bandura's (1994, 1997a, 1997b) vicarious experiences, young students observe their parents, coaches, teachers, and others and model the behavior they demonstrate.

Hartman and Harris (1992) found college students' leadership styles positively correlate with their parents' perceived and reported leadership styles indicating students learned aspects of leadership from their parents. While this only accounted for 25% of the reported style, it does indicate that role models play a part in teaching leadership through behavior modeling. Casper (2004) states in the early stages of the LID, adults "often prompt students to initially get involved in organizations, help them set high expectations for themselves, and later encourage them to consider taking a leadership role" (p. 10). There are several other studies that reinforce the impact role models have on students' initial involvement with leadership experiences (Armino, et al., 2000; Felsheim, 2001; Komives, Casper, et al. 2004; Ouellette, 1998; Romano, 1996; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004).

*Role Model Influence with Continued Involvement*

As students begin to explore and engage in leadership opportunities, role models continue to serve as affirmers but they also begin to serve as mentors. In the previous stage, role models encourage students to get involved in extracurricular activities and that the student can be a

leader. Once a student has taken on a leadership role, other factors and characteristics help them to continue. Research shows the importance of self-efficacy in leadership development (Bandura, 1994, 1997a, 1997b; McCormick, Tanguma & Lopez-Forment, 2002; McCormick, Tanguma & Lopez-Forment, 2003). Once a person believes they are capable of leadership, they will take on more leadership roles. Students no longer need encouragement and support to take on leadership roles once they realize they are capable of leadership.

But role models continue to influence leadership involvement and development. In the third stage of the LID (Komives, et al., 2004), adults serve as mentors, guides, and coaches by helping students process past experiences and reflecting on their leadership style. Peers also serve as role models. Ouellette (1998) and Romano (1996) found students who observed other peer leaders improved their leadership skills. Students emulated the same behavior of peers who they believed to be good leaders. If they found behavior that was inappropriate, they would observe it and learn to do it differently. Role models not only influence a students' initial involvement in leadership roles but continue to serve as mentors once they take on leadership roles.

## Extraversion

### *History of Personality Development*

Curious about similarities and differences in personality, Katharine Briggs began to develop a typology based on human behavior (Myers, 1980). In her research, she discovered Jung's extensive research on psychological types. Jung (1971) developed four types with two descriptions for each type. The first type she called attitude-types, which dealt with the attitude people had about an object or their outer world. Extraverts had a positive relation to an object whereas introverts had an abstract attitude toward it. The other types, she called function-types,

focused on other aspects of human behavior including how people made decisions, organized their lives, and interpreted information. Briggs and her daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers, expanded the types and developed an instrument to assess people's personalities called the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). One of the distinct differences between Jung's type and Myers-Briggs' type is the belief that people can hold both characteristics of extravert and introvert. Myers (1980) believes that one is a dominant characteristic and the other is an auxiliary characteristic.

*Description of Extraversion*

With trait theory, there are certain characteristics that define leadership. Stodgill (1948) found, in his review of the literature from 1904-1947, that one of the highest correlations for leadership was popularity and sociability. Sociability refers to "leader's inclination to seek out pleasant social relationships" (Northouse, 2001, p. 20). People who are sociable have good interpersonal skills and show a concern for others' needs and well-being. They are typically characterized as being friendly and outgoing.

In a follow up of the review of literature on leadership from 1948-1970, Bass (1990) found that "extroversion is another generalized trait that is likely to increase one's tendency to attempt to lead and to participate in group activities" (p. 90). However, extraversion, specifically, was not related as one of the personality traits that influenced leadership. Sociability continued to be a positive influence on leadership.

The literature related to extraversion describes this personality as outgoing, sociable, friendly, and popular (Bauer & Liang, 2003; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1989; Myers, 1980). These descriptions match with the definitions of sociability, which was found to relate to leadership. Shertzer and Schuh (2004) discovered that student leaders identified themselves as extraverts. Student leaders also felt that positions of leadership favor extraverts. Typologies by

Holland (1966, 1997) and Astin (1993a) also define student leaders as outgoing, extraverted, and sociable. There is a perception that leaders hold the characteristics of an extraverted personality.

*Extraversion and Its Relationship to Leadership*

In *Measures of Leadership*, McCauley (1990) analyzed the results of a variety of Myers Briggs Type Indicator databases to look at the various personality types of different people ranging from high school student leaders to Japanese businessmen. She found high school student leaders and college student leaders are primarily extraverts. Sixty-two percent of high school student leaders were extraverted while eighty-four percent of college student leaders were extraverted. In the business field, managers and executives were more extraverted (56.6%) than introverted (43.3%). Generally, extraverts make up 65-75% of the United States population.

In their study, Bauer and Liang (2003) found that students who were extraverted put more of an effort into their personal and social activities, including involvement in clubs and organizations, than any other personality type. Looking at the same personality scales, Judge, Ilies, Bono, and Gerhardt (2002) found that extraversion was the most important trait for leaders and effective leadership. They looked at leader emergence which refers to if individuals are viewed as a leader and leadership effectiveness which refers to a leader's performance including influencing and guiding the group toward its goal. Extraversion was the strongest correlation for leader emergence and leadership effectiveness than any other personality type.

But not all research shows that extraversion has a relationship with leadership. Bass (1990) found in a review of leadership literature that many articles found leaders to be both introverted and extraverted. Despite the research that demonstrates a relationship between extraversion and leadership, McCauley (1990) believes that leaders are also introverted. She believes the personality depends on the situation.

Since extraverts are sociable people and one of the primary reasons they get involved in leadership roles is because they are influenced through their peers, this personality characteristic could simply be a perception of what students believe a leader should be like. Little literature has been found to predict leadership roles related to extraversion.

## Men/Women and Leadership

Men and women are different in many ways and leadership is not an exception. Through a review of literature on leadership and gender, there seemed to be three different areas that describe male and female leaders. The first area focused on leadership aspirations, which relates to why men or women initially take on leadership roles. Another area focused on the effectiveness of male and female leaders. This area looked at group effectiveness and the behaviors of the individual while in a leadership role. A final area discussed the differences in leadership styles between men and women. This area described the approach that males or females had when in a leadership role. Before exploring each of these areas, it is important to understand some of the reasons why there is a difference between men and women and leadership.

### *Why Is There a Difference*

When describing successful managers, people mention words such as aggressive, dominant, and able to get the job done. While men are described with similar characteristics, women are characterized as being deficient in those qualities (Bass, 1990; Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1999; Ruderman, 2004). There is a stereotype that women are not suited for leadership roles or management positions. Instead, they are viewed as having to balance both career and family (Bass, 1990; Boatwright & Egidio, 2003; Northouse, 2001; Ruderman, 2004). Another difference is because of limited opportunities for women. Ruderman (2004) and Northouse

(2001) describe organizational barriers for women who want to get to upper positions. These include lack of high stake assignments and lack of developmental opportunities. In relation to self-efficacy, if women are not given the opportunity to take on leadership roles, they are not able to build their leadership self-efficacy in order to explore other leadership roles.

Another difference is the lack of female mentors and role models. Northouse (2001) states these interpersonal barriers hold women back from taking on leadership roles. They are excluded from informal networks and face isolation since few women are in upper level positions (Ruderman, 2004). A final difference influences both men and women. Ruderman (2004) and Astin (1993b) believe that people prefer same-sex peer groups. Men and women in management positions will most likely pick other men and women for leadership positions.

*Men/Women and Leadership Aspirations*

If women lack opportunities to assume leadership roles as stated in the literature above, one could assume they lack confidence and efficacy to try other leadership roles. Bass (1990), based on a review of literature, and McCormick, Tanguma, and Lopez-Format's (2003) study found those exact results. In the study, females overall reported a significantly lower self-efficacy than males. This had a direct impact on the number of attempts a person made to assume leadership roles. Lower self-efficacy resulted in lower number of attempts.

In another study comparing the CIRP data from 1987 and 1991, Kezar and Moriarty (2000) found males rate themselves higher in leadership ability and various leadership skills than women. The rate of growth was higher for males as well. One of the predictors for leadership ability for males was being elected to office whereas for women one of the strongest predictors was involvement in clubs and organizations. "The findings suggest not only that men believe they are highly skilled in these areas when they enter college but that they may take better

advantage of opportunities to continue their development in these important skill areas during college" (p. 65). This relates to some of the organizational barriers that women face in trying to obtain leadership roles.

Two other predictors for women's leadership aspiration deal with traditional feminine gender characteristics and connectedness (Boatwright & Egidio, 2003). Female students who had traditional feminine gender characteristics were less likely to attempt leadership roles. This relates to the idea of balancing family and work as well as the stereotype and prejudice when describing leadership. Females who had an interest in meaningful connections reported the likelihood of future leadership roles. They saw leadership roles as an opportunity to connect and work collaboratively with others.

