

Abstract

Title of Document:

UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE
STUDENTS' PERCEIVED SENSE OF
CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY AND
SOCIAL CHANGE BEHAVIORS IN
THE CONTEXT OF SERVICE,
ADVOCACY, AND IDENTITY-BASED
STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Chetan Chowdhry, Master of Arts, 2010

Directed by:

Dr. Stephen John Quaye, Assistant
Professor, Department of Counseling and
Personnel Services

This study utilized data from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) to explore the differences between college students involved with service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations, as well as those not involved in any of these organizations, in their perceived sense of civic responsibility, as well as their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. In addition, it explored the relationship between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. The researcher utilized two one-way ANOVAs to see if there were significant differences in perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors among students who were involved exclusively in service, advocacy, or identity-based organizations, as well as students who were involved in a combination of these organizations, and students who did not participate in any of these organizations. The researcher found significant differences between students in the different organizations, with students in a combination of organizations and students involved exclusively in advocacy organizations having the highest mean scores on perceived

sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. Students in identity-based organizations and those not involved in any of the organizations had the lowest mean scores on these two variables. In addition, the researcher found a positive, medium strength correlation between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors among all of the involvement categories. Overall, this study provides important initial findings regarding the civic engagement characteristics of students involved in particular student organizations.

UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEIVED SENSE OF CIVIC
RESPONSIBILITY AND SOCIAL CHANGE BEHAVIORS IN THE CONTEXT
OF SERVICE, ADVOCACY, AND IDENTITY-BASED STUDENT
ORGANIZATIONS

By

Chetan Chowdhry

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
2010

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Stephen John Quaye, Assistant Professor, Chair

Dr. Susan R. Komives, Professor

Dr. Barabara Jacoby, Affiliate Associate Professor

Acknowledgements

I could not have completed the process of writing this thesis without the care and support of several significant people in my life. I would first like to thank Dr. Stephen J. Quaye, my advisor and thesis chair, for the time and support he dedicated to me for the past two years. His belief in my ability to complete this was encouraging and I am fortunate to have had his guidance throughout the entire process. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Susan R. Komives and Dr. Barbara Jacoby for their willingness to meet with me and provide me with resources, ideas, and critical feedback. They have helped me grow significantly as a researcher.

I am also grateful to Kristan Cilente and Dr. Karen Inkelas for generously offering their time to help me with my statistical analysis.

Additionally, I would like to thank my cohort, and in particular Molly Morin, Nicole Mehta, Joakina Modé, and Kelsey South for always being there for me and helping me find humor throughout the toughest times of this process. I could not have achieved this without them by my side.

I would also like to thank my fellow MICA staff members for making work an enjoyable space and often times a much needed getaway from writing my thesis. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. James McShay for his support and encouragement, Pamela Hernandez for her patience and support and for being a great supervisor and mentor, Jee Shim Deogracias for her encouragement and for being a wonderful friend, and Craig Alimo for his willingness to provide me with great advice and resources. I truly appreciate their significant scholarly and emotional support throughout this whole process.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Satish and Prama, and my sister, Manisha, for giving me their love and support even when it wasn't always clear what I was doing. Their encouragement made this achievement possible.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements..... | iv |
| Table of Contents..... | v |
| List of Tables | vii |
| Chapter 1: Introduction..... | 1 |
| Definition of Key Terms..... | 4 |
| Social Change Behaviors | 4 |
| Civic Responsibility..... | 5 |
| Civic Engagement..... | 5 |
| Background of the Study | 6 |
| Social Change Model of Leadership Development | 6 |
| Current Trends of College Student Civic Engagement..... | 6 |
| Student Organizations as Venues for Social Change..... | 8 |
| Problem Statement, Purpose, and Research Questions | 9 |
| Problem Statement..... | 9 |
| Purpose of the Study and Research Questions..... | 10 |
| Overview of Methodology..... | 11 |
| Significance of the Study..... | 12 |
| Summary..... | 14 |
| Chapter 2: Review of the Literature..... | 15 |
| Motivation for Engaging in Community Service..... | 16 |
| Outcomes of Community Service Participation | 18 |
| Limitations | 24 |
| Summary | 25 |
| Student Advocacy and Activism..... | 25 |
| Limitations | 27 |
| Identity as a Predictor of Advocacy and Activism Participation..... | 28 |
| Summary | 31 |
| Civic Responsibility as a Predictor of Social Change Behaviors | 31 |
| Summary | 35 |
| Student Organizations..... | 35 |
| Civic Engagement in the Context of Student Organizations | 36 |
| Civic Engagement in the Context of Service Organizations | 38 |
| Civic Engagement in the Context of Advocacy Organizations | 40 |
| Civic Engagement in the Context of Identity-Based Organizations..... | 42 |
| Racial and Ethnic Student Organizations | 42 |
| Civic Engagement Outcomes..... | 43 |
| Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Student Organizations..... | 45 |
| Civic Engagement Outcomes..... | 45 |
| Limitations | 46 |
| Summary of Literature..... | 47 |
| Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods | 48 |
| Purpose of the Study..... | 48 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Design | 48 |
| Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership..... | 48 |
| Instrumentation | 48 |
| I-E-O Model..... | 49 |
| Reliability and Validity..... | 50 |
| Sampling Strategy..... | 51 |
| Institutional Sample | 51 |
| MSL Student Sample | 51 |
| Sample for this Study | 52 |
| Research Questions and Hypotheses | 58 |
| Measures | 60 |
| Data Analysis | 63 |
| Summary of Methodology and Methods | 64 |
| Chapter 4: Results..... | 65 |
| Question One Results..... | 65 |
| Assumptions of Question One | 65 |
| Testing of Question One Hypothesis | 66 |
| Question Two Results..... | 69 |
| Assumptions of Question Two..... | 69 |
| Testing of Question Two Hypothesis | 70 |
| Question Three Results..... | 73 |
| Assumptions of Question Three..... | 73 |
| Testing of Question Three Hypothesis | 73 |
| Summary of Results..... | 74 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion | 75 |
| Restatement of Research Problem | 75 |
| Discussion of Results..... | 76 |
| Hypothesis One..... | 76 |
| Hypothesis Two | 78 |
| Hypothesis Three | 81 |
| Limitations | 82 |
| Implications for Practice..... | 84 |
| Implications for Research | 86 |
| Conclusion | 87 |
| Appendix A: MSL Respondent Characteristics | 88 |
| References..... | 89 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 - Student Organization Involvement..... | 52 |
| Table 2 - Student Sample Characteristics | 54 |
| Table 3 - Student Sample Gender by Involvement | 55 |
| Table 4 - Student Sample Race by Involvement..... | 56 |
| Table 5 - Student Sample Class Standing by Involvement..... | 57 |
| Table 6 - Sense of Civic Responsibility Items..... | 62 |
| Table 7 - Social Change Behaviors Scale Items | 62 |
| Table 8 - Student Organization Involvement Items | 63 |
| Table 9 - Mean Scores on Civic Responsibility Composite Variable | 67 |
| Table 10 - Civic Responsibility ANOVA Results | 68 |
| Table 11 - Civic Responsibility Games-Howell Multiple Comparison Test..... | 68 |
| Table 12 - Mean Social Change Behaviors Scale Scores | 71 |
| Table 13 - Social Change Behaviors ANOVA | 71 |
| Table 14 - Social Change Behaviors Games-Howell Multiple Comparison Test | 72 |
| Table 15 - Civic Responsibility and Social Change Behaviors Correlation..... | 74 |

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

As I was conducting a workshop on civic engagement for incoming first-year students during a summer orientation program, I asked students why they chose to attend the civic engagement session over others from which they had to choose. Most students replied that they wanted to get involved with the local community or that they simply chose the first session they found that was not already full. However, one student stated that he attended the session to “find out what civic engagement can do for me.” Given that participating in civic engagement activities is often framed as something done to benefit a particular community or society in general, I later reflected on this statement and it sparked a series of questions in my mind. I wondered about the likelihood he would participate in any activities to create social change at some point during his college experience. I also wondered what ways, if any, this likelihood would be different for someone who held as a part of her or his identity a responsibility to create positive social change. In addition, this incident led me to reflect on what structures are in place on college campuses that may help foster civic engagement among students. This study attempts to address these questions by exploring the relationship between one such structure, student organizations, and college student civic engagement, as well as the relationship between students’ attitudes toward serving their communities and their actual engagement in creating social change in their communities.

From the beginning of higher education in America, one of its primary goals was to enable students to become good citizens. Harvard University, followed by hundreds of faith-based and secular educational institutions, had civic missions

(Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Jacoby, 2009). Later, land-grant institutions, through the Morrill Act of 1862, developed with civic missions as well. In addition, after the Civil War, secular private universities such as Stanford University and the University of Chicago and historically Black colleges and universities were founded with missions of improving their communities (Daynes, n.d.). This mission waned, but incidents such as the Great Depression and World War II led to an increased focus of colleges and universities on solving problems in their local and national communities. The introduction of programs such as the Peace Corps in the 1960s and Campus Compact in the 1980s led to a significant increase in community service and service learning on college campuses (Jacoby, 2009). Higher education's civic mission has continued through the 1990s and 2000s as evidenced by a 2006 report published by Harvard University's Task Force on General Education, which stated:

By virtue of their gifts, their hard work, and their good fortune, Harvard's students will enjoy exceptional opportunities. But they will need to make their way in an environment complex in new and incompletely understood ways; and they will also be responsible for more than themselves. They will lead lives that affect the lives of others. It is our mission to help them to find their way and to meet their responsibilities by providing a curriculum that is responsive to the conditions of the twenty-first century. (Harvard University Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 2006, p. 3)

Despite statements such as this, higher education's response to the call for preparing civically engaged citizens has varied, primarily due to conflicting views of

what type of civic education is appropriate for colleges and universities to promote. Even the terms “civic engagement” and “citizenship” are open to debate. Often, civic engagement and citizenship are classified as discussing politics, volunteering for political campaigns, participating in military service, and voting (Astin, 1999). However, Astin, Sax, and Avalos (1999) argued that even if all college students and alumni voted, this would not by any means indicate that the democracy was functioning as it should. Until college students have a true commitment to serving the public good, they argue, the civic engagement mission of higher education institutions are not being met.

Eyler and Giles (1999) distinguished between three forms of civic engagement: political participation, participation in voluntary associations, and generation of social capital. Political participation involves electoral participation and holding public office, whereas participation in voluntary associations involves an organized commitment to some public issue. Generating social capital is defined as either providing direct help/service or solving larger social problems (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Westheimer and Kahne (2002) organized the many conceptions of good citizenship into three “visions” of citizenship: the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen. The personally responsible citizen contributes to society by giving money to charities, volunteering at soup kitchens, and recycling, among other similar activities. The participatory citizen engages in collective actions for the betterment of his or her community. This person would participate in organizations or collective efforts to raise money for a charity or

influence policy. The justice-oriented citizen shares this value of collective community effort, but focuses on analyzing the root structural cause of a problem and changing it in order to eliminate the problem. Justice-oriented citizens may challenge laws they feel are unjust or advocate against discrimination against certain populations in their community. This view holds the assumption that societal structures are the cause of social ills, so focusing on helping individuals does not help, and can even perpetuate, these problems.

Definition of Key Terms

Social Change Behaviors

Numerous studies have been conducted on college student community service (Arnold & Welch, 2007; Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin et al., 1999; Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005; Gasiorski, 2009; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). Others have focused on college student advocacy and activism (Biddix, Somers, & Polman, 2009; Van Dyke, 1998). However, the way these terms are operationalized has not been consistent, thus making it difficult to compare their results (Gasiorski, 2009). Some have treated advocacy and direct community service as separate phenomena (Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, & Corngold, 2007). A limitation of this approach is that it does not present a broad picture of students' overall actions toward creating social change. For the purposes of this study, social change behaviors were considered to be actions that fall under Westheimer and Kahne's (2002) visions of the participatory citizen and the justice-oriented citizen with the addition of community service, which may be considered to be a characteristic of personally responsible citizenship. In short, social

change behaviors were defined as “taking an active role in making a difference for the common good” (National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, 2009, p. 2).

Civic Responsibility

Civic responsibility was used to represent an attitude of responsibility toward serving or creating change in one’s community. I formally define it using Komives, Lucas, and McMahon’s (2006) definition: “A sense of personal responsibility individuals should feel to uphold their obligations as part of any community” (p. 20). Someone who feels a sense of civic responsibility would agree with the following statement: “If I am a member of this community, I have a responsibility to work with others to keep it functioning and make it better” (Komives, Lucas, et al., 2006).

Civic Engagement

For this study, the term civic engagement was used as a guiding definition for viewing the combinations of students’ attitudes and behaviors toward bringing about social change. The definition of civic engagement for this study was taken from the Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership (2005). They define it as:

Acting upon a heightened sense of responsibility to one’s communities. This includes a wide range of activities, including developing civic sensitivity, participation in building civil society, and benefiting the common good. Civic engagement encompasses the notions of global citizenship and interdependence. Through civic engagement, individuals—as citizens of their communities, their nations, and the world—are empowered as agents of positive social change for a more democratic world. (para. 1)

Background of the Study

Social Change Model of Leadership Development

The dependent variables for this study, frequency of engagement in social change behaviors and perceived sense of civic responsibility, are measured using scales based on the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. This model is a leadership model for undergraduate students that consists of eight “critical values,” known as the “8 C’s” of leadership development for social change that fall into three categories: individual, group, and community/society values (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996). Individual values include: consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment. Group values include: common purpose, collaboration, and controversy with civility. The community/society category consists of one value: citizenship. All of these values are considered to be components of “change” for “a better world and a better society for self and others” (HERI, 1996, p. 22), which is considered to be the primary goal of leadership in the model. This study aims to assess undergraduate students’ leadership by analyzing their attitudes and efforts to create change.

