

ABSTRACT

Title of Document:

EDUCATING FOR CHANGE: HOW
LEADERSHIP EDUCATION AND
TRAINING AFFECT STUDENT
ACTIVISM IN LESBIAN, GAY, AND
BISEXUAL UNDERGRADUATES

Craig S. Leets Jr., Master of Arts, 2011

Directed by:

Dr. Susan R. Komives, Professor,
Department of Counseling and Personnel
Services

This thesis explored the extent to which leadership education and training experiences predicted student activism in lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate students. The impact of these experiences were compared to the impact of participants' involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations to identify the additional ways that leadership education and training can supplement a student's organizational participation in encouraging student activism for this student population. Data from 2,681 students who identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership were used for this study. A single hypothesis was tested using the College Impacts model as the conceptual framework, and multiple regression was the chosen statistical method.

The model established for this study explained 51.3% of the observed variance in student activism with demographic variables, pre-college experiences, organizational participation, and leadership education and training experiences serving as positive predictors.

EDUCATING FOR CHANGE: HOW LEADERSHIP EDUCATION AND TRAINING
AFFECT STUDENT ACTIVISM IN LESBIAN, GAY, AND BISEXUAL
UNDERGRADUATES

By

Craig S. Leets Jr.

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2011

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Susan R. Komives, Professor, Chair

Dr. Connie North, Assistant Professor

Dr. James McShay, Affiliate Assistant Professor

© Copyright by
Craig S. Leets Jr.
2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the two faculty members who served on my committee. Without the guidance, thoughtful feedback, and challenging questions from Dr. Connie North and Dr. James McShay, I would not have been able to produce this quality scholarly work. I greatly appreciate their support throughout this process that has allowed me to become a better student, scholar, and researcher.

Second, I would like to thank my writing partners. Without the moral, emotional, physical, and psychological support from Stephanie Chang, Douglas Lee, and Jacqueline Mac, I do not know that I would have been able to finish this process. Thank you for the Starbucks trips, the long nights of writing, and the weekly thesis parties.

Next, I would like to thank Matthew Johnson, my statistics consultant. Matthew took the time to help me learn the statistical method I used in this project and walked me through the process of running a multiple regression with the statistics software. I would not have been able to finish this project without his help, which I appreciate more than he knows.

Additionally, I would like to thank my family for supporting me through this process and understanding the missed phone calls, the weeks without a return call, and the complaining. I appreciate their willingness to put up with me throughout this process, and I cannot thank them enough for always being there to help me complete this project.

Finally, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Susan Komives. More than any other person, she was there to motivate, guide, and coach me through this process. Since our very first conversation in March 2009, she has been there to ensure that I finished this project, and I cannot thank her enough for all that she has done for me.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Student Activism.....	3
Theoretical Frame of the Study.....	5
Kolb’s Model of Experiential Learning.....	6
Astin’s Involvement Theory.....	7
Problem Statement, Purpose, and Research Question.....	8
Problem Statement.....	8
Purpose.....	10
Research Question.....	10
Definition of Key Terms.....	10
Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Undergraduate Students.....	10
Student Activism.....	13
Student Involvement.....	14
Leadership.....	14
Leadership Education and Training.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	16
Design of the Study.....	17
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	18
Kolb’s Model of Experiential Learning.....	18
Characteristics of Experiential Learning.....	19
Cycle of Experiential Learning.....	22
Research on Kolb’s Model.....	24
Relevance of Kolb’s Model of Experiential Learning to this Study.....	25
College Student Activism.....	26
Student Activism in the 1960s.....	27
Civil Rights.....	27
Institutional Representation and Acknowledgement.....	28
Anti-War Movement.....	28
Student Activism from the 1970s to the 1990s.....	29
General Characteristics of Post-Sixties Activism.....	29
The Anti-Apartheid Movement.....	30
Student Activism in the 1990s.....	31
Identity Politics and Multiculturalism.....	31
Techniques of 1990s Student Activists.....	32
Student Activism After the 1990s.....	33
Motivators of Activism in the 2000s.....	33
Technology and Student Activism.....	34
Developmental Aspects of Student Activism.....	36
Student Activism and Student Development Theories.....	37
Learning Outcomes of Student Activism.....	38
Summary.....	39

Leadership Education and Training in Higher Education.....	39
Importance of Leadership Development in Higher Education	40
Leadership Education and Leadership Training	41
A Definition of Leadership Education.....	42
A Definition of Leadership Training	43
Differences Between Leadership Education and Leadership Training.....	44
Leadership Education Curricula	45
Examples of Leadership Training Programs.....	47
Effective Leadership Education and Training Experiences.....	48
Summary	49
Student Involvement and Leadership in Co-curricular Organizations	50
Astin’s Theory of Student Involvement.....	50
Definition of involvement.....	50
Postulates of Astin’s theory	51
Areas on campus for involvement	52
Involvement in Co-Curricular Organizations.	53
Leadership in Co-Curricular Organizations.....	54
Social Identities and Leadership Involvement.....	56
Gender.....	56
Race/Ethnicity.....	57
Socioeconomic Status	58
Intersectionality.....	58
Summary	60
Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Leadership	60
Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Theories	60
Comparing Cass’s and D’Augelli’s models of LGB identity development	62
Fassinger’s Inclusive Model of Sexual Minority Identity Formation.....	62
Using Existing Models to Understand Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Leaders.....	63
An Original Model of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Leadership	67
Conclusion	70
Summary of the Literature	70
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGIES AND METHODS.....	71
Purpose of the Study	71
Research Question and Hypothesis.....	71
Methodological Design.....	72
Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership.....	72
Astin’s College Impacts Model	73
Sampling	74
Measures	75
Social Change Behaviors Scale	75
Reliability.....	76
Leadership Education and Training Items	77
Involvement Measures	79
Demographic Variables	80
Race.....	80
Gender.....	81

Socioeconomic Status	81
Pretest Item	82
Data Analysis	83
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS.....	87
Sample Characteristics.....	87
Sample Demographics.....	88
Regression Analysis.....	93
Hypothesis.....	98
Conclusion.....	99
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	100
Summary of the Findings.....	100
Demographic and Descriptive Findings.....	100
Multiple Regression Analysis.....	105
Inputs.....	106
Environments.....	111
Hypothesis.....	114
Limitations.....	115
Implications for Practice.....	117
Recommendations for Future Research.....	122
Positionality of the Researcher.....	126
Conclusion.....	129
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Social Change Behaviors Scale (Question 14 on MSL).....	76
Table 2 – Leadership Education and Training Items (Question 19 on MSL).....	78
Table 3 – Involvement in Co-Curricular Activities (Question 15 on MSL).....	79
Table 4 – Race (Question 33a on MSL).....	80
Table 5 – Socioeconomic Status (Questions 38 and 39 on MSL).....	81
Table 6 – Pretest for Social Change Behaviors (Question 10 on MSL).....	83
Table 7 – Blocks and Coding for the Multiple Regression Analysis.....	86
Table 8 – Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	89
Table 9 – Means and Standard Deviations for Social Change Behaviors.....	90
Table 10 – Means and Standard Deviations for Environments Variables.....	92
Table 11 – Model Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Dependent Variable...	93
Table 12 – Predictors of Social Change Behaviors.....	96

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) individuals in the United States face legal, physical, emotional, and interpersonal consequences for having minority sexual orientations. In *The 2010 State of Higher Education for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People* report, Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, and Frazer (2010) share that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ) respondents were more likely to experience harassment than their heterosexual peers based on their sexual orientation. Additionally, “LGBQ respondents were twice as likely to be targets of derogatory remarks, stared at, and singled out as ‘resident authority’ regarding LGBT [(lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender)] issues due to their identity when compared to their heterosexual counterparts” (Rankin et al., p. 10). Although these statistics represent the experiences of college and university students, staff, and faculty, they help illuminate the negative ramifications of identifying as a sexual minority in this country.

Another clear example of these negative ramifications is the lack of federal protections for LGBT people. Members of national organizations for LGBT rights, such as the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) and the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), used the 2008 presidential election to bring legislative issues concerning LGBT rights to the forefront of political campaigns. For example, the NGLTF created a document that reviewed candidates’ positions on eight issues that affected LGBT people in this country. These issues included a transgender-inclusive Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, the repeal of the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell (DADT) policy, transgender-inclusive hate crimes laws, domestic partnerships and civil unions, same-sex marriages, same-sex adoption rights, and

opposition to a federal marriage amendment (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Action Fund, 2008). These issues were important in this election because they connect to legislation that could occur on the national level to positively impact the health, employment, emotional well-being, and safety of LGBT people. However, two years after the 2008 election, only two have been addressed on the federal level: transgender inclusive hate crimes laws and the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell legislation.

Because there are many federal rights for which LGBT people continue to fight, the media has highlighted various forms of activism to display the work that is being done to achieve rights for this community. Two large-scale marches on Washington, DC, the National Equality March (Bond, 2009) and the One Nation Working Together March (Thompson, 2010), occurred in the past two years to garner national attention for the struggle for LGBT rights. Additionally, many grassroots organizations worked to collect votes for LGBT-friendly candidates in the 2010 mid-term elections, such as One Colorado (Tomasic, 2010) and Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) (Myers, 2010). These two marches and the campaigning for LGBT-friendly politicians are examples of the work being done by activists to achieve positive change for sexual minorities.

Throughout the history of the United States, college students have engaged in activism to address social issues that are occurring both on- and off-campus. Students were present at both of the marches that were previously mentioned, and it is likely that college student volunteers worked with the organizations that were attempting to collect votes for LGBT-friendly candidates. Since LGBT people are still fighting for equal rights and protections, and college students engage in activism, it follows that LGBT

college students should be involved in the campaign for equal rights and protections for LGBT people. The following study will analyze how leadership education and training experiences during a student's undergraduate career may account for that student's inclination to engage in activism.

The remainder of this chapter will provide the background and justification for this study. First, an introduction to the dependent variable, student activism, will be presented. Following, the theoretical frame of the study will be introduced before the problem statement, purpose, and research question are reviewed. Finally, key terms will be defined and the significance of this study will be presented.

Student Activism

Activism has been an essential component in the fight for positive social change throughout history, which can be seen with examples such as the Women's Suffrage Movement and the Civil Rights Movement. Historically, college and university students have been a considerable force in the struggle to improve society for specific groups of people (Cartwright, 1995). For example, in the 1850s, students at several universities were active in the campaign to end slavery and created abolitionist student organizations to express their opposition to the institution of slavery in the United States. In addition to voicing their disdain for slavery, some students took more active measures, such as those at the University of Michigan who helped runaway slaves escape to Canada (Cartwright).

Scholars use student activism in the 1960s as a referent point for the activism that came before this decade and the activism that has occurred beyond this point in history (Altbach, 1989; Altbach & Cohen, 1990; Cartwright, 1995; Duncan & Stewart, 1995; Thelin, 2003). Altbach and Cohen (1990) explained that "the sixties, of course, saw the

flowering of American student political activism. The American university was in turmoil, and students, for the first time since the 1930s, played on a national political stage” (p. 32). The major concerns of students in the 1960s were the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War (Altbach, 1989). These events, occurring outside of the university, provided the impetus for nation-wide student activism (Thelin, 2003). During this decade, college and university students brought their concerns about war and the treatment of people of color to national attention, which helped achieve social progress for civil rights and anti-war sentiments.

The activism that occurred in the 1990s serves as an additional example of progressive student activism. Campus activism in the 1990s revolved around concerns of diversity. These concerns focused on the problematic ways that members of diverse populations were being marginalized, silenced, or ignored on college and university campuses. Student activism in this decade addressed women’s empowerment, ethnic and cultural studies programs, LGBT rights, racial issues, and financial aid for underrepresented populations, among other societal issues (Loeb, 1994; Rhoads, 1998b).

In these three periods of time, student activism was a crucial element in advancing the status of certain social identity groups in the United States. Students used their time and energy to express their concern for the current social conditions and to engage in intentional action to advocate for the progress they saw possible in this country. This intentional action included activism in a variety of formats, including community service, petitions, boycotting, and civil disobedience, in addition to protests.

In the early 21st century, diversity and multicultural issues continue to be the main focus of student activists on college and university campuses in the United States (Biddix,

2010; Kezar, 2010; Ropers-Huilman, Carwile, & Barnett, 2005). Students are engaging in activism to create better situations for underrepresented populations both on and off campus. Technology facilitates student activism in the 2000s, and students are using everything from email to text messaging to Facebook to be able to advocate for their causes (Biddix).

Currently, as described above, LGBT people face marginalization for existing within a society that values heterosexuality above other sexual identities. Although activism has occurred for LGBT rights in the past, there continues to be a lack of rights and protections by federal law for this portion of the United States population. As such, continued activism is needed to sustain the struggle for equal rights and protections for LGBT individuals in the United States.

Because college student activism has been an essential component of several social movements of the past, activism from present day college and university students could be instrumental in continuing the fight for LGBT rights in the United States. Using leadership education and training contexts in higher education, administrators could promote college and university student activism in the LGBT rights movement. More specifically, this leadership development could be used as a means to empower and encourage LGBT college students to advocate for themselves and engage in activism to achieve equal rights and protections from the United States government.

Theoretical Frame of the Study

Kolb's (1984) Model of Experiential Learning and Astin's (1984) Theory of Student Involvement provided the theoretical frames for this study. These models have practical applications for how student leadership development might be helpful for

increasing student activism in college and university LGB students (The T is intentionally left off of this acronym, which will be explained later in this chapter). Kolb's Model analyzes how learning is increased when cognition is complemented by active engagement in the application of recently collected knowledge while Astin's involvement theory addresses how the amount of energy that a student exerts while participating in an activity affects the resulting advantages or benefits that the student receives from this participation. These two theories provided a basis for understanding how leadership education and training and co-curricular leadership involvement account for student activism in undergraduate populations.

Kolb's Model of Experiential Learning

Kolb (1984) developed his model of experiential learning as a way to address the concerns of individuals who did not see the value of active experience in the learning process of higher education. Based on the works of Dewey, Lewin, and Piaget, Kolb created a model that highlights the value of complementing cognitive learning with experiential engagement to further encourage the process of knowledge acquisition in college and university students. Kolb shares that "learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (p. 38). This definition values experience as an essential component of the learning process.

Kolb (1984) outlines a set of experiential learning characteristics to supplement and substantiate the model. These characteristics include the continuous, holistic, process-oriented nature of experiential learning, the grounding of learning in active experiences, learning as a transaction between a person and his or her environment, and learning as a process of knowledge creation. With these characteristics, he seeks to

emphasize that experience promotes the process of learning through transactional encounters between an individual and the world around him or her (Kolb). As such, learning cannot only occur in classrooms with books but must also occur in active situations where experiences teach new life lessons.

The emphasis that Kolb (1984) places on experience as an essential piece of the learning process supports students' involvement in leadership positions as a means for active learning of what it means to be a leader. However, he acknowledges that experience alone cannot provide all of the knowledge necessary for a well-informed student, and therefore, promotes experience in addition to cognitive knowledge acquisition. Consequently, leadership education, when complemented by leadership experiences, provides a complete, holistic understanding of leadership for college and university students.

Astin's Involvement Theory

In the introduction to his theory, Astin (1984) provides a very short definition of student involvement as "the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 297). This succinct definition communicates Astin's belief that the key component in student involvement is energy, and the extent to which a student expends energy demonstrates the extent to which this student is involved in any given activity. "It is not so much what the individual thinks or feels, but what the individual does, how he or she behaves, that defines and identifies involvement" (Astin, p. 298).

With his theory, Astin (1984) highlights multiple facets of the collegiate experience that pertain to student involvement and the resulting benefits. On campus

employment and residence, academic honors programs, student-faculty interaction, athletic involvement, and positions within student government are relevant factors in student involvement (Astin). Meaning, the extent to which a student devotes energy to the aforementioned activities determines the benefits that are incurred from this participation.

With this theory, Astin (1984) promotes active engagement above all else. He suggests that doing has more benefits than cognition alone. “Perhaps the most important application of the student involvement theory to teaching is that it encourages the instructor to focus less on content and teaching techniques and more on what students are actually doing” (Astin, p. 305).

Using this theory, one can surmise that there would be positive effects for a student who engages in leadership activities during their collegiate experience. Cooper, Healy, and Simpson (1994) support this suggestion with the results of a three-year longitudinal study where they found positive developmental effects for undergraduate students who held leadership positions in student organizations. These positive effects included developing purpose, career and life planning, and life management. As such, this theory provides support for active involvement as an essential piece of the learning process, similar to Kolb’s model.

Problem Statement, Purpose, and Research Question

Problem Statement

Although there have been several empirical studies (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b; Renn, 2007) that focus specifically on student leadership and activism within the LGB population, there continues to be many areas to explore with

regard to leadership within sexual minority populations. Fassinger, Shullman, and Stevenson (2010) explain that “scholarly work on leadership has yet to consider the characteristics that sexual minorities—that is, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals—may bring to the process of leadership” (p. 201). Even with these studies, these characteristics still need to be considered because the three studies focus on LGBT students in the process of leadership, not the qualities that the LGBT students bring to the leadership process. Additionally, these three studies enhance the understanding and perspective of LGBT student leadership, and a large, quantitative study can augment existing research by offering generalizable findings.

One study (Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008) includes an analysis of LGB students with regards to socially responsible leadership, but this study is formatted as a between group analysis, which means that LGB students were compared to non-LGB students. Although this study had a large sample size of 1,700 LGB-identified students, the conclusions drawn from this study state that there was no significant difference between LGB and non-LGB students’ capacities for socially responsible leadership, which provides justification for a study of LGB students to understand LGB student populations without a comparison with heterosexual students.

None of the aforementioned studies specifically address how leadership education and training play a role in LGB student activism. Although these studies address leadership within this population of sexual minority students, they focus on involvement in student organization leadership (Renn & Bildoeau, 2005a; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b; Renn, 2007) and self-reported leadership characteristics (Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008).

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between leadership education and training and student activism in LGB undergraduate students at colleges and universities throughout the United States. In this study, the effect of leadership education and training on LGB students' participation in student activism is compared to the effect of student involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations on this participation in activism. This comparison is made to examine the benefits of leadership education and training relative to involvement and positional leadership in order to determine if education and training should be encouraged, in addition to involvement, for the promotion of student activism in this student population. Student activism is identified through a variety of actions, labeled "social change behaviors," which show a commitment to societal improvement through active participation in a variety of initiatives.

Research Question

With these goals in mind, the following research question has been formulated: To what extent do leadership education and training experiences contribute to student activism above and beyond involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations among lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate students?

Definition of Key Terms

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Undergraduate Students

Sexual minority is term used to describe those individuals who do not identify their sexual orientation as being heterosexual. Sanlo (1998) defines sexual orientation as a term that is "used to describe everything that goes into why people are attracted to each

other” (p. 414). Sanlo’s use of the word “everything” means physical, emotional, and psychological attraction. The label “heterosexual” identifies those people who are only attracted to members of the opposite sex.

Lesbian women, gay men, and bisexual individuals are identified as sexual minorities. In all of the following definitions, attraction includes physical, emotional, and psychological attraction but does not necessarily indicate all three types of attraction. Sanlo (1998) provides definitions for these three sexual orientations in the glossary of her book, *Working With Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender College Students*: lesbian women are women who “are attracted to and love women” (p. 414); gay men are “men who are attracted to and love other men” (p. 413), and; bisexual people are those individuals who are “attracted to and love members of either sex, though not necessarily simultaneously” (p. 414).

The participants selected for this study are sexual minority students. Meaning, these students self-identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. As can be seen above, LGB is used as an acronym to refer to lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. For this study, transgender identified individuals, represented by the T in LGBT, are excluded from the sample because transgender is an identity that refers to an individual’s gender not an individual’s sexual orientation. Sanlo (1998) explains that transgender is “the umbrella term used to include all people who cross gender lines, including transsexuals, cross-dressers, and drag queens” (p. 415). Because transgender labels gender instead of sexual orientation, it is not included in this study of sexual minority students.

Some scholars might suggest that it is problematic to study LGB students as one monolithic group due to gender, racial, age, and many other demographic and individual

differences. Dugan and Yurman (in press) completed a study to determine if it was appropriate to look at LGB students as a composite group in quantitative research designs. The research questions for their study sought to explore any differences in perceptions of campus climate, involvement, and college outcomes. These outcomes included “appreciation of diversity, leadership efficacy, and socially responsible leadership” (Dugan & Yurman, p. 7).

Dugan and Yurman (in press) found that LGB students did not differ in involvement or the college outcome variables. As a result, they suggest that it may be appropriate to examine LGB students as a composite group if a researcher is seeking information about LGB student involvement and outcomes. However, they did find differences in sexual orientation and gender. In their study, lesbian and gay men differed from bisexual individuals in their perceptions of campus climate. These authors identify this difference as a within-group issue that needs further exploration. Additionally, there were differences when considering gender within the LGB sample. Dugan and Yurman suggest “that the gender differences may be less about LGB-within group differences and more about gender differences in the broader college population” (p. 20).

These authors suggest that their “study provides a foundational rationale for the appropriateness of collapsing LGB students into a single category in qualitative analyses” (p. 20). As such, the following study examines LGB undergraduate students as one group that represents the experience of sexual minority students on college and university campuses in the United States.

Student Activism

Defining student activism presents a challenge due to the many and varied definitions of this concept. Additionally, the definition of activism is dependent upon the historical time period within which it is defined. For example, student activism in the 1960s looked very different than student activism in the 1990s because activists in the two time periods focused on different social issues and different strategies were employed to achieve social progress.