*Men/Women and Leadership Effectiveness*

Meta-analyses of 82 studies found no difference in overall leadership effectiveness of women and men (Northouse, 2001). But in comparing the effectiveness between sexes, the author found men were favored when the setting was more male dominated, when a higher percentage of male subordinates, and when the role was seen as more congenial, which meant higher requirements for control rather than cooperation. Women's effectiveness improved when they moved up the corporate ladder and when cooperation rather than control was necessary. Bass (1990) found similar results with no clear perception of how men and women act in leadership positions. There were no significant differences on leadership effectiveness. Both men and women can be successful once they get into leadership positions. The bigger disparities are based on the opportunity to get into a leadership position and the leadership style of women and men.

*Men/Women and Leadership Style*

The biggest difference between men and women and leadership is their leadership style. Leadership has traditionally been viewed from a hierarchical perspective and many businesses still function in this mindset. However, many researchers now view leadership as a process that is more collaborative, involving all members of the group (Astin & Leland, 1991; Daft, 2002; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 1998; Northouse, 2001; Ruderman, 2004).

Carol Gilligan (1993) in her book, *In a Different Voice*, discusses the difference in psychological development for men and women. She believes men and women experience relationships and issues of dependency differently.

> 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).

Based on this perspective of psychological development, men would tend to lead through an individual process whereas women would be inclined to lead through a collaborative, collective process.

Research highlights women tend to lead in a more participative way that connects them with others in the group (Bass, 1990; Boatwright & Egidio, 2003; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Northouse, 2001; Romano, 1996; Ruderman, 2004). Boatwright and Egidio (2003) found the

most important factor in leadership aspirations of women was the connectedness needs of the women. Women view leadership as an opportunity to connect with others and build relationships.

## Chapter Summary

A review of the literature demonstrates the importance in researching characteristics and influences that impact student leadership. What is the relationship between these characteristics and influences and the number of leadership positions that student hold? Which of these characteristics and influences, if any, impact leadership positions more than others? How do these characteristics and influences differ, if any, between males and females?

Peers are one of the variables that impacts not only initial leadership involvement but also continued involvement in leadership positions. Astin's (1993b) concept of progressive conformity demonstrates the strength of peer influence on values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. Because of female connectedness needs, peers may play a larger role for females than males.

One of the consistent characteristics of leadership, according to Bass (1990), is self-confidence. Leaders view themselves as self-confident. Others view leaders as self-confident. Self-confidence impacts leadership in a number of ways including being able to make decisions and appearing competent. Shertzer and Schuh (2004) demonstrate one of the reasons students do not take on leadership roles is because of a lack of self-confidence in their own abilities as well as a lack of confidence from their peer group.

Self-efficacy is a belief of one's capabilities in a given situation. Based on previous experience, observing others, verbal persuasion and being aware of one's physical and emotional stressors, a person can build their efficacy toward a certain task such as leadership. Students who

held previous leadership positions, generally take on future leadership roles. Those who report high self-efficacy are seen as leaders. Women tend to have lower self-efficacy (McCormick, Tanguma, & Lopez-Forment, 2003) and this impacts the number of leadership positions held as well as leadership positions attempted.

Another source of influence is role model support and encouragement. Role models can be parents, teachers, peers, coaches, and others. Through verbal support and encouragement and belief in a student's abilities, role models can influence leadership involvement. Both Felsheim (2001) and Ouellette (1998) found students reported parental support as one reason why they got involved in leadership positions. Role models can also serve as meaning makers and supporters. In this role, they help students continue their leadership involvement by processing skills learned and supporting their leadership potential.

Another self-described leadership characteristic is extraversion. While this characteristic is not as strongly supported in the research, student leaders describe themselves and other leaders as sociable and extraverted. While in leadership positions, students will need to be effective communicators and be able to work well with groups. Both of these require a certain level of sociability.

While there are differences between men and women in regards to opportunities to lead and leadership style, men and women are influenced in some of the same ways. Astin and Leland (1991) conducted a cross-generational student of women leaders and found they were influenced by family background and encouragement, supportive role models and mentors, and early opportunities to lead which contributed to an increase in self-confidence. Research on influences of college student leaders by Felsheim (2001), Ouellette (1998), and Shertzer and Schuh (2004) found that both males and females were influenced by the same characteristics and influences.

While this review of literature highlights how these characteristics and influences relate to leadership, the biggest gap in the literature is the lack of empirical research determining the relationship between these characteristics and influences and the number of leadership positions held. Another gap in the literature is how these characteristics and influences, collectively and individually, influence leadership positions. By determining which, if any, of these factors influence the number of leadership positions held, student affairs administrators can build programs or training on areas where students are greatly influenced. This would allow students, who do not generally take on leadership positions, the opportunity to get involved and build leadership skills.

# CHAPTER 3

# METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to examine the relationship between the number of leadership positions held by college students in relation to five independent variables. Literature has noted the importance of peer influence, self confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion and its impact on leadership (Astin, 1993a; Felsheim, 2001; Holland, 1966; Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2004; Kuh, Hu & Vesper, 2000; Ouellette, 1998; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). The purpose of this chapter was to explain participant selection, describe the development of the survey instrument, and explain the research design and the data analysis used in conducting this research.

## Participants

The population for this study will consist of sophomores, juniors, and seniors attending a large, public institution in the Southeastern United States. The institution is categorized as doctoral extensive according to the Carnegie system (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Retrieved May 5, 2005 from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classification). For the purpose of this research, leadership position was defined as a person who holds a leadership title in an organization and influences a group towards a common goal. Students will need to be in the leadership position for at least four months in order for it to be considered for this study. Freshmen students will not have had the opportunity to take on leadership positions in college and thus would not be able to report this important information. Participant selection was based on two criteria. (a) All students must be

sophomores, juniors, or seniors; and (b) students must currently participate in a student organization.

Student organizations were identified using the *Directory of Clubs and Organizations* (Student Activities, 2005) and met several criteria in order to be included in this study. Participation will be solicited from members at its organizational meeting. The criteria in selecting the student organizations to include in the study are (a) organizations that include undergraduate students, (b) organizations that provide a student email address. There are 398 organizations that met this criteria from a pool of 478 student organizations.

A stratified random sample divides the population into parts and then a simple random sample is conducted in each of the stratum (Huck, 2004). Student organizations are divided into 16 parts including advocacy, arts, cultural/international, fraternities, honor societies, media, military, other, professional, programming and activities, religious, representative council, service, sororities, sports/recreation, and student housing/residential life. A stratified random sample of the organizations meeting the stated criteria was conducted for each of the 16 parts. The purpose of conducting a stratified random sample was to get a representation of the organizations and the students on campus. For each of the 16 parts, student organizations were selected for meeting the stated criteria and then numbered. The numbers were then entered into SPSS and a random sample was drawn for each of the 16 parts, which resulted in the selection of 46 student organizations for the study.

In determining the sample size needed, there are several factors to consider (Cohen, 1992). The first is the significance level, which deals with the risk of committing a Type I error. The significance level for this study was alpha = .05. The second factor is the power level. Power represents the probability of committing a Type II error. According to Cohen (1992), a power

value smaller than .80 would increase the probability of a Type II error. Any power value higher than .80 would result in an unrealistic sample size. Given these issues, the power level for this study was .80. The final factor to consider is the effect size. A medium effect size for multiple correlations is .15 and a large effect size is .35. This study will use an effect size of .20. Using a chart developed by Gatsonis and Sampson (1989), with alpha at .05, power at .80, 5 independent variables, and an effect size of .20, an estimated sample size is 311 subjects.

## Instrumentation

Qualitative studies by Felsheim (2001), Komives, et al. (2004), Ouellette (1998), Shertzer and Schuh (2004) and typologies by Astin (2003a), Holland (1966), and Kuh, Hu, and Vesper (2000) provide characteristics of student leaders. Through a review of this literature, the five primary characteristics that were described across studies included peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion. The paper copy instrument was based on those five independent variables.

In choosing between a commercially developed or locally developed instrument, Schuh and Upcraft (2001) discuss several features that should be considered. One feature is considering the purpose of the study and whether it will be compared to other institutions. Another feature is finding a commercially developed instrument that meets the purpose of the study. Logistics such as cost, ease of administration of the instrument, and if time exists to test pilot a locally developed instrument for reliability are additional considerations. Since no current instrument exists that explores the variables associated in this study and time exists to test pilot an instrument, a local instrument was developed based on a review of the literature.

The first stage of instrument development consisted of creating a table outlining statements in the literature in which characteristics of student leaders were described or

explained. This table listed the statement, the citation, and the independent variable associated with the statement. In the second stage of development, the table was sorted by these independent variables. Statements that were similar to one another were coded for each independent variable resulting in 5 scales with 16 different categories in the final stage of development (see Table 1).

