

Summer 2022

Leadership Self-efficacy of Students Participating in On-Campus Leadership Programming

Benjamin S. Phillips

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Phillips, Benjamin S., "Leadership Self-efficacy of Students Participating in On-Campus Leadership Programming" (2022). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2452.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/2452>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN ON-CAMPUS
LEADERSHIP PROGRAMMING

by

BENJAMIN PHILLIPS
(Under the Direction of Juliann McBrayer)

ABSTRACT

Colleges and universities across the United States are facing continued pressure to meet enrollment and retention goals, as budgets continue to become more important, specifically, being performance-based. On-campus involvement has shown to have a positive influence on a student's decision to stay at their particular institution and thus being retained. One area of on-campus involvement that has been identified is undergraduate leadership development programs. Students participating in an undergraduate leadership development program, such as assuming an on-campus leadership position often results in higher rates of student success. The purpose of this quantitative, cross-sectional study utilizing a correlational design via survey methods was to examine the leadership self-efficacy and engagement of undergraduate students that participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, and explore some of the motivators and barriers to involvement in these programs. The responses to the survey revealed that female (77%) students participate in these programs at a much higher rate than male (20.7%), or non-binary (2.3%) students and that White (64.4%) students participate at a higher rate than non-White students (35.6%). Black (29.9%) students participated at the highest rate among non-White participants, followed by Asian (1.1%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (1.1%). A theme that emerged with the contributing factors to participation was alignment with personal goals, with 74.7% of participants reported that as a contributing factor. A theme that emerged with the detracting factors to participation was lack of time to invest in the opportunity with

51.1% of participants reported that as a detracting factor. Exploring how the factors that contributed to and detracted from leadership development participation showed that contributing factors were a positive and significant predictor in leadership self-efficacy. For every one unit increase in contributing factors, leadership self-efficacy score increased by $\beta = .38$ standard deviations. This study provides valuable information for leadership educators that work in student leadership programming. This study can encourage leadership educators to examine their own leadership development programs, and build recruitment strategies and programs that seek to increase engagement among student demographics such as male students, non-White students, and first-generation college students. Given that this study only examined students that participate in leadership programming, there were more insights on the factors that led them to participate in leadership programming. For future research, researchers could consider including students that did not participate in leadership programs to gain more valuable insights on the motivators and the barriers that students face to participating in leadership programs could be gathered. This information would be valuable to leadership educators as they try to grow their programs numerically, or grow access to their programs.

INDEX WORDS: Leadership development, Leadership self-efficacy, Student leadership, Student retention, Transformational leadership, Leadership programming

LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN ON-CAMPUS
LEADERSHIP PROGRAMMING

by

BENJAMIN PHILLIPS

BBA, Georgia Southern University, 2013

M. Ed., Georgia Southern University, 2016

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

© 2022

BENJAMIN PHILLIPS

All Rights Reserved

LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN ON-CAMPUS
LEADERSHIP PROGRAMMING

by

BENJAMIN PHILLIPS

Major Professor:
Committee:

Juliann Sergi McBrayer
Antonio Gutierrez de Blume
Brandon Hunt

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2022

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my bride, Jana. You make life fun. Your support and confidence in me has been life giving during this program. I hope I am as great as you one day. To the loved ones that have moved onto Glory during this doctoral journey: my dad “Pops” who taught me the importance of responsibility, my grandmother “Goggie” who modeled for me the importance of being present, my mother-in-law “Lilly” who showed me the importance of including others, and to my father-in-law “Big House” for showing me how to love your family, and your wife no matter the circumstances. To the one that we welcomed along the way, Stiles. My son, you have brought more light into our lives than you can ever imagine. To any future children, we pray that you will be respectful, responsible, and resilient. I hope I have made you all proud.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this time to thank my chair, Dr. Juliann Sergi McBrayer. You have been instrumental in bringing this study to life. Your commitment to student success in this program is admirable, and I would be lost without your guidance. To my methodologist, Dr. Antonio Gutierrez de Blume, you are an absolute data wizard. I am forever grateful for how the data spoke to you, and made this study possible. To Dr. Brandon Hunt, thank you for giving insights and direction to my study. To my professional mentors Dr. Ken Gassiot, and Dr. Melanie Miller, thank you for your support and encouragement during my time in this program, and my time as a Higher Education practitioner. You are a consistent model for what it means to put students first, and to lead by serving. I will never be able to repay the kindness that you have shown me over the years, and I am committed to paying that kindness forward throughout my career. To Jesus, thank you for choosing me, for sustaining me, and for your provision for my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....3