Rhoads (1997) adds: “Student activists are difficult to identify outside the context of a particular student struggle” (p. 511). With this comment, Rhoads emphasizes the context-dependent nature of student activism, noting that student activists are motivated by a specific social issue or problem they hope to see addressed. Rhoads continues: “one must identify cases of activism around which to explore the meaning students bring to such struggles” (p. 511). Activism is dependent upon an issue that needs to be resolved, so the definition of activism in different time periods and social contexts may have differing meanings based on the activists’ understanding of their specific struggle.

As a result of the multifaceted nature of defining activism, a broad definition needs to be identified to encompass the various issues and time periods that are associated with this concept. In a study where they aim to identify how an activist identity develops, Corning and Myers (2002) provide the following encompassing definition: “activist orientation is defined as an individual’s developed, relatively stable, yet changeable orientation to engage in various collective, socio-political, problem-solving behaviors spanning a range from low-risk, passive, and institutionalized acts to high-risk, active, and unconventional behaviors” (p. 704). This definition informs the

following study because it provides a broad foundation for analyzing the many different strategies that student activists employ in their campaigns for social change.

Student Involvement

Student involvement is defined using Astin's (1999) definition, mentioned above: "the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 518). This succinct definition provides a broad foundation for discussing how students are impacted by the amount of energy they dedicate to their experiences. For this study, these involvement experiences include participation and positional leadership in various organizations both on- and off-campus.

Leadership

Although there are numerous, subjective definitions of leadership, the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, from which data is used for this study, defines leadership as, "a purposeful, collaborative, values-based process that results in positive social change" (Dugan & Komives, 2007, p. 9). A key piece of this definition of leadership is that it defines leadership as a process, not an attribute that is associated only with a positional role.

Leadership Education and Training

Administrators identify leadership as a general outcome of higher education (Komives, 1996). Consequently, many colleges and universities offer some form of curricular and/or co-curricular leadership development activities in the forms of programs and courses (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). For this study, leadership education is an overarching category that encompasses the curricular leadership development activities that a student engages in during his or her undergraduate experience. Following,

leadership training encompasses those co-curricular leadership development experiences that an undergraduate has during his or her college career.

Rost and Barker (2000) provide definitions for both leadership education and leadership training in an article entitled: “Leadership Education in Colleges: Toward a 21st Century Paradigm.” In this article, these authors suggest new ways to conceptualize leadership education and training in the higher education setting to better prepare students for participation in the current society. The definitions outlined in this article provide conceptual frameworks to inform this study.

Leadership education is defined as the “cognitive exploration of social patterns and moral order that has as its goal an integration of conceptual knowledge, ideals, insights, experiences, and sources of behavior” (Rost & Barker, 2000, p. 9). This definition highlights the cognitive aspect of leadership education to place an intentional focus on the cognitive learning that occurs in education. For this study, leadership education includes participation in a leadership major or minor, enrollment in a leadership course, and participation in an academic leadership certificate program.

Leadership training is the practicing of skills and acquisition of behaviors that are important for leadership. Rost and Barker (2000) define leadership training in the following way:

An activity that converts a capability to an ability through the structuring and practice of a set of behaviors. If leadership is a process of complex interaction and change, training would focus upon those behaviors needed to manage the outputs of the process: namely, the changed or developed social structures, roles, and role expectations. (p. 8)

This definition places an emphasis on practice and skill acquisition, which is typically preferred in training over the cognitive knowledge acquisition promoted in leadership education. For this study, leadership training is identified through participation in conferences, retreats, lectures, workshops, peer education teams, and short-term immersion experiences, among other activities.

Significance of the Study

This study sought to increase the literature that addresses the experience of LGB students in higher education. Dugan and Yurman (2010) suggest that “the degree to which institutions are able to respond to the unique needs of LGB students is hindered by limited research on their broad collegiate experience” (p. 3). This study sought to provide additional information about the LGB student experience in higher education, specifically regarding leadership education and training, co-curricular involvement, and student activism.

Additionally, this study provided additional information about student leadership development on college and university campuses by providing empirical evidence regarding the impact of leadership education and leadership training in higher education. Since significant results were obtained, further support can be garnered for intentional leadership development programs in addition to co-curricular involvement in leadership activities.

Finally, this study attempted to make a connection between leadership education and training and social change behaviors because activism through social change behaviors has a positive effect on social problems, which means that increased leadership

education and training could lead to more positive effects on social problems through increased student activism.

Design of the Study

This study will utilize quantitative research methodologies and an ex post facto non-experimental correlational design. Secondary data analysis will be employed using the results from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership completed in 2009. A multiple regression analysis will be used to determine to what extent leadership education and training experiences are predictive of student activism beyond involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of a review of the literature that is relevant to this study. First, Kolb's Model of Experiential Learning is introduced as the theoretical frame that informs this study. Following, the dependent variable, college student activism, is explored through a review of the relevant literature. Next, the literature on the two independent variables is presented. Leadership education and training in higher education is the first independent variable that is introduced followed by college student involvement. Finally, the unique characteristics of the student population that was studied, lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) students, is explored.

Kolb's Model of Experiential Learning

In 1984, David A. Kolb published his book, *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Drawing on the work of Piaget, Lewin, and Dewey, Kolb aims to provide a theoretical framework that will legitimize and act as a rationale for experiential learning in higher education. Kolb believes that experiential learning theory provides "an approach to education and learning that is soundly based in intellectual traditions of social psychology, philosophy, and cognitive psychology. [This] model pursues a framework for examining and strengthening the critical linkages among education, work, and personal development" (p. 3). Thus, this model is an answer to how leadership education and training and co-curricular leadership involvement can work together to provide greater amounts of individual development over a separation of learning and experience in education.

Characteristics of Experiential Learning

In his book, Kolb (1984) outlines six characteristics of experiential learning. Because other scholars mention these characteristics, Kolb sees them as tenets of experiential learning. These characteristics indicate that learning should be a process that is experiential, holistic, and transactional, reduces conflicts, and aids in creating knowledge (Kolb). The following section will elaborate on these characteristics to provide a foundation for Kolb's model.

The first characteristic of experiential learning is that it is understood as a process, not as an outcome (Kolb, 1984). Because experiential learning theorists believe that ideas are constantly reshaped by experiences, it is antithetical to determine outcomes for learning before the learning process begins. Learning is the process of shaping and reshaping thoughts based on experiences (Kolb). As such, identifying outcomes before learning occurs limits the amount of knowledge an individual may acquire in the learning process.

Second, learning is continuous because an individual is always engaging in new experiences, which influence the knowledge he or she has previously acquired (Kolb, 1984). Kolb explains: "Knowledge is continuously derived from and tested out in the experiences of the learner" (p. 27). An individual receives endless opportunities to question the knowledge he or she already possesses because this person is constantly having new experiences that require consideration of previously held notions of truth. This process allows an individual to modify or dispose of the ideas that do not make sense with the information that is provided by new experiences.

The third characteristic addresses the aspect of learning that resolves conflicts among differing ways of approaching the world (Kolb, 1984). Learning is an inherently conflict-laden process that requires learners to be able to manage the conflicting information that they receive from various sources. Kolb indicates that learners should possess four abilities that compose his cycle of experiential learning: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. However, a learner cannot simultaneously rely on all of these abilities to resolve conflicts because there are contradictions within this group of abilities. Because concrete experience and abstract conceptualization lie at either end of a continuum, one person cannot rely on both at the same time. Similarly, reflective observation and active experimentation lie at either end of another continuum, so these abilities cannot be called upon at the same time (Kolb). Consequently, a learner must position him- or herself somewhere within these two continuums to resolve the conflict that he or she is experiencing at any given time.

Conceiving learning as a holistic process is the fourth characteristic of experiential learning. Kolb (1984) shares: “To learn is not the special province of a single specialized realm of human functioning such as cognition or perception. It involves the integrated functioning of the total organism—thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving” (p. 31). Learning includes both the collection of ideas and information and applying that knowledge through experience. Additionally, Kolb uses this characteristic to support his notion that learning does not only occur in the classroom, but instead, learning occurs at any moment where an individual is collecting new ideas and resolving any conflicts that may arise with preexisting knowledge.

Fifth, Kolb (1984) suggests that learning is a transactional process between an individual and his or her surrounding environment. He shares: “the transactional relationship between the person and the environment is symbolized in the dual meanings of the term *experience* [(emphasis in original)]—one subjective and personal... and the other objective and environmental” (p. 35). Defining learning as transactional, Kolb attempts to identify the complex relationship of the subjective person and the objective environment in each experience that leads to enhanced learning. Learning only within a sterile classroom precludes the important environmental factor, which results in less learning than is ultimately possible.

The final characteristic that Kolb (1984) mentions may seem obvious but is important to note—knowledge is created through the process of learning. He writes: “Knowledge results from the transaction between these objective and subjective experiences in a process called learning” (p. 37). Kolb emphasizes the need to understand learning as a process that involves making sense of fact and opinion to obtain new knowledge.

These characteristics are the main ideas that describe learning as conceptualized by Kolb’s (1984) model. His emphasis of information collection in addition to active experience provides a basis for leadership education and training coupled with involvement in co-curricular activities. Students can use the information they receive in the classroom to make sense of their experiences while their activities provide experience-based knowledge to substantiate the concepts they learn in the leadership classroom.

Cycle of Experiential Learning

Kolb (1984) constructs a four-stage experiential learning cycle to demonstrate how experience enhances the learning process. The four stages in this cycle include concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. These four stages are positioned in the order that they were just mentioned with active experimentation leading back to the concrete experience stage to complete the cycle and represent the feedback processes that were previously mentioned (Kolb). Each stage consists of distinct processes that differentiate it from the previous and following stages. The following section will explain these stages and conclude with an overview of how the stages work together to form the experiential learning cycle.

During the concrete experience stage, learners take an objective approach to new situations where they engage completely with this new experience. Next, in the reflective observation stage, individuals should take this experience and analyze it from a variety of perspectives, asking themselves how this experience fits into preconceived notions (Kolb, 1984). The third stage is abstract conceptualization. In this stage, learners “must be able to create concepts that integrate their observations into logically sound theories” (p. 236). Finally, in the active experimentation stage, these newly developed theories are used in personal decision-making and problem-solving (Kolb). These four stages come together to compose Kolb’s Cycle of Experiential Learning.

Individuals tend to prefer certain stages in this cycle, which indicates a set of traits a learner possesses. Individuals who prefer the concrete experience stage of Kolb’s learning cycle display a certain set of characteristics that are different than learners who favor the other stages. Learners who have an orientation toward this stage fully engage in

the present moment with a personal investment for the outcome of the situation (Kolb, 1984). These learners have a special talent for engaging in interpersonal relationships and preference feeling over thinking in any situation. They are able to make sound decisions based on their intuition, and they excel in unstructured environments (Kolb).

Learners who have an orientation toward the reflective observation stage value truth and understanding over practicality (Kolb, 1984). These individuals work to understand the meaning of situations through observation and objective description, and they are able to appreciate diverse points of view, analyze situations from different perspectives, and use reflective thought to understand the meaning and implications of situations (Kolb).

The learners who prefer the abstract conceptualization stage of Kolb's (1984) cycle promote logic and thinking over reflection and feeling. These learners value scientific approaches over artistic solutions, and they excel with systematic processes and quantitative analyses (Kolb). These learners hold values and talents that exist opposite those learners who prefer concrete experiences.

This final group of learners represents the opposite end of the continuum from the reflective observers. The individuals who orient themselves toward the active experimentation stage work to alter the outcomes of situations and influence others (Kolb, 1984). They prioritize pragmatism over truth in situations and take whatever action is necessary to get the task accomplished (Kolb). The use of the word active in the title of this stage in the cycle indicates these learners' tendency to act in all situations, which often results in action before thought.

Although individual learners may prefer different stages in Kolb's (1984) Cycle, all of the stages are beneficial for every learner because they allow individuals to take their experiences, reflect upon them, and then use them to better understand and react to similar experiences in the future.

This cycle provides a model for connecting leadership education and training experiences to involvement in curricular activities. These activities provide concrete experiences that students can reflect upon to make sense of how these experiences fit in with previous knowledge. This negotiation of new experiences with prior information allows new knowledge to emerge, which can then be used when students encounter new concrete experiences.

Research on Kolb's Model

Since Kolb outlined his four-stage learning cycle in 1971 and published his book about his model of experiential learning in 1984, hundreds of studies have used this theory. Kolb, Boyatzis, and Mainemelis (2001) provide a listing of these studies by academic field, publication, and two time periods they have identified: the early period from 1971-1984 and the recent period from 1985-1999. These authors identify education as the academic field that has completed the most studied in both time periods, with 165 in the early period and 265 in the late period (Kolb, Boyatzis, & Mainemelis). These numbers represent 47% and 41%, respectively, of the total amount of studies that have occurred from 1971 to 1999. Due to the nature of this model in describing the process of learning, it is not surprising that the relative majority of these studies occurred in the field of education.

Kolb, Boyatzis, and Mainemelis (2001) share that the majority of studies in education have focused on topics and settings in higher education. Specifically, these studies use this theory as a tool for improving current teaching methods and practices. For example, one study determined that the majority of students in the sample preferred experiential learning methods over lecture-based instruction (Barber, 2007). Another study used experiential learning to substantiate the effectiveness of different pedagogical approaches, such as lecture, small group work, and exams, in college and university mathematics courses (Di Muro & Terry, 2007). Both of these studies use this theory to determine if students are enjoying and benefitting from classroom learning.

Conversation is a mechanism of experiential learning that has received specific attention from Kolb, Baker, and Jensen (2002) and Baker, Jensen, and Kolb (2005). In their chapter, “Conversation as Experiential Learning,” Kolb, Baker, and Jensen explain: “conversation is a meaning-making process whereby understanding is achieved through interplay of opposites and contradictions” (p. 53). Baker, Jensen, and Kolb, in an article where these authors propose a theoretical model for conversational learning, define this concept as “an experiential process of learners constructing meaning from their collective experiences through conversation—that is, conversation as experiential learning” (p. 413). Both of these definitions frame conversation as a form of experiential learning that allows individuals to construct meaning through discourse with others.

Relevance of Kolb’s Model of Experiential Learning to this Study

The rationale behind using Kolb’s (1984) Model of Experiential Learning for this study is to highlight how learning involves an experiential component that allows an individual to actively synthesize new information into preexisting knowledge. As such,

leadership education and training may increase student activism in undergraduates by complimenting their leadership involvement experiences by adding leadership philosophy and knowledge to their concrete experience of engaging in leadership behaviors and activities.

Leadership education and training can appear in the cycle in two different ways. First, this education and training may provide material for a student in the abstract conceptualization phase that he or she will then use in the following stages of the cycle. Second, education and training might ask a student to recall a concrete experience that he or she has had to then observe and reflect upon before the teacher or facilitator then provides new knowledge. In either case, leadership education and training provide an essential component to Kolb's (1984) model, which supplements the active experiences students are having as they involve themselves in leadership activities.

Kolb's (1984) Model of Experiential Learning emphasizes the notion that experience and learning can work together to provide a greater amount of knowledge acquisition in students. When an individual is able to use new information to evaluate his or her experiences or use prior experiences to substantiate newly learned knowledge, both the learning and the experiences become more meaningful to that student. Kolb's model provides a firm foundation in understanding how leadership education and training in conjunction with leadership involvement experiences may increase student activism in undergraduates.

College Student Activism

Although many people automatically think of the 1960s when student activism is mentioned, students have been advocating for various causes on college and university

campuses since the beginning of higher education in the United States (Cartwright, 1995). However, beginning with the 1960s, students fought for positive social change in many of the same areas that continue to be relevant today, such as civil rights, economic rights, and human rights. As such, continued student activism can be seen on campuses throughout the country today.

The following section will provide a historical overview of student activism from the 1960s through the 1990s before introducing the developmental benefits that students experience as a result of their involvement in campus activism.

Student Activism in the 1960s

When student activism is broached as a topic of conversation, most individuals, within and outside of the field of higher education, immediately think of the student protests that occurred during the 1960s (Cartwright, 1995; Reuben, 1998; Rhoads, 1998a). The 1960s student activism that occurred in the United States has become the quintessential example of what student activism is and what effects it can have on institutions and society. The issues that faced students of the 1960s included civil rights, institutional representation and acknowledgement, and the Vietnam War (Boren, 2001; Reuben, 1998; Rhoads, 1998a; Tischler, 1998). The following section will briefly introduce these issues and provide examples of the ways that students worked to address their concerns with society.

Civil rights. College and university students in the United States were an active part of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Rhoads (1998a) explains: “the activism of the 1960s was in many ways born of student involvement in civil rights demonstrations and out of concern for racial equality” (p. 39). Students were supportive

of the fight for racial equality that was occurring outside of their campus contexts, so they organized to support this movement. The skills that these student activists gained in the early part of the decade as a result of their participation in the struggle for civil rights provided them with helpful tools for the activism that occurred in the later part of the 1960s (Rhoads).

Institutional representation and acknowledgement. Students in the 1960s felt that their interests were not accurately represented by university administration and their complaints were being ignored (Reuben, 1999; Rhoads, 1998a). Students were concerned with restructuring the curriculum to more accurately represent the political and social realities that surrounded them because they felt the current academics were too objective, and in an attempt to pressure administrators, student activists organized free universities, where students were able to attend courses taught by a variety of individuals (professors, community activists, other students) that better represented their experiences outside of the traditional classroom (Reuben). They were also concerned with creating identity-based studies program, such as African American studies, Chicano studies, and women's studies (Rueben; Rhoads). Students protested and pressured administrators until these courses were established.

Anti-War movement. In addition to the Civil Rights Movement, protesting the Vietnam War was another main objective of 1960s student activism. Students were anti-war and promoted peace, so they engaged in various types of protest, such as demonstrating against recruitment efforts on campus (Rhoads, 1998a) and marching to military property to prevent the deployment of newly-trained recruits (Tischler, 1998).

These activities aligned with the Peace Movement that began and gained momentum throughout the 1960s (Rhoads).

The 1960s was a decade of student activism that had not previously occurred with intensity on such wide scale. Activism in this decade occurred on campuses throughout the United States and addressed national issues that were a concern to many college students. The three main themes of this era, discussed above, incited students to be vocal and use their collective power to make an impact on the problems facing society.

Student Activism from the 1970s to the 1990s

Student activism after the 1960s looked very different than the student protests of this decade. The following two decades were relatively quiet and devoid of student activism (Altbach & Cohen, 1990). However, this change is attributed to a number of factors that altered the society outside of the university (Altbach & Cohen, 1989).

General characteristics of post-sixties activism. Altbach and Cohen (1989) outline a set of societal changes that aided in the decrease of student activism after the 1960s. First, the decline of the Vietnam War during the early 1970s removed one of the main themes of previous student activism. In addition, economic crises in the decade following the 1960s lead students to be more concerned about financial security, which caused a decline in their willingness to participate in activism (Altbach & Cohen)

Third, as a result of the economic crises, students began entering in majors, such as business and the sciences, which did not push students toward activism because these disciplines valued individualism and personal reward. Fourth, the activist movement partially deteriorated from within because some students engaged in militant activities, which alienated less passionate, more rational students (Altbach & Cohen, 1989).

Additionally, the media gave increasingly less attention to student activists, and because the media was the vehicle for bringing their causes to a national stage, they quickly lost their audiences. Finally, the political climate of the United States moved rapidly from the liberalist left to the conservative right, so student activist did not receive the same widespread support that they had during the 1960s (Altbach & Cohen, 1989).

All of these characteristics functioned together to create a national climate that was less supportive of and friendly to student activism. Because they were not able to garnish the support that they had previously received from citizens outside of the university, student activists were not able to be as productive as they had been in addressing social issues.

The anti-Apartheid movement. One exception to the lack of student activism following the 1960s is the anti-Apartheid movement that occurred in the mid-1980s. Altbach and Cohen (1990) note: “the anti-apartheid protests in both the United States and South Africa captured the imagination of American undergraduates in spring 1985, sparking the largest student protests since the 1960s” (p. 40). The violence and injustice of this movement in Africa gave American student activists a cause to fight for and a new rigor for social action. Multiple large-scale protests occurred early in 1985 in support of this movement, including a rally outside the South African Embassy in Washington, DC, a three week long protest at Columbia University, and a one-day strike at the University of California at Berkeley (Altbach & Cohen).

One of the main concerns in the American context of this movement that student activists were attempting to address was divestment, a process through which an institution would remove any financial connection to an organization that supported

Apartheid. Altbach and Cohen (1990) explain: “the activists focused most of their attention on pressuring the university and the nation to use their economic leverage... But beyond South Africa itself, the divestment protestors were seeking to send America the message that the political conscience of the campus had not disappeared” (p. 41). With this movement, the student activists sought to use the power of financial support to end the violence occurring in South Africa, and also, they were attempting to show that activism had not completely died on American university campuses. Eventually, after student protest caught the attention of the public beyond the university, administrators agreed to divest in those companies that were supporting the violence in South Africa (Altbach & Cohen, 1990).

Student Activism in the 1990s

After the anti-Apartheid and divestment movement of the 1980s, student activism shifted focus to a new area of concern in the 1990s. In this decade, student protest and other action centered on identity politics and multiculturalism (Rhoads, 1997; Rhoads, 1998). Students in this era advocated for the rights and protections of underrepresented populations in the United States.