Statements for the instrument were then developed from each of the 16 categories resulting in the *Lloyd Leadership Instrument.* The *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* consisted of a total of 42 statements comprised of 9 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, and 9 statements for the extraversion scale. Students were asked to respond to each statement using 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 instrument does not contain any neutral scoring because the researcher wanted students to make a forced choice. Research looking at the utility of a neutral point on a Likert scale found that composite scores from an instrument with a neutral point were not significantly different from an instrument without a neutral point (Guy & Norvell, 1977). Other literature believed forced choice scales are a stronger indicator of the variables being tested in a study (Christiansen, Burns & Montgomery, 2005). The final section of the instrument will include demographic information soliciting information on the number of leadership positions held in college, sex, ethnicity, class standing, and college grade point average.

The *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* was shared with faculty and graduate students in the Student Affairs Administration program for review of content, grammar, sentence structure and

Table 1

*Sources in the Literature for Lloyd Leadership Instrument*

| Scale | Citation |
|---|---|
| **Self-efficacy scale** | |
| Previous experience with leadership | Astin (2003); Felsheim (2001); Holland (1996); Kuh, Hu, & Vesper (2000); Shertzer & Schuh (2004) |
| Self perception of having leadership abilities | Astin (1993); Holland (1997); McCormick Tanguma & Lopez-Forme (2003); Shertzer & Schuh (2004); |
| Attempt to take on future leadership roles | McCormick, Tanguma & Lopez-Formet (2003); Ouellette (1998) |
| **Personality/Extravert Scale** | |
| Self perception of being sociable & outgoing | Astin (1993); Bauer & Liang (2003); Holland (1996 & 1997); Judge, Ilies, Bono & Gerhardt (2002); Komives, Lucas & McMahon (1998); Myers (1980); Shertzer & Schuh, (2004) |
| Perception of others leaders being extraverted | Judge, Ilies, Bono & Gerhardt (2002); Shertzer & Schuh (2004) |
| Extraverts prefer action | Judge, Ilies, Bono & Gerhardt (2002); Komives, Lucas & McMahon (1998); Myers (1980) |
| **Peer Influence Scale** | |
| Self perception of popularity | Astin (1993); Holland (1997) |
| Intention of meeting new people | Astin (1993); Felsheim (2001); Kuh, Hu & Vesper (2000); Shertzer & Schuh (2004); Sohn (2003) |
| Peers as role models | Kuh, Hu & Vesper (2000); Holland (1996); Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella & Osteen (2004); Ouellette, (1998); Romano (1996) |

[Table 1 continues]

Table 1 continued

| Scale | Citation |
|---|---|
| Peer influence from a group perspective | Astin (1993); Holland (1997); Ouellette (1998) |
| **Role Model Influence/Support Scale** | |
| Encouraged to get involved by someone | Felsheim (2001); Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella & Osteen (2004); Romano (1996) |
| Family influence | Felsheim (2001); Ouellette (1998); Romano (1996); Shertzer & Schuh (2004) |
| Received support from someone | Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella & Osteen (2004); Ouellette (1998); Shertzer & Schuh (2004) |
| **Self-Confidence Scale** | |
| Self perception of self-confidence | Astin (1993); Holland (1996 & 1997); Schneider, Paul, White & Holcombe (2000) |
| Others' confidence in leaders | Kirkpatrick & Locke (1991); Ouellette (1998) |
| Confidence in certain skills | Felsheim (2001); Kirkpatrick & Locke (1991); Komives, Lucas & McMahon (1998) |

overall flow of the instrument to aid with content validity (Huck, 2004). These faculty and doctoral students are familiar with and have practical experience working with student leaders. In addition, the instrument was piloted with 39 undergraduate students. This was conducted to ensure internal consistency reliability, which determines consistency among individual questions or subsets of questions (Huck, 2004). Data was entered from the pilot study and statistically analyzed using SPSS. The Cronbach's alpha 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.

Feedback from both of these constituencies was incorporated into the final copy of the instrument that was used in this study. Students wanted more choices on the instrument so the Likert scale was expanded from four choices to six choices in the final instrument.

## Data Collection

Data from the participants will be gathered in the spring 2006 semester upon approval from the institutional review board (IRB). Initial contact was made with the student organizations through email to ask permission to attend a weekly meeting to solicit participation and distribute a paper copy of the instrument. Follow up emails were sent to confirm attendance at meetings that are coordinated. For those organizations that do not respond, a follow up email was sent with the same request. An incentive of $100 will be offered to solicit organizations to allow the researcher to attend an organizational meeting. The $100 will be given to one student organization that has the highest percentage of participation. A random drawing will take place should there be a tie.

## Data Analysis

This study used a multiple regression design seeking to predict the number of leadership positions that student's hold based on a number of identified variables. The dependent variable is the number of leadership positions held in college. The independent variables are the scales scores for 1) peer influence; 2) self-confidence; 3) self-efficacy; 4) role model influence and support; and 5) extraversion.

The following research questions (RQ) were asked.

RQ1: What is the impact of peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion on the number of leadership positions held?

This was analyzed using simultaneous regression analysis in order to understand the extent that the number of leadership positions held in college is explained by the independent variables as a whole.

RQ2: How does each of the independent variables (peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion) contribute to the number of leadership positions held?

This was analyzed using simultaneous regression looking at partial correlations.

RQ3: How do peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explain the number of leadership positions held in college based on sex?

This was analyzed using simultaneous regression analysis to examine the independent variables collectively and individually and the number of leadership positions held. Basic

descriptive statistics were also generated. A Cronbach's alpha test for internal consistency was performed on the instrument.

# CHAPTER 4

# RESULTS

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion and the number of leadership positions a student holds. This chapter presents the results from the statistical data analyses. Descriptive statistics are listed, followed by the results from the three research questions. Research question one examined the relationship between all the independent variables and the number of leadership positions held. Research question two analyzed the impact of the relationship looking at each independent variable individually and the number of leadership positions held. Research question three examined the relationship between the independent variables, both collectively and individually, and the number of leadership positions held based on sex.

## Instrument

The *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* was comprised of statements developed by the researcher for the purpose of this study. The final instrument consisted of a total of 38 statements comprised of 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, and 6 statements for the extraversion scale. Students were asked to respond to each statement using 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 instrument does not contain any neutral scoring in order for students to make a forced choice.

Data was entered into SPSS 13.0 statistical program and further categorized for analysis. The researcher created scales by calculating a composite score for each of the five independent variables. In addition, participants were asked to report the number of leadership positions held in student organizations as well as the number of leadership positions held in community organizations not affiliated with any student organization at the institution. A composite score for these two responses was created to reflect the total number of leadership positions held. Participants were also asked to report the number of semesters they had been enrolled full-time at the institution. These responses were further categorized for students that were enrolled 3-4 semesters, 5-6 semesters, 7-8 semesters and more than 9 semesters enrolled. The researcher also conducted a scatterplot analysis to look for outliers and verify the manually entered data was correct.

## Analysis of Scales

Because it was a locally developed instrument, the *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* was initially piloted with a group of students to test for content validity and internal consistency reliability. Cronbach alpha scores on the pilot ranged from .80 on the peer influence scale to .92 on the self-confidence scale. For this study, Cronbach alpha scores were tested again for each scale and proved to be reliable. Alpha scores for the peer influence scale (PEER) was .76, the self-confidence scale (CONFIDENCE) was .88, the self-efficacy scale (EFFICACY) was .82, the role model influence and support scale (ROLEMODEL) was .85, and the extraversion scale (EXTRAVERT) was .77. In examining the alpha reported if a statement was removed from a scale, the results indicated that by removing one statement from the extraversion scale it would

increase its alpha to .85, so the statement was dropped for the regression analysis. None of the other statements on the instrument affected the overall alpha for each scale.

## Statistical Power Analysis

Using a chart developed by Gatsonis and Sampson (1989), with alpha at .05, power at .80, 5 independent variables, and an effect size of .20, an estimated sample size was 311 participants. With 331 participants in this study, the sample size showed a medium effect. In an effort to not commit a Type I error, the Bonferroni approach was used on some of the analyses. Statistical significance was determined by dividing .05 by the number of variables analyzed.