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION.....7

 Background.....9

 Theoretical Framework.....15

 Statement of the Problem.....16

 Purpose Statement.....17

 Research Questions.....17

 Significance of the Study.....18

 Procedures.....18

 Definition of Key Terms.....22

 Chapter Summary.....23

2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....24

 Review of Literature.....24

 Student Success Rates and Performance Based Funding.....24

 Contributions to Student Involvement and Persistence.....25

 Detractions to Student Involvement and Persistence.....27

 Social Integration & Leadership Capacity Development.....28

 Leadership Development Programs.....29

 Student Leadership Positions.....31

 Leadership Perceptions among Demographics.....33

 Self-Efficacy & Leadership Self-Efficacy.....35

COVID-19 Pandemic.....	37
Theoretical Framework: Transformational Leadership.....	38
Chapter Summary.....	39
3 METHODOLOGY.....	41
Methodology.....	41
Research Design.....	43
Population, Sample, and Sampling.....	44
Instrumentation.....	45
Data Collection.....	46
Data Analysis.....	47
Chapter Summary.....	48
4 FINDINGS.....	49
Research Questions.....	49
Research Design.....	50
Data Analysis.....	51
Overarching Research Question.....	51
Research Sub-Question 1.....	55
Research Sub-Question 2.....	56
Research Sub-Question 3.....	58
Chapter Summary.....	59
5 DISCUSSION.....	61
Introduction.....	61
Review of Literature.....	61

Methodology.....	64
Findings.....	65
Discussion.....	68
Implications.....	70
Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions.....	72
Recommendations for Future Research.....	73
Conclusion.....	74
REFERENCES.....	76
APPENDICES	
A SURVEY.....	90
B RECRUITMENT AND ADVANCE INFORMATION EMAIL.....	101
C INVITATION TO SURVEY EMAIL.....	102
D REMINDER AND FOLLOW UP EMAIL.....	103
E ADDITIONAL REMINDER AND FOLLOW UP EMAIL.....	104

LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN ON-CAMPUS LEADERSHIP PROGRAMMING

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Student success measures, such as first year retention rates, in higher education are an area of concern for colleges and universities (Bennett, 2017). Part of the concern of first year retention comes from declining enrollments across the United States. From 2011 to 2016 total enrollment dropped by 7.8% nationwide (Hershan & Lauderdale, 2018). As enrollments have declined institutions have focused on addressing this issue by increasing first year retention but have only been marginally successful over the previous decade as overall first year retention rates have only increased slightly (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020). The national first year retention rate at a public four-year institution in 2009 was 77% (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011); however, the first-year retention rate for 2018 has risen to 81% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018).

Institutions of higher education in the United States have developed programs and support systems that are focused on socially integrating their new learners (Jafee, 2007). Braxton et al. (2014) suggested a student's social integration within an institution is the primary indicator for student persistence. A student's social integration is his or her perception of socialization with other members of campus, and the similarities shared among the institution and the student are based on attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values of the university community (Braxton et al., 2014). Social integration efforts are particularly important for first year students, as upperclassmen have already become oriented to campus and have begun to focus more on their academic efforts (Webber et al., 2013). There are a variety of educationally purposeful activities

that lead to a socially integrated student and increased first year retention rates such as first-year seminars, service-learning courses, and learning communities (Kuh et al., 2008).