Current Trends of College Student Civic Engagement

The level of civic engagement and the forms that this takes among college students has changed throughout the generations. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) noted that beyond voting and participating in formal political campaigns, a distinct sector of study is “one that requires a specific and more sustained level of commitment and energy, involves students’ attitudes, values, and behaviors relating to the social and civic life of their communities, largely through roles as volunteers in

community groups” (p. 277). They pointed out that in the 1990s civic and community involvement were found to be significantly more prevalent among college students than formal political involvement. (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005)

The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE) conducted a mixed method study to determine civic engagement trends for Millennial Generation college students (students born after 1985). Utilizing a sample of 386 undergraduate students from 12 campuses across the country, they found that these students were more civically engaged than the previous generation of students, but they preferred to express their civic engagement more through direct service than through formal political participation (Kiesa et al., 2007). A study conducted by Campus Compact found similar results and the survey the organization distributed to students received criticism by the students because it distinguished between community service and political activity. The students saw their participation in community service as political and they believed the survey and other studies that portrayed modern youth as apolitical were flawed due to the fact that they ignored this connection between community service and political involvement (Long, 2002). Although not all students may view service and political participation in this way, this perspective provides a rationale for researching students’ social change behaviors as a whole, rather than distinguishing them for students.

Understanding students’ attitudes toward serving their community is a crucial element of the proposed study. In CIRCLE’s 2006 Civic and Political Health of the Nation Survey (CPHS), when asked if it was their choice or their responsibility to “get involved to make things better for society” (Lopez, 2006, p. 27), 39% of 15-25

year olds surveyed indicated that they felt it was their responsibility. In CIRCLE's Millennial students study, 32% of college students indicated it was their responsibility in response to the same question (Kiesa et al., 2007). In CIRCLE's CPHS, 78% of 15-25 year olds stated that their reason for volunteering was "to help other people," while only 6.5% stated they volunteered "to address a social or political problem" (Lopez, 2006). These findings suggest that although a sizable number of college-age individuals feel some level of responsibility to create social change, this attitude is not held by the majority of them.

Student Organizations as Venues for Social Change

The proposed study involves research on student organization participants' civic commitment and involvement in social change behaviors. While not much research has been done on this topic, some research exists that supports the need for my study to be conducted. Putnam (1995) argued that social networks are vital to facilitating civic engagement among people. Astin (1993b) found that college seniors who had frequent interactions with their peers and faculty members were more likely than those who had less interaction to claim that influencing social values, participating in community action programs, and influencing the political structure were important to them. On college campuses today, a crucial venue for students' social networks is student organizations. In 2009, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) released a report entitled *Civic Responsibility: What is the Campus Climate for Learning?* The authors found that students who participated in cocurricular activities such as student government, fraternities and sororities, and student organizations were more likely than non-participants to

strongly agree that they had a stronger commitment to creating positive societal change than when they started college (Dey, Antonaros, Ott, & Holsapple, 2009).

According to CIRCLE's study on Millennial Generation students, a majority of students believe that collective action can bring about positive social change (Kiesa et al., 2007). Students in this study indicated that the presence of a large variety of volunteer organizations motivated them to volunteer. One student stated, "What I found to be really helpful, especially here, is just that there are so many service clubs. If you have something that you want to get involved in, there are opportunities" (p. 15). This suggests that service organizations may help foster community service participation among students who may not otherwise have become involved if left to seek out volunteer opportunities on their own. In this same study, activist student groups were one of the five venues through which students stated they learned about and experienced politics. My study further explores the relationship between particular types of student organizations and civic engagement outcomes.

Problem Statement, Purpose, and Research Questions

Problem Statement

Several studies have been conducted that explore the frequency of college students' engagement in community service (Astin et al., 1999; Kiesa et al., 2007; Lopez, 2006; Sax, 2004), and to a lesser extent, their engagement in advocacy and activism (Colby et al., 2007; Kiesa et al., 2007). However, a gap in this literature exists since few studies have explored students' development of civic engagement associated with their involvement in student organizations. Student organizations are a primary venue for college students to gain self-awareness and participate in

activities that interest them (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Several types of organizations, including service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations, have the potential to be venues for students to develop a value for civic engagement and engage in social change behaviors in order to fulfill this value (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Kiesa et al., 2007). However, without research on this topic, it is difficult to determine if these organizations actually serve this role. This gap in the literature can pose a problem for administrators in civic engagement/community service learning offices who are seeking information on where to direct their resources and outreach efforts.

In addition, although literature exists on motivations of college students to engage in community service (Serow, 1991; Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1995, 1997), there has been little research published linking particular motivations with social change behaviors in general. Without having a broader view of the actions related to particular motivations (e.g., civic responsibility), it is difficult to fully understand what contributes to students' civic engagement.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

This study sought to fill a gap in the civic engagement literature regarding student organizations. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between students' involvement with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations and their perceived sense of civic responsibility as well as their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. In addition, this study sought to add to the literature on the link between students' attitudes and behaviors by analyzing the relationship between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility

and their engagement in social change behaviors. In order to do this, this study was guided by three research questions.

Research Question 1:

Does undergraduate students' perceived sense of civic responsibility differ based on involvement with particular types of student organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based)?

Research Question 2:

Does undergraduate students' frequency of engagement in social change behaviors differ based on involvement with particular types of student organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based)?

Research Question 3:

Is there a relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors among students involved with service, advocacy, or identity-based organizations, and students who are not involved with any of these organizations?

Overview of Methodology

An ex post facto design using secondary data analysis of responses to the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) was used for this study. The MSL was developed using the Social Change Model of Leadership and Astin's (1991) I-E-O model as a theoretical lenses. The Social Change Model was measured by a revised version of Tyree's (1998) Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006). Astin's model helped shape the MSL's quasi pre-test design, which allows for the analysis of students' inputs (pre-existing characteristics and

experiences before college), environments (experiences in college), and their outcomes (unique characteristics students come to develop through the combination of their inputs and environments). Two questions from the citizenship scale of the MSL were used to evaluate students' civic responsibility in this study. A Social Change Behaviors scale in the instrument was used to evaluate students' frequency of engaging in social change behaviors.

Significance of Study

This study will benefit both researchers and student affairs practitioners and senior student affairs officers. In *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), a statement released jointly by the American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (2004), civic engagement is highlighted as a learning outcome that student affairs practitioners should adopt. Astin (1993b) found that students' peer groups had a significant impact on their development, especially in regards to leadership. Since student organizations are a primary venue for peer interaction on college campuses (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), it is important to understand the relationship between membership in particular organizations and students' civic engagement.

Service and advocacy organizations were chosen for analysis in this study since the purpose of these organizations is to positively impact a community or society at large. This would suggest that students who are involved with them would be engaging in some type of social change behaviors. Identity-based organizations were chosen because the small amount of literature that has been conducted on them has shown that they are often venues for students to learn about and practice civic

engagement, although participation in these organizations is not always associated with these outcomes (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Museus, 2008). In addition, the research that has been done on identity-based organizations has typically been conducted on organizations focusing on one identity (e.g., African American, Asian American, LGBT) (Guiffrida, 2003; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Montelongo, 2003; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). By combining all identity-based organizations into one group, this study will add to the literature by illuminating what relationship this overall group of organizations has with students' civic engagement.

Understanding the perceived sense of civic responsibility and the frequency of social change behaviors that are associated with students who are involved with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations can be of value to student affairs practitioners. In particular, this understanding can help those who seek to promote civic engagement among students become more informed about what types of organizations they should outreach to and support. Also, understanding the relationship between students' commitment to their community and their social change behaviors can assist student affairs practitioners at all levels in determining what types of interventions are likely to be most useful in promoting civic engagement and facilitating the development of a sense of civic responsibility among students. This information can also benefit researchers in deciding how strong of a connection they can make between students' self-reported sense of responsibility toward their community and their actual behaviors to create change in their community.

Summary

This chapter demonstrated that college students are often interested in volunteering or participating politically, and many students view these as inextricably linked. There have been mixed findings in regards to students' sense of civic responsibility. Student organizations were found to be one venue in which students engage in these activities due to the opportunities these organizations provide for students to interact with their peers. The following chapter will provide further details of the literature that exists on college student civic engagement. I will include a discussion of general outcomes of college student involvement in community service and advocacy as well as civic engagement in the context of advocacy, service, and identity-based student organizations.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the literature regarding the two dependent variables for this study: college student civic responsibility and social change behaviors. I begin with a discussion of the motivations of college students engaging in community service, which is one example of a social change behavior. Based on an extensive search of literature from journals, including *The Journal of College Student Development*, *NASPA Journal*, *The Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, and additional journals in the EBSCOhost databases, I found that the majority of literature on civic responsibility and social change behaviors has focused on community service. There is a scarcity of literature on the predictors/motivations, participation in, and outcomes of college student advocacy and activism in the past 20 years. The chapter will discuss the literature on outcomes students gain from community service participation as well as the literature on advocacy and activism among college students that exists.

Following this is a discussion of the research that has been conducted on the link between students' civic responsibility and social change behaviors. I then discuss the general outcomes of involvement with college student organizations. This leads into a description of the motivations for and outcomes of involvement with college student service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations. However, there is little research published related to college student service organizations and college student advocacy organizations. This was verified by Barbara Jacoby (personal communication, December 4, 2009), one of the premier scholars on the topic of college student civic engagement and service-learning. Therefore, the majority of this

section focuses on identity-based organizations, as these organizations have been the focus of more civic engagement-related research.

Motivation for Engaging in Community Service

Motivations for participation in community service are often characterized as being either egoistic or altruistic. Egoistic theories such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Human Needs, Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory, and McClelland and Atkinson's Expectancy Motivation Theory, hold that individuals seek to do what will serve them best, including if the activity serves others (e.g., volunteering) (Winniford et al., 1995, 1997).

Altruistic theories hold that individuals' motivations can include helping others without one's self-interest in mind. Wakefield (as cited in Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1997) argued that the core of humanitarianism is altruism. Allen and Rushton's (1983) literature review found that characteristics associated with altruism, such as empathy and high moral standards, were more prevalent among volunteers than non-volunteers.

Some theories have acknowledged the influence of both egoistic and altruistic motives in volunteering. Social Exchange theory argues that people's motivations involve both giving and receiving. Viewing volunteerism through this lens, volunteers may have an altruistic motivation for starting to volunteer, but they might only continue to do so if what they get out of it satisfies them (Winniford et al., 1997). Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider (1995) found this to be the case among college students participating in service organizations at Texas A&M University. Fitch (1987) found that the strongest motivation for students to volunteer was that it

made them feel good about themselves (egoistic). This was followed by a motivation to help others (altruistic) and have a sense of fellowship with other volunteers (egoistic). The fourth strongest motivation for students to volunteer was a feeling of obligation or debt to society (e.g., students serve others because they hope someone else would help them if they were in the same situation). This motivation was categorized as a feeling of *social obligation*.

In a single-campus study of Generation X students (age 18-29 in the 1990s), Marotta and Nashman (1998) found that social obligation was the primary reason students engaged in community service, followed by social exchange (serving their community while expecting to have fun and feel good about doing it). They also found that community service participation resulted in participants gaining a better understanding of the community they were serving. This enhanced understanding provided a stronger foundation for students to want to engage in serving their community. However, these results are difficult to generalize to other settings due to the fact that the study was conducted on a single campus with an availability sample of 104 mostly white students.

Serow (1991) conducted a mixed-method study of college student motivations for participating in community service, utilizing a sample of 759 survey respondents and 42 interviewees from four public universities in the Southern and Midwestern regions of the United States. Serow found that 80% of volunteers participated to have a personal sense of satisfaction, 54% participated out of a sense of responsibility to create social change, and 56% participated because it was a part of their class or student organization. However, Serow's study looked solely at the motives of college

student community service and did not take into account the potential developmental shifts that can occur in students through continued community service participation. This is a limitation because some literature suggests that civic responsibility is one of the many outcomes of college student community service participation (Astin, 1993b; Jones & Hill, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Thus, community service that starts out with the egoistic motivations could potentially result in the development of civic responsibility in a student.

Jones and Hill (2003) illustrated this point in a constructivist qualitative study in which they found that high school community service participants who continued to participate in community service in college moved from external motivations for participation to an internal commitment to serve. However, high school community service participants who discontinued service participation in high school were motivated primarily by external factors. Specific factors they found to influence high school students' commitment to serving their communities included family members' role modeling and support for participating in community service, active religious involvement, and high school teachers explaining the importance of community service. Factors they found that influenced college students' civic responsibility included institutional support for community service and awareness of and access to community service opportunities. Additional literature on the outcomes of community service are discussed in the following section.

Outcomes of Community Service Participation

Upon a review of the literature on college student outcomes of community service participation, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found that most studies on the

subject indicate that all types of community service participation positively influence students' sense of civic responsibility. A significant source of information on college student development of civic responsibility has been the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman and Senior surveys, both of which are multi-institutional studies of college students. These resources have been valuable tools since they provide longitudinal data on students' development of civic responsibility (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin et al., 1999; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000).

Astin and Sax (1998) conducted a study of students from 42 institutions and found that when controlling for students' partiality toward service before they started college, service participation positively affected students' commitment to their communities, to helping others in difficulty, to promoting racial understanding, and to influencing social values. The researchers found that all 12 measures of civic responsibility in the survey instrument were positively influenced by students' participation in service. Also, they found that longer duration of service and service conducted independently from a college group or course, positively affected students' sense of civic responsibility. Although the results were positive, this study only provided evidence of the short-term effects of service on college students.

Astin, Sax, and Avalos (1999) built upon this study by seeking to determine what lasting effects service participation had on college students' development. They attained a sample of 12,376 students from 209 institutions using data from the CIRP collected in 1985 during students' first year in college, four years later in 1989, and then five years later during 1994-1995. The researchers found that volunteering

during college was positively associated with the following values related to civic responsibility measured in the years after college: helping others in difficulty, participating in community action programs, and participating in environmental cleanup programs. In regards to behaviors, they found that students who spent six or more hours per week doing volunteer work during their last year of college were about twice as likely to participate in volunteer work several years after they graduated. An important limitation to this study was that no information on the type of service conducted or the context through which it was done (course based, through an organization, or independently) was collected.