Identity politics and multiculturalism. Student activism in this decade centered on struggles around identity politics and multiculturalism. Rhoads (1998) provides an understanding of identity politics: “the efforts of diverse students to forge their own place in campus life through organized demonstrations may also be understood as a form of participatory democracy... [where] students seek to build a truly multicultural society” (p. 623). In this definition, Rhoads alludes to “their own place” as a portion of campus that supports these students in their diverse, underrepresented identities. These politics

include working to have the voice of these students included in the conversations that occur on campus.

Although Rhoads (1997) does not identify a concrete definition for multiculturalism, the events that he chooses to examine in his study belie a certain contextualized notion of this concept. These events include student action against anti-affirmative action and anti-immigration legislation, anti-LGBT policies, aggression toward people of color, and sexist practices on the institutional and governmental levels (Rhoads). These students' concerns indicate a general promotion of policies, practices, and legislation that are inclusive of individuals with a variety of identities. As such, multiculturalism can be understood as an appreciation of multiple, diverse perspectives and advocating for equality and equity for all people.

Techniques of 1990s student activists. Although the techniques of student activism in the 1990s are not exclusively limited to students in this decade, there is some benefit to understanding how students were able to get their message to other students, administrators, and the public outside of the university. These students used techniques from the philosophy of civil disobedience in addition to utilizing the media to spread awareness of their causes. These methods allowed students to make a more powerful statement and communicate this statement to a larger audience than they would have been able to without these techniques.

Students used various forms of civil disobedience to challenge the policies that were continuing to marginalize individuals within and outside of the campus. For example, students at Mills College, an all-female institution, held a two-week strike when administrators shared their decision to begin admitting male students (Rhoads, 1998).

Additionally, LGBT students and their allies held rallies, marches, and teach-ins at The Pennsylvania State University with the goal to have sexual orientation added to the university's non-discrimination policy. The Chicano Studies Movement at the University of California at Los Angeles provides another example, where students participated in sit-ins and hunger strikes to have a Chicano Studies Center established on campus (Rhoads).

The media proved to be extremely helpful for student activists in this era because it allowed them to more quickly communicate their message to a wide audience. The students who were protesting gender integration at Mills College brought their cause to a national audience through their appearances on a television talk show, where they spoke about their school and women's education (Rhoads, 1998). African American students and their allies reached national audiences when they staged a sit-in on the court of a major basketball game at Rutgers University to protest racist comments made by the university's president (Rhoads). In both of these cases, the media played an essential role in spreading the awareness of these events to individuals throughout the United States.

Student Activism after the 1990s

A number of authors have analyzed student activism in the past decade (Biddix, 2010; Kezar, 2010; Ropers-Huilman, Carwile, & Barnett, 2005). Several of these authors have identified the issues that are motivating student activism in this decade (Biddix; Kezar; Ropers-Huilman et al.). Biddix (2010) has identified the ways that technology has been used since 2000 as a tool of student activists. The following section will provide a brief review of these studies.

Motivators of activism in the 2000s. Ropers-Huilman et al. (2005), Kezar (2010), and Biddix (2010) have identified the issues that have motivated student activism

in the past decade. Ropers-Huilman et al. in their study of student activists' perceptions of administrators identified the following motivations for student activists: a women's center, working conditions in Bangladesh, workers' rights, privatization of the campus bookstore, renovations of the student union, and the campus climate for LGBT students. Biddix identified some similar motivations and others that were not previously mentioned: political reform and advocacy, a living wage, Asian American youth rights, and LGBT rights.

Kezar (2010), in a study about faculty and staff members who support student activists, identified the issues that motivated activists at certain institutional types. Kezar found that students at liberal arts colleges engaged in activism around the following issues: creating an environmental studies program, establishing an LGBT center, forming a women's union, starting a campus farm, developing an alumni group for graduates of color, creating a childcare center on campus, and developing opportunities for service learning. At community colleges, Kezar identified the following motivators of student activists: multiculturalism, environmentalism, math reform, and immigration rights. Finally, at universities, Kezar identified multicultural and diversity concerns as the main issues that student activists were attempting to address.

Through these studies, it can be seen that issues surrounding diversity, multiculturalism, social justice, and identity politics continue to motivate students in the 2000s similar to the issues that motivated students in the 1990s.

Technology and student activism. Biddix (2010) provides a study of the ways in which technology was used as a tool by student activists from 2000 until 2008. Through this study, Biddix was able to gain perspective on the different ways that

technology allowed activists to communicate with each other more efficiently and also allowed them to present their campaigns to wider audiences. The following technology tools will be discussed: email, Internet and websites, blogging, cellphones and texting, instant messaging, Facebook, and technology through Google.

Biddix (2010) explains that email was used by student activists as a means to send messages to a large group of people through listservs. Email also provided a means for having debates about relevant topics without every member of the group needing to present in the same space. The Internet and websites were used by student activists to gather and disseminate information to individuals outside of the group (Biddix). These students created websites that included links to other sites to help educate others about their cause. Student activists used blogging to share their thoughts about certain issues and provide updates to constituents who were invested in their campaigns (Biddix).

Cellphones and text messaging allowed student activists to reach other students in an instant (Biddix, 2010). Impromptu meetings could be planned with a short text message that was sent to an entire group, and text messaging also allowed for short updates and reminders. Although instant messaging (IM) was utilized more frequently earlier in the decade, it provided another means of instant communication with students who might be geographically far from each other. For example, some student activists would use IM to connect with students at other campuses to solicit advice in campaigns that were recently completed by students on another campus (Biddix).

Biddix (2010) identifies Facebook as a revolutionary tool for student activists. Facebook groups provided an effective way to inform others about their cause and quickly garner support when students joined the group. The group format also allowed

for new members to invite their friends, which caused exponential growth in the membership of these groups. Biddix mentions that Google technology provided one place for student activists to organize online. Google accounts allow for mass emailing, document sharing and editing, and chatting. Having all of these functions in one web-based tool allowed for efficient and effective communication among student activists.

The technological advances of the past decade has proved to be a major benefit for student activists. Using electronic communication tools, from cellphone to email, students are able to share their causes with increasingly wider audiences to gain the support needed to enact positive change on their campuses, in their communities, and in society.

Developmental Aspects of Student Activism

Multiple authors cite the developmental benefits that students can experience as a result of their participation in activism during their undergraduate careers (Biddix, Somers, & Polman, 2009; Chambers & Phelps, 1993; Corning & Myers, 2002; Hamrick, 1998). Before explaining these developmental characteristics, it will be helpful to revisit two definitions of student activism:

- (1) the active participation of individuals in group behavior for the purpose of creating change—in attitudes, knowledge, behavior, and/or symbols (Chambers & Phelps, p. 20), and;
- (2) an individual's developed, relatively stable, yet changeable orientation to engage in various collective, socio-political, problem-solving behaviors spanning a range from low-risk, passive, and institutionalized acts to high-risk, active, and unconventional behaviors. (Corning & Myers, p. 704)

These two definitions provide two basic characteristics of activism: change and an issue. While the first definition explicitly identifies activism as an intentional act in pursuing change, the second implicitly indicates change through the identification of a problem. In addition, the second definition broadly describes the range of actions in which an activist might engage to address differing social issues while the first definition provides specific examples of things that might need to be changed. The second definition helps clarify that various actions can be defined as activism and broadens the concept of activism to include more than just protests.

The following section will provide a rationale for the ways that student activism can aid in the development of undergraduate students in higher education.

Student activism and student development theories. Chambers and Phelps (1993) explore the connections between student activism and several developmental theories commonly identified as being relevant to students in higher education. First, they note that “student activists are often intensely involved in an educational environment” (p. 25), which would lead to positive benefits according to Astin’s (1984) Involvement Theory. Next, they explain that student activism has implications on cognitive development, such as moral development, because it requires students to make value judgments about the causes they are supporting (Chambers & Phelps). These authors also suggest that activism affects psychosocial development because it requires students to resolve issues and tasks as they progress through their lifespan. Finally, because student activists are affected by the contexts that they exist within and have an effect on the social spheres that they are attempting to improve, person-environment interaction theories are discussed.

This article serves as a helpful introductory piece because it provides a review of how student activism has positive implications upon student development. Because this article indicates other studies that have addressed the connections between activism and these theories, it serves as a helpful bibliography for further exploration of activism as a piece of student development. Chambers and Phelps (1993) conclude: “student activism has been, and will continue to be, an important part of students’ learning experiences, whether through participation or observation” (p. 27).

Learning outcomes of student activism. In addition to development, learning is an outcome of student activism. Biddix, Somers, and Polman (2009) identify a set of learning outcomes that resulted from student activism at Washington University. As a result of the immediate firing of multiple immigrant workers at this campus, student activists organized to establish fair working conditions and employment terms for those individuals who completed contracted work for the university.

These authors identified eight learning outcomes that they believed students achieved as a result of their participation in this campaign. First, students learned how to engage an entire community to come to an agreeable solution to an issue. Second, these activists acquired skills that allowed them to continually substantiate the variety of viewpoints that they were representing (Biddix et al., 2009). Additionally, these students were required to analyze their personal values and develop new values, resulting from their participation in this situation. Another outcome was the students were able to learn how to enact change in the communities around them (Biddix et al.).

Fifth, this campaign resulted in a new feeling of community on campus that had not previously existed. Also, these activists needed to consider their responsibility as one

citizen in relation to their societal obligations (Biddix et al., 2009). Seventh, the students learned what it means to be global citizens by supporting individuals who were not United States citizens. Finally, students learned the power in being able to access information quickly, without cost to them.

These eight outcomes display the possible benefits for students engaging in activism on their campuses. Through these campaigns, students are able to learn more about themselves, more about society, and more about their role in relation to the society that surrounds them.

Summary

This section provided a review of student activism in past decades and the developmental benefits that students incur as a result of their participation in activism. With current societal problems, student activism will continue to be important in promoting positive social change, which is cited in the following section as an important aspect of leadership. Student activists who promote change are displaying leadership qualities that can be honed through leadership education and training on campus.

Leadership Education and Training in Higher Education

Leadership development occurs in a variety of contexts on college and university campuses. Whether in the classroom, the residence halls, or the student union, administrators provide opportunities for students to develop skills that will allow them to be effective leaders in their future careers and communities. The following section will provide an overview of the initiatives that are taking place on campuses, both academic and co-curricular, to develop undergraduates as leaders and will provide a brief rationale

for why leadership development is an important component of a quality student experience in higher education.

Importance of Leadership Development in Higher Education

Astin and Astin (2000), in their book, *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change*, claim that leadership development is an essential component of the higher education experience. They suggest that effective leadership is necessary to address the problems that currently plague society. As such, they encourage administrators to promote leadership development on their campuses to enhance the undergraduate experience. Astin and Astin believe that leadership development will lead students to feel that they have greater control over their experiences and empower them to make positive social change.

Multiple scholars discuss change as an important component and expected outcome of leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000; Bridgeforth, 2003; Huber, 2002; Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009; Rost & Barker, 2000; Watt, 2003). Astin and Astin describe leadership as a process that should foster change, and specifically within the context of higher education, these authors believe that leadership should foster change to improve the institution in addition to positive change in the larger society. Bridgeforth conceives leadership to be a process that creates change by addressing “any gap between actual and desired states” (p. 11). As such, leaders are responsible for the change that will actualize a vision or goal.

Similar to Astin and Astin (2000), Huber (2002), Komives, Wagner, and Associates (2009), Rost and Barker (2000), and Watt (2003) view leadership as an important vehicle for social change. Huber shares: “leadership is a shared responsibility

for creating a better world in which to live and work which manifests in our passion to engage others in bringing about purposeful change” (p. 26). Komives et al. echo this responsibility through noting that leadership involves committing to making the world a better place through engaging in meaningful change. Likewise, Rost and Barker explain that leadership should serve social and not corporate needs, emphasize community over individual gain, and support the plural and increasingly global trends of society.

Additionally, Watt notes that leaders should be prepared to address the changes that result from a pluralistic society and be able to effectively manage and navigate situations to encourage productive outcomes.

Essentially, these authors emphasize the importance of positive social change that results from quality leaders. Consequently, leadership development programs in higher education should provide students with skills that will allow them to be agents who promote change both within and outside of the institution.

Leadership Education and Leadership Training

Before beginning their discussion of leadership education, multiple authors describe leadership as a set of behaviors that an individual can learn (Bridgeforth, 2005; Huber, 2002; Park, 2005; Watt, 2003; Williams, Townsend, & Linder, 2005). These authors mention that leadership can be taught, which is in contrast to a belief that leadership is an inherent quality that some possess and others do not. Bridgeforth shares that the increasing quantity of leadership development courses and programs provide evidence that leadership can be taught. Similarly, Watt notes that most scholars concede that leadership can be learned. Williams, Townsend, and Linder allude to the ability to teach leadership through their sharing of how leadership abilities can be fostered and

enhanced through classroom settings and educational activities. Similarly, Park suggests the educational activities in the classroom are an opportunity for learning and practicing leadership. Huber connects leadership with lifelong learning to highlight the continued need to learn how to be an effective leader. In some manner, all of these authors speak to the belief that leadership is a set of behaviors and abilities that can be taught to and learned by an individual.

Establishing that leadership can be learned and is not simply the inherent qualities of some individuals provides a foundation for discussing leadership education and training. The following section will provide a definition for each of these concepts before providing sample curriculums and examples of leadership training programs.

A definition of leadership education. Following the information that was presented above, leadership education can be roughly defined as any workshop, course, or program that teaches leadership. Rost and Barker (2000) supply a more precise definition of leadership education: “It is a cognitive exploration of social patterns and moral order that has as its goal an integration of conceptual knowledge, ideals, insight, experiences, and sources of behavior” (p. 9). These authors provide several distinctions that indicate leadership education; namely, the cognitive aspect of leadership education and the goal of integrating conceptual knowledge. Rost and Barker identify that education includes a cognitive aspect in that learning cannot occur without the involvement of thought and cognition. Additionally, these scholars identify the acquisition of knowledge, including information and experiential learning, as an essential component of leadership education.

Roberts (1981) also presents a definition of leadership education. He defines leadership education as any initiative that increases an individual's leadership competence through providing information that is theoretical, generalizable, and based in principles. Although this information may be relevant to an individual's present role, the goal of leadership education is to provide information that will be used in many contexts (Roberts).

A definition of leadership training. Although leadership education and leadership training are very similar and sometimes overlapping concepts, Rost and Barker (2000) identify several minor but key differences that differentiate training from education: training “converts a capability to an ability through the structuring and practice of a set of behaviors. If leadership is a process of complex interaction and change, training would focus upon those behaviors needed to manage the outputs of the process” (p. 8). The two pieces of this definition that clearly set it apart from the definition of leadership education are practice and behaviors. These authors identify that practicing the behaviors that promote effective leadership is the main purpose of leadership training. They suggest that training involves the process of taking previously gained knowledge, a capability, and practicing until this knowledge is integrated into an individual's behavior, which makes it an ability. Consequently, individuals who facilitate leadership trainings should focus on the integration of abilities into students' behavior to allow them to effectively lead in a variety of settings.

Roberts (1981) outlines an additional definition of leadership training. He describes leadership training as an activity that aims to improve performance for specific individuals at a certain point in time (Roberts). Unlike the generalizability of leadership

education, leadership training is bound in context and meant to address needs in present situations.

Differences between leadership education and leadership training. Although it may not be explicitly stated, several authors allude to the differences between leadership education and training (Roberts, 1981; Rost & Barker, 2000; Watt, 2003; Williams, Townsend, & Linder, 2005; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Roberts suggests that training is meant to address present needs while education should be generalizable to many of the situations that leaders will face in their many experiences. Rost and Barker most explicitly state the difference between these two concepts by explaining that training is goal-oriented, focused on skills acquisition, and pragmatic, while education is comprehensive, theoretical, and focused on knowledge acquisition. Watt, in a discussion about an exemplary leadership curriculum, mentions that education should focus on ideas, information, and research, which is a different focus than leadership training. Furthermore, Williams, Townsend, and Linder, in their study to determine how students retain information after taking a leadership course, list a group of theories and competencies that would be too extensive for a leadership training workshop. Finally, Zimmerman and Oster, in their review of a variety of leadership education and training activities in higher education, specifically note leadership courses and leadership majors and minors while the remaining activities place more emphasis on training than education. Although the differences between education and training are important to note, higher education professionals facilitate these activities with similar goal of increasing students' leadership knowledge, effectiveness, and abilities.

Two sources (Roberts, 1981; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2009) divide leadership education, leadership training, and leadership development into three distinct categories. Roberts (1981) developed the TED Model, where TED is an acronym for training, education, and development. As mentioned above, Roberts describes training as a brief activity with the goal to increase skills for a current leadership position which education is more involved and aims to provide information that can be generalized to multiple situations. The third piece of Roberts' model, development, begins with the assumption that learning leadership becomes progressively complex in an ordered sequence of knowledge. Development includes settings where leaders can interact with others to increase effectiveness and productivity (Roberts).

Similarly, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009) separates leadership training, leadership education, and leadership development into three separate categories. This Council defines training as “activities designed to improve individual performance within specific roles;” education as “activities designed to provide improve the overall leadership knowledge of an individual;” and development as “activities and environments that encourage growth and increasing complexity” (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, p. 369). The Council makes distinctions between each of these categories because training, education, and development serve distinct purposes in Student Leadership Programs.

Leadership education curricula. An essential component to any educational venture is the curriculum because it provides a framework, guide, and rationale for the learning experience. As such, leadership educators must make careful and intentional decisions when deciding what to include in their leadership education experiences.

Several authors focus on leadership education curriculum (Bridgeforth, 2003; Watt, 2003; Williams, Townsend, & Linder, 2005). All of these authors discuss what they see as important components of an effective leadership curriculum.

Bridgeforth (2003), after reviewing the curricula for four graduate programs in leadership, suggests fourteen courses that he believes are important for a comprehensive leadership education curriculum. These courses include theories, concepts, and philosophies from a variety of academic disciplines, including management, economics, statistics, psychology, and communication studies. Bridgeforth notes that this curriculum is learner-centered, appeals to different learning styles, and includes an experiential learning component. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009) supports Bridgeforth's suggestion of including an experiential learning component in leadership curricula. The Council instructs leadership educators to include activities that promote active learning, such as retreats, conferences, workshops, and internships (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education).

Similar to Bridgeforth's (2003) curriculum, Watt (2003) suggests a curriculum that provides different ways of learning to maximize the learning that occurs in the leadership classroom. Additionally, this author cites the importance of understanding the concept of leadership in addition to the interdisciplinary theories that inform the field of leadership studies. Watt also emphasizes the importance of setting clear goals and objectives for the leadership curriculum, and after determining these outcomes, developing a means for assessing the extent to which these outcomes are met in through the leadership curriculum.

Unlike the other two authors, Williams, Townsend, and Linder (2005) are testing the effectiveness of a leadership curriculum as opposed to suggesting how to create a quality leadership education program. However, similar to the others, these authors provide a set of leadership theories and concepts that are the components of the curriculum being assessed. The pieces of this curriculum include leadership in teams, motivation, power, consensus, and several leadership theories (Williams, Townsend, & Linder). Studying 74 student leaders in a one campus study, these authors find that that up to three years after taking a leadership course, students display competency in the lessons presented in the leadership curriculum.

Across these three studies, similarities can be seen among leadership curricula. The interdisciplinary nature of leadership curricula is evident. In addition, foundational leadership concepts and theories are presented in all of the curricula reviewed above. Finally, all of these authors promote a diversity of information be presented to provide students with the skills needed for effective leadership in a variety of contexts.

Examples of leadership training programs. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (1999), in an effort to support leadership development programs in higher education, reviewed 31 initiatives to determine the impact of these initiatives on undergraduates' collegiate experiences. As a component of this review, these authors identified the wide variety of leadership development initiatives that were occurring on campuses throughout the country. They identified 22 different types of activities that were employed among the 31 initiatives actually occurred on college campuses and were solely attended by undergraduate students. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt do not provide how many different campuses were represented by the 22 initiatives, but they do mention that these

initiatives were occurring at both public and private universities. Only two leadership education experiences were noted: leadership courses and leadership majors/minors (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt). Several examples of leadership training programs that were reviewed include seminars and workshops, conferences, outdoor education, summer programs, mentors, and guest speakers. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt found that leadership workshops and seminars were the most widely-used training method with 94% of the initiatives including this type of program, while mentors, guest speakers, and community service opportunities followed as the most often used programs. The authors of this study provide a variety of examples of the leadership training programs that are used on campus to provide co-curricular leadership development opportunities for undergraduate students.

Effective Leadership Education and Training Experiences. Although there are a variety of leadership education and training experiences in which an undergraduate might participate, all of these experiences may not have the same benefit for the student. Dugan (in press) sought to determine how different leadership education and training experiences affect a student's capacity for leadership that encourages social change. Using data from a national study of college student leadership, Dugan found that certain experiences were predictive of a student's capacity for socially responsible leadership. These experiences included: leadership conferences, lectures and workshop series, single leadership courses, capstone leadership experiences, peer leadership teams, positional leadership training, service immersion experiences, multicultural leadership programs, and leadership retreats. Based on these results, Dugan suggests greater consideration

when leadership educators design curriculum for the student leadership development experiences that occur on their campuses.

Similar to Dugan, Owen and Komives (2007), using data from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership complete in 2006, determined that not all curricular leadership experiences contribute to leadership outcomes. When analyzing the connection between leadership minors, majors, and certificate programs, Owen and Komives found that students who participated in these curricular leadership experiences had lower scores on leadership outcomes than those students who did not participate in curricular leadership experiences.