Webber et al. (2013) found that students were two to three times more likely to have a positive student experience if they perceived that their institution emphasized both academic and nonacademic support and interaction. One of the ways institutions are emphasizing nonacademic support is through undergraduate leadership development programs. Undergraduate leadership development is largely influenced by a students' collegiate environment and individual experiences (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Studies have shown there are a variety of experiences that have positive predictive relationships on student leadership development such as student involvement, community engagement, on campus leadership positions, faculty mentors, and undergraduate leadership development programs (Dugan, 2006; Komives et al., 2006). Undergraduate student leadership development has served as a central purpose in higher education for many years and this has been displayed by an increase in undergraduate leadership development programs across the United States (Astin & Astin, 2000).

Colleges and Universities nationwide are facing continued pressure to meet enrollment, and retention goals, as budgets and performance based outcomes continue to become more important. On-campus involvement has shown to have a positive influence on a student's decision to stay at their particular institution and thus being retained. One area of on-campus involvement that has been identified is undergraduate leadership development programs. Students participating in an undergraduate leadership development program or assuming an on-campus leadership position often results in higher rates of student success. This research is important because it may add to the current research by examining factors that motivate students to engage in leadership development programs or take on leadership positions, and in turn

increase student retention and what factors may serve as barriers. While there is a significant amount of research on student leadership development, there is limited research on leadership self-efficacy of participants in undergraduate leadership development programs and thus a gap in the literature warrants further research.

Background

This background includes a brief review of the literature pertaining to student success rates, campus involvement, student leadership development, a comparison of male and female leadership perceptions, and the transformational leadership theory, the latter which will serve as the theoretical framework.

Student Success Rates

First year retention rates are viewed by many universities as a major factor when it comes to the success of an institution both financially and academically (Turner & Thompson, 2014). When a student is retained after their first year, the university is not only helping a student progress towards graduation but is also gaining financially in the collection of tuition and fees as well as gaining state funding if the university is a public institution. The National Center for Educational Statistics (2018) reported that 19% of full-time students who entered a four-year university for the first time in the fall of 2015 did not return to that same institution in the fall of 2016.

Retention Indicators

There are several personal indicators that can influence a student's decision to not return to an institution for their second year such as prior academic performance, socioeconomic status, race, and first-generation college student status (Turner & Thompson, 2014). Students have also indicated that family dynamics and financial means have played a major role in first-year

retention (Van Duser et al., 2020). These are factors that are outside of the control of an institution; however there are other factors that can play a major role in the retention of a first-year student that an institution can play a part in such as large-scale events and small focused events and activities and these largely determine if a student will return to an institution after their first year (Turner & Thompson, 2014). Additionally, noted was that 67% of individuals attributed freshmen focused events and activities as the greatest enabler for returning to their institution for their second year. Students that are more frequently engaged in student life initiatives have earned higher grades and greater levels of satisfaction during their college experience (Webber et al., 2013).

On Campus Involvement

As first year retention rates continue to be a high priority for most institutions, university administrators are developing a variety of programs that focus on first year retention by targeting first year students (Jacobs & Archie, 2008). These programs include themed housing in residence life, leadership programs, Greek life, multicultural affairs, career and professional programming, student activities, recreational activities, and community engagement opportunities. In their study, Braxton et al. (2014) noted that a primary indicator for first year retention is a student's social integration within a university. In an effort to socially integrate first year students, some institutions are building leadership development programs and service-learning initiatives that engage undergraduate students (Panke & Stephens, 2018). These programs not only help socially integrate first year students but also help carry out university missions by accomplishing some of the traditional societal contributions of higher education such as educating community members, improving individual competencies, and boosting economic development by serving the local community (Altbach et al., 2009).