Sax (2004) conducted a longitudinal study on college students' civic values and behaviors using data from the CIRP Freshman and follow-up surveys. The three outcomes she measured were: commitment to social activism, sense of empowerment, and community involvement. Commitment to social activism was operationalized by the extent to which students stated the following goals were important to them: participating in community action programs, helping others who are in difficulty, influencing social values, and influencing the political structure. Sense of empowerment was measured by the extent to which students disagreed with the statement "Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society." Community involvement was measured by the number of hours per week students stated they engaged in "volunteer work/community service" during the year prior to taking the survey.

Sax (2004) found that although students showed significant gains in their commitment to social activism by the fourth year of their college experience, this

declined significantly nine years after they started college. This was the trend for all of the measures of commitment to social activism except influencing social values, which only declined by 1.3% in the survey given to students after they graduated. Overall, these results suggest that a commitment to social activism may not be a lasting outcome of the college experience. Students' participation in community service declined sharply from their senior year of high school to their years in college (from 72.1% to 35.7%). In the years after college, their amount of volunteering increased to 46.1%. Although Sax found that students who volunteered in high school were significantly more likely to volunteer during college and after than non-volunteers in high school, overall she found that there was a significant amount of inconsistency in students' participation in community service. Interestingly, although the attitude she measured was a commitment to social activism, the behavior she measured was community service. This leaves room for future research to be conducted on the relationship between a commitment to social activism and activism behaviors.

Hunter and Brisbin (2000) studied the attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of students' service participation. Their sample consisted of students from three institutions participating in service-learning, co-curricular service, and non-participants during one semester. A majority of the students participating in any kind of service during the study said they were likely to participate in other service activities in the future. However, a majority of these students indicated that their service experience did not affect their views about democracy or about their role as a citizen. Students who participated in co-curricular service experiences showed the

greatest support for the idea that it was the responsibility of a community to help the poor and hungry. Endorsing this statement was a good indication of students' sense of civic responsibility.

Vogelgesang and Astin (2000) analyzed differences in students' measures on a variety of outcomes between the beginning of their college experience and the end of it. The researchers found that "commitment to promoting racial understanding," "commitment to activism" (p. 30), and a belief that an individual can bring about change in society were positively impacted by community service participation. The researchers also found that students who participated in any kind of service, regardless of their freshman year career choice, were more likely than non-service participants to plan to pursue a service-related career on the post-test. Vogelgesang and Astin argued that choice of a social service career can be interpreted as a significant form of civic responsibility since career choice in general is one of the most important life choices an individual may make in his or her life. Therefore, someone dedicating such a large part of her or his life to the service of others may be a good indicator of having developed civic responsibility.

The Hunter and Brisbin (2000) study and the studies using CIRP data (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin et al., 1999; Sax, 2004; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000) were limited by the fact that they measured students' civic responsibility by quantitative scales. Although quantitative methods can be helpful due to their ability to be administered to a large number of students, it is difficult to provide in-depth insight into what occurs to students during their service experiences that leads to changes in their level

of civic responsibility using these methods. The best way to gain this level of understanding about students' identity development is through qualitative research.

Jones and Abes (2004) added to the understanding of students' development of civic responsibility through a study they conducted based on a constructivist framework to understand how service-learning influenced identity development and self-authorship. Students in the study participated in a 10-week leadership theories course with a service-learning component in which they volunteered in either an AIDS service organization or a neighborhood food pantry. Unlike much of the literature on community service and service-learning developmental outcomes, the constructivist framework used in this study allowed the researchers to gain understanding about what happens to students during their service experiences that leads them to develop civic responsibility and commitment. Eight students were interviewed for this study two to four years after they had taken the leadership theories course.

Jones and Abes (2004) found that participants' service-learning experiences helped students reflect on their values and identities, which led to a change in motivation for community service, from external reasons (class requirement and build résumé) to internal motivations (added to their sense of self and fit with their values). Most of the participants gradually moved from an initial feeling of guilt about their economic privilege in comparison to those they were serving, to a feeling of responsibility as they began to understand what they could do to use their privileges to help those they were serving. Through understanding the life circumstances of the people they were serving and the social issues that impacted these people, students'

sense of efficacy grew, which led to increasing civic responsibility. Similar to the experience of the participants in Vogelgesang and Astin's (2000) study, all of the participants stated that the service-learning course helped them shift their career goals to service-oriented professions. Jones and Abes (2004) argued that the students were able to make this shift because their service-learning experience increased their ability to make decisions using more internally defined values and their willingness to try more new experiences and take risks. These findings illuminate the change that can occur within students to lead them to have a stronger sense of civic responsibility.

Limitations

Although the literature on college community service is valuable, it is important to note some common limitations across the literature on this topic. Some of the studies described were conducted with samples of primarily White women (Johnson, 1998; Jones & Abes, 2004). Additional research on the development of civic responsibility through service for men and students of color needs to be conducted. In addition, a limitation of research of this nature is the participant social-desirability factor (Payne & Bennett, 1999). Students responding to surveys as well as interviews and focus groups may suggest they developed a higher level of civic responsibility than they actually did due to their desire to make themselves appear to be a better person in the eyes of the researcher and/or themselves. Researchers should control for this whenever possible. The qualitative findings provide valuable insight into the experiences of students participating in service, but due to small sample sizes, the findings are difficult to generalize.

Summary

Overall, a significant amount of research that has been conducted on the outcomes of college students' community service participation has focused on the development of civic responsibility. The research has shown positive results linking service participation to a development of a sense of civic responsibility. Quantitative studies have shown that service participation promotes both short- and long-term development of civic responsibility in undergraduate students. Qualitative studies have provided support for these findings as well as additional insight into how specifically students develop civic responsibility.

Student Advocacy and Activism

Civic engagement has been a part of college campuses in institutionally supported ways, such as volunteer centers and service-learning in classrooms (Musil, 2009). However, it has also been present in forms that have not traditionally been sanctioned by institutions, such as protests, boycotts, and other advocacy-related activities (Biddix et al., 2009; Hamrick, 1998; Rhoads, 1997). A majority of the literature on student civic engagement is focused on community service, which encompass Westheimer and Kahne's (2002) vision of personally responsible citizenship and to some extent, participatory citizenship. However, in order to have a complete picture of students' social change behaviors, it is important to look at actions that are characteristic of justice-oriented citizens as well. This includes examining citizenship through the lens of advocacy and activism. However, the literature on advocacy and activism is scarce (Perry & Katula, 2001). The literature

that does exist on college student advocates and activists is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Biddix, Sommers, and Pollman (2009) conducted a case study on a 2005 protest that occurred at Washington University, a private, mid-sized university in the Midwest. Students at the University formed an organization, the Student Worker Alliance (SWA) to assist campus workers in advocating for a living wage. For over a year and a half, the students in this organization rallied, gained support through petitions, and ultimately staged a sit-in and hunger strike at the University's admissions office. After several communication exchanges with the University's Chancellor, the students and the Chancellor ultimately came to an agreement. Biddix et al. noted several developmental outcomes from this series of events. First, this experience enabled students to reflect on and develop their personal values. Every time the students decided to change their tactics, they had to determine if they were willing to face the consequences of continuing their struggle. Second, the experience showed the students who participated in the protests and the rest of the campus that challenging institutions can be effective in bringing about change. Third, the protests facilitated dialogue among the campus in and outside the classroom about the tactics the students were using as well as the issue of the living wage for which they were supporting (Biddix et al., 2009). Based on their analysis, Biddix et al. concluded that administrators should be open to dialogue and dissent from students, as they show a "commitment to democratic principles" (p. 143). This analysis demonstrates a potential developmental civic engagement outcome of advocacy and activism among college students.

Similarly, Hamrick's (1998) narrative study of a protested administrative decision at Iowa State University illuminated the ways incidents on campus can be viewed through a lens of citizenship. She described student protest over their campus administration's decision to name a building after a prominent alumna who had been accused of making racist remarks. Hamrick described the student movement against this decision, which was lead by an African American student group. She noted how students used a variety of methods to raise awareness about this issue and garner support for their demands. Viewing this through a lens of democratic citizenship, she highlighted how the students' actions served to attempt to influence decisions that affected them, thus being a form of active democracy. Like Biddix et al. (2009), she concluded that student affairs professionals should recognize student acts of dissent as engagement in active citizenship and should, thus, support students when they engage in them. This positive civic engagement outcomes illustrated in this literature provides support to further study advocacy and activism among college students.

Limitations

A limitation of the studies presented on student advocacy and activism is that they utilize either a case study or narrative methodology, and are thus narrow in scope and difficult to generalize to other settings. Although the case study and narrative methodological approaches are helpful in providing detail about particular experiences students have had with advocacy, they cannot determine the extent of students' advocacy and activism behaviors nationally. In addition, this research is limited by the fact that in all of the cases, students' advocacy was in response to issues affecting their campus directly. Without research on student advocacy for

broader national and global issues, the literature provides an incomplete picture of the potential outcomes of student advocacy.

Identity as a Predictor of Advocacy and Activism Participation

An important factor in college students' willingness to engage in advocacy is their identity (Guiffrida, 2003; Hamrick, 1998; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Museus, 2008). The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement includes the following statement on identity:

Our politics are consciously shaped through the lens of our social, national, ethnic, racial, economic, gender, sexual, and religious identities. While we are all Americans, we are each rooted in unique sub-cultures. We share the belief that each of us deserves a chance at the "American Dream" and that equality is tremendously important. Identity motivates us to do service work, and service work can lead to self-reflection that impacts our identity. (Long, 2002, p. 3)

This statement illustrates the importance different aspects of identity have on students' political perspectives of social equality and thus, the students' approach to bringing about social equality.

Studies that have been conducted on the influence of identity on advocacy have typically focused on race and ethnicity. One study of 15-25 year olds found that African Americans were the most politically engaged racial/ethnic group (Lopez, 2006). Political engagement was operationalized as: contacting public officials or the news or print media to express an opinion about a political issue, signing a petition (written or electronic), boycotting, buycotting (purchasing from a company because

one supports the company's social or political values), protesting, or going door-to-door for a political candidate. These can all be viewed as relating to advocacy. In the same study, 25% of Latinos said they had participated in a protest, which is more than double the percentage of any other racial/ethnic group in the study (Lopez, 2006). However, other than this, among the other factors on which Latinos were measured on, they were the least politically and civically engaged of all other racial/ethnic groups. Asian Americans were "the most likely to work on community problems, volunteer regularly, boycott, sign petitions, raise money for charity (tied with African Americans), persuade others about an election, contact officials, and regularly volunteer for a party or candidate" (Lopez, 2006, p. 20). Whites were found to be more likely to participate in walks and run for charity, but were less likely than other racial/ethnic groups to protest, give financial contributions to politicians, or try to advocate for people to vote a particular way in an election. (Lopez, 2006) Thus, Whites were found to participate more in direct service and charity and participate less in advocacy. Hamrick (1998) noted that students who engaged in acts of dissent and activism were often from marginalized populations, which supports the finding that Whites may be less likely drawn to participating in advocacy. Overall, this research illustrates that racial and ethnic identity has an important role in shaping the development of civic engagement in individuals.

Identity-based advocacy and activism was a common theme found in Rhoads' (1997) phenomenological study on student activism that took place at different institutions in the 1990s. Of the more than 200 cases of student activism he analyzed, about 60% of them were in the context of women's issues, racial/ethnic struggles, or

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGB) rights. The five cases he chose to analyze in depth were: The Mills College strike of 1990, the 1993 Chicano studies movement at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), gay rights demonstrations at Pennsylvania State University from 1991-1993, the 1995 African American student movement at Rutgers University, and Native American financial aid protests at Michigan State University from 1994-1996. Rhoads highlighted the impact of identity on bringing students to take action in these situations. One student who participated in the Chicano studies movement at UCLA explained the importance she saw in fighting for a Chicano studies department:

...We want a place where people can get the kind of service that a university is supposed to provide. What's really important is educating our students. By that I mean not schooling them but truly educating them on their roots, on who they are. They need to graduate from the university and be more than just a doctor for the establishment. They need to go back to their communities and service our people...What UCLA offers is schooling...We wanted a department of Chicana/Chicano studies to be something more than that. (p. 514)

Another student who participated in protests at Michigan State University to retain the state's Indian Tuition Waiver Program stated:

In college you start thinking more critically about the issues that are affecting your people. You start to realize why things are bad in your community. You start to see bad in your community. You start to see maybe a historical basis

for it. So then you stop to realize and you start to stand up a little bit more. (p. 16)

Both of these students' statements indicate feelings of responsibility to advocate for their respective communities. This sense of responsibility is rooted in their identities. Rhoads framed these students' identity-based struggles as an effort to "instill a broader realization of American democracy" (p. 517). Like Biddix et al. (2009) and Hamrick (1998), he concluded that since student affairs practitioners and faculty have a responsibility to help facilitate student learning, student activism is one context in which they can do this.

Summary

The literature on student advocacy has primarily focused on dissent among students. The researchers who have contributed to this small body of literature have called on student affairs professionals and faculty to embrace advocacy and activism through dissent as signs of a civically engaged student body. Identity has been a significant topic in the advocacy literature. Researchers have shown that personal identity, particularly for those who are marginalized, plays a significant role in motivating students to advocate for a cause. The next section will discuss the literature that has been written on the connection between civic responsibility and social change behaviors.

Civic Responsibility as a Predictor of Social Change Behaviors

Perry and Katula (2001) stated in their extensive literature review of community service and citizenship outcomes that very little research has been conducted linking civic attitudes to civic behaviors. The literature directly on this

topic and other relevant literature on the connections between intentions to engage in social change behaviors and following through with these intentions are described below.