## Results of Data Analysis

### *Demographics*

Survey respondents varied on sex, semesters enrolled, ethnicity, and the number of leadership positions held. Demographic information is included in Table 2. In summary, respondents were 47.7% female and 52% male with no response from one person (.3%). In regard to semesters, participants were predominantly enrolled full-time for 3-4 semesters (32.3%) followed by participants enrolled 5-6 semesters (31.7%), participants enrolled 7-8 semesters (20.5%), participants who did not have a response (11.5%), and participants enrolled more than 9 semesters (3.9%). The vast majority of the survey respondents were White/Caucasian (80.1%). The ethnicity of the other participants included Black/African American (8.2%), Asian (6.9%), Hispanic/Latino (.9%), American Indian/Alaska Native (.3%), and Multiracial (2.1%). Multiracial demographics were gathered by students who selected more than one ethnic group. Five students (1.5%) did not respond to the ethnicity statement. Respondents represented a variety of student organizations. Out of the 16 categories listed in the *Directory of Club & Organizations* (Student Activities, 2005), 10 categories were represented in

Table 2

*Demographic Characteristics of the Sample*

| Variable | *n* | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | | |
| Females | 158 | 52% |
| Males | 172 | 47.7% |
| No response | 1 | .3% |
| **Number of semesters enrolled in college** | | |
| 3-4 semesters enrolled | 107 | 32.4% |
| 5-6 semesters enrolled | 105 | 31.7% |
| 7-8 semesters enrolled | 68 | 20.5% |
| More than 9 semesters enrolled | 13 | 3.9% |
| No response | 38 | 11.5% |
| **Ethnicity** | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | .3% |
| Asian | 23 | 6.9% |
| Black or African American | 27 | 8.2% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3 | .9% |
| Multiracial | 7 | 2.1% |
| White/Caucasian | 265 | 80.1% |
| No response | 5 | 1.5% |

[Table 2 continues]

Table 2 Continued

| Variable | *n* | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Type of Organization** | | |
| Advocacy | 19 | 5.7% |
| Arts | 36 | 10.9% |
| Cultural/international | 4 | 1.2% |
| Fraternities | 36 | 10.9% |
| Honor societies | 20 | 6.1% |
| Other | 59 | 17.8% |
| Programming and activities | 16 | 4.8% |
| Representative council | 55 | 16.6% |
| Service | 27 | 8.2% |
| Sororities | 59 | 17.8% |
| **Number of leadership positions held** | | |
| 0 | 68 | 20.5% |
| 1 | 47 | 14.2% |
| 2 | 53 | 16.1% |
| 3 | 44 | 13.3% |
| 4 | 46 | 13.9% |
| 5 | 34 | 10.3% |
| 6 | 18 | 5.4% |

[Table 2 continues]

Table 2 Continued

| Variable | *n* | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 7 | 4 | 1.2% |
| 8 | 7 | 2.1% |
| 9 | 1 | .3% |
| 10 | 6 | 1.8% |
| 11 | 1 | .3% |
| 12 | 1 | .3% |
| 17 | 1 | .3% |

the study. Two student organizations were identified through the Office of Student Activities as a part of the "Other" category with one organization associated with cultural filmmaking and another associated with representing students regarding judicial issues. The total number of leadership positions held ranged from 0 positions to 17 positions. The mean score for the number of leadership positions held for all participants was 2.84.

*Outlier and Multicollinearity*

Scatterplots were calculated to analyze the regression line between the total number of leadership positions held and each independent variable as well as to look for possible outliers that may impact the regression analysis. Cook's Distance was calculated to determine if any individual response influenced the slope and intercept and should be deleted. None were found to have such an influence so all participants were included in the multiple regression analysis.

Correlation coefficients were computed for the five independent scales to analyze possible issues related to multicollinearity. In order to control for a Type I error across the 10 correlations, the Bonferroni approach was used and a $p$ value less than .005 (.05/10=.005) was required for significance. The results in Table 3 show that all the independent variables are significantly correlated with one another. The highest correlation among the independent variables was .605 between CONFIDENCE and EFFICACY and the lowest correlation was .223 between EXTRAVERT and ROLEMODEL. Because of these correlations, a collinearity diagnostic was conducted on the multiple regression analysis. The variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance statistics indicated the correlations were not strong enough to cause multicollinearity problems in the multiple regression analysis.

*Research question 1*

Before a simultaneous regression analysis was performed, a test for interactions was conducted across all the independent variables. None of the interactions were statistically

Table 3

*Correlations Among the Five Independent Scales (N=331)*

| | Confidence | Efficacy | Extravert | Peer |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Efficacy | .605* | | | |
| Extravert | .556* | .486* | | |
| Peer | .413* | .394* | .509* | |
| Role Model | .350* | .428* | .223* | .496* |

* Correlation is significant at the .00 level

significant so they were not further explored in this study.

The first research question examined the relationship between the number of leadership positions held and the five independent variables collectively. Table 4 shows the mean scores and standard deviation for all the variables for all participants, males, and females. The independent variables were peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion. A simultaneous regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well the independent variables predicted the number of leadership positions held. The linear combination of the independent variables was significantly related to the number of leadership positions held, $F(5, 325) = 17.75$, $p = .000$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .46, indicating that peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explained approximately 21.5% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held. The regression equation for this model was Y = 4.7 + .47 (EFFICACY) + .04 (EXTRAVERT) - .03 (PEER) - .06 (ROLEMODEL) + .00 (CONFIDENCE). The negative regression coefficients for peer influence and role model influence indicate an inverse relationship to the number of leadership positions held. Peers and adult role models do not influence students to take on leadership positions. Because these coefficients, as well as the CONFIDENCE and EXTRAVERT coefficients, are so close to zero it indicates they do not impact the number of leadership positions held. Therefore, self-efficacy or previous leadership a position appears to be the strongest predictor for leadership positions held.

Because of the high correlation between self-efficacy and self-confidence, another regression analysis was conducted to explore the impact the independent variables had on the number of leadership positions held when self-efficacy was removed. This regression model was

Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations for Variables*

| Independent Variable | All participants | | Males | | Females | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Peer Influence | 41.8 | 5.32 | 41.4 | 5.66 | 42.3 | 4.8 |
| Self-Confidence | 50.5 | 5.82 | 51.1 | 5.44 | 49.9 | 6.1 |
| Self-Efficacy | 30.7 | 4.57 | 30.7 | 4.52 | 30.8 | 4.6 |
| Role Model Influence | 31.5 | 6.34 | 31.4 | 6.4 | 31.7 | 6.3 |
| Extraversion | 25.4 | 3.42 | 25.4 | 3.5 | 25.4 | 3.4 |
| Total positions held | 2.8 | 2.52 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 |

also significantly related to the number of leadership positions held, $F(4, 326) = 8.196$, $p=.000$. However, the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was .09, indicating the regression model without self-efficacy explained only 9% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held. This means that self-efficacy, alone, explains 12.5% of the number of leadership positions held. The regression equation for this model was Y = 4.1 + .141 (EXTRAVERT) - .03 (PEER) + .06 (ROLEMODEL) + .192 (CONFIDENCE). Based on this regression model, peer influence and role model influence do not impact the number of leadership positions held since these beta coefficients are close to zero.

*Research question 2*

In order to understand the relative strength each independent variable has on the total number of leadership positions held, bivariate and partial correlations were examined. To control for a Type I error across the bivariate correlations, the Bonferroni approach was used and a *p* value less than .01 (.05/5=.01) was required for significance. The same significance level was used for the partial correlations with the full regression model, however, the significance level for the regression model without efficacy required a value less than .0125 (.05/4=.0125). Table 5 provides a summary of the results. All the bivariate correlations between the independent variables and the number of leadership positions held were statistically significant. Only the partial correlation between self-efficacy (.368) and the number of leadership positions held was statistically significant in looking at the full regression model. This indicates that self-efficacy is the best predictor for the number of leadership positions held. However, the partial correlations for the regression model where self-efficacy was removed, self-confidence (.153) was statistically significant, indicating self-confidence is the next best predictor for the number of leadership positions held.

Table 5

*Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Independent Variables with Positions Held*

| Independent Variables | Bivariate correlations | Partial correlations controlling for all other variables | Partial correlations, without efficacy, controlling for all other variables |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extraversion | .204* | .037 | .113 |
| Peer Influence | .149* | -.028 | -.023 |
| Role Model Influence | .141* | -.051 | .049 |
| Self Confidence | .278* | .000 | .153** |
| Self Efficacy | .458* | .368* | |

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .0125$

A correlation that is close to zero indicates there is no relationship or relative strength between those variables and the number of leadership positions held. Peer influence and role model influence do not predict students holding leadership positions in both regression models. The negative correlations for peer influence (-.028) and role model influence (-.051) in the full model indicate these variables have an inverse relationship to leadership positions. But in the regression model where self-efficacy is removed, only peer influence (-.023) shows an inverse relationship. Although extraversion (.113) was not statistically significant in this model, it was the next strongest predictor compared to self-confidence.

*Research question 3*

The final research question examined the relationship between peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion and the number of leadership positions held based on sex. It also explored the impact each independent variable had on the number of leadership positions held based on sex. For males, the linear combination for all the independent variables was significantly related to the number of leadership positions held, $F(5, 166) = 8.393$, $p = .000$. The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was .20 indicating that peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explained approximately 20% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held. The regression equation for the model was Y = 4.7 + .39 (EFFICACY) + .06 (EXTRAVERT) + .04 (PEER) + .05 (ROLEMODEL) - .04 (CONFIDENCE). Based on this model, self-efficacy appears to be the strongest predictor since the beta coefficients for extraversion, peer influence, role model influence, and confidence show no relationship with the number of leadership positions held.