There has been a renewed emphasis placed on the importance of community engagement within higher education (Bowman et al., 2010). In a 2015 survey, Campus Compact (2016) reported that 85% of public institutions have mission statements that support leadership and community engagement initiatives. Leadership and community engagement programs are highly effective ways of accomplishing the missions of institutions that seek to serve their communities and impact the development of students (Bowman et al., 2010). Additionally, leadership and community engagement programs develop students through reflection that shows them the importance of giving back. Furthermore, not only is there a renewed emphasis on leadership and community engagement by the university, there is also a renewed emphasis on leadership and community engagement by the student body. Eagan et al. (2015) reported that 39.8% of incoming freshmen indicated that becoming a community leader was either “very important” or an “essential” life objective, and this marked an all-time high for that particular life objective.

Student Leadership Development

There has been increasing attention on college student leadership development since the early 1990s (Dugan & Komives, 2007). There have been several trends over the subsequent years that have supported a renewed focus on developing critical leadership outcomes in students and caused this movement to gain momentum in recent years (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Some of these trends include: a paradigm shift in leadership theory to a relational model (Northouse, 2007), a movement within volunteerism, civic engagement, and service-learning (Colby et al., 2003), the empowerment and subsequent leadership needs of emerging social identity groups (Bordas, 2007), and the student leadership educator role becoming more professionalized (Komives et al., 2006). These trends all come together to form an institutional and societal

mandate that calls for colleges and universities to develop student leaders that are socially responsible (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to a person's belief in their capability of completing a task, and influences their thoughts, emotions, behaviors, and motivations (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy has also been defined as an individuals' judgment about the extent to which they can succeed in the difficult situations they may encounter in the future (Senemoglu, 2004). Bandura (1977) proposed that self-efficacy is derived from four principal sources: performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. Self-efficacy beliefs are typically concerned with individuals' own judgments based on how well they can execute the actions required to meet a certain goal or achievement (Ozdemir & Yalcin, 2018). An important note about the concept of self-efficacy is that it should be recognized as one's belief in themselves, not the actual capability of an individual (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008).

Leadership Self-Efficacy

There can be many forms or specific types of self-efficacy, such as leadership self-efficacy. Leadership self-efficacy is a key predictor of development in leadership capacity as well as a factor in whether or not students actually engage in leadership behaviors (Dugan et al., 2013). Paglis and Green (2002) described leadership self-efficacy in this way: a person's judgment that he or she can successfully exert leadership by setting a direction for the work group, building relationships with followers in order to gain their commitment to change goals, and working with them to overcome obstacles to change.

Students with lower leadership self-efficacy could be less likely to engage in leadership opportunities to further develop their leadership skills because they do not believe they have the

ability to be successful as a leader (Dugan et al., 2013). Leadership self-efficacy is critical to students as it can contribute to increased motivation to engage in leadership behaviors, and development in leadership performance and leadership capacity is imperative to student success (Dugan et al., 2013). Scholars have found that leadership self-efficacy is highly malleable (Machida & Schaubroek, 2011). A critical experience for students to develop leadership self-efficacy that has been identified is a positional leadership opportunity, as these experiences allow students to put into practice leadership behaviors, and thus develop more confidence for future leadership opportunities (Dugan et al., 2013). Engaging in these types of experiences as a professional has also shown to be a significant positive predictor for leadership self-efficacy gains (McBrayer et al., 2020)

Leadership Opportunities

Many institutions offer a vast array of student-led and university-sponsored student leadership opportunities that encourage students to engage with others, engage with thoughts and ideas, and engage with on-campus and off-campus entities. These leadership opportunities include serving as campus ambassadors, becoming orientation leaders, acting as peer mentors for first-year programs, participating in service programs, joining the student government association, and serving on student organization committees to name a few (Haber-Curran, 2019). While many of these programs are often initially associated with student life offices, they also exist in a number of pockets across campus such as academic colleges, career centers, and admission offices (Haber-Curran, 2019). These experiences can vary from active experiences such as leading a group or more passive in nature like attending a speaker workshop series (Haber-Curran, 2019).