Knefelkamp (2008) noted that a civic identity contributes to students' engagement in social change behaviors. A civic identity is the concept that a sense of civic responsibility is core to one's identity, just as race, gender, and nationality may be to an individual. Someone who holds a strong civic identity would feel unfulfilled if he/she was not regularly participating in activities to bring about social change. Colby et al. (2007) noted that a sense of efficacy to create change is also important in determining students' civic engagement. However, reinforcing Knefelkamp's argument, they also highlighted that being knowledgeable and skilled does not automatically result in political involvement. They stated that intrinsic motivations, including "political interest, passion, commitment, or sense of civic duty" (p. 139) are crucial in fostering consistent political participation, which encompasses several social change behaviors. These intrinsic motivations can be considered a part of one's civic identity.

Ajzen's (1991) theory of reasoned actions posits that individuals' intentions predict their behaviors. Hellman, Hoppes, and Ellison (2006) further describe this theory, stating "Intention to perform a behavior is considered a function of attitudes about the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control" (p. 30). In their study of college students' intentions to engage in community service, they found a strong positive relationship between students' sense of responsibility toward serving their community, feeling that there was a serious need for community service in their

community, feeling that there were actions that could be taken to alleviate community problems, feeling a moral obligation to serve their community, feeling that one could be effective in creating social change, and intending to engage in community service. The factor that had the strongest positive correlation with intention to engage in community service was feeling a sense of responsibility toward one's community. Interestingly, students' feeling that they were able to create change in their community did not account for significant variance in their intention to engage in community service (Hellman, 2006). This would suggest that regardless of feelings of personal effectiveness in one's ability to create change in a community, students' sense of responsibility to their community was the strongest indicator of whether they intended to actually attempt to create change in their community. This intention, according to Ajzen, would most likely result in engaging in social change behaviors.

Contrary to Ajzen's (1991) theory, using data from the CIRP, Hurtado et al. (2007) and Liu et al. (2008) found a discrepancy between first-year students' stated intentions to engage in community service and their follow-through with this intention. In Hurtado's study, 74.6% of first-year students indicated that there was some chance or a good chance that they would participate in community service during their time in college, while only 61.5% actually did during their first year. Similarly, in the Liu et al. study, 77.1% of students indicated they planned to participate in community service during their time in college, while only 55.2% did during their first year. Some potential explanations for these results are that these students may have intended to participate in community service and faced challenges

in following through during their first year or never intended to, but said they did due to social desirability (Gasiorksi, 2009).

In regards to advocacy, Hurtado et al. (2007) found that 31.6% of first-year students expected to participate in an organized demonstration during their time in college, while a larger percentage of students (39%) actually participated in an organized demonstration during their first year. However, Liu et al. (2008) found that 26.7% of students planned to participate in an organized protest or demonstration during their time in college, while only 9.5% did during their first year. It is unclear what led to the discrepancy between the two studies. It is important to note, however, that students' intentions exceeded their actual experiences for a majority of the other factors on which students were surveyed. Hurtado's findings, therefore, may have been an anomaly due to an event or issue that occurred during the year the survey was distributed that led more students to engage in organized demonstrations than typically would.

In CIRCLE's report on Millennial Generation college students' civic engagement, Kiesa et al. (2007) found that there was a gap between students' interest in particular social issues and their actions to create change about these issues. Students in the study indicated that the war in Iraq, the genocide in Darfur, Sudan, healthcare, HIV/AIDS, access to college immigration, poverty, and education issues were all issues about which they were passionate, but very few of them took action to address any of these issues. Although these were largely national and international issues, the students channeled their volunteering efforts locally (Kiesa et al., 2007). Although these students were still taking action locally, there was a disconnect

between the issues the students were passionate about and the actions they took. It is possible that these students, although passionate about national and global issues, did not feel a strong sense of responsibility to address them on a large scale. Another possibility is that the students did feel a sense of responsibility but did not believe they could be effective in impacting these issues in a significant way.

Summary

The literature is mixed on the topic of civic responsibility as a predictor of social change behaviors. Colby et al. found that intrinsic civic motivations in addition to a sense of effectiveness are important in determining students' social change behaviors. Hellman et al. showed that a sense of responsibility toward one's community was strongly associated with intention to serve or create change in the community. However, Hurtado et al. (2007) and Liu et al. (2008) found that intentions may not be an accurate predictor of behaviors. Kiesa et al. (2007) found that students were taking action locally despite the fact that they were passionate about national and global issues. These mixed findings suggest more research needs to be conducted on the links between students' sense of civic responsibility, intentions to participate in social change behaviors, and actual participation in social change behaviors.

Student Organizations

A significant amount of co-curricular involvement for college students occurs within the context of student organizations (Astin, 1993b). Student organizations serve as venues for students to engage with people with similar interests and identities (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Involvement with student organizations has been

associated with a variety of positive outcomes including identity development (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Museus, 2008; Wang, Sedlacek, & Westbrook, 1992), persistence (Gonzalez, 2002; Museus, 2008), cognitive development (Gellin, 2003), and psychosocial development (Foubert & Grainger, 2006). In addition to these, an emerging body of literature is beginning to show positive associations between student organization involvement and civic engagement outcomes. This literature is outlined in the following section.

Civic Engagement in the Context of Student Organizations

In Putnam's (1995) famous article "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," he argues that a decline in social capital is threatening American democracy, which is based on civic participation. This article highlights the importance of social ties in facilitating civic engagement among people. Students' likelihood of volunteering and participating in activism has been shown to be positively influenced by having social networks and being part of organizations (Astin, 1993a; Kiesa et al., 2007; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Activism for social change requires people in a community to come together to advocate and work for change. When individuals have social ties to each other, they tend to develop trusting relationships. This helps facilitate people's willingness to give their time to volunteer or advocate for a cause.

Organizations also help to disseminate information about volunteer opportunities. This has resulted in people who are involved with organizations being asked to volunteer more than those who are not (Wilson, 2000). Although there are generally many positive links between volunteering and organizational affiliation,

more controversial activities such as protesting may be negatively associated with organizational involvement. Since protesting is less conventional, organizations not dedicated to activism specifically may deter members from engaging in it (Wilson, 2000).

Jones and Hill (2003) found that college students' service participation was influenced by their friends' service participation, especially in the case of students who participated in community service in high school but discontinued it in college. Some students in their study stated that they probably would have continued their participation if their friends in college did so also. This can perhaps be attributed to the fact that students are provided with numerous types of involvement opportunities on campus and often simply choose to engage in those opportunities that they can share with their friends. Another potential explanation for this is that students who do not have friends who regularly participate in community service are not asked to volunteer by others on their campus. Jones and Hill found that students on campuses with large populations indicated that even though they understood that their community could benefit from having volunteers, it was difficult for them to find opportunities to engage in community service.

AAC&U's recent report on civic responsibility in higher education found that co-curricular involvement that allowed students to experience giving back to their community, such as participation in fraternities and sororities and varsity sports, motivated them to continue their community service (Dey et al., 2009). One student in the study stated:

I became involved with [a community-service organization] as a first-year [student], actually became a commissioner my second year, and have continued to be a part of it until now. The people involved and the issues we face as an organization have taught me a lot about being a dedicated citizen who needs to work toward social change. (p. 13)

This experience illustrates the importance student organizations can have for students' development of civic commitment. This student's comment suggests that the organization provided him/her with an experience that contributed to his/her dedication to creating social change. Having a consistent group of people to volunteer with through the organization is a unique aspect of the volunteering experience that the student may not have had if he/she volunteered independently of a student organization.

Civic Engagement in the Context of Service Organizations

An extensive review of journals about college students (e.g., *Journal of College Student Development*, *NASPA Journal*), community service (e.g., *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*), and publications of organizations dedicated to civic engagement (e.g., CIRCLE, Campus Compact), generated only two articles on college students in student service organizations in the past 20 years. The findings of these studies are described below.

Sergent and Sedlacek (1990) studied the personality characteristics of college students volunteering in one of four types of groups on one college campus: (1) a student union programming board, (2) a group affiliated with undergraduate admissions that hosted programs to recruit students, (3) a peer counseling group, and

(4) a service fraternity. Utilizing the Self-Directed Search (SDS) instrument that evaluates students' Holland typology, they found that there was a diversity of motivation among students in the four types of organizations and among students within each type of organization. Overall, a majority of the students in the service fraternity and the programming board were categorized as being Investigative types, which indicated they were drawn to solving problems. The majority of the students in the peer counseling group were categorized as being Social types, which indicated that they primarily valued helping others. The majority of the students in the undergraduate recruitment organization were the Enterprising type, which suggested that they valued leading others. These findings suggest that different types of organizations may draw students with different personalities and motivations for volunteering. However, the findings of this study are difficult to generalize because of the small sample (199 students) that was drawn from a single institution.

Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider (1995) conducted a more in-depth study of the traits and motivations of college students who participated in service organizations. Service organizations were defined as organizations whose primary purpose was to provide voluntary service to others on their campus or in their community. Their sample consisted of 443 students who were actively involved in any service organization at Texas A&M in 1991. Service organizations were defined as organizations whose primary mission was voluntary service to the campus and broader communities. Of the students in their sample, 76% indicated that they found out about the service organization they joined from friends, and 63.7% of them said their friends were most influential in their decision to join the organization. Students'

responses to questions on a survey of how important different types of motivations were for their initial and continued involvement in service organizations revealed that altruistic motivations were the primary reason students joined the organizations. This included statements such as “I wanted to serve (contribute to) the community” and “To accomplish something worthwhile/useful to others” (p. 31). Interestingly, the researchers found that a statement that was categorized as indicating a social obligation motive (“Because of my strong sense of social responsibility”) was found to be closely associated to statements categorized as indicating altruistic motives. The researchers found that motivations for initial involvement and continued involvement in the organizations did not significantly differ. However, open-ended responses from students contradicted these findings, indicating that students had altruistic motivations for joining student organizations, but egoistic motivations, primarily friendships and social interactions, were the primary motivations for continued involvement. Like Sergent and Sedlacek’s (1990) study, the findings from this study are difficult to generalize due to the fact that students in this sample were only drawn from one institution.

Civic Engagement in the Context of Advocacy Organizations

The primary literature that exists regarding advocacy student organizations is on student organizations from the 1960s and prior. National student organizations such as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Student Peace Union gained prominence in 1960s for advocating for social, economic, and political change (Van Dyke, 1998). Although in-depth information about the inner workings of these organizations is interesting, providing this information is tangential to the topic of this

thesis. Information about past college student activism, however, is relevant in regard to the development of activist subcultures on campuses.

Van Dyke (1998) argued that activist subcultures that developed historically helped predict current activism on college campuses. In her study of the relationship between college student activism in the 1930s and 1960s, she found that campuses in which student activism was prevalent in the 1930s were also sites for campus activism in the 1960s. She noted that activist organizations helped maintain activist subcultures in times when widespread movements, such as the women's movement, died down for a period. She argued that the continuity of these subcultures helped movements re-emerge after years of latency.

Sax (2004) also found that the culture of institutions impacted students' commitment to activism. She found that regardless of students' commitment to social activism before college, those who attended colleges that had student cultures that promoted social activism tended to be more committed to activism. Given Van Dyke's (1998) assertion that activist organizations tended to promote and maintain activist subcultures, Sax's finding highlights these organizations' importance on college campuses in promoting civic engagement. Sax found that a commitment to activism was also positively associated with the following activities: "time spent attending religious services, performing volunteer work, attending classes and labs, and exercising or playing sports" (p.75). The fact that these activities all involve a high level of social contact provides more support to the idea that college student advocacy organization membership may be associated with a higher sense of

commitment to activism. Participating in an organization provides a social aspect to advocacy that one may not experience outside a formal organization.

Civic Engagement in the Context of Identity-Based Organizations

Racial and Ethnic Student Organizations

The majority of the literature on identity-based student organizations has focused on racial and ethnic student organizations. Racial and ethnic student organizations can include “fraternities and sororities open solely to membership among one racial/ethnic group, cultural groups that celebrate on specific racial or ethnic heritage, and activist organizations that concentrate on political interests for a certain race or ethnicity” (Inkelas, 2004, p. 285).

The value of identity-based college student organizations has been debated on college campuses across the country. Biddix (2009) and Inkelas (2004) noted that some (e.g., D’Souza, 1991) have argued these organizations promote self-segregation among students. However, several studies have been conducted to determine the value of these organizations to student members. These benefits have included cultural adjustment, especially at predominantly White institutions, and the ability to reflect on and express one’s identity (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Museus, 2008). Students with historically marginalized racial and ethnic backgrounds at predominantly White institutions have been shown to find comfort in subcultures composed of others who share their racial/ethnic identities. Racial and ethnic student organizations often serve as a space for these subcultures (Museus, 2008).

Civic Engagement Outcomes. Literature on the links between membership in racial and ethnic identity organizations and citizenship outcomes is lacking (Inkelas,

2004). However, some studies have shown that connected to the benefits outlined above, racial and ethnic minority students have been shown to have gained a strong commitment toward serving their racial/ethnic community as a result of their participation in these identity-based organizations. In a study of 259 Asian Pacific American (APA) students at a large public research university in the Midwest, Inkelas (2004), controlling for other student inputs and college environments, found that students involved in Asian American focused college student organizations showed a strong increased awareness and understanding of APA issues.

Museus (2008) found that the concepts of cultural expression and advocacy for Black and Asian American students in ethnicity-based student organizations were so intertwined that he had to combine them into one category in his analysis. These organizations provided a venue for the students in his study to express their cultural identities by educating others about their identity and advocating for a cultural shift on campus through institutional change. Two of the most important issues for Black student organizations were to increase the number of Black students admitted to the university and educate the campus community about Black culture. Asian American students were also concerned about the lack of knowledge about Asian Americans among their peers, which they tried to address by advocating for adding Asian American Studies courses at their institution (Museus, 2008). These activities reflecting civic engagement among racial and ethnic minority students have been reflected in some identity development models.