Table 6

*Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Independent Variables with Positions Held for Males (N=172)*

| Independent Variables | Bivariate correlations | Partial correlations controlling for all other variables | Partial correlations, without efficacy, controlling for all other variables |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extraversion | .262* | .049 | .126 |
| Peer Influence | .251* | .036 | .028 |
| Role Model Influence | .248* | .043 | .155 |
| Self Confidence | .272* | -.028 | .061 |
| Self Efficacy | .442* | .307* | |

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .0125$

To examine the impact each independent variable had on the number of leadership positions held for males, bivariate and partial correlations were analyzed. Table 6 provides a summary of the results. The Bonferroni approach was used for the bivariate and partial correlations with the full regression model and a *p* value less than .01 (.05/5=.01) was required for significance. The significance level for the regression model without efficacy required a value less than .0125 (.05/4=.0125). Based on these criteria, all the bivariate correlations were statistically significant to the number of leadership positions held for males. However, when controlling for all other variables, self-efficacy (.307) was the only statistically significant variable that best predicts the number of leadership positions held.

Another regression model was analyzed for males without self-efficacy in order to understand the impact it had on the independent variables and the number of leadership positions held. The linear combination for this regression model was significantly related to the number of leadership positions held, $F(4, 167) = 5.614$, $p=.000$. The adjusted $R^2$ was .10 indicating that this model only explains 10% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held showing that efficacy alone explains 10% as well (.20 -.10=.10). The partial correlations for this regression model were not statistically significant indicating that self-efficacy is the only predictor for males regarding the number of leadership positions held. The partial correlations for males without efficacy show that extraversion (.126) and role model influence (.155) are the next strongest predictors although they are not statistically significant.

For females, the regression equation was Y = 4.2 + .57 (EFFICACY) + .06 (EXTRAVERT) - .06 (PEER) -.12 (ROLEMODEL) - .07 (CONFIDENCE). The linear combination for all the independent variables was significantly related to the number of leadership positions held, $F(5, 152) = 10.798$, $p=.000$. For females, peer influence, role model

influence, and self- confidence all show inverse relationships to the number of leadership positions held, although only role model influence shows any relative strength. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .512, indicating that peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explained approximately 26.2% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held.

Bivariate and partial correlations were also analyzed for females to explore the relationship between each independent variable and the number of leadership positions held. Table 7 shows a summary of the results. The Bonferroni approach was used again to control for a Type I error with bivariate and partial correlations for the full regression model requiring a significance level of $p<.01$ and partial correlations for the regression model without self-efficacy requiring a significant level of $p<.0125$. Again, self-efficacy (.434) is the best predictor for females for number of leadership positions held. Another regression model without efficacy was analyzed in order to understand how the other independent variables impact the number of leadership positions held. The linear combination for this regression model was statistically significant, $F(4, 153) = 3.844$, $p=.005$. However, the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was .09, indicating the regression model without efficacy explained only 9% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held. Similar to other regression models in this study, self-efficacy explains the highest variance (17.2%) in the number of leadership positions held. In addition, the partial correlations reveal that extraversion, peer influence, role model influence, or confidence are not statistically significant to the number of leadership positions held. This indicates that self-efficacy is the only predictor for females regarding the number of leadership positions held. Self-confidence (.195) and extraversion (.139) are the next strongest predictors

Table 7

*Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Independent Variables with Positions Held for Females (N=158)*

| Independent Variables | Bivariate correlations | Partial correlations controlling for all other variables | Partial correlations, without efficacy, controlling for all other variables |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extraversion | .230* | .052 | .139 |
| Peer Influence | .074 | -.057 | -.055 |
| Role Model Influence | .057 | -.117 | -.038 |
| Self Confidence | .268* | -.058 | .195 |
| Self Efficacy | .487* | .434* | |

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .0125$

for females although they were not statistically significant. Unlike the males, peer influence (-.055) and role model influence (-.038) had an inverse relationship to the number of leadership positions held for females.

## Chapter Summary

This study examined the relationship between peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion and the number of leadership positions a student holds. Members from 10 student organizations completed a 38-item instrument that measured each of the independent variables. Data were analyzed based on responses from 331 participants.

Significant research findings show that self-efficacy is the best single predictor for the number of leadership positions a student holds. Because of the strong correlation between self-efficacy and self-confidence, the researcher conducted additional analyses. Specifically, self-efficacy was removed from the regression model to study further the affect of the remaining variables. Overall, self-confidence emerged as the next best predictor for the number of leadership positions a student holds. Although several inverse relationships existed on both regression models, the results of the data analysis indicate that they have no significant relationship to the number of leadership positions held.

Self-efficacy served again as the best predictor for both males and females on the number of leadership positions held. In removing self-efficacy, however, no other independent variables were statistically significant. The second highest predictors for males were extraversion and role model influence. For females, the second highest predictors were self-confidence and extraversion. The correlations, however, are considered weak.

# CHAPTER 5

# DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study measured characteristics (extraversion, self-efficacy, and self-confidence) and influences (peer and adult role model) that describe student leaders based primarily on typologies by Astin (2003a), Holland (1966), and Kuh, Hu, and Vesper (2000) and qualitative research studies by Felsheim (2001), Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2004), Ouellette (1998) and Shertzer and Schuh (2004). This study will contribute to the literature as the existing literature has not studied the relationship between these characteristics and influences and the number of leadership positions held. This chapter will highlight the findings from the data analysis, discuss some of the limitations of the study, discuss its implications for practitioners in student affairs, and offer suggestions for additional research.

## Discussion of Findings

### *Research question 1*

The first research question asked how peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion impacted the number of leadership positions held. Simultaneous multiple regression analyses were conducted to answer the research question. The multiple regression analysis in the first research question was statistically significant which showed that peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion do predict leadership positions. Students involved in leadership positions have these characteristics. The results, however, show that these characteristics are only a small portion of what define a student leader.

Because of the correlation between self-efficacy and self-confidence, an additional multiple regression analysis was conducted to control for self-efficacy. This multiple regression analysis was again statistically significant but peer influence, self-confidence, role model influence and support, and extraversion explain even less of a student leader.

*Research question 2*

The second research question asked how each of the independent variables (peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion) contributed to the number of leadership positions held. Bivariate and partial correlations were analyzed to study the impact each independent variable had on the number of leadership positions held. Partial correlations analyzed the unique contribution that each independent variable had when controlling for all other independent variables.

All the bivariate correlations, which explained the strength of the relationship between each independent variable and the number of leadership positions held, were statistically significant. However, when controlling for the other independent variables, the partial correlations showed that only self-efficacy or previous experience was statistically significant. This indicates self-efficacy is the strongest predictor for leadership involvement. When self-efficacy was removed from the analysis, self-confidence was statistically significant, which indicates self-confidence is the next strongest predictor. The results for each of the independent variables are discussed in more detail below.

*Research question 3*

The third research question asked how peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explained the number of leadership positions held in college based on sex, both collectively and individually. Simultaneous multiple regression

analyses were analyzed to examine the independent variables collectively. Partial correlations were analyzed to explain the impact each of the independent variables had on the number of leadership positions held between males and females.

The multiple regression analyses for both males and females were statistically significant indicating that peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion describe male and female student leaders. The results also show these characteristics better describe females than males. Peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion explained approximately 20% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held for males and 26% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held for females. Another multiple regression analysis was conducted for both males and females to control for self-efficacy. The regression model for self-confidence, peer influence, role model influence, and extraversion was statistically significant for both males and females but again explained less than the full regression model, which included self-efficacy.

The partial correlations indicate again that self-efficacy is the strongest predictor for leadership involvement for both males and females. College student leaders have previous leadership experiences. In removing self-efficacy, none of the partial correlations were statistically significant for both males and females, which indicates previous experience is the only predictor for males and females. Results of the partial correlations, although not statistically significant, show that there are different influences and characteristics that affect males and females.

*Self-Efficacy Discussion*

In the current study, self-efficacy was measured through students' previous leadership experience and was the strongest predictor for the number of leadership positions students held

in all the regression models and correlations. If a student successfully takes on a leadership position, he or she is more likely to attempt to take on leadership positions in the future. Bandura (1994, 1997a, 1977b) describes four ways to gain self-efficacy with one being "mastery experiences." Students in Shertzer and Schuh's (2004) research believed if they had one opportunity to be a student leader that other leadership opportunities would become available to them. All the college student leaders who Felsheim (2001) interviewed had previous involvement in extracurricular activities in high school. They believed it was a natural progression for them to take on leadership positions in college since they had been previously involved. The current study and its findings support previous research by McCormick, Tanguma, and Lopez-Forment (2003) that found students who had high self-efficacy took on more leadership roles. In addition, it also supports the qualitative research by Felsheim (2001), Ouellette (1998), and Shertzer and Schuh (2004) that found college student leaders were more inclined to take on leadership roles because they had previous leadership experience in high school.