On-campus leadership opportunities are often viewed as a metaphor, a laboratory or a practice field in that they provide students a space with less risk and consequences than the “real world” to practice and develop leadership skills (Mainella, 2017). Individuals serving as student organization leaders are a great example of how on-campus student leaders are engaging in leadership practices and behaviors because they are called on to make decisions for their organizations, develop and implement policies, and empower members of their groups (Mainella, 2017).

Student Leadership Program Competencies

Leadership competencies have been defined as knowledge, values, abilities, and behaviors that help an individual contribute to or successfully engage in a role or task (Seemiller, 2013). Additionally, the researcher identified competencies specifically to be used for student leaders. To identify these competencies this study examined components of the Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2013), the Social Change Model of Leadership (Astin et al., 1996), the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2008), the standards for leadership programs for the Council for the Advancement of Standards (Dean, 2006), and outcomes from the American College Personnel Association/Student Affairs Administrators in the Higher Education 2004 document titled “Learning Reconsidered” (Day et al., 2004). From that review, a list of student leadership competencies were developed and included self-development, motivation and collaboration, create change, and take responsibility for personal behavior and ethics (Seemiller, 2013). As undergraduate leadership programs seek to effectively prepare students for their future careers, it is common practice to use leadership competencies as a way to build and assess program effectiveness.

Leadership and Academic Perceptions by Gender

The Almanac of Higher Education (2018) conducted a study that asked students in the 2016 incoming college class a question about their confidence in their leadership ability. The study reported that female students self-ranked their leadership ability 7% lower than their male counterparts, 59.7% compared to 66.7%. This same study also noted that female students self-ranked their academic ability 6.5% lower than male students. Compare these findings to Webber et al. (2013), that found freshman and senior females both had higher cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) than their respective male counterparts. From these findings it could be noted that both male and female students have misguided self-perceptions in terms of academic and leadership ability. These findings show a paradox of male students, that while they self-report higher confidence in their academic and leadership ability, their enrollment rates and graduation rates are lower than female students (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014).

Marshman et al. (2018) conducted a study comparing the self-efficacy of students enrolled in a physics course based on gender, and found that female students who received a final grade of “A” in the course, had similar self-efficacy scores as males that received a final grade of “C” in the course. In addition this study showed that females had a significantly lower self-efficacy score compared to their male counterparts in all grade groups. Maya and Uzman (2019) found that although female undergraduate students engaged in self-leadership strategies more than male students, male students had a higher leadership self-efficacy score.

The researcher acknowledges that there is limited research on these topics for individuals that identify as non-binary, however in an attempt to be inclusive and add to the existing research has included that as an option for the participants of this study.

Theoretical Framework: Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was first conceptualized by Burns (1978), where he discussed the differences between ordinary leaders and extraordinary leaders (Abu-Tineh et al., 2009). Transformational leadership helped move the leadership field of study away from a leader-centric approach to an emphasis on meeting the needs of followers (Burns, 1978). For the purposes of this study, transformational leadership provided the theoretical framework. Burns stated that “leaders address themselves to followers’ wants, needs and other motivations...” (p. 20).

Bass later formalized this theory of transformational leadership and stated four key components of transformational leaders to include: idealize influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Kouzes and Posner (1995) later expanded on this theory by emphasizing what they called exemplary leadership which asserts that producing leader-follower trust is central for transformational leadership. Northouse (2016) proposed this definition of transformational leadership as, “...the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leaders and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential” (p. 162). As undergraduate leadership development programs allow for this type of leader-follower model between students and administrators, transformational leadership was used as the theoretical framework to provide the foundation for this study.

Statement of the Problem

Student success in higher education has been a point of concern for colleges and universities across the United States for many years. In order to improve student success rates in college, it is important to understand some of the reasons why students are and are not engaging

in student life initiatives such as undergraduate leadership development programs. Universities have identified student life initiatives as a way to keep students engaged and improve their retention, progression, and graduation rates. One of these student life initiatives that many universities have implemented is a student leadership program. These programs aim to develop student leadership competencies such as leadership development, motivation, innovative changes, ethics and integrity. Undergraduate student leadership programs help students increase their capacity for leadership development and aim to develop leadership self-efficacy. Both of these outcomes are factors that could help students perform better in the classroom and graduate from the university. Additionally, this study intended to identify underrepresented groups in these programs, and explore motivators and barriers to participation in leadership opportunities.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs.