These authors suggest two reasons for these lower scores. First, they suggest that curricula that do not focus on leadership for social change would result in lower scores on social change outcomes (Owen & Komives, 2007). Second, Owens & Komives posit that if students who participate in leadership curricular experiences are more informed about the history and theory of leadership, they may be more critical of their own abilities when rating their development toward leadership outcomes.

With these results, Owens and Komives (2007) cite the need for continued exploration of how leadership courses may increase or decrease students' self-perceptions of leadership outcomes and the determination of which leadership curricula are more effective in developing confident student leaders.

Summary. This section provided definitions for leadership training and leadership education while also highlighting the differences between these two formats for student leadership development. Additionally, leadership education curricula were

reviewed before the sections was closed with an overview of leadership education and training experiences. The following section will review student involvement.

Student Involvement and Leadership in Co-curricular Organizations

In their review of the literature on college student involvement, Moore, Lovell, McGann, and Wyrick (1998) share: “when students become involved in their collegiate environment, students develop and learn outside the classroom” (p. 5). With this statement, these authors provide a succinct, parsimonious statement to emphasize the benefit of involvement. Astin’s (1984) Theory of Student Involvement provides a foundation for the research on student involvement that would follow. Involvement theory provides a justification for increasing student involvement to reap greater benefits from the undergraduate experience. The following section will provide a description of Astin’s Theory of Student Involvement and a review of the literature that focuses on the benefits of involvement in organizations and student leadership.

Astin’s Theory of Student Involvement

The following section will provide a review of Astin’s (1984) Theory of Student Involvement. This theory may be simplistic in nature, but it provides a broad foundation for understanding how a student’s involvement in various curricular and co-curricular activities will enrich his or her undergraduate experience. This theory provides a simple rationale for why students’ involvement in co-curricular organizations will have positive benefits for undergraduates.

Definition of involvement. Unlike other theories that include complex models and pages of explanation, Astin (1984) distilled his theory down to one sentence: “Quite simply, student involvement refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy

that the student devotes to the academic experience” (p. 297). With this sentence, Astin acknowledges the parsimonious nature of his theory. He explains that, essentially, involvement includes the combination of two types of energy, physical and psychological. Involvement includes action and thought. For Astin, if a student is not engaging on both a mental and a behavioral level, he or she is not really involved in a certain activity, academic or otherwise. He shares: “it is not so much what the individual thinks or feels, but what the individual does, how he or she behaves, that defines and identifies involvement” (Astin, p. 298).

Postulates of Astin’s theory. Astin (1984) provided five postulates to support his short definition of involvement. These postulates act as the propositions that support his theory of involvement. With the first postulate, Astin emphasizes that involvement is when a student puts forth both psychological and physical energy toward an experience. This experience may be broad, such as the second semester of the student’s second year, or specific, such as the final paper that is due next week for an English course (Astin). The second postulate concerns the aforementioned experiences. Astin suggests that the amount of energy that a student invests in these experiences lies along a continuum because each student will devote different amounts of energy and each experience demands different amounts of investment.

Third, Astin (1984) explains that involvement can be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively since one can examine the amount of energy devoted to an experience and the behaviors that are employed during an experience. For example, a student may spend hours engaged in a community service activity, but if he or she does not reflect on

the meaning of that experience, this individual is not significantly involved in the experience.

Astin's (1984) uses his last two postulates to make claims about the benefit of involvement specific to the educational experience. He claims 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" (Astin, p. 298). With this postulate, Astin exemplifies his belief that increased involvement leads to increased learning and development. Finally, he notes that the utility of any policy is determined by the amount of involvement that results from this policy (Astin). Administrators should construct policies that promote involvement because this increased involvement will benefit the students who are affected by these policies, and increased involvement should be the goal of the undergraduate experience since greater involvement leads to more beneficial outcomes.

These postulates provide a framework for student involvement by outlining what is required for involvement and briefly introducing how involvement can benefit students during their time in higher education.

Areas on campus for involvement. Administrators and educators should strive for involvement in all areas of the campus environment. There are, though, a number of campus locations that Astin (1984) specifically identifies as places that are optimal for increased student involvement. He begins by mentioning the benefits of living in an on campus residence hall. Through their participation in a residential learning community, students are more likely to persist to graduation, participate in co-curricular activities, and interact more frequently with faculty members (Astin).

Additionally, Astin (1984) lists honors programs, interactions with faculty, athletics, and student government as places where student involvement can be maximized. Students' participation in honors programs allow for more highly developed student-faculty relationships, which can lead to increased and more meaningful interactions with faculty to further increase involvement. Also, participation in athletics leads to a deeper commitment to the institution, and participation in student government leads to richer interactions with other students, which both lead to increased involvement (Astin). Administrators should look to these areas of campus to increase student involvement.

Involvement in Co-Curricular Organizations.

Several scholars have determined benefits of undergraduates' involvement in co-curricular organizations (Astin, 1993; Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994). These benefits include increases in certain behaviors (Astin, 1993) and psychosocial development (Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994). Students who devote physical and psychological energy to student organizations reap the benefits associated with this involvement.

Astin (1993) provides a listing of the environmental variables within higher education that affect student behavior. One of these variables is involvement in student clubs and organizations. Astin provides a list of the behaviors that are positively affected by this type of involvement. These behaviors include being elected to a student office, participating in campus protests, and joining a social fraternity or sorority (Astin). Because students are involved in these organizations, they have a higher likelihood of engaging in these behaviors.

In 1994, Cooper, Healy, and Simpson, completed an empirical study to determine the differential development of undergraduates who participated in organizations and

those who did not. These authors found that involvement in a student organization had developmental effects for students throughout their undergraduate career. After controlling for the individual, pre-college characteristics, Cooper, Healy, and Simpson found that older students who participated in organizations displayed more growth in the following areas than their peers who did not become involved in these clubs: educational involvement, academic autonomy, lifestyle and career planning, life management, and cultural participation.

Leadership in Co-Curricular Organizations

In addition to the effects of simply being involved in co-curricular organizations, scholars have determined that there are benefits for the undergraduates who lead student clubs and organizations (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; Logue, Hutchens, & Hector, 2005). These scholars identify developmental outcomes and skills acquisition that are caused by the student's participation in leadership activities on campus.

Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, and Burkhardt (2001), using data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) through the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles, assessed the changes in various outcomes during students' undergraduate careers. These students completed the CIRP as entering first-year students, and when they began their senior years, these scholars gave them a survey to assess their development in various areas over their time in college. The sample of students in this study was separated into two groups: participants and nonparticipants in leadership activities.

When analyzing the comparative results of these two groups, Cress et al. (2001) found that the students who participated in leadership activities scored significantly higher on a number of developmental outcomes than the students who did not participate in leadership activities. These developmental outcomes include conflict resolution skills, goal setting, program planning and facilitation, personal ethics, risk-taking, civic responsibility, and increased co-curricular involvement (Cress et al.). With their data, these authors provide substantive evidence that students who participate in leadership activities experience greater development than other undergraduates in certain developmental tasks.

Unlike the previous study, Logue, Hutchens, and Hector (2005) employed qualitative methodologies and a much smaller sample. These authors sought to understand the experiences of student leaders through a phenomenological study. Using these methods, these scholars developed a thematic structure for undergraduate student leadership experiences.

Logue, Hutchens, and Hector (2005) divided the students' experiences into three thematic areas: people, action, and organization. These authors identify the people theme as the interpersonal experiences that student leaders have, which provide them with skills in leading and helping others and working in teams. They explain that the action theme relates to the active nature of leading in student organizations, and this theme includes success, busyness, and accomplishing tasks (Logue, Hutchens, & Hector). Finally, the authors describe the organization theme as the benefits that student leaders receive from their participation in a group environment. This theme includes skills of event planning and facilitation, delegation, and the ability to emphasize the distinction between a leader

and a member of the group (Logue, Hutchens, & Hector). The authors in this study present three themes and the related skills that result from active participation in leading student clubs and organizations.

Social Identities and Leadership Involvement

Several studies (Arnold & Welch, 2007; Dugan, 2006; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000) specifically examine how differing social identities affect leadership involvement in undergraduate students. These studies examine how gender, race, and ethnicity affect students' leadership development on college campuses.

Gender. All five studies (Dugan, 2006; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000) address gender in college student leadership development. Dugan (2006) found that women were better prepared to serve as leaders in post-industrial leadership paradigms, which are process-oriented and promote collaboration and values-based leading. Dugan, Komives, and Segar's (2008) results support previous researchers who claim that women's leadership styles promote democracy, relationship building, and group participation. Kezar and Moriarty's (2000) study provided evidence that female leaders display more self-confidence in their intellectual and social development than male leaders. All of these studies support a gender difference in leadership, where women are more skilled at the relational, interpersonal qualities of leadership.

Alice H. Eagly is a leading scholar in the study of women and leadership and has participated in a number of studies and publications (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly &

Carli, 2003; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003) that identify differences in the ways that men and women participate in the process of leadership. Eagly and Johnson (1990), through a meta-analysis of 162 studies, found that women demonstrated a slightly larger focus on interpersonal dimensions of work than their male counterparts, who were more focused on task dimensions. Eagly and Johnson also found that women exhibited more democratic, participative leadership styles while the men in these studies tended to be more autocratic and directive in their leadership.

Eagly et al. (2003) completed a meta-analysis that compared the leadership styles of male and female managers to determine if their leadership styles were more transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire. Through their analysis of 45 studies, Eagly et al. found that women tended to employ a more transformational style of leadership while men tended to be more transactional in their styles. Similarly Eagly and Carli (2003), in reviewing the literature on gender and leadership, identify women's strengths in interpersonally-focused, democratic, and transactional leadership. These studies substantiate the need to be aware of the ways in which gender may be affecting the leadership process for individuals in a variety of settings.

Race/Ethnicity. Two of the studies mentioned above (Dugan et al., 2008; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000) analyze race and/or ethnicity in the process of college student leadership development. Dugan et al. found significant differences between White students and students of color in addition to differences among students of color from different racial backgrounds. These differences can be credited to acculturation, marginalization, and cultural values (Dugan et al.). Participants in Kezar and Moriarty's study from separate racial groups rated themselves differently on leadership ability and

growth with Caucasian students consistently rating themselves higher than African American students, which may be caused by the predominance of Caucasian students, faculty, staff, and administrators on American college and university campuses.

The results from these studies allow scholars to conclude with certainty that social identities play a role in college student leadership development. This conclusion provides substantiation for the continued analysis of the effects of social identity group membership when analyzing leadership development in college students.

Socioeconomic Status. One additional demographic variable that is often studied is socioeconomic status. In their study, “Who We Really Are: Demographic Factors that Predict Student Service Leadership,” Arnold and Welch (2007) include Parents’ Income Level as a demographic variable that might factor into a student’s propensity for engaging in service leadership. Parents’ income level is often used to determine an undergraduate’s socioeconomic status because they are often still dependent upon financial support from their parents. In this study, however, Parents’ Income Level was not a significant predictor of students’ service leadership (Arnold & Welch). These authors mention that this variable received a low number of observations because students chose not to answer the item that measure parents’ income level, which may have affected the significance level of this variable (Arnold & Welch). More research is needed to determine what effect socioeconomic status has on college student leadership.

Intersectionality

Considering the importance of social identities in the process of leadership, it follows that these identities will be an important piece of understanding the ways that any individual engages in the leadership process. For this study, specifically, which is

focusing on a group of students that have an identified, underrepresented identity, the inclusion of other social identities in understanding leadership and activism for this sample aligns with the study of intersectionality.

Intersectionality is a study that analyzes the ways in which intersections of identities create unique experiences for an individual with multiple identities or groups of people with multiple, shared identities (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). Collins (1998) explains that “as opposed examining gender, race, class, and nation, as separate systems of oppression, intersectionality explores how these systems mutually construct one another” (p. 63). Collins’ explanation of intersectionality highlights the notion that multiple, marginalized identities creates unique ways that individuals experience inequality and oppression.

Crenshaw (1991) provides an example of a unique experience with oppression for a specific group of people with her article about violence against women of color. In this article, Crenshaw explains how women of color are marginalized by their own communities when anti-racism efforts ignore their gender and feminism activism ignores their race. Consequently, women of color who are subject to violence are underserved due to the intersection of their race and gender and sometimes other identities, such as socioeconomic status, language, and immigration status (Crenshaw).

Intersectionality was employed in this study through the analysis of certain social identities other than sexual orientation within this sample. Through this analysis it can be seen how underrepresented sexual orientations intersecting with other social identities have an effect on involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations, leadership education and training, and student activism for undergraduate

students. It is important to identify the differences among gender, race, and socioeconomic status for this sample because the ways in which these social identities intersect with the participants' sexual orientations may provide insight into the experiences of these student populations.

Summary

This section provided a review of the definition, benefits, and outcomes of student involvement. Specifically, it was noted that students who participate in co-curricular organizations experience greater development than their peers who do not participate in organizations. Additionally, students who were involved in leadership experiences on campus displayed increased skills relative to their peers who did not have these leadership experiences. As such, involvement has a positive impact on the undergraduate experiences of students in higher education. However, the impact of involvement in student leadership may differ based on the students' social identities.

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Leadership

The following section will provide a look at the student population that will be examined in this study. First, identity development models for sexual minority individuals are discussed. Next, existing leadership development models are used to understand LGB student leadership. Finally, an original model of LGB student leadership will be presented. The purpose of this section is to provide a look at the ways that these students' experiences in higher education are different than their heterosexual peers.

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Theories

In order to understand why LGB students' experiences on college and university campuses might be different than that of their heterosexual peers, it is helpful to have a

basic understanding of LGB identity development. There have been various scholars and researchers who have created models of identity development specifically for LGB individuals.

These models address and attempt to capture the unique developmental process for sexual minorities. Many of “these models are grounded in the assumption that oppressive contextual influences exert impact on the normative developmental processes and attempt to articulate a common sequence of recognizing, accepting, and affirming a stigmatized sexual identity” (Fassinger, 1998, p. 14). Because LGB individuals are an underrepresented group in society, they face challenges in progressing through a positive identity development process. As they develop their intrapersonal sexual minority identity, LGB people are required to simultaneously construct an external, social identity. Consequently, LGB and heterosexual individuals progress through different sexual identity development processes because heterosexual people do not need to create external sexual identities in a society that is structured to benefit them.

Although there are various models depicting the identity development of gay men, lesbian women, and bisexual individuals, three models have similar structures and are particularly relevant to LGB college students. These models are Cass’s (1979) Model of Homosexual Identity Formation, Fassinger and Miller’s (1996) Inclusive Model of Sexual Minority Identity Formation, and D’Augelli’s (1994) Model of Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual Development. These three models the different stages or processes that LGB individuals participate in during specific points in their development. The difference between two of these models, Cass’s and Fassinger’s, and D’Augelli’s model is that the former are progressive stage models, where an individual proceeds from one stage to the

next in a specific order, while D'Augelli's model includes overlapping processes, which allows for an individual to be simultaneously participating in more than one process at a certain point in their development.

Comparing Cass's and D'Augelli's models of LGB identity development.

There are several similarities between Cass's (1979) model and D'Augelli's (1994) model. Both models are comprised of six separate stages or processes, and these authors agree about what LGB individuals experience during the developmental process.

However, as previously mentioned, there are differences between these two models.

While Cass suggests that lesbian and gay individuals move progressively from the first stage to the sixth stage, D'Augelli explains, "identity is conceived of as the dynamic processes by which an individual emerges from many social exchanges experienced in different contexts over an extended historical period" (p. 324). Because identity formation is a complex process, D'Augelli claims that an individual cannot neatly develop through six progressive stages to find him- or herself a completely developed individual at the end. He allows for the complexity of the human experience by noting that these stages are continually experienced and do not have a final, culminating endpoint.

Fassinger's Inclusive Model of Sexual Minority Identity Formation.

Fassinger and Miller's (1996) model consists of four stages: awareness, exploration, deepening/commitment, and internalization/synthesis. For each of these stages, these authors differentiate how the stage affects the person's individual sexual identity and how, at the same time, the stage affects the group membership identity with other members of the sexual minority group. This differentiation between individual identity and group

membership identity sets this model apart from the aforementioned two models. While both Cass (1979) and D'Augelli (1994) account for the individual's development of an LGB group identity in addition to a personal LGB identity, Fassinger and Miller suggest that internal and external identities develop concurrently and should be accounted for in each point in an LGB person's development. Thus, each of their stages discusses how the person is developing as an individual in addition to how the person is forming their group membership identity (Fassinger & Miller).

In their model, Fassinger and Miller (1996) provide an understanding of the difference in individual identity development and group identity development. Sexual minorities do not only internally develop their sense of self as LGB; they also develop an identity in the context of their membership to an oppressed group in society. This model acknowledges that an individual must develop internally in addition to developing, externally, within the framework of a heterosexist society.

All three of the models mentioned above are helpful in understanding how an LGB person may face challenges in developing his or her identity as an individual who does not identify as heterosexual. These challenges may affect how LGB individuals develop in other aspects of their identity, such as leadership development, which is why researchers need to specifically examine how sexual minority individuals develop in a variety of contexts.

Using Existing Models to Understand Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Leaders

Due to the lack of prior research, scholars first identified the unique processes of LGB students' leadership development by using existing development models as a structure for analyzing LGB students' leadership development. By using existing models,

scholars had a framework through which they could analyze the experiences of these students. Renn and Bilodeau (2005a, 2005b) have compared LGB students' leadership development to D'Augelli's (1994) Model of Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual Development and Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen's (2005) Leadership Identity Development Model.

In their article, "Queer Student Leaders: An Exploratory Case Study of Identity Development and LGBT Student Involvement at a Midwestern Research University," Renn and Bilodeau (2005b) use D'Augelli's (1994) Model of Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual Development to organize the leadership experiences of seven undergraduate students engaged in the planning process for a regional LGBT student conference. These scholars found that many of the leadership experiences that resulted from the students' participation in planning this conference could be understood using D'Augelli's model.

Renn and Bilodeau (2005b) suggest that "involvement in the [conference] provided opportunities for some students to further the process of exiting heterosexual and/or traditionally gendered identity—personally and publicly" (p. 57), which aligns with the first process of D'Augelli's (1994) model, Exiting Heterosexual Identity. They share that students were able to participate in Developing a Personal LGB Identity Status, D'Augelli's second process, through their experiencing of residual effects from the conference, which allowed them to continue developing in their personal identity outside of the conference context (Renn & Bilodeau).

The students experienced D'Augelli's (1994) third process, Developing a LGB Social Identity, as they helped plan the conference and become more engaged in LGB-related activities on their campus (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b). Due to their increased and

visible involvement, they were able to develop their LGB identity in a social, interpersonal context.

Because Renn and Bilodeau (2005b) were interviewing students specifically regarding their experience in planning this conference, D'Augelli's (1994) fourth process, Becoming an LGB Offspring, was not apparent through, or present in, the conversations. However, students were able to engage in Developing a LGB Intimacy Status, D'Augelli's fifth process, by fraternizing with other LGB individuals at the conference and seeing how the LGB couples at the conference had structured their relationships (Renn & Bilodeau). D'Augelli's final process, Entering a LGB Community, was apparent as the students who participated in the conference planning became engaged in leadership roles in several LGB student organizations on campus (Renn & Bilodeau).

Through this study, Renn and Bilodeau (2005b) exemplified how leadership opportunities can be a vehicle through which students develop in their LGB identity. In this case study, the students' LGB identity development was facilitated by the leadership experiences they engaged in due to their participation in conference planning. This study shows that LGB students' identity development can be supported and fostered by leadership opportunities, where the students are valued and supported in their sexual minority identity.

Conversely, Renn and Bilodeau (2005a), in "Leadership Identity Development Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Student Leaders," discuss how participation as a leader in an LGBT organization facilitates leadership development. To illustrate their findings, they use the Leadership Identity Development (LID) model (Komives, Owen, Longersbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005) to illustrate how the LGB

students develop as leaders. The six stages of the Leadership Identity Development model are awareness, exploration/engagement, leader identified, leadership differentiated, generativity, and internalization/synthesis (Komives et al., 2005). These authors interviewed fifteen LGBT-identified students from three different universities of varying size and type.

Renn and Bilodeau (2005a) note that for the first stage in the LID model, Awareness (Komives et al., 2005), the LGB students' involvement facilitated an increased knowledge of leadership opportunities through their identification of LGB role models. Students displayed stage two, Exploration/Engagement (Komives et al.), when they "described the process of taking on responsibilities and support roles outside of holding a formal leadership position... [and] describe developing a sense of confidence that comes from being open about their LGBT identities while participating in leadership" (Renn & Bilodeau, p. 353).

Students characterized the third stage, Leader Identified, as they moved into leadership roles within the LGB organizations, which provided (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a). In the fourth stage, Leadership Differentiated (Komives et al., 2005),

Students recognized the power of a group working together with leadership happening "from anywhere" to do what had seemed impossible to them as individuals. Descriptions of personal roles in that accomplishment reflected the shift away from leadership rooted in individual positions to leadership shared by a group responsible for meeting mutual goals. Keys to this interdependence were communication, perseverance, and teamwork. (Renn & Bilodeau, p. 357)

In this stage, students understood the synergy that can come from shared leadership by realizing that the goals and tasks they could accomplish together were more significant than anything they could have done separately.