Student affairs administrators who work with college student leaders are able to refer these leaders to other student organizations or opportunities since they have worked with them previously. It may be easier for administrators to select student leaders for other leadership positions because they know if the student will be successful or not. Opportunities may not exist for non-student leaders because they require additional training and supervision in order to be successful. Administrators may not have the time to develop new student leaders.

Although not statistically significant, the partial correlation for self-efficacy for females was slightly higher than males indicating that previous experience is more important for females when taking on future leadership positions. Research by McCormick, Tanguma, and Lopez-

Forment (2003) found females reported significantly lower leadership self-efficacy and took on less leadership roles than males. Therefore, the current study does not support the previous research that females have lower leadership self-efficacy. However, the mean score for self-efficacy and the number of leadership positions held between males and females in the current study were almost the same. Northouse (2001) and Ruderman (2004) describe organizational barriers that impede females who want to get into leadership positions. These barriers affect their opportunity to take on leadership positions. In the current study, the partial correlation for self-efficacy for females was higher than males and the number of leadership positions was approximately the same, this indicates some barriers that are preventing females from getting into more leadership positions, which supports the current literature.

*Self-Confidence Discussion*

Because self-confidence is a component of self-efficacy, this study explored the impact that characteristics and influences had on the number of leadership positions held when self-efficacy was not considered. Across all participants, self-confidence was statistically significant which indicates it is the next strongest predictor for number of leadership positions held. In a review of literature from 1904 to 1970 (Stodgill, 1948; Bass, 1990), self-confidence was the only characteristic that had a positive relationship with leadership. However, when looking at the partial correlations between males and females in the current study, self-confidence was not significant. For females, self-confidence was the next highest correlation. This can be explained by research by Felsheim (2001) who found that females believe confidence is about motivating others. Additionally, research by Boatwright and Egidio (2003) found the most important factor in leadership aspirations of females was to connect with others and build relationships. Females want to take on leadership positions so they can relate with others and they view the ability to

build these relationships and motivate others as confidence. Therefore, the current study adds to the literature regarding how females in leadership positions view self-confidence. For males, it supports the research by Bass (1990), Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), and Ouellette (1998) that self-confidence is a consistent characteristic for student leaders.

*Role Model Influence Discussion*

Interestingly, although it was not significant, the next highest correlation for males was role model influence and support. These role models can be parents, coaches, teachers, and other adults. Shertzer and Schuh (2004), Felsheim (2001), and Ouellette (1998) reported the influence of role models who helped student leaders get involved in extracurricular activities. Males, in the current study, could have had more role models who encouraged them to take on leadership positions. Although women student leaders contributed their motivation for leadership to their mothers and other female role models in a study by Romano (1996), role model influence was not positively correlated with females in the current study. This could be attributed to a lack of role models for females. Northouse (2001) describes this as one of the barriers why females do not get into leadership positions. Therefore, the current study supports the literature by Northouse (2001) that females lack role models who influence their involvement in leadership positions. For males, it supports qualitative research by Felsheim (2001) and Komives, Caspar, et al. (2004) where role models encouraged students to get involved.

*Extraversion Discussion*

Extraversion, for both males and females, was the next highest correlation. Student leaders see themselves and other student leaders as being extraverted (Astin, 1993a; Holland, 1966, 1997; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). McCauley (1990) found that 84% of college student leaders were extraverted which supports this study. People who are extraverted enjoy being

around people and are more likely to engage in social activities (Myers, 1980). This finding does not mean that students who are introverted are not leaders. Instead, the results from the current study support the perception that student leaders are extraverted.

*Peer Influence Discussion*

Surprisingly, peer influence was the weakest correlation for both males and females indicating that peers did not influence one another to take on leadership positions. Astin (1993b) believed the students' peer group was the strongest influence during college. His concept of progressive conformity stated that students make and change their decisions based on their peer group. Felsheim (2001), Ouellette (1998), and Shertzer and Schuh (2004) also found that students initially got involved in leadership opportunities in high school through their friends. Results from the current study, however, support Sohn's (2003) findings that peers were not a reason for getting involved in extracurricular activities. Instead peers could serve as a reason for why students stay involved in extracurricular activities.

Participants in the current study were asked to recall information from high school. They may not have remembered the role that peers played in their leadership involvement in high school. In addition, the current study did not assess the role peers played but rather if peers were an influence in getting them involved in leadership experiences. There are other roles that peers can play including serving as mentors, role models, encouragers, and supporters. Perhaps peers, in the current study, played a different role than instigating leadership involvement.

*Additional Characteristics Discussion*

The results of the current study showed that peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion account for about 21% to 26% of the variance in the number of leadership positions held. This indicates there are other characteristics and

influences that attribute to students taking on leadership positions. Competence in interpersonal relationships, socioeconomic status, and public speaking (Astin, 1993b) are examples of some of the characteristics that may better explain students involved in leadership positions. The current study was able to identify and explore certain characteristics and influences that were described in the literature. But, additional characteristics and influences need to be identified and analyzed in order to gain a better understanding of student leaders and why they take on leadership positions.

## Limitations

There are several limitations in the current study that are important to mention. The first is that participants were asked to recall information from high school and this may have impacted the results. Participants were asked about their leadership experience in high school as well as the role of peers and role models during that time. As mentioned above, participants may not have remembered the role peers and adults played in their leadership involvement, which may explain why these two variables were not statistically significant.

Another limitation was that freshmen were not included in the current study. Participants that were enrolled between 1-2 semesters were not included in the sample. The assumption was that freshmen would not be able to report leadership positions since they needed to be in the position for at least 4 months. However, it would have been interesting to include them in the current study and examine how they impacted the results. Participants enrolled 1-2 semesters would be able to better recall information from high school.

An additional limitation is that participants were involved in student organizations. Although the majority of participants in the current study had not held a leadership position, there may be a natural progression for them to take on leadership positions in the future. It would

have been interesting to collect data from participants who may not have had such an inclination and to compare the differences between the two groups. Student organizations also provide an outlet for socializing with other students which supports extraverted personalities. The majority of students who participated in this study were extraverted. This may have impacted the results of the study when looking at extraversion.

Although the *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* proved reliable in its analysis and was examined for content validity, a final limitation is the overall reliability of the instrument. Factor analysis could have been conducted prior to dissemination to examine the scales. In addition, test-retest methods could have been incorporated in order to further increase the reliability of the instrument.

## Implications

The research findings in this study have implications not only for student affairs administrators who work with student organizations but also school counselors and administrators who work in areas that involve leadership training and selection. Although this study did not explore the effectiveness of students in leadership positions, it does provide information that will assist with training and identifying future leaders. This section will first discuss the need for providing leadership opportunities for students. Second, it will discuss the importance of working with high school students with their leadership development and implications for school counselors and administrators. Third, it will provide suggestions regarding the importance of role models and mentors for female students. Lastly, it will provide suggestions for breaking stereotypes of leaders being extraverted as well as building leadership skills for introverted students.

Previous leadership experience is the most important part of building college student leaders. The results of the current study reinforce the significance of previous leadership experience for students. Student affairs administrators need to provide opportunities for students to take on leadership positions and to provide guidance in order to help them succeed. By succeeding in these positions, students will take on other leadership positions.

Although students view leadership as positional, it is essential for student affairs administrators to create opportunities for all students to get leadership experiences. Rotating responsibilities in a student organization would be one way that more students have an opportunity to lead. In order for students to build positive self-efficacy, advisors must provide more guidance. One of the common complaints from administrators is they do not have a lot of time to advise students or student organizations effectively. Considering the student growth and development that is documented in the research regarding leadership involvement, student affairs administrators should view advising and guiding students as one of their vital responsibilities.

In addition, the results of this study show the value of working with high school students to begin leadership training at an earlier age. Many colleges and universities have partnerships with local high schools where leadership can be taught and provided for high school students. For example, retreats or first-year programs should be coordinated before classes begin which would provide opportunities for students to gain leadership experiences. Another example could be a leadership conference for high school students coordinated by college and university student organizations.

The results also have implications for high school teachers, counselors, and administrators. Since college student leaders have previous experiences in high school, these administrators also play an essential role in building student leaders. High school students have

stereotypical views of leadership. Many times, students believe leaders are born, not made and thus believe they do not have the capacity to be a leader. It is crucial for school counselors and administrators to provide leadership training, education, and opportunities to educate students that leadership can be learned. For example, a leadership program such as the "All Student are Leaders" program through the University of Pittsburgh's Maximizing Adolescent Potentials Program (Fertman & Long, 1990) would be beneficial. They target high school students who are not involved in leadership positions and teach them leadership skills and provide opportunities to practice those skills. More programs should be built for high school students in order to increase their potential for leadership involvement.