McEwen, Roper, Bryant, and Langa (1990) included Developing Social Responsibility into their nine dimensions necessary for including African Americans

into prior college student development theories. In addition, the final stage of Cross's (1995) model of Black identity development, Internalization-commitment, is characterized by being comfortable with one's Black identity and feeling a sense of responsibility to bring about social justice for African Americans and other marginalized populations. These models highlight the importance of challenging inequities in society for many African American students due to their marginal status. Many of these students do this within the context of identity-based student organizations. In Harper and Quaye's (2007) phenomenological study of African American male student leaders on campus, they found that a majority of the students were involved in primarily Black and minority student organizations. The students utilized their involvement in these organizations to bring about change for Black and other racial/ethnic minority students on campus. They did this through sponsoring academic and nonacademic programs to promote retention for racial/ethnic minority students and advocating for more support for racial/ethnic minorities on campus. Although these activities have not traditionally been considered in the realm of civic engagement, they may signal a trend in how students approach creating social change based on their identity. In Campus Compact's Wingspread Statement (2002), students noted that civic engagement included challenging "isms" (p. 1) or the status quo.

Jones and Hill (2003) noted that several African American students in their study of college student community service participation were very much involved in serving their communities, but this was so deeply embedded into their sense of self and cultural background that they had trouble identifying this work as community service. This difficulty led them to being labeled as non-participants in the study.

This issue highlights the limitations of studying community service among students with marginalized backgrounds and puts into question literature (O'Grady, 2000) that has suggested that White, middle-class students are the primary participants in civic engagement on college campuses (Jones & Hill, 2003).

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Student Organizations

Although research on identity-based student organizations has primarily focused on racial and ethnic student organizations, some research has been conducted on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) student organizations as well. Mallory (1998) identified five roles LGBTQ organizations can serve: support, education, social, personal development, and advocacy. Support often involves helping individuals explore their identities, counseling them on struggles they are experiencing, and providing a safe space for them to express themselves. Education might involve speaking to classes or other groups about being LGBTQ. Providing social spaces for students can include formal social programs (e.g., dances or mixers) or going out to dinner with other LGBTQ students. Personal development includes hosting programs such as career workshops for members. Finally, advocacy involves trying to influence campus, local, or national laws and policies, or registering people to vote. Students may join an LGBTQ organization seeking others with whom to perform advocacy, or these organizations may foster advocacy among members who may have joined for other reasons.

Civic Engagement Outcomes. Although the literature on LGBTQ student organizations is sparse, the literature that does exist supports the notion that these organizations contribute to civic engagement outcomes. In a grounded theory study of

15 LGBTQ students, Renn (2007) characterized 10 of the students as activists, many of whom stated that their activism occurred in the context of LGBTQ student organizations. She found that as students took on leadership roles in LGBTQ student organizations, they more often publicly identified themselves as LGBTQ, which in turn resulted in them engaging in more leadership activities and activism. Renn and Bilodeau (2005) also found that LGBTQ students' increased leadership in a campus conference committee assisted with their identity development, which resulted in an increased desire to take on more leadership and activist roles. This emerging literature suggests that LGBTQ student organizations may have an important role in fostering students' civic engagement.

Limitations

Many of the studies that have found links between involvement in identity-based student organizations and civic engagement have been qualitative in nature (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Museus, 2008; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005) and have drawn samples from only a small number of institutions (Guiffrida, 2003; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). Although these studies provide in-depth insight into the experiences of the students at these institutions, it is difficult to generalize them to other institutions. A multi-institutional quantitative study can provide insight into the social change attitudes and behaviors of students in identity-based organizations that may be better generalized to students at other institutions. In addition, the literature on identity-based organizations has focused on particular identities, distinguishing between race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Studies linking these separate identities together can

be helpful in understanding similarities that may exist between students in separate types of identity-based organizations.

Summary of the Literature

The association between involvement in service and advocacy organizations with civic responsibility and engagement in social change behaviors has not been studied in depth. However, the literature on identity-based organizations has suggested that these organizations often serve as venues for students to develop a sense of civic responsibility and provide opportunities for them to engage in a variety of social change behaviors. A significant amount of literature shows that community service participation has a positive effect on students' development of a sense of civic responsibility. However, the results are mixed when seeking to explore whether a sense of civic responsibility is associated with higher frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. Additional research needs to be conducted on this topic. The next chapter will discuss the methodology and methods that were employed in the current study.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

In this chapter, I describe the research methodology and methods that I utilized for this study. I begin with a description of the purpose of the study. This is followed by a description of the research design, including the instrument used to collect the data and the sampling strategies. The research questions and the hypotheses tested will follow, and the chapter will conclude with a description of the statistical procedures that were used to analyze the data.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to analyze the relationship between students' involvement with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations and their perceived sense of civic responsibility as well as the relationship between their involvement in these organizations and their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors.

Design

This study utilized an ex post facto non-experimental causal comparative design as well as a non-experimental correlational design using secondary data analysis from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL).

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

Instrumentation

The MSL was developed by a group of 19 faculty, students affairs professionals, and graduate students from the University of Maryland, College Park (Komives, Dugan, et al., 2006). It was designed for the purpose of studying college student leadership development. The MSL was constructed based on the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Higher Education Research Institute,

1996). This model was operationalized by Tyree's (1998) Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS). The SRLS consists of 103 items divided into eight subscales drawn from the Social Change Model: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, common purpose, collaboration, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change. These are known as the "8 C's". This scale was reduced to 68 items (SRLS-Rev2) for the first version of the MSL. A pilot test of the instrument was conducted in June 2008 to enhance the citizenship scale for a revised 2009 version of the instrument (SRLS-R3) and a modified 2009 MSL instrument. This 2009 MSL instrument consists of 40 questions that were drawn from the MSL 2006, the SRLS-R3, select scales from the National Study of Living Learning Programs, as well as additional questions developed by the MSL research team (Komives, Dugan, et al., 2006).

I-E-O Model

The MSL was developed to analyze college student outcomes based on their college environments and pre-college inputs. This model was developed using Astin's (1991) I-E-O model. This model holds that the outcomes of students in college are the results of a combination of their inputs and environments. Inputs are students' pre-existing characteristics and experiences before college. The MSL contains questions that gather cross-sectional data about students using quasi-pretests, which are retrospective self-reported responses of students' college inputs. Examples of inputs collected in the MSL include students' reported involvement in community service prior to college and students' reported high school student organization involvement. College environment are students' experiences in college. The MSL

measures college environments by a number of variables including students' college student organization involvement and their experience being mentored in college. College outcomes are the unique characteristics students come to develop through the combination of their inputs and environments. The MSL contains questions that measure the eight C's, all of which are potential college outcomes (National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, 2009). This framework is the basis of the MSL instrument.

Reliability and Validity

In October 2008, a pilot study of the instrument was conducted with a sample of 3,000 University of Maryland Students. This garnered a response rate of 660 (22%) students. This study established inter-rater reliability for the instrument. The scales specific to this study, Social Change Behaviors (Chronbach alpha = .90) and Citizenship (Chronbach alpha = .91) were both found to be reliable (Komives, 2009a; Komives, 2009b). The sense of civic responsibility variable for this study that consisted of a composite score of two items from the Citizenship scale was shown to be reliable as well (Chronbach alpha = .77).

Construct validity was established for the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS-R3) by determining positive correlations between it and other instruments developed based on leadership theories (the Leadership Practices Inventory and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) (Komives, 2009c).

In an attempt to further ensure accurate data, the Crowne-Marlow measure of social desirability was used to remove items on the MSL that appeared to solicit biased responses from participants (Dugan et al., 2009).

Sampling Strategy

Institutional Sample

An open call for participation in the Multi-institutional Study of Leadership was sent out through various listservs sponsored by organizations including the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Knowledge Community for Student Leadership Programs, the American College Personnel Association Commission on Student Involvement, the National Clearinghouse for Leadership programs, the International Leadership Association, and the Association of Leadership Educators. 104 institutions enrolled in this study and 103 of them completed the survey. Of these, 101 of them were considered part of the national sample due to the fact that two of the institutions were international (one in Canada and one in Mexico) (Komives, 2009a).

MSL Student Sample

Student sampling rates were determined using a desired confidence level of 95% and ± 3 confidence interval. This resulted in a target sample size of 3,000 for mid-sized and large institutions. To reach this goal, a sample size of 4,000 was chosen for the study. Institutions that enrolled less than 4,000 students administered the survey to all students on their campuses. For institutions with more than 4,000 students enrolled, the survey was administered to a random sample of 4,000 students. Students in the sample were contacted by e-mail up to three times to complete the survey (Komives, 2009a). A total of 337,482 students were invited to participate in the survey. This yielded a 34% response rate (115,632 students). The majority of respondents identified as White (72.7%), followed by Asian American (7.72%),

Multiracial (7.61%), African American/Black (5.38%), Latino (4.13%), Middle Eastern (0.64%), and American Indian (0.43%). In regards to gender, 51.2% of respondents identified as Female, 28.1% identified as Male, 0.1% Transgender, and 20.5% did not respond. See Appendix A: MSL Respondent Characteristics for a complete table of respondent demographics.

Sample for This Study

This study only utilized a portion of the entire MSL sample. The sample consisted of 44,911 students. The sample included students who participated exclusively in service organizations ($n = 16,381$), exclusively in advocacy organizations ($n = 2,297$), exclusively in identity-based organizations ($n = 8,440$), in more than one of these three organizations ($n = 9,360$), and a random sample of students who did not participate in any of the three organizations ($n = 7,983$) (see Table 1). It is important to note that this study did not take into account students' participation in organizations beyond service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations. Therefore, when the term “exclusively” is used here, it refers to participation exclusively in an organization (e.g., service) in comparison to the other organizations that were analyzed.

Table 1: Student Organization Involvement

| Category | N | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Service Org Involvement | 16,831 | 37.5 |
| Advocacy Org Involvement | 2,297 | 5.1 |
| Identity-Based Org Involvement | 8,440 | 18.8 |
| Combination of Orgs Involvement | 9,360 | 20.8 |
| No Org Involvement | 7,983 | 17.8 |

In regards to race and ethnicity, 59.2% of the overall sample identified as White ($n = 27,518$), 8.9% Asian American/Asian ($n = 4,149$), 7.3% Multiracial ($n = 3,407$), 6% African American/Black ($n = 2,809$), 3.9% Latino/Hispanic ($n = 1,833$), 1.4% Race/Ethnicity not included in the list of options ($n = 631$), .6% Middle Eastern ($n = 295$), and .4% American Indian/Alaska Native ($n = 170$), and 9.3% of the respondents did not provide a response ($n = 4169$). In regards to gender, 62% of the sample identified as female ($n = 27863$), 28.7% identified as male ($n = 12, 876$), .2% identified as transgender ($n = 84$), and 9.1% did not provide a response ($n = 4088$). Additionally, the sample consisted of 20.1% Freshmen ($n = 9, 012$), 22.2% Sophomores ($n = 9, 967$), 26.6% Juniors ($n = 11, 963$), 30.4% Seniors (4th year and beyond) ($n = 13,633$), .7% were unclassified ($n = 330$), and 5 students did not provide a response.

Tables 3 – 5 provide detailed demographic information for students in each of the involvement categories for this study. Overall, women were the majority of students in all of the involvement categories. A significant majority of students in service and advocacy organizations as well as students who were not involved in any of the organizations were White. Students of color comprised 44.3% of those involved in a combination of the three organizations. There was a fairly even class standing distribution among each of the involvement categories, with students who were seniors+ comprising a slight majority in each of the categories.

Table 2: Student Sample Characteristics

| Category | N | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| <u>Race</u> | | |
| White/Caucasian | 27,478 | 61.2 |
| Middle Eastern | 293 | .7 |
| African American/Black | 2,802 | 6.2 |
| American Indian/ Alaska Native | 169 | .4 |
| Asian American/ Asian | 4,143 | 9.2 |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 1,828 | 4.1 |
| Multiracial | 3,402 | 7.6 |
| Race/ Ethnicity not included above | 627 | 1.4 |
| Did Not Respond | 4,169 | 9.3 |
| <u>Gender</u> | | |
| Female | 27,863 | 62.0 |
| Male | 12,876 | 28.7 |
| Transgender | 84 | .2 |
| Did Not Respond | 4,088 | 9.1 |
| <u>Class Standing</u> | | |
| Freshman | 9,013 | 20.1 |
| Sophomore | 9,967 | 22.2 |
| Junior | 11,963 | 26.6 |
| Seniors (4 th year and beyond) | 13,633 | 30.4 |
| Unclassified | 330 | .7 |
| Did Not Respond | 5 | .0 |

Table 3: Student Sample Gender by Involvement

| | | | Female | Male | Trans gender | Total |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| ORG TYPE | Service Org Involvement | n | 11,170 | 4,257 | 10 | 15,437 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 72.4% | 27.6% | .1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Gender | 40.1% | 33.1% | 11.9% | 37.8% |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | n | 1,439 | 637 | 6 | 2,082 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 69.1% | 30.6% | .3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Gender | 5.2% | 4.9% | 7.1% | 5.1% |
| | Identity- Based Org Involvement | n | 4,823 | 2,742 | 29 | 7,594 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 63.5% | 36.1% | .4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Gender | 17.3% | 21.3% | 34.5% | 18.6% |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | n | 6,050 | 2,464 | 36 | 8,550 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 70.8% | 28.8% | .4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Gender | 21.7% | 19.1% | 42.9% | 20.9% |
| | No Org Involvement | n | 4,381 | 2,776 | 3 | 7,160 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 61.2% | 38.8% | .0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Gender | 15.7% | 21.6% | 3.6% | 17.5% |
| Total | | n | 27,863 | 12,876 | 84 | 40,823 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 68.3% | 31.5% | .2% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Gender | 100.0 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | | % | | | |

Table 4: Student Sample Race by Involvement

| ORGTYP | Service Org Involvement | n | American | | | | | | | | | | Race/ Ethnicity not included above | Total |
|--------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--|------------------------------------|-------|
| | | | White/ Caucasian | Middle Eastern | African American/Black | Indian/ Alaska Native | Asian American/ Asian | Latino/ Hispanic | Multi-racial | | | | | |
| | | | 12,961 | 46 | 339 | 37 | 650 | 330 | 927 | 121 | 15,411 | | | |
| | % within ORGTYP | | 84.1% | .3% | 2.2% | .2% | 4.2% | 2.1% | 6.0% | .8% | 100.0% | | | |
| | % within Racial Groups | | 47.2% | 15.7% | 12.1% | 21.9% | 15.7% | 18.1% | 27.2% | 19.3% | 37.8% | | | |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | n | 1,655 | 12 | 43 | 7 | 98 | 57 | 177 | 29 | 2,078 | | | |
| | % within ORGTYP | | 79.6% | .6% | 2.1% | .3% | 4.7% | 2.7% | 8.5% | 1.4% | 100.0% | | | |
| | % within Racial Groups | | 6.0% | 4.1% | 1.5% | 4.1% | 2.4% | 3.1% | 5.2% | 4.6% | 5.1% | | | |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | n | 2,611 | 85 | 1,276 | 48 | 1,838 | 651 | 869 | 205 | 7,583 | | | |
| | % within ORGTYP | | 34.4% | 1.1% | 16.8% | .6% | 24.2% | 8.6% | 11.5% | 2.7% | 100.0% | | | |
| | % within Racial Groups | | 9.5% | 29.0% | 45.5% | 28.4% | 44.4% | 35.6% | 25.5% | 32.7% | 18.6% | | | |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | n | 4,750 | 96 | 828 | 34 | 1,194 | 516 | 915 | 196 | 8,529 | | | |
| | % within ORGTYP | | 55.7% | 1.1% | 9.7% | .4% | 14.0% | 6.0% | 10.7% | 2.3% | 100.0% | | | |
| | % within Racial Groups | | 17.3% | 32.8% | 29.6% | 20.1% | 28.8% | 28.2% | 26.9% | 31.3% | 20.9% | | | |
| | No Org Involvement | n | 5,501 | 54 | 316 | 43 | 363 | 274 | 514 | 76 | 7,514 | | | |
| | % within ORGTYP | | 77.0% | .8% | 4.4% | .6% | 5.1% | 3.8% | 7.2% | 1.1% | 100.0% | | | |
| | % within Racial Groups | | 20.0% | 18.4% | 11.3% | 25.4% | 8.8% | 15.0% | 15.1% | 12.1% | 17.5% | | | |
| Total | | n | 27,478 | 293 | 2,802 | 169 | 4,143 | 1,828 | 3,402 | 627 | 40,742 | | | |
| | % within ORGTYP | | 67.4% | .7% | 6.9% | .4% | 10.2% | 4.5% | 8.4% | 1.5% | 100.0% | | | |
| | % within Racial Groups | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | | |

Table 5: Student Sample Class Standing by Involvement

| | | | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior + | Total |
|-------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|
| ORG | Service Org | n | 3,128 | 3,786 | 4,588 | 5,208 | 16,710 |
| TYPE | Involvement | % within ORGTYPE | 18.7% | 22.7% | 27.5% | 31.2% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Class Standing | 34.7% | 38.0% | 38.4% | 38.2% | 37.5% |
| | Advocacy Org | n | 419 | 526 | 599 | 738 | 2,282 |
| | Involvement | % within ORGTYPE | 18.4% | 23.0% | 26.2% | 32.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Class Standing | 4.6% | 5.3% | 5.0% | 5.4% | 5.1% |
| | Identity-Based | n | 2,010 | 1,859 | 2,171 | 2,335 | 8,375 |
| | Org Involvement | % within ORGTYPE | 24.0% | 22.2% | 25.9% | 27.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Class Standing | 22.3% | 18.7% | 18.1% | 17.1% | 18.8% |
| | Combination of | n | 1,482 | 2,054 | 2,611 | 3,148 | 9,295 |
| | Orgs Involvement | % within ORGTYPE | 15.9% | 22.1% | 28.1% | 33.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Class Standing | 16.4% | 20.6% | 21.8% | 23.1% | 20.9% |
| | No Org | n | 1,974 | 1,742 | 1,994 | 2,204 | 7,914 |
| | Involvement | % within ORGTYPE | 24.9% | 22.0% | 25.2% | 27.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Class Standing | 21.9% | 17.5% | 16.7% | 16.2% | 17.8% |
| Total | | n | 9,013 | 9,967 | 11,963 | 13,633 | 44,576 |
| | | % within ORGTYPE | 20.2% | 22.4% | 26.8% | 30.6% | 100.0% |
| | | % within Class Standing | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses were addressed in this study.

Research Question 1:

Does undergraduate students' perceived sense of civic responsibility differ based on involvement with particular types of student organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based)?

Hypothesis 1:

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the literature on service and advocacy student organizations is sparse. However, based upon the literature that suggests students who participate in identity-based student organizations develop a strong sense of civic responsibility (e.g. Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005), the following hypothesis was established: there is a difference in undergraduate perceived sense of civic responsibility based on students' involvement with service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations, as compared to students not involved with any of these organizations. Furthermore, students in identity-based student organizations will have a higher level of perceived civic responsibility than students in service and advocacy organizations. In addition, students in all three types of organizations will have a higher level of perceived civic responsibility than non-participants.

Research Question 2:

Does undergraduate students' frequency of engagement in social change behaviors differ based on involvement with particular types of student organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based)?

Hypothesis 2:

Based upon the literature that suggests students who participate in identity-based student organizations engage in a significant number of social change behaviors (e.g. Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005), the following hypothesis was established: students in service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations will differ in frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. Furthermore, students in identity-based student organizations will have a higher frequency of engagement in social change behaviors than students in service and advocacy organizations. However, students in all three types of organizations will engage more frequently in social change behaviors than non-participants.

Research Question 3:

Is there a relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement with social change behaviors among students involved with service, advocacy, or identity-based organizations, and students who are not involved with any of these organizations?

Hypothesis 3:

The literature was mixed regarding the relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engaging in social change behaviors.

However, based on research by Colby et al. (2007), Hellman, Hoppes, and Ellison (2006), and Knefelkamp (2008), the following hypothesis was established: there is a positive relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors among students involved with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations, and students who are not involved with any of these organizations.

Measures

The first dependent variable for this study was students' perceived sense of civic responsibility. Perceived sense of civic responsibility was operationalized by students' level of agreement with two items from the MSL's citizenship scale: "I believe I have responsibilities to my community" and "I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public". Students had the option to respond to these questions on a five point Likert scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree (see Table 6). Students' responses to these two items were averaged to form a composite variable called "Civic Responsibility."

The second dependent variable for this study, students' frequency of engagement in social change behaviors, was operationalized by their responses to the Social Change Behaviors Scale, a series of 10 activities that students indicated the frequency with which they engaged in on a Likert scale of 1 = never, 2= Sometimes, 3=Often, 4 = very often (see Table 7). The MSL research team that created the Social Change Behaviors Scale conducted a factor analysis on the 10 items it is composed of and found that the items formed a reliable scale (Komives, 2009a). A composite

score taking into account their responses to these activities was the measure of their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors.

The independent variable in this study was student organization involvement. More specifically, student data was grouped by students who participated exclusively in each of the three types of student organizations: (1) Service, (2) Advocacy, (3) Identity-Based. Students' involvement in these organizations was measured by their response to the following question: "Have you been involved in the following kinds of student groups during college?" (see Table 8). Students were given the option to choose 1 = Yes or 2 = No to 23 categories of student organizations. Examples of each type of organization were provided to students responding to the MSL: Service organizations (ex. Circle K and Habitat for Humanity), Advocacy organizations (ex. Students Against Sweatshops and Amnesty International), Identity-based organizations (ex. Black Student Union, LGBT Allies, and Korean Student Association). For this study, a fourth involvement category was created to include students who participated in any combination of the three groups (service and advocacy; advocacy and identity-based; service and identity-based; all three organizational types). The rationale for creating this fourth category was that being a part of more than one of these organizations may indicate an increased sense of civic responsibility and increased opportunities to engage in social change behaviors. A fifth involvement category consisted of a random sample of students who did not participate in any of these three types of organizations.

Table 6: Sense of Civic Responsibility Items (Question #20 on MSL Instrument)

20. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following items:

1 = Strongly Disagree 4 = Agree
 2 = Disagree 5 = Strongly Agree
 3 = Neutral

I believe I have responsibilities to 1 2 3 4 5
 my community

I believe I have a civic 1 2 3 4 5
 responsibility to the greater public

Table 7: Social Change Behaviors Scale Items (Question #14 on MSL Instrument)

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 1 2 3 4

Acted to benefit the common good or protect the 1 2 3 4
 environment

Been actively involved with an organization that addresses 1 2 3 4
 a social or environmental problem

Been actively involved with an organization that addresses 1 2 3 4
 the concerns of a specific community (ex. academic
 council, neighborhood association)

Communicated with campus or community leaders about a 1 2 3 4
 pressing concern

Took action in the community to try to address a social or 1 2 3 4
 environmental problem

Worked with others to make the campus or community a 1 2 3 4
 better place

| | |
|---|---------|
| Acted to raise awareness about a campus, community, or global problem | 1 2 3 4 |
| Took part in a protest, rally, march, or demonstration | 1 2 3 4 |
| Worked with others to address social inequality | 1 2 3 4 |

Table 8: Student Organization Involvement Items (Question #16 on MSL Instrument)

| | |
|---|--------|
| 16. Have you been involved in the following kinds of student groups <u>during college</u>? | |
| (Respond to each item) | |
| 1 = Yes | 2 = No |
| Identity-Based (ex. Black Student Union, LGBT Allies, Korean Student Association) | 1 2 |
| Service (ex. Circle K, Habitat for Humanity) | 1 2 |
| Advocacy (ex. Students Against Sweatshops, Amnesty International) | 1 2 |

Data Analysis

SPSS was used to analyze the data for this study. Students in the five groups were compared on their perceived sense of civic responsibility using a one-way ANOVA and the Games-Howell post hoc test to further analyze these differences. Lomax (2007) suggested that this post hoc test be used when group variances are unequal and $n > 50$. Descriptive statistics were generated to test the assumptions of normality and Levene's Statistic was generated to test for the assumption of homogeneity of variance. The same procedures were conducted to compare students on their frequency of participation in social change behaviors. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was calculated to determine the correlation between students'

stated civic responsibility and their actual social change behaviors. This coefficient was used instead of the Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficient because Spearman does not assume normality, homoscedasticity, and linearity, which were all not met. Additionally, the Spearman test allows for measuring the correlation of ordinal level data.

Summary of Methodology and Methods

In this chapter, I provided a description of this ex post facto non-experimental causal comparative and correlational study. I discussed the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, which is the survey instrument from which the data was drawn. The research questions and hypotheses were stated, as well as the statistical analyses that were conducted to test them. The next chapter will discuss the results of this study.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

As stated in Chapter One, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between students' involvement with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations and their perceived sense of civic responsibility as well as their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. In addition, this study sought to understand the link between students' attitudes and behaviors by analyzing the relationship between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and their engagement in social change behaviors. This chapter describes the results of the ANOVAs conducted for the first two research questions as well as the correlation conducted for the third question. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the findings of this study.

As discussed in Chapter Three, the sample consisted of students who participated in service, advocacy, and/or identity-based student organizations as well as a random sample of 7,983 students who did not participate in any of these organizations. The data was then cleaned to include only students who responded to all of the questions on the Social Change Behaviors scale as well as the two questions that were combined to form the Civic Responsibility Composite variable. This resulted in a final sample of 44,911 students.

Question One Results

Assumptions of Question One

The researcher conducted a preliminary analysis of the data to check if the assumptions for ANOVA were met. ANOVA requires the dependent variable to be normally distributed and have homogeneity of variance among each category of the independent variable. Both normality and homogeneity of variance were violated in

this sample. However, Krathwohl (2004) noted that ANOVA is robust to violations of normality and homogeneity of variance and a large sample size can alleviate the potential problems of these violations. In order to adjust for skewed distributions and heterogeneity of variance, he suggested using a conservative 1% significance level rather than the conventional 5% level. This method was applied to this study. In addition, to further ensure the results of the study were accurate, the Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests were conducted, as suggested by Pallant (2007). ANOVA also requires the dependent variable to be measured on an interval or ratio level. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the sense of civic responsibility composite variable was ordinal data measured on a Likert scale. However, Lomax (2007) suggested that ordinal level Likert scale data may be treated as interval level data, which is what was done in this study.

Testing of Question One Hypothesis

The hypothesis for Question One was that there is a difference in undergraduate perceived sense of civic responsibility based on students' involvement with service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations, as compared to students not involved with any of these organizations. Furthermore, the hypothesis stated that students in identity-based student organizations will have a higher level of civic responsibility than students in service and advocacy organizations.

Table 3 provides the mean Civic Responsibility composite variable scores for students in each of the involvement categories. The ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences between the groups on the Civic Responsibility composite variable at the .01 significance level (see Table 4). The Welch and Brown-

Forsythe tests were also significant, confirming the ANOVA results. To further understand what groups differed from each other, the Games-Howell multiple comparison test was conducted.

As Tables 4 and 5 illustrate, all of the five categories of organizational involvement were significantly different from each other in regards to their perceived sense of civic responsibility. Students who participated in multiple organizations had higher mean scores on the civic responsibility variable than students who participated exclusively in each of the organization types and students who did not participate in any of the organizations. Advocacy organizations had the second highest mean scores followed by service organizations. Contrary to my hypothesis, students who participated exclusively in identity-based organizations had lower mean scores than all of the other involvement categories except for students who did not participate in any of the three organizations. Students who did not participate in any of the three organizations had lower mean scores than students who participated in any of the three organizations.