Research Questions

The participants of this quantitative study included students from a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States that were currently participating in, or had previously participated in an undergraduate leadership program. A survey was sent to the participants of the study to examine their leadership self-efficacy, and explore why they chose to participate in the leadership program. The overarching research question for this study was, To what extent do students in leadership programs perceive themselves to be self-

efficacious? To further explore the answer to this question, the following research sub-questions were developed:

1. What demographic characteristics are represented in leadership programs on campus?
2. What are some of the factors that contribute (motivators) to and detract (barriers) from participation in undergraduate leadership programs?
3. To what extent do factors that contribute to or detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy?

Significance of the Study

This study examined students participating in an undergraduate leadership development program at a large public research university in the southeast United States. Specifically, this study aimed to explore why students choose to engage in an undergraduate leadership program, and potential motivators or barriers to joining these programs. There is very little research that explores the motivators or barriers as to why certain students are more or less likely to engage in an undergraduate leadership program from an empirical research lens. This study may serve as a starting point to help other undergraduate leadership development programs understand some of the positive attributes students denote as motivating them to engage in leadership opportunities, as well as barriers to participation. This study may provide some insight on possible programming initiatives that could help develop more targeted recruiting efforts to attract more varied participants. This study is also significant because students who participate in undergraduate leadership development opportunities are engaging in leadership practices when they enter the workforce.

Procedures

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative study via a pre-existing assessment tool (See Appendix A) to collect survey data from undergraduate students at a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States. From the data the researcher examined self-efficacy and potential explanations on why certain students engage in leadership development programs while others choose not to do so. The researcher utilized a modified version of this existing assessment tool comprised of a series of questions on leadership self-efficacy and questions that focused on barriers and motivators to join these programs (Yoon et al., 2016). This leadership self-efficacy survey tool had an overall reliability of Cronbach's $\alpha = .973$ from $N = 173$, and all items on the survey were worthy of retention because the removal of any item would not have increased the reliability coefficient of Cronbach's α .

The first five questions of the Student Leadership Self-Efficacy Survey served to collect demographic data such as classification, gender identity, racial identity, first-generation college status, and type of undergraduate leadership opportunity. Questions six through 33 were Likert-scale questions that focused on leadership self-efficacy categories including leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity. The Likert-scale ranges from one (1) representing strongly disagree to five (5) representing strongly agree. The final two questions on the survey served to collect data on factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in undergraduate leadership programs.

The researcher worked with the Division of Student Affairs and the Office of Leadership and Community Engagement (OLCE) staff at the institution to collect data for the purpose of this study. The Division of Student Affairs Leadership provided contact emails of student leaders on campus, and the researcher invited these students to participate in the study. The researcher collected the completed assessment tool which contained de-identified data. The only identifiers

collected on the survey were, gender, race, classification, first generation college status, and the leadership opportunity the participant engaged in. Once this data were collected the researcher was able to compare and contrast the answers of participants by the various identity groups. Finally, the researcher examined the answers to the questions that collected data on contributors and detractors to participating in on-campus leadership programs. The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participate in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contribute to and detract from participation in these programs.

Participants

The participants of this study were undergraduate students who were currently participating in or previously engaged in an undergraduate leadership program. The population was current students that have engaged in varied campus leadership experiences. These student leadership opportunities included, but were not limited to, orientation leaders, peer mentors, tutors, campus ambassadors, student workers, peer educators, emerging leaders, resident assistants, student government association, student organization officer, and campus programming board members. A focus was on the comparison between males and females to explore the differences among gender in terms of attributes of motivation for leadership engagement as well as other demographic representations.