It is essential that school counselors and administrators build successful leadership experiences for students in order to develop students' leadership efficacy. If students initially fail as a leader, they are not likely to take on additional leadership responsibilities because they will believe they are not capable. Another way to build leadership efficacy in high school is for school counselors and administrators to provide realistic feedback to students and allow students to reflect on their effectiveness while in a leadership role.

Current literature demonstrates the barriers that affect females regarding leadership involvement. Lack of opportunities and lack of mentors are two critical areas that need to be addressed. This study showed that previous leadership experience is especially essential for females since it is a stronger predictor compared to males. Student affairs administrators must build leadership programs and opportunities for females to encourage their involvement and growth in leadership experiences. As an example, leadership programs designed specifically for females can address the issues they will face in a leadership role. These include the barriers that are discussed in the literature such as the stereotype for leaders and the balance between career

and family. Leadership effectiveness is the same for males and females, but a lack of opportunities exist for females so previous experience is crucial.

Females lead through a collective process so mentors will play a very important role of their leadership development. Another suggestion should be a mentor program for female students with female administrators or faculty on campus since females need more role models. Role models are an important part of students' leadership development by not only encouraging their involvement but also by serving as mentors and guides to sustain their involvement (Casper, 2004).

Although they were not significant, extraversion was the next strongest predictor for both males and females. Being introverted does not predict leadership involvement, which indicates that introverts and extraverts both hold leadership positions. However, the perception that leaders are sociable is demonstrated in the results of this study. First, it is important to educate students the difference between introversion and extraversion and that although introverts may not be as sociable, they can serve as leaders. Second, student affairs administrators should build leadership skills for introverted students such as public speaking and interpersonal skills. This could enhance their opportunity to get into a leadership position since students view leaders as outgoing and sociable. This information should be discussed as part of an orientation program when talking about student involvement on campus. Further training should be provided for all students interested in building their leadership skills.

## Recommendations for Future Research

While this study adds to the literature, future researchers should take these findings and conduct additional research on student leadership involvement. A factor analysis of the *Lloyd Leadership Instrument* should be done in order to improve the instrument and its reliability.

Although the instrument proved reliable, the correlations among the independent variables indicate an overlap in the scales. Self-efficacy and self-confidence are highly correlated with one another and could possibly be combined into one scale. Conducting a factor analysis will improve the *Lloyd Leadership Instrument*.

The current study collected data from participants who were involved in student organizations. Additional research should be conducted to compare peer influence, self-confidence, self-efficacy, role model influence and support, and extraversion with students who are not involved in student organizations. Is there a difference so that student affairs administrators can provide better training in order to get them involved in leadership positions?

Another consideration is leadership positions outside of student organizations such as community or non-profit agencies. According to some research (Felsheim, 2001; Ouellette, 1998), students are involved in extracurricular activities because of their peers. Are there differences between characteristics and influences for student leaders involved in community agencies compared to student leaders in organizations?

Since other characteristics explain students who hold leadership positions, future researchers should identify these characteristics. This relates to the concept of trait theory in that there are certain characteristics that define leaders. The difference from the previous trait theory approach is that anyone interested could develop these skills in order to become a leader rather than an inherited trait. The relationship between these new characteristics and the number of leadership positions held should be explored as well in order to predict student leadership involvement.

Although the current study required students to be in a leadership positions for at least 4 months, it did not explore the relationship between length of time in a leadership position and the

characteristics needed for this level of commitment. Astin's (1999) research shows students who put in more of an effort gain more from their experiences. What characteristics contribute to this level of commitment? Additional research should be conducted to explore this relationship.

The current study looked at the characteristic differences between males and females and the number of leadership positions held. Research by Littleton (2002) and Armino, Carter, et al. (2000) discussed the importance of role models and family members for students of color in leadership positions. Further research could be conducted to explore the differences in characteristics and influences for different ethnic groups and the number of leadership positions held in order to increase leadership involvement from students of color.

Dialogue among leadership educators exist regarding experiential leadership training versus formal leadership education. Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, and Burkhardt (1991) found students who were involved in leadership education and training programs had increased leadership skills compared to students who were not involved. A final suggestion for additional research could examine the differences between students who participate in leadership classes and how that impacts leadership positions held compared to those who do not have any formal training. Does increased leadership skills impact the number of leadership positions held? A study should be conducted by providing students an experiential leadership opportunity and comparing the number of leadership positions held to another group of students who enroll in a leadership course.

## Chapter Summary

Students involved in leadership positions benefit from their experiences. Some of these include growth in social adjustment, matriculation, cognitive development, interpersonal development, and improved communication skills (Littleton, 2002; Pascarella & Terenzini,

2005; Romano, 1996). This study identified the influences and characteristics that impact students who take on leadership positions. Self-efficacy, defined as previous experience, was the single most important characteristic for students in leadership position. Students who had leadership positions in college had previous leadership experiences in high school. The results demonstrate the importance of building leaders at a younger age. Leadership scholars suggest that everyone can be a leader (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998) but first the opportunity for everyone to lead must be available. Student affairs administrators must communicate the benefits of being involved in leadership positions and then encourage students who may not take advantage of this opportunity to get involved.

# REFERENCES

Arminio, J. L., Carter, S., Jones, S. E., Kruger, K., Lucas, N., Washington, J., Young, N., & Scott, A. (2000). Leadership experiences of students of color. *NASPA Journal, 37*(3), 496-510.

Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297-307.

Astin, A. W. (1993a). An empirical typology of college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*(1), 36-46.

Astin. A. (1993b). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, *40*(5), 518-529.

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., & Associates (2001). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change.* Battle creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In. V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, (pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1997a). Self-efficacy. *Harvard Mental Health Letter*, *13*(9), 4-7.

Bandura, A. (1997b). *Self-efficacy: Exercise of control*. NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bauer, K. W., & Liang, Q. (2003). The effect of personality and precollege characteristics on first-year activities and academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development*, *44*(3), 277-290.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (1992). Cocurricular influences on college students' intellectual development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*(3), 203-213.

Beeny, C. K. (2003). *Perceptions of learning in the co-curriculum: A study of expectations and involvement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.

Boatwright, K. J., & Egidio, R. K. (2003). Psychological predictors of college women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of College Student Development*, *44*(5), 653-669.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organization* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Caruso, R. (1981). Rationale. In D. Roberts, *Student leadership programs in higher education*, (pp. 7-15). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Casper, J. O. (2004). Learning by design. *Concepts & Connections*, *12*(3), 9-11.

Chemers, M. M., Watson, C. B., & May, S. T. (2000). Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(8), 1057-1068.

Chemers, M. M. (1994). Leadership. In. V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, (pp. 45-56). New York: Academic Press.

Christiansen, N. D., Burns, G. N., & Montgomery, G. E. (2005). Reconsidering forced-choice item formats for applicant personality assessment. *Human Performance, 18*(3), 267-307.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155-159.

Cooper, D. L., Healy, M. A., & Simpson, J. (1994). Student development through involvement: Specific changes over time. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*(2), 98-102.

Cooperative Institutional Research Program. (n.d.). Retrieved March 14, 2005 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.html

Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C.(1991). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities, *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 15-27

Daft, R. L. (2002). *The leadership experience* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.

Evans, N., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Felshiem, M. J. (2001). *Pathways to success: How university students become student leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fertman, C. I., & Long, J. A. (1990). All students are leaders. *School Counselor, 37*(5), 391-397.

Fitch, R. T. (1991). The interpersonal values of students at differing levels of extracurricular involvement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*(1), 24-30.

Gatsonis, C., & Sampson, A. R. (1989). Multiple correlations: Exact power and sample size calculations. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*(3), 516-524.

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Guy, R. F., & Norvell, M. (1977). The neutral point of a Likert scale. *The Journal of Psychology, 95*(2), 199-204.

Hartman, S. J., & Harris, O. J. (1992). The role of parental influence on leadership. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*(2), 153-167.

Holzweiss, K. (2004). *Leadership survey: March 2004*. (Texas A&M Student Life Studies). Retrieved on October 12, 2005 from http://studentlifestudies.tamu.edu/8.asp

Huang, Y., & Change, S. (2004). Academic and cocurricular involvement: Their relationship and the best combinations for student growth. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 391-406.

Huck, S. W. (2004). *Reading statistics and research* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Pearson Education Inc.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1999). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience* (3rd ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Holland, J. L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing Company.

Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Judge, T. A., Ilies, R., Bono, J. E., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *8*(4), 765-780.