Renn and Bilodeau (2005a) saw that students in the fifth stage, Generativity (Komives et al., 2005), “develop[ed] an active commitment to a personal passion, accept[ed] responsibility for the development of others, for team learning, and for sustaining organizations” (p. 358). Finally, in stage six, Internalization/Synthesis (Komives et al.), the students clearly expressed their intentions to be committed to leadership throughout their lives.

Renn and Bilodeau (2005a) state: “Overall, we found that involvement in leadership and activism specific to LGBT identity promoted the development of leadership identity. Students’ descriptions of events and activities—and the meaning they made of those events and activities—demonstrated their progression” (p. 360) through the LID model (Komives et al., 2005). Through this set of interviews, it becomes apparent that LGB students who engage in leadership activities through LGB organizations develop their leadership capacities. In this situation, opposite to the study mentioned above (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b), students’ participation in LGB organization facilitates their leadership development. As they engage in leadership experiences within these organizations, their identities as leaders become more salient.

An Original Model of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Leadership

Although this continues to be a largely absent portion of the literature, scholars have been spending increasingly more time on the topic of LGB leadership development in the past several years (Renn & Bildeau, 2005a; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b; Renn, 2007).

One article, in particular, (Renn) presents an original thought on multiple types of LGB student leaders she observed during her qualitative study of LGBT-identified college students.

In her article, “LGBT Student Leaders and Queer Activists: Identities of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Identified College Student Leaders and Activists,” Renn (2007) identifies four different types of LGB student leaders that she encountered while interviewing fifteen self-identified LGBT students from three different campuses. With each of the types, she notes similar yet defining characteristics that set each type of student leader apart from one another. The four types Renn identified are LGB(T) Student Leader, LGB(T) Activist, Queer Student Leader, and Queer Activist. Note that Renn did not have any transgender students who fell into either the LGB(T) Student Leader or LGB(T) Activist categories, which is why the T is in parentheses.

Renn (2007) describes the LGB(T) Student Leader as an individual who “subscribes to a fairly traditional, positional conception of leadership as something that leaders do, and publicly acknowledges LGB(T) identity” (p. 321). This individual might be identified as fulfilling the stereotypical notion of a positional leader who also happens to be a sexual minority. The next type of student, LGB(T) Activist, displayed similar identification in sexual orientation but employed a more activist-oriented approach to his or her leadership (Renn). These students “incorporated a commitment to transformational leadership beyond work on LGBT issues” (p. 322).

Because Renn (2007) did not have any students in her sample who represented the Queer Student Leader, she explains: “Assuming that some undergraduate students might fit this category, I would describe Queer Student Leaders as subscribing to a positional

understanding of leadership and having an orientation toward dismantling dichotomous views of sexual orientation and/or gender identity” (p. 323). Since she did not have any of this type of student in her sample, she could not make conclusions based on an individual’s words or experiences, but she does suggest an individual who would share the characteristic of positional leadership with the LGB(T) Student Leader and the characteristic of a queer identity with the Queer Activist.

The last type of leader that Renn (2007) identified is the Queer Activist. This student “embraced a public gender and/or sexual identity in opposition to normative, straight culture and had moved away from a positional view of leadership to an approach that incorporated a commitment to changing social systems for the purpose of decentering power” (p. 323). The Queer Activist employs a transformational leadership style while refusing to subscribe to societal norms of sexual orientation and gender.

The three types of student leaders that Renn describes, plus the additional hypothesized type, illustrate ways of leading that are specific to LGB individuals in the college setting. Renn (2007) shares:

The three categories I observed among participants—LGBT Student Leader, LGBT Activist, and Queer Activist—represent different identities held by students who lead LGBT campus groups. Students may use varying terminology for their identities, but the categories seem to represent robust differences in how students understand themselves and the work they do in LGBT contexts. (p. 325)

One of the strengths of Renn’s work is that she uses the students’ understandings of their own experiences to delineate the different types of student leaders. These students are living examples of each type; Renn simply put a name to each category.

Conclusion

This section provided a concise look at LGB students in a variety of contexts. Identity development models were presented to communicate how these students have different life experiences than their peers. Following, the unique experiences of LGB student leaders were discussed to review the unique leadership qualities that characterize this student population.

Summary of the Literature

The proceeding review of the literature made connections to existing bodies of knowledge for each of the areas that play an important role in this study. Kolb's (1984) Model of Experiential Learning provided a theoretical basis for promoting leadership education and training in addition to co-curricular leadership experience to result in optimal student learning. Next, the review of student activism provided a historical foundation for this concept and illustrated the developmental outcomes that result from activism on campus. Following, leadership education and training were proven to be a productive means from teaching students the theories, skills, and concepts that are needed for effective leadership. Then, Astin's (1984) Involvement Theory was reviewed to illuminate the benefits that result from students' involvement in co-curricular activities and leadership experiences. Finally, the student population for this study was introduced, and unique characteristics of these individuals were shared in order to better understand the need to study this group of undergraduate students.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGIES AND METHODS

The following section will provide an overview of the methodologies and methods that were used to complete this study. First, the purpose of this study will be reviewed before the research question and hypothesis are shared. Next, the methodological design will be presented, followed by sampling and measures. Finally, the data analysis procedures will be reviewed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent leadership education and training account for student activism among lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate students. Specifically, the extent to which leadership education and training account for student activism beyond involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus activities in lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate students was examined.

Research Question and Hypothesis

The following research question and hypothesis are addressed in this study:

Research Question:

To what extent do leadership education and training experiences contribute to student activism above and beyond involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off campus activities among lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate students?

Hypothesis:

According to Kolb's (1984) Model of Experiential Learning, education coupled with active experience provides greater learning for individuals. Additionally, Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, and Burkhardt (2001) note that involvement in

leadership activities promotes development in undergraduate students.

Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt (1999) report that student involvement in leadership education and training experiences results in increased civic, social, and political activity. With consideration of this research, the following null hypothesis was established: Leadership education and training do not predict social change behaviors beyond involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations.

Methodological Design

This study used a quantitative research methodology through an ex post facto non-experimental correlational design utilizing secondary data analysis from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). The 2009 MSL was the second of two national studies of college student leadership executed through a quantitative research design with an electronic survey completed by the study's participants. This survey asked participants to self-report on a number of measures, including pre-college characteristics, leadership involvement, and social change behaviors. This survey was web-based and could be completed from any computer. Respondents had the option to begin the survey and return to it at any time until they finished.

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) was conceptualized in the summer of 2005 by a collection of graduate students, faculty, and student affairs educators at the University of Maryland in an attempt to formulate a picture of college students' leadership experiences (Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006). The first iteration of

this study was completed in 2006; however, the data for this study will be taken from the second administration of this study that was conducted in 2009.

The instrument used in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership was developed using Astin's (1991) College Impact Model, also referred to as the I-E-O Model, as the conceptual model for this study, and the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996) was used as the theoretical frame for this study (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Additionally, a revised version of Tyree's (1998) Socially Responsible Leadership Scale was employed to operationalize the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. This model and scale will not be reviewed since they are not the focus of this study.

Astin's College Impacts Model. In his book, *Assessment for Excellence*, Astin (1991) outlines his College Impacts Model, which aims to determine how the collegiate experience affects students. This model is also commonly referred to as the I-E-O Model because the structure of this model is separated into three pieces: inputs, environments, and outcomes. Astin explains that inputs are the qualities and characteristics with which a student enters his or her undergraduate experience; environments are the experiences that a student has while he or she is in college, and; outcomes are the knowledge, competencies, and skills that faculty, staff, and administrators are attempting to promote in their students.

With this model, Astin (1991) aims to highlight the importance of understanding how the qualities that students bring with them to college affect the outcomes of higher education. He explains: "the outcome of an institution or a program does not really tell us much about the educational *impact* or educational *effectiveness* in developing talent.

Rather, outputs must be evaluated in terms of inputs” (emphasis in original) (Astin, p. 17). Because all students do not enter higher education with the same identities, experiences, or backgrounds, researchers need to assess how the qualities that students bring with them affect the outcomes of their experiences in higher education.

For this study, Astin’s (1991) model was used to frame the structure of the instrument. To assess students’ inputs, respondents are asked to share demographic information and to complete a retrospective self-assessment of pre-college characteristics. Additionally, respondents are asked a series of questions about their involvement in both curricular and co-curricular activities to determine the environments portion of Astin’s model. Finally, respondents are asked to assess themselves on a variety of measures, including their engagement in social change behaviors and their perceived outcomes of the leadership education and training experience they have had during their collegiate career, to determine the outcomes of their experiences in higher education.

Sampling

The data that was analyzed for this study was taken from data collected through the 2009 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). The sampling strategy for this study required a two-step approach. First, sampling was required at the institutional level, which resulted in 103 institutions participating in this study, which included 101 institutions located in the United States, one institution in Canada, and one institution in Mexico (Dugan & Komives, 2009). All of these institutions self-selected to participate in the study, and students from these campuses completed the survey instrument electronically.

The second step in this sampling process included the selection of participants from each institution. Colleges and universities with 4,000 or fewer students were included as full population samples. Institutions with more than 4,000 students were asked to provide a simple random sample of 4,000 students from their full student body. This stage in the sampling process aimed to provide a representative sample of United States college students through random sampling measures.

For this study, all of the self-identified lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) participants composed the sample from which data was drawn. These participants were identified as those who chose “Gay/Lesbian” or “Bisexual” in response to Item 31: “What is your sexual orientation?” Due to the random sampling procedures employed by many of these institutions, these LGB participants should provide a representative sample for the larger LGB college student population.

Of the 337,482 students who were invited to participate in the MSL, 115,632 students responded to achieve a 34% response rate, and 115,582 of these surveys were usable (Dugan & Komives, 2009). Within this respondent group, 2,681 identified as LGB (1,291 identified as lesbian or gay, and 1390 identified as bisexual).

Measures

One scale and various items from the instrument used in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) were utilized to complete this study.

Social Change Behaviors Scale

First, the dependent variable, student activism, was operationalized using the Social Change Behaviors Scale in the MSL. This is a ten-item scale established through exploratory factor analysis. For this scale, respondents were asked to rate ten items on an

ordinal scale from 1 to 4, where 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, and 4 = Very Often. The responses to this scale provide a score between 10 and 40 when totaled that is then averaged resulting in a mean score between 0 and 4 for each participant. This mean score provided a measure for each respondent's frequency of student activism. The ten items are presented below in Table 1.

Reliability. For the overall population, the Cronbach's Alpha for this scale was determined to be .90, which is above the recommended satisfactory level of .70 (Pallant, 2007). The Cronbach's Alpha for this LGB student sample was .92, which exceeds the satisfactory level.

Table 1

Social Change Behaviors Scale (Question 14 on MSL)

14. How often have you engaged in the following activities during your college experience:

1 = Never

3 = Often

2 = Sometimes

4 = Very Often

Performed community service

Acted to benefit the common good or protect the environment

Been actively involved with an organization that addresses a social or environmental problem

Been actively involved with an organization that addresses the concerns of a specific community (ex. Academic council, neighborhood association)

Communicated with campus or community leaders about a pressing concern

Took action in the community to try to address a social or environmental problem

Worked with others to make the campus or community a better place

Acted to raise awareness about a campus, community, or global problem

Took part in a protest, rally, march, or demonstration

Worked with others to address social inequality

Leadership Education and Training Items

The first group of independent variables was represented by nine different leadership education and training experiences. These experiences will be taken from Item 19, where participants are asked to answer several questions about their involvement in these types of experiences. Respondents are first asked to answer to the following question by selecting “1 = Yes” or “2 = No”: “19. Since starting college, have you ever participated a leadership training or leadership education experience of any kind (ex. Leadership conference, alternative spring break, leadership course, club president’s retreat...)?” If respondents answer “2 = No,” they are automatically skipped to the next question. If they answer “1 = Yes,” they are then asked to respond to two groups of items. The first group includes 12 items (See Table 2) that each respondent is asked to rate from 1 to 4, where 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, and 4 = Very Often. The second group includes 4 items (See Table 2) that each respondent is asked to respond with either “1 = Yes” or “2 = No.” For this study, only some of the options from Item 19 (bolded below) were used. Dugan, Bohle, Gebhardt, Hofert, Wilk, and Cooney (2011) identified these specific experiences as being significant for socially responsible leadership. Using a multiple regression analysis, Dugan et al. found that certain leadership education and training experiences were predictive of a student’s capacity for socially responsible leadership. These experiences are bolded below in Table 2.

Table 2

Leadership Education and Training Items (Question 19 on MSL)

19a. Since starting college, to what degree have you been involved in the following types of leadership training or education?

1 = Never

3 = Sometimes

2 = Once

4 = Often

Leadership Conference

Leadership Retreat

Leadership Lecture/Workshop Series

Positional Leader Training (ex. Treasurer's training, Resident Assistant training, Student Government training)

Leadership Course

Alternative Spring Break

Emerging or New Leaders Program

Living-Learning Leadership Program

Peer Leadership Educator Team

Outdoor Leadership Program

Women's Leadership Program

Multicultural Leadership Program

19b. Since starting college, have you been involved in the following types of leadership training or education?

1 = Yes

2 = No

Leadership Certificate Program

Leadership Capstone Experience

Leadership Major

Involvement Measures

The next measure that was used in this study is a question that focuses on the respondent's participation in and leadership of co-curricular organizations both on- and off-campus, which was used to represent the second group of independent variables: Involvement in Co-Curricular Activities. For this question, respondents are asked to complete an ordinal scale from 1 to 5 for 4 items (See Table 3), where 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Many Times, and 5 = Much of the Time. Each of these items was used in the analysis to determine the relative significance of each of these types of involvement. The items are displayed below in Table 3.

Table 3

Involvement in Co-Curricular Activities (Question 15 on MSL)

15. Since starting college, how often have you:

1 = Never

4 = Many Times

2 = Once

5 = Much of the Time

3 = Sometimes

Been an involved member in college organizations?

Held a leadership position in a college organization(s)? (ex. Officer in a club or organization, captain of athletic team, first chair in musical group, section editor of newspaper, chairperson of committee)?

Been an involved member in an off-campus community organization(s) (ex. Parent-Teacher Association, church group)?

Held a leadership position in an off-campus community organization(s)? (ex. Officer in a club or organization, leader in youth group, chairperson of committee)?

Demographic Variables

The following demographic variables have been shown by prior research (Arnold & Welch, 2007; Dugan, 2006; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000) to have significant effects on how an individual engages in student leadership. Consequently, these variables were included in the statistical analysis to determine if they have a significant effect on the outcome variable, student activism.

Race. Participants in this survey were asked to self-identify their race by responding to item 33a noted in Table 4. Because participants could select multiple races, any participants who selected multiple races will be recoded into a separate category.

Table 4

Race (Question 33a on MSL)

33a. Please indicate your broad racial group membership: (Mark all that apply)

White/ Caucasian	1
Middle Eastern	2
African American/ Black	3
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	4
Asian American/ Asian	5
Latino/ Hispanic	6
Multiracial	7
Race/Ethnicity not included above	8

Gender. Participants self-identified their gender by responding to the following item with “1 – Female,” “2 – Male,” or “3 – Transgender”: “30a. What is your gender?” As mentioned in Chapter 1, transgender respondents will not be included in this study.

Socioeconomic status. Participants indicated their socioeconomic status by responding to two items, which were used separately. These ordinal response choices appear in Table 5, where higher responses indicate higher socioeconomic status. Participants who replied with “Don’t know” to Item 38 were excluded from this analysis. Additionally, those who replied with “Don’t know” or “Rather not say” to Item 39 were excluded from this analysis.

Table 5

Socioeconomic Status (Questions 38 and 39 on MSL)

38. What is the HIGHEST level of formal education obtained by any of your parent(s) or guardian(s)? (Choose one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| Less than high school diploma or less than a GED | 1 |
| High school diploma or GED | 2 |
| Some college | 3 |
| Associates degree | 4 |
| Bachelors degree | 5 |
| Masters degree | 6 |
| Doctorate or professional degree (ex. JD, MD, PhD) | 7 |
| Don’t know | 8 |

39. What is your best estimate of our parent(s) or guardian(s) combined total income from last year? If you are independent from your parent(s) or guardian(s) indicate your income. (Choose one)

Less than \$12,500	1
\$12,500 - \$24,999	2
\$25,000 - \$39,999	3
\$40,000 - \$54,999	4
\$55,000 - \$74,999	5
\$75,000 - \$99,999	6
\$100,000 - \$149,999	7
\$150,000 - \$199,999	8
\$200,000 and over	9
Don't know	10
Rather not say	11

Pretest Item

Several items in the MSL focus on each participant's experiences before entering college. Two parts of Item 10 were used as pretest measures for social change behaviors. These parts will be used because the same types of experiences (bolded below in Table 6) included in this item are included in the social change behaviors scale. Participants are asked to respond to each part of this item by noting the frequency that they engaged in each of the following activities through their response, which could be: "1 = Never," "2 = Sometimes," "3 = Often," and "4 = Very Often."

Table 6

Pretest for Social Change Behaviors (Question 10 on MSL)

10. Looking back to before you started college, how often did you engage in the following activities:

1 = Never

3 = Often

2 = Sometimes

4 = Very Often

Performed community service

Reflected on the meaning of life

Participated in community organizations (ex. church group, scouts)

Took leadership positions in community organizations

Considered my evolving sense of purpose in life

Worked with others for change to address societal problems (ex. rally, protest, community organizing)

Participated in training or education that developed your leadership skills

Found meaning in times of hardship

These measures and items provided the scores for the dependent variable and the two independent variables in addition to the demographic variables and pretest measures that will be used as data to complete this study.

Data Analysis

In order to determine the extent to which both independent variables account for the dependent variable, multiple regression analysis was utilized in this study. Licht (1995) explains that multiple regression analysis determines “whether there is a significant prediction of subjects’ scores on the dependent variable from knowledge of their group membership” (p. 20). In this study, group membership refers to one of two

groups: students who participate in leadership education and training and students who are involved and have positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus activities. Participants may be in both groups. As such, the two independent variables, leadership education and training and involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus activities, function as the predictor variables to determine the dependent variable, student activism, also referred to as the criterion variable (Licht). Through multicollinearity testing, it was determined that this assumption of regression analyses was not violated.

Astin's (1991) College Impacts Model was employed to organize the different blocks in this multiple regression analysis. First, to determine how demographics affect the dependent variable, the first block included the input variables, specifically race, sex, and two dimensions of socioeconomic background. These variables were included due to their demonstrated importance in Chapter 2 through prior research (Dugan, 2006 [sex]; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008 [race and sex]; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000 [race and ethnicity]) or as a result of the need for further research (Arnold & Welch, 2007 [socioeconomic status]). Additionally, the pretest item was included in the first block because it shows a student's propensity for the dependent variable before he or she is influenced by the college environment.

The following two blocks represented the environments portion of Astin's (1991) model. First, an environments block that includes respondents' scores on four types of involvement activities was added to the multiple regression analysis. Each type of involvement (e.g., frequency of involvement in an on-campus organization, involvement in an off-campus organization, leadership in an on-campus organization, leadership in an

off-campus organization) was entered separately into the first environments block.

Because the research question asks how leadership education and training accounts for social change behaviors above and beyond involvement in co-curricular activities, the impact of involvement was determined before the impact of the leadership education and training experiences.

Following the first environments block, a second environments block was added to the analysis to represent respondents' participation in leadership education and training experiences. Each leadership education and training experience was analyzed separately within this block because Dugan, Bohle, Gebhardt, Hofert, Wilk, and Cooney (2011) determined that the 16 leadership education and training experiences cannot "be reduced to a smaller number of composite measures" (p. 73). This second environments block allowed the researcher to determine to what extent each of the leadership education and training experiences predicted the criterion variable beyond the first independent variable.

The following table display each of the blocks in the multiple regression analysis and lists how each variable was coded.

Table 7

Blocks and Coding for the Multiple Regression Analysis

Block 1		Block 2		Block 3	
<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Coding</u>	<u>Environments</u>	<u>Coding</u>	<u>Environments</u>	<u>Coding</u>
<i>Demographic characteristics</i>		<i>Involvement Experiences</i>		<i>Leadership Education and Training Experiences</i>	
Race		College organizations	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=many times; 4=much of the time	Leadership Conference	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
White/ Caucasian Middle Eastern African American/ Black American Indian/ Alaskan Native Asian American/ Asian Latino/ Hispanic Multiracial Multiracial-chose more than one race	Dummy Coded (0,1) with White/ Caucasian serving as the referent group	Leader in college orgs	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=many times; 4=much of the time	Leadership Retreat	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
Sex	0=male; 1=female	Off-campus organization	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=many times; 4=much of the time	Leadership Lecture/ Workshop Series	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
Socioeconomic Status		Leader in off-campus org	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=many times; 4=much of the time	Positional Leader Training	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
<i>Parents' Education Level</i>				Leadership Course	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
Less than high school diploma or less than a GED	1			Alternative Spring Break	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
High school diploma or GED	2			Peer Leadership Educator Team	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
Some college	3			Multicultural Leadership Program	0=no; 1=once; 2=sometimes; 3=often
Associates degree	4			Leadership Capstone Experience	0=No Capstone; 1=Had Capstone Experience
Bachelors degree	5				
Masters degree	6				
Doctorate or professional degree (ex. JD, MD, PhD)	7				
<i>Parents' Income</i>					
Less than \$12,500	1				
\$12,500 - \$24,999	2				
\$25,000 - \$39,999	3				
\$40,000 - \$54,999	4				
\$55,000 - \$74,999	5				
\$75,000 - \$99,999	6				
\$100,000 - \$149,999	7				
\$150,000 - \$199,999	8				
\$200,000 and over	9				
<i>Pretests</i>					
Performed community service	0=no; 1=sometimes; 2=often; 3=very often				
Worked with others for change to address societal problems	0=no; 1=sometimes; 2=often; 3=very often				
				Block 4	
				<u>Outcomes</u>	
				<i>Social Change Behaviors Scale</i>	
				See Table 1	
				Mean score of scale from 0-4 with higher values indicating increased frequency	

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between leadership education and training and student activism in lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) undergraduates. Additionally, this study sought to determine to what extent leadership education and training contributed to LGB student activism beyond the contribution of involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations. Identifying the contribution of leadership education and training beyond involvement will provide an understanding of the extent to which these activities encourage social change behaviors beyond students' involvement in organizations.