Table 9: Mean Scores on Sense of Civic Responsibility Composite Variable

| Categories | Mean | SD | SE |
|---------------------------------|------|-----|-------|
| Combination of Orgs Involvement | 4.21 | .66 | .0069 |
| Advocacy Org Involvement | 4.10 | .66 | .0138 |
| Service Org Involvement | 4.04 | .63 | .0048 |
| Identity-Based Org Involvement | 3.87 | .70 | .0076 |
| No Org Involvement | 3.74 | .71 | .0079 |

Table 10: *Sense of Civic Responsibility ANOVA Results*

| | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|----------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| Between Groups | 1,125.74 | 4 | 281.44 | 636.07 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 19,868.97 | 44,906 | .44 | | |
| Total | 20,994.71 | 44,910 | | | |

Table 11: *Sense of Civic Responsibility Games-Howell Multiple Comparison Test*

| (I) ORGTYPE | (J) ORGTYPE | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|------|
| Service Org Involvement | Advocacy Org Involvement | -.06* | .015 | .001 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .17* | .009 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | -.17* | .008 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .30* | .009 | .000 |
| Advocacy Org Involvement | Service Org Involvement | .06* | .015 | .001 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .23* | .016 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | -.11* | .015 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .36* | .016 | .000 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Identity-Based Org Involvement | Service Org Involvement | .17* | .009 | .000 |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | .23* | .016 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | .34* | .010 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .13* | .011 | .000 |
| Combination of Orgs Involvement | Service Org Involvement | .17* | .008 | .000 |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | .11* | .015 | .000 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .34* | .010 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .46* | .010 | .000 |
| No Org Involvement | Service Org Involvement | .30* | .009 | .000 |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | .36* | .016 | .000 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .13* | .011 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | .46* | .010 | .000 |

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Question Two Results

Assumptions of Question Two

The assumptions for Question Two were the same as those for Question One. Both normality and homogeneity of variance were violated in this sample. However, as with the analysis of question one, an ANOVA was still conducted at the .01

significance level along with the Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests to ensure the results of the test were reliable. Also, as with the analysis of the first question, the ordinal level Likert scale data were treated as interval level data for the analysis of the second question.

Testing of Question Two Hypothesis

The hypothesis for Question Two was that students in service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations will differ in frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. Furthermore, the hypothesis stated that students in identity-based student organizations will have a higher frequency of engagement in social change behaviors than students in service and advocacy organizations. It also stated that students in all three types of organizations will engage more frequently in social change behaviors than non-participants.

Table 6 provides the mean Social Change Behaviors Scale scores for students in each of the involvement categories. The ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences between the groups on their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors, as measured by the Social Change Behaviors Scale at the .01 significance level (see Table 7). As with Question One, to further understand what groups differed from each other, the Games-Howell multiple comparison test was conducted.

As Tables 7 and 8 illustrate, there were significant differences among each of the involvement categories. Students who participated in multiple organizations had higher mean scores on the Social Change Behaviors Scale than students who participated exclusively in one of the other organizations and students who did not

participate in any of the organizations. Advocacy organizations had the second highest mean scores followed by service organizations. Contrary to the researchers' hypothesis, students who participated exclusively in identity-based organizations had lower mean scores than all of the other involvement categories except for students who did not participate in any of the three organizations. However, their mean scores were higher than students who did not participate in any of the groups.

Table 12: Mean Social Change Behaviors Scale Scores

| Categories | Mean | SD | SE |
|---------------------------------|------|-----|------|
| Combination of Orgs Involvement | 2.91 | .67 | .007 |
| Advocacy Org Involvement | 2.64 | .66 | .014 |
| Service Org Involvement | 2.36 | .63 | .005 |
| Identity-Based Org Involvement | 2.20 | .72 | .008 |
| No Org Involvement | 1.80 | .64 | .007 |

Table 13: Social Change Behaviors ANOVA

| | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|----------------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|------|
| Between Groups | 5,717.99 | 4 | 1,429.50 | 3,267.60 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 19,645.31 | 44,906 | .44 | | |
| Total | 25,363.30 | 44,910 | | | |

Table 14: Social Change Behaviors Games-Howell Multiple Comparison Test

| (I) ORGTYPE | (J) ORGTYPE | Mean Difference (I-J) | SE | Sig. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------|------|
| Service Org Involvement | Advocacy Org Involvement | -.28* | .015 | .000 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .17* | .009 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | -.55* | .008 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .56* | .009 | .000 |
| Advocacy Org Involvement | Service Org Involvement | .28* | .015 | .000 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .45* | .016 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | -.27* | .015 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .84* | .015 | .000 |
| Identity-Based Org Involvement | Service Org Involvement | -.17* | .009 | .000 |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | -.45* | .016 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | -.71* | .010 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | .39* | .011 | .000 |
| Combination of Orgs Involvement | Service Org Involvement | .55* | .008 | .000 |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | .27* | .015 | .000 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | .71* | .010 | .000 |
| | No Org Involvement | 1.11* | .010 | .000 |
| No Org Involvement | Service Org Involvement | -.56* | .009 | .000 |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | -.84* | .015 | .000 |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | -.39* | .011 | .000 |
| | Combination of Orgs Involvement | -1.11* | .010 | .000 |

Question Three Results

Assumptions of Question Three

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used instead of the Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficient because Spearman does not assume normality, homoscedasticity, and linearity, which were all not met. Additionally, the Spearman test allows for measuring the correlation of ordinal level data.

Testing of Question Three Hypothesis

The hypothesis for Question Three was that there is a positive relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors among students involved with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations, and students who are not involved with any of these organizations.

The correlation between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement in social change behaviors for each of the five involvement categories was positive and significant at the .01 level, thus providing support for the research hypothesis. In addition, using Cohen's (1988) guidelines for correlation effect size, the correlation among each of the involvement groups was of medium strength. The correlation was weaker for students exclusively involved in identity-based organizations ($R = .336$) than for students who were not involved in any of the organizations ($R = .341$), which disputes the second part of the hypothesis. The correlation was strongest among students involved in a combination of service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations ($R = .400$). See Table 9 for the complete listing of the results.

Table 15: Civic Responsibility and Social Change Behaviors Correlation

| | Organization Type | | Social Change Behaviors |
|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Spearman's rho | Combination of Orgs Involvement | Civic Responsibility | .400* |
| | Advocacy Org Involvement | Civic Responsibility | .367* |
| | Service Org Involvement | Civic Responsibility | .342* |
| | No Org Involvement | Civic Responsibility | .341* |
| | Identity-Based Org Involvement | Civic Responsibility | .336* |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Summary of Results

Each analysis conducted resulted in statistically significant results. Overall, students in a combination of service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations had a higher perceived sense of civic responsibility and engaged in social change behaviors more frequently than students who participated exclusively in one of the organizations and students who did not participate in any of the organizations. Contrary to the researchers' hypothesis, students in identity-based student organizations had a lower perceived sense of civic responsibility and engaged in social change behaviors less frequently than all the other categories of involvement except students who were not involved in any of the three organizations. Students' perceived sense of civic responsibility was moderately positively correlated with their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors among all of the involvement categories. The following chapter will discuss the implications of these findings.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a summary of the study along with a discussion of the results. It concludes with the limitations of the study and a discussion of the implications of this study for future research and practice.

Restatement of the Research Problem

As stated in Chapter One, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between students' involvement with service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations and their perceived sense of civic responsibility as well as their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. In addition, it sought to explore the relationship between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and their engagement in social change behaviors. The study was guided by three research questions:

Research Question 1:

Does undergraduate students' perceived sense of civic responsibility differ based on involvement with particular types of student organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based)?

Research Question 2:

Does undergraduate students' frequency of engagement in social change behaviors differ based on involvement with particular types of student organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based)?

Research Question 3:

Is there a relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engagement with social change behaviors among students

involved with service, advocacy, or identity-based organizations, and students who are not involved with any of these organizations?

As discussed in Chapter Four, I conducted two, one-way Analysis of Variance tests to analyze the first two research questions and a Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient to analyze the third question. The following section will discuss the results from these analyses.

Discussion of Results

Hypothesis One

The overall result of the ANOVA conducted to analyze the first research question supported the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the five student organization involvement groups on their perceived sense of civic responsibility at the .01 level significance level. Students who participated in a combination of the organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based) had the highest mean score on this variable. Students may have joined a combination of these organizations due to their increased sense of civic responsibility, or their increased sense of civic responsibility may have resulted from participating in more than one of these types of organizations. Further research needs to be conducted to analyze these two possibilities.

Students in advocacy organizations had the second highest mean scores on the Civic Responsibility variable. Since little literature has been published recently on college student advocacy organizations, these findings provide positive insight in regards to the characteristics associated with students in these organizations. Advocacy work can be seen as controversial at times. However, if heightened levels

of civic responsibility are associated with organizations that have taken on the role to advocate for a particular set of issues or causes, a case can be made for higher education institutions to support advocacy organizations and their activities, as Biddix et al. (2009) have argued.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Winniford et al. (1995) found that students involved in service organizations had altruistic motivations for joining the organizations, but their findings were mixed regarding what resulted in students' sustained involvement in the organizations. The findings of the present study suggest that students' sense of civic responsibility may potentially be a factor in their involvement in service organizations.

Students in identity-based organizations had a higher perceived sense of civic responsibility than students who did not participate in any of the organization types. However, contrary to the researcher's hypothesis, students who participated exclusively in identity-based organizations had lower mean scores than students in a combination of organizations, students exclusively in advocacy organizations, and students exclusively in service organizations. A possible explanation for this is that many students who were involved in identity-based organizations and had a high perceived sense of civic responsibility may have also joined service or advocacy organizations, which resulted in their exclusion from being considered exclusively members of an identity-based organization for this study. The higher proportion of students of color in the combination of groups category than in the other involvement categories, as mentioned in Chapter 3, provides support for this explanation.

Another potential explanation for this finding is that many students participating in an identity-based organization may have been reflecting on and developing their personal sense of identity without having gotten to a point where they felt strongly committed to a particular community. Several identity-development theories describe individuals moving through various stages of identity, with at least one stage involving an awareness of and/or commitment to one's community based on their identity (e.g., Cross, 1995; Kim, 2005, McCarn & Fassinger, 1996). Cross' Internalization-Commitment stage in his model of Black identity development, Kim's Awakening to Social and Political Consciousness Stage in his Asian American Identity Development Model, and McCarn and Fassinger's stage of Deepening/Commitment in the group membership identity branch of their Model of Sexual Minority Identity Formation all involve individuals having a commitment to a community based on their identity development. However, other earlier stages in these models do not involve this commitment. Many students in identity-based organizations in this study may have been experiencing different stages of identity development that did not include as strong a perceived sense of civic responsibility as students in service or advocacy organizations.

Students who were not involved in any of the three organizations had the lowest mean scores on the Civic Responsibility variable as expected. These results indicate that overall, being involved in a service, advocacy, and/or identity-based organization without considering any other factors, is indicative of having a higher perceived sense of civic responsibility than students who are not involved with any of these organizations.

Hypothesis Two

The overall result of the ANOVA conducted to analyze the second research question confirmed the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the five student organization involvement groups on their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors at the .01 significance level. As was the case with students' perceived sense of civic responsibility, students who participated in a combination of the organizations (service, advocacy, and identity-based) had the highest mean score on the Social Change Behaviors Scale. As mentioned in Chapter 3, this was expected due to the speculation that students may have more opportunities to engage in social change behaviors by their nature of being involved in more than one of these organizations. However, it is also possible that students intentionally sought to be part of more than one of the organizations because of their desire to have more opportunities to engage in social change behaviors.

Students who participated exclusively in advocacy organizations had the second highest mean scores on the Social Change Behaviors Scale. This is interesting, as this was the case for civic responsibility as well. One possible explanation for this is that since advocacy organizations often focus on particular issues (e.g., Students Against Sweatshops and Amnesty International), students drawn to them already feel some commitment to creating change regarding these issues, and are thus more inclined to take part in activities to create social change. Involvement in these organizations, however, may also expose students to others passionate about social issues, which could further motivate students to engage in social change behaviors and develop an even stronger sense of civic responsibility.

Students who participated exclusively in service organizations had the third highest mean scores on the Social Change Behaviors Scale. These results indicate that while students in service organizations did not engage in social change behaviors as frequently as students in advocacy organizations or a combination of organizations, service organization involvement can still be associated with stronger social change behavior outcomes than non-involvement.

Students who participated in identity-based organizations had higher mean scores on the Social Change Behaviors Scale than students who were not part of any of the organizations in this study. This indicates that identity-based organizations may have a role in fostering social change behaviors or supporting students who are interested in engaging in social change behaviors. However, contrary to the researcher's hypothesis based on literature that suggested students in identity-based organizations frequently engage in social change behaviors (e.g., Harper & Quaye, 2007; Inkelas, 2004; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005), students who participated exclusively in identity-based organizations had lower mean scores than all the other involvement categories except the category of students who did not participate in service, advocacy, or identity-based organizations. Jones and Hill's (2003) finding that several African American students in their study considered serving their community so close to their identity that they did not identify their service as community service may provide an explanation for the findings of the current study. Students in identity-based organizations may have failed to indicate that they participated in particular activities on the Social Change Behaviors Scale (e.g., performing community service, working with others to make the campus or

community a better place) even if they did so, due to their inability to label their actions in the way the instrument asked for them. Further research on how students in identity-based organizations label their social change behaviors is needed in order to better account for this finding.

As was hypothesized, students who were not involved in any of the three organizations had the lowest mean score on the Social Change Behaviors Scale. These results indicate that overall, being involved in a service, advocacy, and/or identity-based organization without considering any other factors, is indicative of engaging more frequently in social change behaviors than students not involved with any of these organizations.

Hypothesis Three

The result of the correlation conducted to analyze the third research question confirmed the hypothesis that there was a significant positive relationship between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and their overall social change behaviors for all of the five involvement categories at the .01 significance level. However, the relationship between the variables for students involved with identity-based organizations was slightly weaker than students not involved in any of the organizations. This did not support the hypothesis that students not involved in any of the organizations would have lowest correlation between the variables. This result may be related to the issue raised earlier regarding the lower mean score for social change behaviors that students in identity-based organizations had.

The correlation between the variables was strongest for the students who participated in some combination of service, advocacy, and identity-based

organizations, which is consistent with the findings of the previous two research questions. This suggests that there may be greater civic responsibility motivations for frequently engaging in social change behaviors among students who join a combination of the three types of organizations than for students who are exclusively involved in one of the organizations or those not involved in any of the organizations.