Data Collection

The researcher used a four-part request to survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) that includes an advanced notice alerting potential participants to the survey, a notice requesting participation in the survey, a follow-up notice approximately one week after the survey notice, and a personalized contact to all participants approximately three weeks after the survey notice;

the survey remained open for one more week totaling a four-week data collection period. A recent study found the average response rate for online empirical studies was 34.2% (Poynton et al., 2019) but educational researchers provide many strategies to increase response rates. The researcher intended to send the survey to approximately 500 students, and has a goal of a 30% or more response rate, in order to have approximately 150 participants in the study. One study found that the three most important factors in order to receive a high response rate for an online survey were cost, trust, and rewards (Saleh & Bista, 2017). In order to increase the response rate for the data collection, there was no cost to participate in the study, and there were assurances of anonymity, and minimal risks in the communication plan for participating in the survey.

Prior to the distribution of the survey instrument the researcher sought the approval for the study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once that approval was granted the researcher contacted administrators in the Division of Student Affairs, as well as other campus partners such as Enrollment Management, and Academic Affairs to collect email information for potential participants. The survey was then distributed to eligible participants that were engaged in leadership development opportunities on-campus. Accompanying the survey was an email correspondence that explained the details of the study, including all of the associated risks with participation, which were no more than risks associated with daily life experiences. The survey did not collect any information pertaining to personal student information, so it was completely anonymous. The estimated time to complete the entire survey for participants was expected to be less than 10 minutes.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, percentiles) and bivariate, zero-order correlations were conducted with the data. These statistics answered the overarching and first

research sub-question. Frequency counts were employed to quantify the magnitude of the presence of factors, which subsequently informed the descriptive statistics for and answered research sub-question two. Finally, an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model was employed to answer the third research question, in which the factors that contributed (motivators) to or detracted (barriers) from participation in leadership programs serving as predictors and leadership self-efficacy serving as the criterion/outcome. The findings were disseminated in tables and figures as appropriate.

Definition of Key Terms

Undergraduate Leadership Development Programs – An undergraduate leadership development program designed to develop or increase leadership competencies in undergraduate students. This could be in a curricular or co-curricular setting (Dugan & Komives, 2010).

Self-Efficacy – A person's belief in their capability of completing a task, and influences their thoughts, emotions, behaviors, and motivations (Bandura, 1993).

Leadership Self-Efficacy – a person's judgment that he or she can successfully exert leadership skills or qualities (Paglis & Green, 2002).

Social Integration – an individual's perception of socialization with other members of campus, and the similarities shared among the institution and student of attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values of the university community (Braxton et al., 2014).

Transformational Leadership – The process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leaders and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential (Northouse, 2016).

First-Generation College Student – a student that is the first individual in their immediate family to attend college (Checkoway, B).

Chapter Summary

Colleges and universities across the United States are facing continued pressure to meet enrollment, retention, and graduation goals, as budgets continue to become more important. On-campus involvement has shown to have a positive influence on a student's decision to stay at their particular institution. Students participating in an undergraduate leadership development program or assuming an on-campus leadership position often results in higher rates of student success. The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participate in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. This study was significant because it may fill a gap in the literature by examining factors that may lead students to join leadership development programs or take on leadership positions, as well as help leadership program administrators to specifically design leadership programming that could attract students from groups that are not well represented.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to better understand the relationship between undergraduate students participating in on-campus leadership programs and leadership self-efficacy, and provide a foundation for this study, a comprehensive review of the literature related to these topics was conducted. Topics covered in this chapter include student success rates, indicators of retention, on-campus involvement, student leadership development, self-efficacy, leadership self-efficacy, leadership opportunities, student leadership program competencies, and leadership and academic perceptions by demographics. The theoretical framework for this study was transformational leadership, thus a review of that framework is included in this chapter. A review of these topics aimed to provide a better understanding of the research to examine the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders, and factors that contributed to and detracted from a student's participation in an on-campus leadership program.