The results of this study will be presented in this chapter in the following way. First, a description of the demographic characteristics of the sample will be presented followed by the mean scores by demographics for the variables in this study. Second, the regression analysis will be presented, including the model summary and the predictors for social change behaviors. Finally, the hypothesis for this study will be reviewed.

Sample Characteristics

The sample for this study was drawn from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) 2009 data set, which includes information from 115,632 student respondents. Within this data set, 2,681 respondents identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. More specifically, 48% (n=1,291) identified as either lesbian or gay, and 52% (n=1,390) identified as bisexual. Each of the 2,681 respondents indicated a value for each one of the variables included in the model employed for this study.

Sample Demographics

Within this sample, 56% (n=1503) identified as female, and 44% (n=1178) identified as male. When indicating their racial group membership, those participants who indicated one race were coded into a single race, and those who indicated multiracial as their only response were coded as multiracial. Participants who chose more than one response, even if they included multiracial as one of their multiple responses, were coded as “chose more than one race.” Thus, within this sample, 70.9% (n=1902) identified as White/ Caucasian; 0.4% (n=12) identified as Middle Eastern; 6.0% (n=160) identified as African America/ Black; 0.7% (n=18) identified as American Indian/ Alaskan Native; 5.2% (140) identified as Asian American/ Asian; 5.8% (n=154) identified as Latino/ Hispanic; 1.5% (n=39) identified as Multiracial, and; 9.5% (n=256) chose more than one race.

For this study, socioeconomic status was determined by a participant’s response to two items: parents’ level of education and parents’ income from the previous year. In response to the first item, at least one of the participants’ parents achieved the following highest level of education: 3.4% (n=92) had less than a high school diploma or less than a GED; 15.5% (n=416) had a high school diploma or GED; 15.9% (n=425) attended some college; 9.0% (n=240) had an Associates degree; 25.6% (n=686) had a Bachelors degree; 19.0% (n=511) had a Masters degree, and; 11.6% (n=311) had a doctorate or professional degree.

In response to the second item, the combined income for the respondents’ parents, guardians, or themselves was the following: 9.0% (n=240) indicated less than \$12,500; 10.6% (n=283) indicated \$12,500-\$24,999; 10.9% (n=291) indicated \$25,000-\$39,999;

12.1% (n=324) indicated \$40,000-\$54,999; 13.9% (n=373) indicated \$55,000-\$74,999; 13.5% (n=362) indicated \$75,000-\$99,999; 13.7% (n=367) indicated \$100,000-\$149,999; 6.9% (n=185) indicated \$150,000-\$199,999, and; 9.5% (n=256) indicated \$200,000 and over. Table 8 includes a listing of all demographic characteristics for this sample.

Table 8

Demographic characteristics of respondents

Respondent Characteristics	N	Percentage
<u>Sexual Orientation</u>		
Gay/ Lesbian	1,291	48%
Bisexual	1,390	52%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	1,178	44%
Female	1,503	56%
<u>Race</u>		
Caucasian/ White	1,902	70.9%
Middle Eastern	12	0.4%
African American/ Black	160	6.0%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	18	0.7%
Asian American/ Asian	140	5.2%
Latino/ Hispanic	154	5.8%
Multiracial	39	1.5%
More than one racial group	256	9.5%
<u>Socio Economic Status</u>		
<i>Parents' Education Level</i>		
Less than a high school diploma or less than a GED	92	3.4%
High school diploma or GED	416	15.5%
Some college	425	15.9%
Associates degree	240	9.0%
Bachelors degree	686	25.6%
Masters degree	511	19.0%
Doctorate or professional degree	311	11.6%
<i>Parents' Income</i>		
Less than \$12,500	240	9.0%
\$12,500 - \$24,999	283	10.6%

\$25,000 - \$39,999	291	10.9%
\$40,000 - \$54,999	324	12.1%
\$55,000 - \$74,999	373	13.9%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	362	13.5%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	367	13.7%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	185	6.9%
\$200,000 and over	256	9.5%

The following two tables present information about the means and standard deviations for variables in this study categorized by gender and race. Table 9 presents information for the Social Change Behaviors Scale and each of the ten items that compose this scale. Table 10 presents information for the independent variables within the two environments blocks for this study.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for Social Change Behaviors

	Social Change Behaviors Scale	Performed community service	Acted for common good or to protect environment	Involved with organization to address social or environmental problem	Involved with organization to address concerns of specific community	Communicated with leaders about a pressing concern
Total		2.57 (1.01)	2.90 (0.96)	2.49 (1.18)	2.23 (1.20)	2.13 (1.13)
Men	2.40 (0.87)	2.56 (1.03)	2.82 (0.98)	2.51 (1.17)	2.33 (1.22)	2.24 (1.15)
Women	2.34 (0.85)	2.58 (1.00)	2.96 (0.94)	2.47 (1.18)	2.16 (1.18)	2.04 (1.10)
White	2.35 (0.84)	2.54 (1.00)	2.92 (0.93)	2.48 (1.17)	2.18 (1.19)	2.12 (1.11)
Middle Eastern	2.28 (1.05)	2.50 (1.38)	2.67 (1.50)	2.08 (1.44)	1.83 (1.34)	1.83 (1.27)
African American/Black	2.56 (0.89)	2.81 (1.04)	2.80 (1.01)	2.61 (1.15)	2.52 (1.24)	2.36 (1.16)
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	2.21 (1.06)	2.61 (1.38)	3.11 (1.13)	2.22 (1.22)	2.11 (1.45)	1.78 (1.11)
Asian American/Asian	2.35 (0.83)	2.68 (1.03)	2.93 (0.95)	2.49 (1.17)	2.31 (1.19)	2.04 (1.11)
Latino/Hispanic	2.35 (0.90)	2.53 (1.06)	2.68 (1.06)	2.47 (1.18)	2.31 (1.23)	2.14 (1.17)
Multiracial	2.41 (0.94)	2.51 (1.02)	2.79 (1.06)	2.44 (1.33)	2.33 (1.31)	2.21 (1.22)
Chose more than one category	2.42 (0.88)	2.64 (0.99)	2.93 (0.97)	2.49 (1.20)	2.36 (1.22)	2.14 (1.16)

	Took action to try to address social or environmental problem	Worked with others to make a better place	Acted to raise awareness about a problem	Took part in protest, rally, march, or demonstration	Worked with others to address social inequality
Total	2.18 (1.09)	2.47 (1.14)	2.37 (1.16)	1.97 (1.05)	2.36 (1.17)
Men	2.22 (1.09)	2.56 (1.14)	2.44 (1.16)	1.96 (1.03)	2.39 (1.16)
Women	2.15 (1.10)	2.40 (1.14)	2.32 (1.16)	1.97 (1.06)	2.33 (1.17)
White	2.17 (1.08)	2.45 (1.13)	2.36 (1.15)	1.94 (1.02)	2.32 (1.16)
Middle Eastern	2.33 (1.30)	2.17 (1.34)	2.33 (1.37)	2.17 (0.94)	2.83 (1.19)
African American/Black American	2.24 (1.16)	2.74 (1.15)	2.65 (1.18)	2.16 (1.17)	2.66 (1.18)
Indian/ Alaskan Native	1.89 (1.32)	2.28 (1.45)	2.17 (1.38)	1.83 (1.30)	2.11 (1.32)
Asian American/Asian	2.29 (1.06)	2.54 (1.12)	2.31 (1.07)	1.71 (0.96)	2.21 (1.12)
Latino/Hispanic	2.21 (1.11)	2.31 (1.15)	2.32 (1.20)	2.06 (1.07)	2.44 (1.18)
Multiracial	2.33 (1.22)	2.46 (1.32)	2.41 (1.29)	2.18 (1.05)	2.38 (1.27)
Chose more than one category	2.19 (1.10)	2.52 (1.18)	2.41 (1.20)	2.12 (1.11)	2.44 (1.20)

Note: Mean (SD)

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Environments Variables

	Co-curricular organizations	Positional leader in co-curricular organization	Off-campus organization	Leader in off-campus organization	Leadership conference	Leadership retreat	Leadership lecture/ Workshop series
Total	3.25 (1.46)	2.38 (1.60)	1.92 (1.27)	1.53 (1.08)	1.36 (0.78)	1.30 (0.72)	1.44 (0.88)
Men	3.44 (1.43)	2.64 (1.65)	1.93 (1.28)	1.59 (1.12)	1.46 (0.87)	1.41 (0.82)	1.54 (0.96)
Women	3.10 (1.48)	2.18 (1.52)	1.91 (1.26)	1.47 (1.04)	1.28 (0.69)	1.21 (0.62)	1.36 (0.81)
White	3.25 (1.46)	2.35 (1.58)	1.84 (1.22)	1.46 (1.01)	1.32 (0.73)	1.26 (0.67)	1.40 (0.84)
Middle Eastern	2.75 (1.60)	2.58 (1.56)	2.25 (1.36)	1.50 (1.24)	1.50 (1.00)	1.42 (0.90)	1.67 (1.07)
African American/ Black American	3.32 (1.49)	2.48 (1.62)	2.39 (1.51)	1.92 (1.43)	1.60 (1.01)	1.44 (0.86)	1.74 (1.10)
Indan/ Alaskan Native	2.17 (1.65)	1.94 (1.51)	2.11 (1.41)	1.67 (1.33)	1.28 (0.83)	1.22 (0.73)	1.50 (1.15)
Asian American/ Asian	3.16 (1.38)	2.52 (1.53)	2.03 (1.32)	1.69 (1.19)	1.36 (0.75)	1.34 (0.76)	1.44 (0.86)
Latino/ Hispanic	3.21 (1.50)	2.47 (1.67)	1.94 (1.25)	1.66 (1.13)	1.47 (0.88)	1.48 (0.89)	1.59 (0.98)
Multiracial	3.38 (1.48)	2.59 (1.77)	1.92 (1.20)	1.74 (1.23)	1.46 (0.94)	1.38 (0.88)	1.49 (1.02)
Chose more than one category	3.40 (1.45)	2.38 (1.66)	2.11 (1.37)	1.57 (1.11)	1.41 (0.89)	1.35 (0.82)	1.44 (0.90)
	Positional leader training	Leadership course	Alternative spring break	Peer leadership educator team	Multicultural leadership program	Leadership capstone experience	
Total	1.36 (0.84)	1.30 (0.75)	1.17 (0.54)	1.18 (0.59)	1.17 (0.58)	1.97 (0.17)	
Men	1.47 (0.92)	1.38 (0.84)	1.21 (0.62)	1.24 (0.67)	1.21 (0.65)	1.96 (0.21)	
Women	1.28 (0.75)	1.23 (0.66)	1.13 (0.47)	1.14 (0.52)	1.14 (0.53)	1.98 (0.14)	
White	1.33 (0.80)	1.26 (0.70)	1.14 (0.49)	1.16 (0.56)	1.11 (0.46)	1.97 (0.16)	
Middle Eastern	1.67 (1.07)	1.42 (0.90)	1.42 (0.90)	1.42 (0.90)	1.33 (0.89)	1.83 (0.39)	
African American/ Black American	1.56 (1.01)	1.54 (0.92)	1.30 (0.73)	1.44 (0.86)	1.43 (0.92)	1.97 (0.18)	
Indan/ Alaskan Native	1.33 (0.97)	1.39 (0.98)	1.11 (0.47)	1.17 (0.51)	1.33 (0.97)	2.00 (0.00)	

Asian American/Asian	1.35 (0.80)	1.26 (0.70)	1.18 (0.54)	1.11 (0.42)	1.16 (0.56)	1.94 (0.25)
Latino/Hispanic	1.44 (0.92)	1.48 (0.93)	1.29 (0.77)	1.25 (0.65)	1.42 (0.89)	1.93 (0.25)
Multiracial	1.46 (1.00)	1.23 (0.67)	1.31 (0.73)	1.23 (0.67)	1.38 (0.91)	2.00 (0.00)
Chose more than one category	1.40 (0.89)	1.32 (0.80)	1.13 (0.49)	1.20 (0.63)	1.25 (0.73)	1.97 (0.16)

Note: Mean (SD)

Regression Analysis

The significance level established to test the hypothesis for this study was $p < .05$. However, all three of the blocks and several of the independent variables were significant predictors of social change behaviors at the $p < .001$ significance level. See Table 11 for the final model summary and Table 12 for the variables that were significant predictors of social change behaviors for this sample. Overall, the results of this multiple regression analysis indicate that demographic factors and experiences in high school, involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations, and leadership education and training experiences explain a significant amount of the variance of social change behaviors for lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduates, $R^2 = .527$.

Table 11

Model summary of multiple regression analysis for dependent variable, Social Change Behaviors

Block	R^2	Adjusted R^2	R^2 Change	Significance
Block 1	.159	.157	.159	.000
Block 2	.489	.487	.330	.000
Block 3	.513	.510	.023	.000

Table 11 presents the R^2 , adjusted R^2 , R^2 change, and the significance of each block for this model. R^2 indicates the total amount of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables as each block is added to the model. Consequently, for the final model in this study, 15.9% of the variance can be explained by the independent variables within the first block. When the additional independent variables within the second block are added to the model, 48.9% of the variance for this sample can be explained. Finally, when the third block is added with the remaining independent variables, 51.3% of the total variance is explained. Meaning, 51.3% of the variance for the participants' engaging in social change behaviors is explained by demographics and pre-college experiences, involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations, and leadership education and training experiences.

The adjusted R^2 accounts for any variance that might randomly occur as independent variables are entered into the regression model. The small difference between R^2 and adjusted R^2 indicates that minimal variance might be randomly be occurring as the independent variables are added to the model.

R^2 change indicates the amount of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables, which means for this model 15.9% of the variance is explained by the inputs block, 33.0% of the variance is explained by the first environments block, and 2.3% of the variance is explained by the second environments block for this sample. Further explained, this means that 15.9% of the variance is explained by the participants' demographics and pre-college experiences, 33.0% is explained by participants' involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus

organizations, and 2.3% is explained by participants' leadership education and training experiences.

The significance level indicates whether or not each block has a statistically significant on the dependent variable. Because the significance level for each block is below the predetermined significance level of $p < .05$ and also below a higher threshold for statistical significance, each of the three blocks has a significant impact on the dependent variable when added to the regression model. However, it is important to note, using the R^2 and R^2 change, that the blocks do not explain equal amounts of the variance although they are all statistically significant.

Additionally, the R^2 change indicates how much of the variance is explained by each of the blocks. This information is particularly important for the research question and the hypothesis. The research question and the hypothesis indicate the need to understand how the second environments block compares to the first environments block. Recall that this study sought to determine the relative differential impact of involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations and leadership education and training experiences. Specifically, this study sought to determine the impact of leadership education and training experiences beyond involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations.

In looking at the R^2 change value in Table 11, it can be seen that leadership education and training experiences (Block 3) explain, albeit minimally, a significant portion of the variance beyond involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations (Block 2). Although this portion of the variance is small, it is a

statistically significant portion of the variance that explains participants' engagement in social change behaviors.

Table 12

Predictors of Social Change Behaviors

Independent Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	SE	β	B	SE	β	B	SE	β
Model 1									
Demographics and Pretests									
<i>Race</i>									
White/ Caucasian									
Middle Eastern	-.09	.23	.68	-.06	.18	.74	-.10	.17	.55
African American/ Black	.12	.07	.06	.02	.05	.77	-.03	.05	.57
American Indian/ Alaskan									
Native	-.21	.19	.26	-.02	.14	.90	-.05	.14	.71
Asian American/ Asian	-.04	.07	.55	-.04	.05	.45	-.04	.05	.49
Latino/ Hispanic	-.04	.07	.61	-.06	.05	.22	-.09	.05	.07
Multiracial	.02	.13	.87	-.08	.10	.45	-.11	.10	.28
Two or More	.03	.05	.61	-.04	.04	.36	-.05	.04	.19
<i>Gender</i>	-.07	.03	.04*	.07	.02	.01*	.08	.02	.00**
<i>Socioeconomic Status</i>									
Parents' Education	.02	.01	.06	-.00	.01	.58	-.00	.01	.85
Parents' Income	.01	.01	.51	-.00	.01	.55	-.00	.01	.64
<i>Pretests</i>									
Performed Community Service	.1	.02	.00**	.02	.01	.13	.01	.01	.46
Worked with others for societal problem	.30	.02	.00**	.21	.0	.00**	.20	.01	.00**
R ²	.159**								
Model 2									
Involvement Experiences									
College Organizations Leader in College				.21	.01	.00**	.20	.01	.00**
Organizations				.12	.01	.00**	.08	.01	.00**
Off-Campus Organizations				.13	.01	.00**	.13	.01	.00**
Leader in Off-Campus Organizations				.03	.02	.06	.02	.02	.24
R ² Change	.330**								

R ²	.489			
<hr/>				
Model 3				
Leadership Education and Training Experiences				
Leadership Conference		.05	.03	.05*
Leadership Retreat		.00	.03	.96
Leadership Lecture/ Workshop Series		.06	.02	.01*
Positional Leader Training		.08	.02	.00**
Leadership Course		-.02	.02	.39
Alternative Spring Break		.03	.03	.32
Peer Leadership Educator Team		-		
		.05	.03	.05*
Multicultural Leadership Program		.09	.03	.00**
Leadership Capstone Experience		.01	.07	.86
R ² Change	.023**			
R ²	.513			

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 12 presents the independent variables used in this regression model. Using this table, it can be seen which independent variables are statistically significant and help to explain the variance of the dependent variable.

Gender is the only demographic variable that is statistically significant in this model. The significance of this variable is indicated throughout the model and becomes more significant as additional independent variables are added with the second and third blocks of the model. These values indicate that gender accounts for a significant, positive portion of the variance.

The pretest variables are determined to be significant before additional blocks are added. However, when the second and third blocks are added to the model, the first pretest variable, performing community service, no longer explains a significant portion of the variance. The second pretest variable, working with others for change to address

societal problems, continues to explain a statistically significant, positive portion of the variance as additional blocks are added.

When involvement and leadership variables are added to the model with the second block, three of the four variables are statistically significant and remain significant when the third block is added. Being involved in a co-curricular organization, holding a leadership position in a co-curricular organization, and being involved in an off-campus organization explain a significant, positive portion of the variance.

Five of the nine leadership education and training experiences explain a significant portion of the variance. Leadership conferences, leadership lectures and workshop series, and multicultural leadership programs explain a significant, positive portion of the variance. Conversely, peer leadership educator teams explain a significant, negative portion of the variance.

Hypothesis

The null hypothesis established for this study was as follows: Leadership education and training do not predict social change behaviors beyond involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations. Using this regression analysis, constructed using Astin's (1993) Inputs-Environments-Outputs Model, the null hypothesis was rejected. The output from this regression analysis provides evidence that leadership education and training experiences explain a statistically significant 2.3% of the variance beyond the statistically significant 33.0% of the variance that was explained by the participants' involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations. Together, the three blocks in this model explain 51.3% of the variance for the participants' engagement in social change behaviors.

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the results for this study. The demographic information for the sample of lesbian, gay, and bisexual students was reviewed. The regression analysis was explained, including a discussion of the total amount of variance explained, the model summary, and the significant independent variables. Finally, the null hypothesis established for this study was reviewed and rejected using the information generated from this regression analysis. The following chapter will provide a discussion of these results, possible implications, the limitations of this study, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

This study examined how demographics, pre-college activities, and college experiences contributed to lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduates' engagement in student activism. After a review of the relevant literature, a null hypothesis was established, and a multiple regression analysis was designed using Astin's (1993) college impacts model to test this hypothesis. The following chapter will provide a summary of the findings, present the limitations of this study, discuss the implications of the results, and offer suggestions for further research.

Summary of the Findings

The following section will present a brief review of the findings for this study. First, demographic and descriptive data from the sample will be reviewed. Following, the results of the multiple regression analysis will be presented to examine the significant variables that predict student activism for this sample.

Demographic and Descriptive Findings

The demographic percentages for participants in this study varied from the national sample on all of the demographic variables. The gender breakdown for this study was closer to equal groups with 44% men and 56% women while the national sample was more skewed toward women with only 33.6% men and 61.3% women.

Regarding race, the racial group percentages for participants in the study were different on all categories although some differences were minimal. The proportion of participants who identified as White/ Caucasian was almost the same for both groups with 70.9% in this study and 69.0% in the national sample. Middle Eastern participants were largely underrepresented in both groups with 0.4% in this study and 0.6% in the

national sample. Participants who identified as African American or Black composed 6.0% of the sample for this study and 5.1% of the national sample.