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kezar, A. & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 55-69.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, *5*(2), 48-60.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., McMahon, T. R. (1998). *Exploring leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Komives, S. R., Casper, J. O., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F., & Osteen, L. (2004). Leadership identity development. *Concepts & Connections*, *12*(3), 3-4.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., Andreas, R. E., Lyons, J. W., Strange, C. C., Krehbiel, L. E., & MacKay, K. A. (1991). *Involving colleges*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.

Kuh, G. D., Douglas, K. B., Lund, J. P., & Ramin-Gyurnek, J. (1994). *Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8. Washington, DC: The Georgia Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *Journal of Higher Education*, *66*(2), 123-155.

Kuh, G. D., Hu, S., & Vesper, N. (2000). "They shall be known by what they do": An activities-based typology of college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(2), 228-244.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Littleton, R. A. (2002). Campus involvement among African American students at small, predominately white colleges. *College Student Affairs Journal, 21*(2), 53-67.

Lloyd, J. M. (2004). *The perceptions of the purpose and assessment process of leadership development programs*. Unpublished manuscript, the University of Georgia.

McCauley, M. H. (1990). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and leadership. In K.E. Clark and M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership,* (pp. 281-295). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

McCormick, M. J., Tanguma, J., & Lopez-Forment, A. S. (2002). Extending self-efficacy theory to leadership: A review and empirical test. *Journal of Leadership Education, 1*(2), 1-15.

McCormick, M., Tanguma, J., & Sohn Lopez-Forment, A., (2003, Spring). Gender differences in beliefs about leadership capabilities: Exploring the glass ceiling phenomenon with self-efficacy theory. *Leadership Review*, Article 2. Retrieved April 15, 2005 from http://www.leadershipreview.org/2003spring/article2_spring_2003.asp

Myers, I. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ouellette, M. (1998). *Characteristics, experiences, and behavior of university student leaders*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Alberta, Canada.

Pace, C. R. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences: An account of the development and use of the college student experiences questionnaire*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education.

Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*. Retrieved April 1, 2005, from http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Roberts, D. & Ullom, C. (1990). *Student leadership program model*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership programs.

Romano, C. R. (1996). A qualitative study of women student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(6), 676-683.

Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Ruderman, M. N. (2004). Leadership development across gender. In C. D. McCauley and E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*, (pp. 271-303). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Saklofske, D. H., & Eysenck, H. J. (1994). Extraversion-introversion. In. V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, (pp. 321-332). New York: Academic Press.

Schneider, B., Paul, M. C., White, S. S., & Holcombe, K. M. (2000). Understanding high school student leaders, I: Predicting teacher ratings of leader behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(4), 609-636.

Schuh, J. T., & Upcraft, M. L. (2001). *Assessment practice in student affairs: An applications manual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, M. K., Axtman, K. M., & Freeman, F. H. (1998). *Leadership education source book* (7th ed.). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership

Shertzer, J. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal, 42(1),* 111-131.

Sohn, M. M. (2003). *High school students' perceptions regarding learning leadership behaviors through participation in extra-curricular activities*. Unpublished dissertation, University of South Florida.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Student Activities Office (2005). Directory of clubs and organizations. Retrieved November 2005 from http://www.uga.edu/stuact/programs/studentOrg/0506NOVEMBERDIR-3.pdf

Swatez, M. J. (1995). Preparing leadership students to lead. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 2*(2), 73-82.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Retrieved May 5, 2005, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classification

Tomlinson-Clarke, S., & Clarke, D. (1994). Predicting social adjustment and academic achievement for college women with and without precollege leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(2), 120-124.

APPENDIX A

# Lloyd Leadership Instrument

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

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). Mark the box 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.

| **Statement** | **SDA** | **D** | **SD** | **SA** | **A** | **SAA** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I was involved in extracurricular activities in high school. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I attempted to take on leadership positions in high school. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| It is natural for me to take on leadership positions in college since I had been involved in high school. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I have leadership abilities. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

| Statement | SDA | D | SD | SA | A | SAA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I had successful experiences while serving in leadership positions. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I attempt to take on leadership positions in college. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am energetic. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am sociable. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I get energized from being around people. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Leaders are extroverted. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I like to talk with people. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I enjoy group discussions. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Spending time with friends was an important aspect for me being involved in extracurricular activities in high school. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am popular. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| One reason I got involved in extracurricular activities was to meet people. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I spend hours socializing with my friends. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I trust other student leaders. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Positive recognition by my peers influenced me to take on leadership positions. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| My friends have held leadership positions. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I associate with friends who have similar interests. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I initially got involved in high school because someone took the time to contact me and made me feel welcome. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| In high school, I had an adult role model who encouraged me to get involved in leadership positions. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

| Statement | SDA | D | SD | SA | A | SAA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In high school, I received support from an adult role model for my leadership involvement. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| In high school, an adult role model influenced me to get involved in extracurricular activities. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I received a great deal of support throughout my leadership experiences. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I was encouraged by others telling me I did a great job while in a leadership position. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| My parent(s) or guardian were active in the community. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| My parent(s) or guardian are important role models for me. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am self confident. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am confident in being a leader. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Others perceive me as being self confident. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Others have confidence in my abilities as a leader. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am comfortable with who I am. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I gain self confidence through taking on more Leadership positions. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am capable in making decisions while in a leadership position. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am capable of gaining others' trust while in a leadership position. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I am even tempered while in a leadership position. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| I know I can rely on my skills while in a leadership position. | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

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

**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 write the number of leadership positions you held in college (even those held at previous institutions) for each of the areas**:

____ In student organizations
Student organization is an officially registered organization at this institution.

____ In community agencies
Community agencies are non-profit organizations **not affiliated** with any student organization at this institution (including religious organizations)

**Number of semesters, including the current one, that you have been enrolled full-time (current and previous institutions)**

**_____**

**Current College GPA**: _____

**Sex**: ____ Male ____ Female

**Ethnicity**: Please select all that apply

____ Black or African American
____ Asian
____ White/Caucasian
____ American Indian or Alaska Native
____ Hispanic/Latino
____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

# APPENDIX B

## Informed Consent

I agree to take part in a research study titled "Predicting leadership: Characteristics associated with student leadership," which is being conducted by Jan Lloyd from the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia. The research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, who may be reached at merrily@coe.uga.edu.

I do not have to take part in this study. I can stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have information related to me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed. I understand that participating in this project could result in research that might be published.

**Purpose**
The purpose of this study is to examine the following independent variables 1) peer influence, 2) self-confidence, 3) self-efficacy through previous experience, 4) role model influence and support, and 5) personality and determine if they will predict leadership positions.

**Benefits**
While there are no direct benefits to me individually, I understand that $100 cashier's check will be given to the organization will the highest percentage of participation. If more than one organization is eligible for the prize, I understand that the winner will be randomly selected. The winning organization will be selected by May 13, 2006.

**Procedures**

If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:

1. I will read and sign this consent form. (Be sure to ask any questions if you have any.)
2. I will complete a short questionnaire called the Lloyd Leadership Instrument that will be disseminated at an organizational meeting that I attend. This will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.
3. I understand that I may elect not to answer any question on the instrument without having to explain why.
4. In order to assure that my responses are kept confidential, my name will not be placed anywhere in the data.

**Discomfort/Risks**
No discomforts or stresses are expected. No risks are expected to any participant. Participation will be confidential by assigning codes to each student organization, which will be used throughout the study. Personal identification information will not be collected. I understand that surveys will be destroyed in May 2007.

**Further Questions**
I understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time should I become uncomfortable. The researchers will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: 706-543-7610.

---

My signature below indicates that the researchers have answered all of my questions to my satisfaction and that I consent to volunteer for this study. I will be given a copy of this form.

Signature of Participant: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Researcher: _____ Date: _____

Name of Researchers: Jan Lloyd Telephone: (706) 543-7610
Email: janlloyd@uga.edu

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D. Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

# APPENDIX C

I am a doctoral student in Student Affairs Administration at the University of Georgia. «Club_name» has been randomly selected to participate in a research study. As the contact person for the organization, I am writing to ask you for «Club_name» to participate in a study examining student leadership positions. Specifically, I am interested in examining the number of leadership positions sophomore, junior and senior students hold based on five factors including self-confidence, self-efficacy, extraversion, peer influence, and role model influence. As an incentive, the student organization with the highest percentage of participation will be given a $100 cashier's check for their organization.

If you agree to participate, I will arrange with you a convenient time for me to attend one of your organizational meetings to disseminate consent forms and a survey to the members in your organization. It will take approximately 15- 20 minutes to complete the survey. If available, I would like to attend a meeting this fall semester before break or we can arrange a time for the beginning of the spring semester.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and the responses of all of your members who participate will be kept confidential. Surveys will be coded with a specific number to represent each organization participating in the study to determine the highest percentage of participation. Information from individual surveys will not be available nor will information about your specific organization to protect the privacy of the participants.

I appreciate your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (706) 543-7610, or by email at janlloyd@uga.edu.