It is important to note that although the correlations for all groups were significant, they were all of only moderate strength. This is not surprising given the mixed findings in the literature regarding the relationship between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility, their intentions to engage in social change behaviors, and their actual participation in social change behaviors (Hellman et al., 2006; Hurtado et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2008). The findings of the present study further clarify that there is a link between perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequency of engaging in social change behaviors. However, additional factors may exist that combine with a sense of civic responsibility to result in increased frequency of social change behaviors, or that combine with frequently engaging in social change behaviors that result in a heightened sense of civic responsibility.

Limitations

This study was limited in several ways. In regards to the ANOVAs utilized to analyze the first two research questions, the assumptions of normality and heterogeneity of variance were violated. In addition, ANOVA requires data to be interval or ratio level. However, for the present study, Likert scale ordinal data from the MSL were treated as interval data to conduct each of the analyses. Although the

researcher took steps to alleviate the problems these violations could cause, the results of the study should still be interpreted cautiously.

Another limitation of the study is that the sample contained a majority of White students and female students. This limits the generalizability of the findings one can draw from this study. Also, the study did not control for any inputs of the sample, which limits the conclusions that can be made about the influence of being involved with a particular organization on students' civic responsibility and frequency of social change behaviors.

In regards to the analysis of student organizations specifically, the study did not take into account the length of time students participated in any particular student organizations. Therefore, students who were a part of an organization for one semester were not differentiated from students who had been a part of an organization for several years. Also, this study did not take into account at what point during a student's time in college he or she joined an organization. The study also did not differentiate between student organization members and positional leaders of organizations. There may be significant differences in the perceived sense of social responsibility and engagement in social change behaviors between members and positional leaders.

Social desirability is also a potential limitation in this study. The researcher sought to explore the relationship between college students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and their actual social change behaviors. Serow (1991) noted that social desirability has an impact on college students' responses about their motivations for participating in community service. Although the Crowne-Marlowe test for social

desirability was conducted on the MSL data and social desirability was found not to be a significant factor in students' responses to the variable used for this study, one should still be cautious in interpreting students' self-report of their sense of civic responsibility and how frequently they engage in social change behaviors.

Implications for Practice

As mentioned earlier in Chapter Two, the literature on student organization involvement and social change behaviors is sparse. Therefore, this study fills an important gap in the literature regarding aspects of the college environment that are associated with students who hold a strong perceived sense of civic responsibility and frequently engage in social change behaviors. In addition, the results of the study provide further support for Astin's (1993b) research that suggests peer interaction has a significant influence on students' development in college. Although the results only show an association between the different types of organizational involvement and perceived sense of civic responsibility and social change behaviors, it is important to note that being part of particular student organizations, which involves a significant amount of peer interaction, is associated with more positive civic engagement outcomes than not being part of these organizations.

The results of this study also suggest that student affairs practitioners seeking to enhance student's civic engagement outcomes should consider outreaching to and supporting service, advocacy, and identity-based organizations. In addition, as mentioned in Chapter One, some have argued against the existence of identity-based organizations (e.g., D'Souza, 1991) due to the perception that they promote self-segregation. The results of the current study provide support for the existence of

identity-based organizations, as they were shown to be associated with students who had both a higher perceived sense of civic responsibility and a higher frequency of engagement in social change behaviors than students who were not involved in them. Although the tests conducted for this study did not show a directional relationship between organizational involvement and outcomes on the two dependent variables, the fact that identity-based organizations are associated with higher civic engagement outcomes provides tentative further support for student affairs to promote them as a positive way for students to get involved on campus.

The findings also suggest that advocacy organizations should be supported by student affairs practitioners. As mentioned in Chapter 2, advocacy and activism are often viewed as more controversial than direct community service. However, the results of this study reveal that advocacy organizations are associated with a higher perceived sense of civic responsibility and higher frequency of engagement in social change behaviors than service or identity-based organizations. This provides support to Hamrick (1998) and Biddix et al. (2009) assertion that higher education institutions should be supporting student advocacy and activism as a way to support their civic engagement.

The findings of this study also reveal that students' self-reported commitment to serving their communities are positively associated with their social change behaviors to some extent. However, researchers should take note that the correlation between them in this study was not particularly strong. Student affairs practitioners should understand that while creating experiences to develop students' sense of civic responsibility may play a role in influencing their behaviors to create change and vice

versa, other interventions mentioned in the literature, such as helping to enhance students' sense of efficacy to create change, may also be important (Colby et al., 2007).

Implications for Research

The results of this study raise several additional areas of research that should be conducted to further understand college student civic engagement in the context of student organizations. Future studies should control for pre-college perceived sense of civic responsibility and involvement in social change behaviors in order to better understand the impact the college environment has on students' development in these areas. In addition, the relationship between perceived sense of civic responsibility and particular social change behaviors should be analyzed in order to better understand what types of activities students choose to engage in when they hold a high sense of civic responsibility. Furthermore, advanced statistics beyond basic correlation should be used to provide stronger evidence of whether higher perceived sense of civic responsibility results in more frequent engagement in social change behaviors, or whether the relationship is the other way around.

In regards to further understanding the relationship between student organizations and civic engagement outcomes, future research should analyze organizations such as political organizations since civic engagement is often linked to politics (Jacoby, 2009), and multicultural fraternities and sororities, since these organizations may serve similar functions as other identity-based organizations. In addition, factors such as length of involvement and status (positional or member)

should be taken into account in order to further clarify what student experiences result in stronger civic engagement outcomes.

Conclusion

This study provided initial research on the association between service, advocacy, and identity-based student organizations and two aspects of civic engagement: perceived sense of civic responsibility and social change behaviors. The results of the study provide support for the hypotheses that students who participate in at least one of the three organizations have stronger senses of civic responsibility and more frequently engage in social change behaviors than students who do not participate in those organizations. In addition, the study also supports the hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and their frequency of engagement in social change behaviors. Overall, this study provides important initial findings to clarify the impact that involvement in particular student organizations has on students' perceived sense of civic responsibility and social change behaviors, as well as the relationship that exists between these two aspects of civic engagement.

Appendix A: MSL Respondent Characteristics

| Category | N | Percent |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| <u>Race</u> | | |
| White/Caucasian | 66,722 | 57.7 |
| Middle Eastern | 583 | .5 |
| African American/Black | 4,902 | 4.2 |
| American Indian/ Alaska Native | 397 | .3 |
| Asian American/ Asian | 7,063 | 6.1 |
| Latino/ Hispanic | 3,779 | 3.3 |
| Multiracial | 6,989 | 6.0 |
| Race/ Ethnicity not included above | 1,264 | 1.1 |
| Did Not Respond | 23,933 | 20.7 |
| <u>Gender</u> | | |
| Female | 59,217 | 51.2 |
| Male | 32,520 | 28.1 |
| Transgender | 143 | .1 |
| Did Not Respond | 23,752 | 20.5 |
| <u>Class Standing</u> | | |
| Freshman | 25,842 | 22.3 |
| Sophomore | 24,971 | 21.6 |
| Junior | 28,437 | 24.6 |
| Senior + | 31,913 | 27.6 |
| Unclassified | 1,040 | .9 |
| Did Not Respond | 3,429 | 3.0 |

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Allen, N. J., & Rushton, J. P. (1983). Personality characteristics of community mental health volunteers: A review. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 12, 36-49.
- Arnold, P. P., & Welch, M. (2007). Who we really are: Demographic factors that predict student service leadership. *NASPA Journal*, 44(1), 147-164.
- Astin, A. W. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1993a). Diversity and multiculturalism on campus: How are students affected? *Change*, 25(2), 44-49.
- Astin, A. W. (1993b). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39, 251-263.
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Promoting leadership, service, and democracy: What higher education can do. In R. G. Bringle, R. Games & E. A. Malloy (Eds.), *Colleges and universities as citizens* (pp. 31-48). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(2), 187-202.

- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA
- Biddix, J. P., Somers, P. A., & Polman, J. L. (2009). Protest reconsidered: Identifying democratic and civic engagement learning outcomes. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(3), 133-147.
- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). Educating undergraduates for responsible citizenship. *Change, 35*(6), 40-48.
- Cross, W. E. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revising the cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 93-122). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Daynes, G. The use of history in the movement for the civic engagement of higher education. *Journal for Civic Commitment, 1*. Retrieved from <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue1/Daynes.shtml>
- Dey, E. L. B., Cassie L., Antonaros, M., Ott, M. C., & Holsapple, M. A. (2009). Civic responsibility: What is the campus climate for learning?: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Fenzel, L. M., & Peyrot, M. (2005). Comparing college community participation and future service behaviors and attitudes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(1), 23-31.
- Fitch, R. T. (1987). Characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering for community service. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*(5), 424-431.
- Foubert, J. D., & Grainger, L. U. (2006). Effects of involvement in clubs and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. *NASPA Journal, 43*(1), 166-182.
- Gasiorski, A. (2009). *Who serves in college?: Exploring the relationship between background, college environments, and college community service participation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 2009). (UMI No. 3359272)
- Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 746-762.
- Gonzalez, K. P. (2002). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education, 37*(2), 193-218.
- Guiffrida, D. A. (2003). African American student organizations as agents of social integration. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 304-319.
- 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 expression and development 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* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.
- Hellman, C. M., Hoppes, S., Ellison, G. C. (2006). Factors associated with college student intent to engage in community service. *Journal of Psychology, 140*(1), 29-39.
- Hunter, S., & Brisbin, R. A., Jr. (2000). The impact of service learning on democratic and civic values. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 33*(3), 623-626.
- Inkelas, K. K. (2004). Does participation in ethnic cocurricular activities facilitate a sense of ethnic awareness and understanding? A study of Asian Pacific American undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 285-302.
- Jacoby, B. (2009). Civic engagement in today's higher education: An overview. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 149-166.

- Jones, S. R., & Hill, K. E. (2003). Understanding patterns of commitment: Student motivation for community service involvement. *Journal of Higher Education*, 74(5), 516-539.
- Kiesa, A., Orłowski, A. P., Levine, P., Both, D., Kirby, E. H., Lopez, M. H., et al. (2007). *Millennials talk politics: A study of college student political engagement*. College Park, MD: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Kim, J. (2005). Asian American identity development theory. In M. E. Wilson & L. E. Wolf-Wendel (Eds.), *ASHE reader on college student development theory* (pp. 281-293). Boston: Pearson. (Reprinted from *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology*, pp. 67-90, by B. W. Jackson, III & C.L. Wijeyesinghe, Eds., 2001, New York: New York University Press)
- Knefelkamp, L. L. (2008). Civic identity: Locating self in community. *Diversity and Democracy*, 11(2), 1-3.
- Komives, S.R. (2009a). *Methods of Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. Unpublished Document.*
- Komives, S.R. (2009b). *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership 2009 reliability levels for composite measures. Unpublished Document.*
- Komives, S.R. (2009c). *Methods of Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership validation. Unpublished Document.*
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J., & Segar, T. C. (2006). The multi-institutional study of leadership: Understanding the project. *Concepts & Connections*, 15, 5-7.

- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2006). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2004). *Methods of educational & social science research: An integrated approach*. (2nd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Lomax, R. G. (2007). *Statistical concepts: A second course* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Long, S. E. (2002). *The new student politics: The wingspread statement on student civic engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Lopez, M. H., Levine, P., Both, D., Kiesa, A., Kirby, E., Marcelo, K. (2006). *The 2006 civic and political health of the nation: A detailed look at how youth participate in politics and communities*. College Park, MD: Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement.
- Marotta, S., & Nashman, H. (1998). The generation x college student and their motivation for community service. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 17(2), 18-31.
- McCarn, S. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Re-visioning sexual minority identity formation: A new model of lesbian identity and its implications for counseling and research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 24(3), 508-534.
- McEwen, M. K., Roper, L. D., Bryant, D. R., & Langa, M. J. (1990). Incorporating the development of African American students into psychosocial theories of student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 429-436.

- Montelongo, R. (2003, April). *Latina/o undergraduate involvement with college student organizations and its effects on specific student outcomes at two large, predominately white, Midwestern universities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Museus, S. D. (2008). The role of ethnic student organizations in fostering African American and Asian American students' cultural adjustment and membership at predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49, 568-586.
- Musil, C. M. (2009). Educating students for personal and social responsibility. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 49 - 68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. (2009). Brief Overview of the 2009 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.leadershipstudy.net/downloads/MSL%202009%20Overview%20Handout.pdf>
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual* (3rd ed.). Berkshire, UK: Open University.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Payne, C. A., & Bennett, E. B. (1999). Service-learning and changes in involvement preferences among undergraduates. *NASPA Journal*, 37(1), 337-348.
- Perry, J. L., & Katula, M. C. (2001). Does service affect citizenship? *Administration Society*, 33(3), 330-365.

- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.
- 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. (2005). 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.
- Sax, L. J. (2004). Citizenship development and the American college student. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2004(122), 65-80.
- Sergent, M. T., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1990). Volunteer motivations across student organizations: A test of person-environment fit theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 255-261.
- Serow, R. C. (1991). Students and voluntarism: Looking into the motives of community service participants. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 543-556.
- Tyree, T. M. (1998). Designing an instrument to measure socially responsible leadership using the social change model of leadership development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 9836493)

- Van Dyke, N. (1998). Hotbeds of activism: Locations of student protest. *Social Problems, 45*(2), 205-220.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*, 25-34.
- Wang, Y., Sedlacek, W. E., & Westbrook, F. D. (1992). Asian Americans and student organizations: Attitudes and participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 214-221.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2002). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2): 237–269.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*(1), 215-240.
- Winniford, J. C., Carpenter, D. S., & Grider, C. (1995). An analysis of the traits and motivations of college students involved in service organizations. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*, 27-38.
- Winniford, J. C., Carpenter, D. S., & Grider, C. (1997). Motivations of college student volunteers: A review. *NASPA Journal, 34*(2), 134-146.