American Indian and Alaskan Native participants were largely underrepresented in both populations with 0.7% of the participants for this study and 0.4% of the national sample. Asian American and Asian participants were a smaller proportion of the sample for this study than the national sample with 5.2% of the participants in this study and 7.3% of the national sample. Latino and Hispanic participants represented a larger proportion of the participants in this study than the national sample with 5.8% and 3.9%, respectively.

Participants who identified as Multiracial seem to be less representative in the sample for this study than the national group with only 1.5% of the participants for this study and 7.2% of the national sample. However, this underrepresentation in this study is most likely due to the coding of multiracial participants for this study. Because participants who indicated more than one racial group membership were coded into a separate group, this may explain why the proportion of multiracial participants is much smaller than the national sample.

Through a comparison of means across groups, trends and patterns can be identified regarding the relative amount of engagement in the various activities involved in this study. The means for the social change behaviors and scale, involvement experiences, and leadership education and training experiences were separated by demographic variables to provide a picture of how race and gender interact with each of the variables.

Looking first at the dependent variable, men and women seem to engage in relatively the same amount of social change behaviors. Regression analysis later in this chapter affirmed that African American and Black participants engaged in more social change behaviors than any other group although they performed less of certain behaviors than other racial groups.

Scholars (Ellis-Williams, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Swain, 2010) have discussed characteristics of African American and Black college student involvement that may provide an understanding of their increased involvement in social change behaviors. Ellis-Williams (2007) completed a qualitative study involving 7 African-identified college students. With this study, Ellis-Williams sought to better understand youth who engaged in activism. She found that college students felt more empowered on campus to engage in activism than they did off-campus. These students felt like they could make a larger impact by advocating on campus where they had relative power in their environment. They did not feel any sense of power off campus and therefore did not feel like they could enact any lasting change.

Ellis-Williams' (2007) findings may help to explain the increased amount of African American and Black students' engagement in social change behaviors. Perhaps the participants in this study similarly feel more power as a college student and consequently engage in further activism.

Harper and Quaye (2007) present similar findings in their study of African American undergraduate male student leaders. Through their qualitative study of 32 men, Harper and Quaye found that these male student leaders were committed to advancing the African American communities on their campuses. To do this, these students created

new student organizations, gained access to administration through positional leadership, and intentionally took action to gain access to funding for their initiatives. Harper and Quaye explain that “the student leaders were compelled to get involved to have their voices and the voices of the African American community heard” (p. 136).

The students in Harper and Quaye’s (2007) study engaged in intentional action to advance their community on campus. Although the data for this study does not identify the specifics of the participants’ social change behaviors, one might suggest that these students are engaging in activism to create additional opportunities for others who share in their identities, either race or sexual orientation.

Swain’s (2010) study provides additional perspective on African American and Black students’ participation in social change behaviors, which he labels “non-electoral modes of activism” (p. 567). Through this study, Swain attempted to gain additional perspective on African American individuals’ activism that did not include voting. He explains that signing a petition, participating in a protest, attending a political meeting or rally, or picketing or participating in a boycott can all be identified as non-electoral modes of activism.

The African American and Black participants in this study may participate in these non-electoral modes of activism, in part, for the following reason:

Because racism and class inequality are prevalent in American society, many in the African American community recognize that non-electoral social and political activism stands a better chance of improving the quality of life for all in society—and not just Blacks—by increasing the salience and specter of the issues raised by institutionalized class and race discrimination (Swain, 2010, p. 568).

Although the data does not provide information about the reasons behind the participants' involvement in social change behaviors, this explanation of non-electoral modes of activism provides greater perspective on the overall greater involvement of African American and Black individuals' engagement in social change behaviors. The following paragraphs present the means for the individual actions that compose the social change behaviors scale.

Although statistical analyses were not conducted to determine if these trends were significant, an item analysis of the types of social change behaviors in the Social Change Behaviors scale reveals interesting trends that may lead to further research. African American and Black participants performed more community service than other groups while American Indian and Alaskan Native participants acted for the common good or to protect the environment more than other groups. African American and Black students were involved in more organizations that address social or environmental problems, and similarly, they were most involved with organizations that addressed the concerns of a specific community.

African American and Black students communicated with leaders about a pressing concern more often than other groups while Middle Eastern and Multiracial students took more action to try and address a social or environmental problem than other groups. African American and Black students worked with others to make their campus or community a better place and acted to raise awareness about an issue more often than other groups.

Multiracial participants took part in a protest, march, rally, or demonstration more often than other groups, and Middle Eastern participants worked with others more often than other groups to address social inequality.

Considering the independent variables, men are involved with co-curricular and off-campus organizations and hold leadership positions within these organizations more often than women. Also, men participate in all of the leadership education and training experiences more often than women in the study.

Participants who chose more than one racial category participated more often in co-curricular organizations than other groups, and participants who identified as multiracial more often lead these groups. African American and Black participants were more involved with off-campus organizations than other groups, and they lead these groups more often.

Regarding the leadership education and training experiences, African American and Black participants were involved in leadership conferences, leadership lecture and workshop series, leadership courses, peer leadership educator teams, and multicultural leadership programs more often than other groups in this sample. Latino participants went on leadership retreats more often, and American Indian and Alaskan Native participants engaged in more leadership capstone experiences. Middle Eastern participants in this study went through positional leadership training and participated in Alternative Spring Break trips more often than other groups.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Using a multiple regression analysis, several predictor variables were determined to be statistically significant on the outcome variable, student activism. Astin (1993)

developed a model to identify how the college environment affects students. This model accounts for students' pre-college characteristics, called inputs, and students' experiences in college, called environments, on certain identified outcomes, called outputs (Astin). For this study, the inputs included demographic information and pre-college experiences, the environments consisted of involvement and leadership experiences, and output was student activism, operationalized through a number of activities labeled social change behaviors.

Inputs. Demographics and pre-college activities were determined to be important input variables for this study through a review of relevant literature. These demographic variables included race, gender, and socioeconomic status. Additionally, two pretest items from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership are included in the social change behaviors scale. Consequently, these pre-college activities may contribute to the outcome variable.

Through the statistical analysis it was determined that gender was the only demographic variable that was a significant predictor of student activism with women engaging significantly more than men. This result is likely connected to women's leadership styles that are collaborative, empowering, and involve effective communication and listening skills (Eagly & Carli, 2003). Because many of the behaviors included within the Social Change Behaviors Scale are completed within groups, it follows that women's group-oriented styles of leading may be more effective for engaging in student activism with others.

This finding also connects to data collected through the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). In a report that presents national norms for college students

from 1966 to 2001, Astin, Oseguera, Sax, and Korn (2002) list attitudes held by students in their first year of college. Several of these attitudes connect to the student population for this study and social change behaviors. These attitudes include: “Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus; It is important to have laws prohibiting homosexual relationships; Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about change in society; Same sex couples should have the right to legal marital status” (Astin et al., p. 105).

In this report, the norms for college students’ attitudes are disaggregated by gender, which allows for comparing the attitudes of first-year college men and women. On all of the four attitudes listed above for the five years from 1997 to 2001, women report attitudes that are consistent with the finding from this study that women engage in student activism significantly more than men. The data from the CIRP show that more women feel that policies should be created to stop racist and sexist speech on campus and more women feel that same sex couples should be able to legally married (Astin et al., 2002). Additionally, the data show that less women feel that laws should be in place to ban same sex relationships and less women feel that they can do little to bring about change in society (Astin et al.). This data shows that women, as compared to me, hold attitudes that might lead them to engage in student activism to make their attitudes become realities in society.

Race and socioeconomic status were not statistically significant predictors of student activism within this sample. Two theoretical models provide possible explanations for the non-significant impact of race and socioeconomic status for this sample, and both of these models require an intersectional perspective because they view

individuals as beings who have and are affected by multiple social identities. First, Sue and Sue's (2003) Racial and Cultural Identity Development model might explain the race-related finding in suggesting that participants are in advanced stages of identity development. Second, Abes, Jones, and McEwen's (2007) reconceptualized Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity would explain the lack of significance in race and socioeconomic status if the participants' races were less salient at the time they took the survey or when they engaged in activism.

Sue and Sue (2003) revised an earlier model on minority identity development to create the Racial and Cultural Identity Development Model. This model includes five stages of development where an individual progressively develops a sense of racial and cultural identity as they engage in difference experiences in their lives. This model is comprised of five stages, beginning with conformity and moving through dissonance, resistance and immersion, and introspection to end at synergistic articulation and awareness. In this final stage, individuals have a better understanding of their own identity and are able to synthesize their racial and ethnic identities with their other identities.

Participants' race for this sample might not significantly predict activism because these students are either in the final stage of Sue and Sue's (2003) model, or they are able to at least synthesize their racial and ethnic identities with their other identities.

Abes, Jones, and McEwen's (2007) reconceptualized Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity could help to explain why race and socioeconomic status are not significant predictors of activism for this sample. This reconceptualized model includes three parts: contextual influences, the meaning-making filter, and self-perceptions of

multiple identity dimensions. Contextual influences are the conditions outside the individual, such as social norms, stereotypes, and other people, which may affect how an individual views his or her own identities (Abes, Jones, & McEwen). Following, the meaning-making filter regulates which of the contextual influences have an impact on an individual, and finally, the self-perceptions are the ways that an individual views him- or herself regarding the multiple identities that he or she possesses (Abes, Jones, & McEwen).

For both identities, race and socioeconomic status, the participants in this study may have been experiencing their sexual orientation with more salience as they were completing the survey, which might make their engaging in social change behaviors more similar to their LGB peers than the respondents with whom they shared race and class identifications.

The two identified pre-college activities that are included in the social change behaviors scale are performing community service and working with others to change or address a societal problem. Pre-college community service was not found to be a statistically significant predictor of student activism. This may be the case because increasingly more high schools are requiring students to participate in community service before they graduate. In addition, high school students may see community service as an extra item to boost their college applications. Consequently, students may not be engaging in community service before college as a method of activism. Instead, students may be simply fulfilling a requirement or boosting their resume, which does not convey a desire to enact positive social change.

This suggestion is supported by scholars (Marks & Jones, 2004; Niemi, Hepburn, & Chapman, 2000) who studied the nature and outcomes of high school community

service experiences. Marks and Jones (2004) explain that many high schools, both public and private, are adding community service requirements for graduation. With their study, these scholars attempted to determine the connection between high school community service and a student's likelihood of engaging in collegiate community service experiences. Marks and Jones found that the students in their sample who engaged in high school community service were less likely to engage in volunteerism in college. These scholars suggest that this may be due to the external factors that motivate high school community service, such as group norms, school expectations, or graduation requirements, because these students are engaging in service for personal benefit (Marks & Jones).

Niemi et al. (2000) identify the types of service experiences in which high school students are engaging, such as babysitting and janitorial work. These authors suggest that these experiences do not have developmental benefits for high school students because they are service experiences without any meaningful educational component. Meaning, students are not experiencing positive, developmental outcomes because they are engaging in experiences that do not provide them with the space for intentional and thoughtful reflection. When the students do not make meaning of their experiences, they are not taking anything away from community service.

However, working with others to change or address a societal problem was found to be a statistically significant predictor of social change behaviors. This finding is intuitive because an individual who has worked to specifically address a societal problem in the past is likely to continue engaging in activism that will allow for continued social

change. This finding would suggest that individuals in this sample did not lose their propensity for social change as they left high school and entered college.

The various inputs variables mentioned above accounted for 15.9% of the total variance within this model. Meaning, 15.9% of the variance for predicting why a student in this sample would engage in student activism can be attributed to race, gender, socioeconomic status, and pre-college activities. However, it is important to remember that not all of the variables were significant when considered individually.

Environments. The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of leadership education and training beyond involvement and leadership of co-curricular and off-campus organizations. As such, the environments for this study were the leadership education and training experiences and the involvement and leadership experiences. Because the study sought to determine the affect of leadership education and training beyond the other environments, the impact of involvement and leadership of co-curricular and off-campus organizations was determined first.

The first set of environments variables was composed of various student experiences with organizations. Participants were asked about their involvement in both co-curricular and off-campus organizations. They were also asked to indicate if they had any positional leadership experiences with these organizations.

Through the multiple regression analysis it was determined that involvement in co-curricular and off-campus organizations and having a leadership position within a co-curricular organization were statistically significant predictors of student activism for this sample. Conversely, having a leadership position in an off-campus organization was determined to not be a statistically significant predictor of student activism.

This first set of environments variables accounted for 33.0% of the total variance within this model. Meaning, 33.0% of the variance for predicting why a student will engage in activism can be attributed to involvement in co-curricular and off-campus organizations and positional leadership in co-curricular organizations.

The significant and large impact of involvement and positional leadership on a participant's propensity for engaging in student activism connects to previous studies about the benefits of student organization involvement and positional leadership (Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994; Dugan & Komives, 2007). Both of these articles cite the connection between involvement and positional leadership experiences and student activism or social change.

Cooper et al. (1994) studied the benefits of student organization involvement over a period of several years while a student was in college. They found that this involvement resulted in a number of developmental outcomes, and one of these outcomes was increased cultural participation. The participants in this study demonstrate cultural participation through their engaging in student activism, which through the regression analysis was predicted, in large part, by a student's involvement in co-curricular and off-campus organizations.

Additionally, Dugan and Komives (2007), using data collected in the first iteration of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership in 2006, identified a higher propensity for students to engage in the Social Change Model of Leadership (HERI, 1996) when they were members of a student organization. They also found that positional leadership roles encourage leadership that aligns with the values of the Social Change Model of Leadership. Both of these findings support the findings in this present

study that involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular and off-campus leadership affect the extent to which participants engage in student activism.

The second set of environments variables included leadership education and training experiences. A review of the relevant literature resulted in the selection of the following experiences: leadership conference, leadership retreat, leadership lecture/workshop series, positional leader training, leadership course, alternative spring break, peer leadership educator team, multicultural leadership program, and leadership capstone experience. Each experience was run separately to determine whether or not it was a significant predictor of student activism.

Five of the leadership education and training experiences were found to be significant predictors of student activism. This second set of environments variables accounted for 2.3% of the variance within this model. Meaning, 2.3% of the variance for predicting why students engage in activism can be attributed to these leadership education and training experiences. It should be noted this explained variance beyond that of leadership and organizational involvement. Leadership conferences, leadership lectures and workshop series, positional leader training, peer leadership educator teams, and multicultural leadership programs were found to be statistically significant predictors of student activism for this sample. However, it should be noted that the peer leadership educator team was a negative predictor, so this experience significantly predicted that students who engaged in this experience would not engage in social change behaviors. Leadership retreats, leadership courses, alternative spring break programs, and leadership capstone experiences were not significant.

The significance of these leadership education and training experiences can be connected back to Kolb's (1984) Model of Experiential Learning. The four experiences that significantly predicted participants' engagement in student activism are educational or training experiences where students are provided with information and theory to increase their meaning-making that comes from their participation in various leadership activities. The significance from these specific formats might also come from the leadership model around which these experiences are crafted because certain models, such as the Social Change Model (HERI, 1996) and the Relational Leadership Model (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998), promote leadership as a process in moving toward positive change. As such, if students are being taught models that encourage positive change, it follows that they would more likely to engage in student activism through social change behaviors.

Together, 51.3% of the variance was explained by the independent variables included in this multiple regression analysis for this sample. This means that 51.3% of the variance for predicting why a student will engage in activism can be attributed to demographics, pre-college experiences, involvement and leadership of co-curricular and off-campus organizations, and leadership education and training experiences.

Hypothesis

The null hypothesis established for this study stated that leadership education and training experiences do not predict student activism beyond involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations. The results of the regression analysis show that leadership education and training experiences significantly predict social change behaviors in lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate beyond their involvement

and leadership experiences in co-curricular and off-campus organizations. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the leadership education and training experiences predict student activism in this sample.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are based on the chosen methodology, the student population, and the categorization of sexual orientation in this study. Because quantitative methodologies are being employed, the amount of detail in the results is limited. Since the leadership education and training experiences are coded with student's level of participation being minimized to only indicate whether or not a student participates in those experiences, the amount that a student participates in a specific activity was unclear without post hoc analyses. Additionally, this methodology overlooks the qualitative aspects of the leadership education and training experiences, the involvement experiences, and the experiences had when students engage in social change behaviors.

Although post hoc analyses were employed to identify the extent to which participants were involved in each of the leadership education and training experiences, the frequency of involvement does not provide detail about how participants were specifically impacted by those experiences. Additionally, in utilizing quantitative methodologies, it is unclear why involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations and leadership education and training experiences predict student activism. Survey methods do not provide information about the possible connections that participants make among all of their different experiences.

Regarding the limitations associated with the student population, with quantitative analyses, there is no way to determine where an LGB student is in his or her identity development. The data from this study does not indicate where in Cass's (1979), D'Augelli's (1994), or Fassinger and Miller's (1996) models an LGB student might be located, which may have an affect on his or her leadership and activism. There is a similar limitation with the racial demographic identifier because the race selection in this instrument does not fully identify racial identity, and racial identity development is particularly obscured.

Also, there are limitations in the ways that participants are able to identify their sexual orientation on this survey. The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership allows for participants to choose heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual, or questioning. Renn (2010) suggests that Queer Theory provides an alternative to current, static categories of sexual orientation. Renn shares: "Queer Theory enables a more contextual, less categorical examination of development that considers the mutual influences of multiple, fluid identity domains" (p. 135). With this study, participants who identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual might have preferred to indicate a more dynamic identifier for their sexual orientation, such as fluid, pansexual, or queer, but were unable to do this. Consequently, the limitation is that this study continues to reify the notion that sexual orientation is an identity that can be simplified to five categories: lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning, and heterosexual (or straight).

Implications for Practice

The following section will present implications for practice based on the results of this study. First, the implications of organizational involvement will be explored. Then, the opportunities of leadership education and training experiences will be presented. Next, implications for collaboration across campus will be shared. Additionally, the potential for activism in off-campus organizations will be discussed. Finally, implications for pre-college community service will be explored. Following this section, recommendations for future research will be presented.

The results of this study indicate that involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations is a significant and substantial predictor of LGB student engagement in student activism. This finding is similar to Renn's (2007) finding that students who held positional leadership roles in LGBT organizations connected them to activism on campus for issues not related to their sexual orientation. Involvement in organizations, whether as a member or a positional leader, provides opportunities for students to become engaged in social change behaviors.

A potential reason that these organizational involvement experiences were a strong predictor of student activism is the connection between the activities that student might engage in as members or leaders of these organizations. For example, Renn (2007) explained that students who held positional roles in LGBT organizations were often asked to represent other LGBT students or serve in an advisory capacity to ensure that LGBT students were being supported on campus. This opportunity would be defined as a social change behavior by the present study since the student is communicating with a campus leader about a pressing concern as a member of an advisory board. Consequently,

participants in this study may be regularly engaging in social change behaviors as members of these organizations because the activities that the organization engages in could be identified this way.

Because these organizations are either engaging in social change behaviors or providing students, as members or as leaders, with the opportunity to engage in these behaviors, student affairs educators should encourage students' participation in organizations to increase their opportunities to engage in student activism. Being members of an organization, either co-curricular or off-campus, students will have opportunities to engage in activities that result in positive change for the organization, the campus, the surrounding community, or the greater society. Student activism results from the students who engage in social change behaviors as member or leaders of these organizations.

Additionally, considering the findings from this study and Renn's (2007) findings, lesbian, gay, and bisexual students who are involved and leading co-curricular and off-campus organizations may be more likely to engage in activism that benefits the LGBT community. Students who engage in these organizations might be more inclined to engage in social change behaviors. This increased enactment of social change behaviors could result in LGB student speaking with an administrator about the concerns they have related to their sexual orientation, or it might result in a student working with others to address a concern about the campus climate for LGBT students at their institution.

Student affairs educators might question which organizations they should lead students to join or what characteristics of an organization might encourage a student to engage in activism. Although this study only identified that involvement in co-curricular

organizations is a significant predictor of student activism, there are certain organizational characteristics that might intuitively lead a student to engage in positive social change. First, organizations that explicitly identify themselves as organizations that are working to promote positive change would most likely lead students to engage in activism, so student affairs educators might suggest these as involvement opportunities for LGB students. Second, identity-based organizations might also provide opportunities for students to engage in activism if these organizations are working for positive change for their communities either on campus, in their communities, or in society.

Another implication of the significance of involvement and positional leadership in co-curricular organizations for student affairs educators is the possibility of encouraging social change behaviors within all co-curricular organizations. Some colleges and universities require all co-curricular organizations to complete some form of community service each semester. Since community service was identified in this study as a component of student activism, requiring community service in organizations and then coaching student leaders to engage in meaningful community service might encourage activism in more students on college and university campuses in the United States.

Through this study, leadership education and training experiences were found to be a significant predictor of student activism in LGB undergraduates. More specifically, there were certain leadership education and training formats that were significant predictors of student activism. These formats were: leadership conferences, leadership lectures and workshop series, positional leader training, and multicultural leadership programs. Dugan, Bohle, Gebhardt, Hofert, Wilk, and Cooney (2011) also found that

leadership conferences and leadership lectures and workshop series were significant predictors of similar outcomes.

Since these were found to be formats that predict student activism, more students should be encouraged to participate in these experiences, and it follows that more student affairs educators should create opportunities to have these experiences. Because the small amount of the variance that was explained by these experiences, student affairs educator should not stop other types of leadership education and training experiences for only those listed in the previous paragraph. However, if a campus currently does not have one of the experiences that were found to be significant, student affairs educators should consider creating these types of opportunities for students on their campuses.

A consideration that leadership educators should keep in mind when creating these opportunities is the curriculum of these education and training experiences. Dugan et al. (2011) suggest that leadership educators be intentional when planning the curriculum for these experiences to maximize on student learning and to achieve identified outcomes. These experiences should not be constructed on a foundation of personal best practices and anecdotal evidence but instead upon scholarship and research for effective, meaningful programs.

Another implication of this study is the need for collaboration across campus. The results of this study suggest that involvement is a significant and substantial predictor for LGB student activism. Additionally, certain leadership education and training experiences were significant predictors of student activism within the LGB undergraduate sample. Connecting these results, student affairs educators need to find

ways to pair these experiences and find ways to maximize on both of these areas that promote student activism.

LGB undergraduates should be encouraged to join co-curricular and off-campus organization as a means to promote their engagement in activism. Through their experiences in these organizations, LGB students may be presented with a variety of opportunities to make positive change on campus or in their communities. After they have joined these organizations, student affairs educators should complement their involvement experiences with the leadership education and training experiences that were significant predictors of student activism.

Additionally, considering the significance of participation in off-campus organizations, LGB students should be encouraged to join off-campus organizations that are advocating for causes that align with students' passions and interests. Ellis-Williams (2007) explains that the African students in her study do not feel like they have the power to make positive change off-campus because they are individuals trying to make an impact on society. Connecting the finding from this study with the finding from Ellis-Williams' study, LGB student should join off-campus organizations because they might feel that they have more power to positively affect society when they work with others toward a common goal. As they engage in activism with others off-campus, LGB students will hopefully begin to feel that they have the ability to make positive social change that will result in a better society.

Understanding the implications of the findings of this study will allow student affairs educators to be intentional in providing opportunities for LGB students that might encourage them to engage in student activism. Through involvement, positional

leadership, and leadership education and training, LGB students may become individuals who engage in social change behaviors and stand up to work for equal rights in society.

A final implication of this study is the need for more meaningful community service experiences in high school. With many schools adding community service to graduation requirements (Marks & Jones; 2004), it will be important for these experiences to allow for thoughtful reflection to promote activism within these students. Marks and Jones suggest that community service experiences should be more than short, one-time experiences and should instead be prolonged with multiple opportunities for engagement followed by space for reflective meaning-making and discussions. With more significant, impactful pre-college community service experiences, LGB students may enter college with a predisposition for engaging in student activism and positive social change, unlike the students in the sample for this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following section will present recommendations for further research. These recommendations will include suggestions for further understanding the connections that were seen in this study. Additionally, within-group analyses will be encouraged for sexual minorities. Also, including additional understandings of gender in a future study will be put forward. Opportunities for further research with regards to gender, off-campus involvement, religious identity, and alternative spring break trips will be discussed. Finally, qualitative methodologies will be suggested for understanding the activist experiences of this student population.

A future study could focus on the connection between student activism and the independent variables. Further research could be done to better understand why

involvement and leadership in co-curricular and off-campus organizations explains such a large portion of the variance for this population. What about this involvement encourages student activism? Do these experiences predict activism in students with other social identities? How do students become engaged in activism? Are students engaged in activism with these organizations? Future studies could employ different methods to be able to focus on the connection between organizational involvement and student activism.

Additionally, future research could identify within group differences among the lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduate population. Separate identity development models have been created for lesbian women, gay men, and bisexual people. These models have identified the individualized ways that each of these identity groups develops. Consequently, future research could examine the unique ways that individuals in each of these groups engage in activism and how this engagement is mediated by an individual's identity development.

Further, future research could provide additional options for participants to identify themselves. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Queer Theory allows for greater flexibility in the self-identification of sexual orientation (Renn, 2010). Future studies should provide this greater flexibility by allowing participants to write in their sexual orientation or by providing additional options other than lesbian, gay, bisexual, and questioning.

Additionally, it is important to understand the ways that gender was classified in the literature that was reviewed for this study and in this study. In all of the articles mentioned earlier and for the student sample for this study, gender was portrayed as a

binary with male and female being the only genders identified. Kezar and Moriarity (2000) do not indicate any consideration of gender identities other than male and female. Dugan (2006) and Dugan et al. (2008) only mention male and female genders in their results, but it should be noted that the 2006 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership from which their data came allowed participants to identify as transgender.

Future research should be completed to understand involvement, leadership, and student activism within student populations that do not identify with the restricting gender binary. Future studies could allow participants to identify their gender with an open response instead of a multiple response format. This could allow for further understanding of student leaders and activists who do not fall within the normative gender binary. Additionally, this will allow for a better perspective on the ways in which sexual orientation, gender, and other identities intersect to promote or impede activism within undergraduate populations. Consequently, this may allow for additional understanding of how transgender, queer-identified, and gender non-conforming students engage in activism on campus and in their surrounding communities.

A future study might also attempt to further understand why women are more likely to engage in student activism and positive social change than men. How does this connect to the socialization of men and women in society? Are women more likely to engage in activism because they have been socialized to be more caring of others and want to work for better experiences for their fellow citizens? These questions and more might be answered by a future study that focuses more explicitly on gender and student activism.

There are also opportunities with future research to understand why leadership in off-campus organizations was not a significant predictor for engaging in social change behaviors. This study might look at the types of off-campus organizations where students hold positional leadership. This may provide insight as to why positional leadership within these organizations does not significantly predict student activism.

More research could be conducted to understand how religious identity affects student activism in lesbian, gay, and bisexual students. Because religion was not identified as a significant variable through the literature review for this study, it was not included in the multiple regression analysis. However, religion may be an important factor specifically for this population due to the historical tension between religion and sexual minorities. A future study could seek to identify how religious identity intersects with a marginalized sexual orientation to either encourage or deter a student from engaging in activism. This study might also help to explain the non-significance of positional leadership in off-campus organization if the organizations that students lead are religious organizations where they are not able to disclose their sexual orientation or are unable to engage in activism.

Based on the findings that alternative spring break (ASB) trips were not a leadership experience that significantly predicted student activism, further research should be conducted on the outcomes of these types of experiences. ASB trips allow for short-term experiences where students are immersed in community service and learning through reflection. Further research should be conducted to identify what the identified and actual outcomes are of ASB trips and if any of these outcomes, either identified or achieved, include student activism or social change behaviors.

Finally, the results of this study provide many opportunities to further understand the results using qualitative methodologies. Utilizing qualitative methodologies, there is the possibility to better understand a student's experiences with activism. What motivated them to engage in social change behaviors? How do they feel when they are engaging in these behaviors? What are the developmental outcomes for students who engage in these behaviors? What do these students feel are the benefits or rewards of their actions? These questions, and many others, could be answered through an in-depth look at the experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual student activists.

Positionality of the Researcher

Although quantitative methodologies, consistent with post-positivist paradigms, seek to provide objective findings with generalizable results, it is important to identify the ways in which a study is not completely objective, understanding that complete objectivity is not possible. A way that I will seek to do this is to identify the ways in which my positionality as the researcher may have affected this study.

First, the purpose of this study was affected by my identities and life experiences. Being a gay man, I am interested in the ways that additional rights might be acquired for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community. Additionally, my self-identification as an activist and as student activist when I was in school motivated me to create a study about what predicts student activism in undergraduates. Finally, my personal, professional, and academic interests in student leadership provided the means by which students might be encouraged to engage in further activism. As such, this study, which sought to understand how student leadership experiences encourage student activism in undergraduates for LGBT rights, was proposed and completed as a way to

find more information about this student population but also as a way to better understand my own experience.

Second, the input variables that were included in this study were the outcome of my own sociocultural identities. With this study, I attempted to spotlight sexual orientation as a way to learn more about how students with marginalized sexual identities engage in student activism. However, I made choices with this study to remove several groups of students who could have been included in this student but did not fall into the categories that I aimed to study. Individuals who identified as Questioning are considered sexual minorities, yet I did not include them in this study. Looking back, this choice connects to my own identity as a gay man. Because my sexual identity falls into the rigidly constructed categories that society has created for sexual minorities, I chose to study those students who also self-identified within one of these categories: lesbian, gay, or bisexual. Because the literature does not include much research on Questioning individuals, I could cite this as the only reason for not studying these individuals, but I think it is important to identify how my identity affected the selection of participants in my sample.

Similarly, the choice to focus on sexual orientation and not gender identity and expression can be credited to my understanding of my own gender. Because I identify as a male and express my gender in a masculine way, I can easily fit into the gender binary that society impresses upon individuals. Because I do not identify outside of this binary, I can more easily disregard how gender identity and expression affect a student's propensity for engaging in student activism. I did not consider this as I was designing this study, though. My goal was to separate sexual orientation from gender because these

two are often conflated. However, in separating these two, I can now see that I have continued to silence and disregard those individuals who identify as transgender or gender non-conforming or do not identify with any sort of gender at all. Additionally, in looking back with an intersectional lens, I understand that sexual orientation and gender cannot be separated as easily as I may have expected that they could, so it will be important for future research to be conducted to include the experiences of individuals who identify outside of the gender binary.

Finally, I would like to comment on the exclusion of religion in this study. Although religion did not emerge as a significant variable for this study through my review of the literature, it is likely that the inclusion of religion may have provided additional findings for the connection between identity, organizational involvement, and student activism. Similar to the exclusion of transgender and gender non-conforming participants, religion and religious identity was excluded from this study due in part to the role of religion in my life. I am not a religious person and struggle with religious organizations due to the historical and continued conflict between certain religious and LGBT people. Because religion is not an important part of my life, I was able to look past it as a variable that could have provided additional information in this study. Religion may have been a significant factor in predicting student activism for the students in my sample, but I did not take the opportunity to find this as a result of my own religious identity.

The purpose of this section was not to damage the credibility of myself as the researcher or the study. Instead, I hoped to use this section to be more critical of how I, as the researcher, had an affect on the way this study was designed and the results that

were obtained based on the choices that were made in designing this study. Although objectivity is the ultimate goal, it is important to remember that choices are made with every project, and it is my responsibility as a researcher to help others understand how my positionality affected this project.

Conclusion

This study provides additional information about lesbian, gay, and bisexual student leadership in undergraduates at colleges and universities in the United States. Using multiple regression analysis, the model created for this study explained 51.3% of the variance in the outcome of student activism. Several positive and negative predictors of student activism were identified for this population. Although additional information was obtained about LGB student leadership, further research is needed to understand the reasons behind these students' choice to engage in activism.

Using the results of this study, student affairs educators can intentionally develop leadership education and training experiences that will encourage student activism in LGB students. Additionally, student affairs educators can provide LGB students with information about involvement and leadership opportunities in co-curricular and off-campus organizations, where they can enact social change behaviors. Hopefully, the results of this study will be used to create opportunities for LGB students to engage in activism that will promote equal rights, protections, and prosperity for all lesbian, gay, and bisexual people in the United States.

This study sought to identify ways that student activism could be encouraged within LGB undergraduates for several purposes. First, this information increases the body of scholarship on lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduates and the scholarship on

LGB student leadership. Second, and equally important, this study has identified predictors of student activism and this knowledge will help student affairs educators to provide experiences for LGB undergraduates that will lead them to engage in positive social change. The findings from this study provide information that student affairs educators can use to help LGB undergraduates become involved in organizations where they will engage in student activism or where they will build the confidence to engage in activism both on and off campus for the LGBT community and advocate for other causes. With increased numbers of LGB student activists on college and university campuses, equal rights for the LGBT community might be achieved sooner because these students will be more willing to stand up and fight for the rights that they deserve as citizens of the United States of America. This study will hopefully lead to student affairs educators empower their students to take personal responsibility in the struggles for their rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of multiple dimensions of identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 1-22.
- Altbach, P. G. (1989). Perspectives on student political activism. *Comparative Education, 25*(1), 97-110.
- Altbach, P. G., & Cohen, R. (1989). American student activism: The post-sixties transformation. In Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). *Student political activism: An international reference handbook* (pp. 457-473). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Altbach, P. G., & Cohen, R. (1990). American student activism: The post-sixties transformation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 61*, 32-49.
- Arnold, P. P., & Welch, M. (2007). Who we really are: Demographic factors that predict student service leadership. *NASPA Journal, 44*, 147-164.
- Astin, A. W. (1991). *Assessment for Excellence*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*, 297-308
- Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Astin, A. W., Oseguera, L., Sax, L. J., & Korn, W. S. (2002). *The American freshman: Thirty-five year trends*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute,

- UCLA.
- Baker, A. C., Jensen, P. J., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Conversation as experiential learning. *Management Learning, 36*. 411-427.
- Barber, M. (2007). Reassessing pedagogy in a fast forward age. *International Journal of Learning, 13*(9). 143-149.
- Biddix, J. P. (2010). Technology uses in campus activism from 2000 to 2008: Implications for civic learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*. 679-693.
- Biddix, J. P., Somers, P. A., & Polman, J. L. (2009). Protest reconsidered: Identifying democratic and civic engagement learning outcomes. *Innovation in Higher Education, 34*. 133-147.
- Bond, J. (2009, October 9). Rights still to be won. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/08/AR2009100803292.html>
- Boren, M. E. (2001). *Student resistance: A history of the unruly subject*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bridgeforth, B. W. (2005). Advancing the practice of leadership: A curriculum. *Journal of Leadership Education, 4*(1). 4-29.
- Cartwright, C. A. (1995). Inquire. Learn. Reflect. The evolution of student activism. *Educational Record, 76*(1). 26-31.
- Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4*, 219-235.
- Chambers, T., & Phelps, C. E. (1993). Student activism as a form of leadership and

- student development. *NASPA Journal*, 31. 19-29.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). It's all in the family: Intersections of gender, race, and nation. *Hypatia*, 13(3). 62-82.
- Cooper, D. L., Healy, M. A., & Simpson, J. (1994). Student development through involvement: Specific changes over time. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35. 98-102.
- Corning, A. F., & Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political Psychology*, 23. 703-729.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2009). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43. 1241-1299.
- Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42. 15-26.
- D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of Lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In Trickett, E. J., Watts, R. J., & Birman, D. (Eds.). *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 312-333). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Di Muro, P., & Terry, M. (2007). A matter of style: Applying Kolb's learning style model to college mathematics teaching practices. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 38(1). 53-60.
- Dill, B. T., & Zambrana, R. E. (2009). Critical thinking about inequality: An emerging

- lens. In Dill, B. T., & Zambrana, R. E. (Eds.). *Emerging intersections: Race, class, and gender in theory, policy, and practice* (1-21). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006). Explorations using the Social Change Model: Leadership development among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development, 7*. 217-225.
- Dugan, J. P., Bohle, C. W., Gebhardt, M., Hofert, M., Wilk, E., & Cooney, M. A. (2011). Influences of leadership program participation on students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 48*(1), 65-84.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. A Report from the Multit-Institutional Study of Leadership. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2009). *Elements of 2009 MSL Methods*. Unpublished research report. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Dugan, J. P., Komives, S. R., & Segar, T. C. (2008). College student capacity for socially responsible leadership: Understanding norms and influences of race, gender, and sexual orientation. *NASPA Journal, 45*. 475-500.
- Dugan, J. P., & Yurman, L. (in press). Commonalities and differences among lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: Considerations for research and practice. *Journal of College Student Development*. 1-30.

- Duncan, L. E., & Stewart, A. J. (1995). Still bringing the Vietnam war home: Sources of contemporary student activism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 914-924.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 807-834.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 569-591.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 233-256.
- Ellis-Williams, A. (2007). Discovering the possibilities: A study of African American youth resistance and activism. *Educational Foundations*, *21*, 107-124.
- Fassinger, R. E., & Miller, B. A. (1996). Validation of an inclusive model of sexual minority identity formation on a sample of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *32*(2), 53-79.
- Fassinger, R. E., Shullman, S. L., & Stevenson, M. R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist*, *65*, 201-215.
- Hamrick, F. A. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, *39*, 449-460.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for Black identity development and expression among African American male student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*, 127-144.

- Higher Education Research Institute (1996). *A social change model of leadership development guidebook (Version III)*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute.
- Huber, N. S. (2002). Approaching leadership education in the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership Education, 1*(1). 25-40.
- Kezar, A. (2010). Faculty and staff partnering with student activists: Unexplored terrains of interaction and development. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*. 451-480.
- 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*. 55-69.
- Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In Chickering, A. W. (Ed.). *The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society*, (pp. 232-255). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experiences as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kolb, D. A., Baker, A. C., & Jensen, P. J. (2002). Conversations as experiential learning. In Baker, A. C., Jensen, P. J., and Kolb, D. A. (Eds.) *Conversational learning: An experiential approach to knowledge creation* (pp. 51-66). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Kolb, D. A., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mainemelis, C. (2001). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. In Sternberg, R. J. & Zhang, L. (Eds.).

- Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles* (pp. 227-247). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Komives, S. R. (1996). A call for collaborative leadership. *About Campus*, 1(3). 2-3.
- Komives, S. R. (2009). Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership 2009 reliability levels for composite measures. *Unpublished document*.
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., & Segar, T. C. (2006). The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership: Understanding the project. *Concepts & Connections*, 15(1). 5-7.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (1998). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46. 593-611.
- Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., & Associates (2009). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Licht, M. H. (1995). Multiple regression and correlation. In Grimm, L. G. & Yarnold, P. R. (Eds.). *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 19-64). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Loeb, P. R. (1994). *Generation at the crossroads: Apathy and action on the American campus*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Logue, C. T., Hutchens, T. A., & Hector, M. A. (2005). Student leadership: A phenomenological exploration of postsecondary experiences. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46. 393-408.

- Marks, H. M., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Community service in the transition: Shifts and continuities in participation from high school to college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*. 307-339.
- Moore, J., Lovell, C. D., McGann, T., & Wyrick, J. (1998). Why involvement matters: A review of research on student involvement in the collegiate setting. *College Student Affairs Journal, 17*(2). 4-17.
- Myers, F. (2010, September 14). Gay rights support addressed as Iowa midterm elections loom. *Iowa State Daily.com*. Retrieved from:
http://www.iowastatedaily.com/news/article_b1a41c6e-c073-11df-9bb1001cc4c002e0.html
- National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Action Fund (2008). *The 2008 presidential candidates' positions on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues*. Washington, DC: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
- Niemi, R. G., Hepburn, M. A., & Chapman, C. (2000). Community service by high school students: A cure for civic ills? *Political Behaviors, 22*. 45-69.
- Owen, J. E., & Komives, S. R. (2007). Does credit matter? Examining the effects of co-curricular leadership programs. *Concepts & Connections, 15*(3). 4-6.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual* (3rd ed.). Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Park, S. D. (2005). *Leadership can be taught: A bold approach for a complex world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W., & Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual, & transgender people*. Charlotte, NC: Campus Pride.

- Renn, K. A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher*, 39, 132-141.
- Renn, K. A. (2007). LGBT student leaders and queer activists: Identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer identified college student leaders and activists. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 311-330.
- Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. L. (2005a). Leadership identity development among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student leaders. *NASPA Journal*, 42, 342-367.
- Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. (2005b). Queer student leaders: An exploratory case study of identity development and LGBT student involvement at a Midwestern research university. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 2(4), 49-71.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1997). Interpreting identity politics: The educational challenge of contemporary student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 508-519.
- Rhoads, R. A., (1998a). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1998b). Student protest and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 621-646.
- Ropers-Huilman, B., Carwile, L., & Barnett, K. (2005). Student activists' characterizations of administrators in higher education: Perceptions of power in "the system." *The Review of Higher Education*, 28, 295-312.
- Rost, J. C., & Barker, R. A. (2000). Leadership education in colleges: Toward a 21st century paradigm. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(1), 3-12.
- Reuben, J. A. (1998). Reforming the university: Student protests and the demand for a

- 'relevant' curriculum. In DeGroot, D. J. (Ed.). *Student protest: The sixties and after* (pp. 153-168). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Roberts, D. C. (Ed.). (1981). *Student leadership programs in higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University/American College Personnel Association.
- Sanlo, R. (Ed.). (1998). *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Swain, R. D. (2010). Shall we march on?: An analysis of non-electoral participation in the Black community in the post-Civil Rights era. *Journal of Black Studies*, 40. 566-582.
- Thelin, J. R. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. In Komives, S. R, Woodard, Jr., D. B., & Associates (Eds.). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.) (pp. 3-22). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, K. (2010, October 1). One Nation rally energizes liberals. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2010/10/01/AR2010100107229.html>.
- Tischler, B. L. (1998). The refiner's fire: Anti-war activism and emerging feminism in the late 1960s. In DeGroot, D. J. (Ed.). *Student protest: The sixties and after* (pp. 186-200). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Tomasic, J. (2010, September 13). Gay rights group One Colorado endorses

- Hickenlooper in guv race. *The Colorado Independent*. Retrieved from:
<http://coloradoindependent.com/61678/gay-rights-group-one-colorado-endorses-hickenlooper-in-guv-race>
- Tyree, T. M. (1998). Designing an instrument to measure the socially responsible leadership using the social change model of leadership development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(06). 1945.
- Watt, W. M. (2003). Effective leadership education: Developing a core curriculum for leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 2(1). 13-26.
- Williams, J. R., Townsend, C. D., & Linder, J. R. (2005). Teaching leadership: Do students remember and utilize the concepts we teach? *Journal of Leadership Education*, 4(1). 62-74.
- Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). Leadership in the making: A comprehensive examination of the impact of leadership development programs on students. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3). 50-66.