Student Success Rates and Performance Based Funding

Under the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act of 1990, colleges and universities that receive federal funding for student financial aid programs are required to provide information on student success measures like progression and graduation rates for the institution (Ober et al., 2018). The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) began to collect student success data in 1997 for annual cohorts that measured completion of degree programs as well as first year retention rates (Ober et al., 2018). As these student success measures have become more publicly available, many public institutions of higher education have tied at least a portion of their available funding to these student success initiatives as a form of accountability (Ortagus et al., 2020).

Over the last forty years governmental agencies around the world have attempted to hold publicly funded institutions more accountable for their outcomes in effort to be responsible stewards of public funds, and to improve performance (Ortagus et al., 2020). Higher education has specifically been facing additional pressures for accountability due to questions over the value of a college education, rising costs of attendance, and the rising student loan debt. These challenges have led to states seeking accountability systems that improve student outcomes (Ortagus et al., 2020). Approximately 30 states are now using performance-based funding (PBF) models that are tying at least a portion of state appropriations to outcomes such as graduation rates, first year retention rates, and educational attainment among historically underrepresented student groups (Rosinger et al., 2020). Despite the spread in popularity of PBF models, there is little evidence that suggests these policies substantially improve the intended outcomes, and there is a growing body of literature that suggests that PBF models may be leading to some unintended consequences such as exacerbating inequities among underserved students and under-resourced institution types (Hagood, 2019; Umbricht et al., 2017).

Contributions to Student Involvement and Persistence

In the 1980s the anticipated time to complete a college degree was four years, while by the 2000s the anticipated time to complete a college degree had increased to six years (Moody et al., 2020). Although universities have placed a greater emphasis on degree completion during that time, completion rates have remained relatively unchanged, hovering around 50% (Johnson & Stage, 2018). Demetriou & Schmitz-Sciborski (2011) identified five factors related to student persistence to include academic preparation, academic engagement, social engagement, financing college, and demographic characteristics. Additionally, the researchers noted that institutions are still seeking ways to increase student success rates, and research suggested that

the greatest two factors impacting student persistence are parental level of education and student aspiration. Furthermore, in their study, theories were reviewed that linked to student aspiration as it relates to student success and academic persistence, and noted that student self-efficacy beliefs are a significant predictor in improving student behaviors associated with purpose, and could encourage the participation in more positive and meaningful experiences for college students.

Parental values and expectancies for educational attainment have been linked to a students' motivation for educational achievement (Simpkins et al., 2012). Spera et al. (2009) found that parents with lower levels of education had lower levels of educational aspirations for their students, and similarly students who had a parent with a bachelor's degree were 15% more likely to complete a degree than students with parents with no degree (Bailey et al., 2006). However, in an earlier study it was found that there was no relation between parental education and student success (Jacobs & Berkowitz-King, 2002).

Student aspiration also has some mixed results as a factor for student success, persistence, and motivations. Fraser and Garg (2011) posited that educational aspiration reflects educational goals an individual sets for themselves, and encourages and energizes an individual to achieve them. However, Harrison and Waller (2018) argued that the aspirational level of a student does not hinder student success outcomes, stating that evidence suggested that young adults regardless of their socio-economic status have reasonably high educational aspirations. Harrison and Waller (2018) noted that focusing efforts on increasing student aspiration levels risks assuming a student's expectations will be met in terms of achieving their aspirations.

Moody et al. (2020) conducted a longitudinal study that explored the relationship between parental education level and student aspiration as they relate to student engagement and persistence. The survey instrument asked participants to indicate the highest level of education

their parents had achieved, and the highest level of education that they plan to achieve.

Additionally the instrument asked questions about the participant's engagement on campus, and generated an engagement score. The study found that there was a link between degree aspiration and engagement score, in that the higher level of aspiration a student had the higher the level of engagement they had. However, the study found no statistically significant data that suggested a relationship between student engagement and persistence and level of parent education.

Detractions to Student Involvement and Persistence

While there are several studies that explore some of the contributing factors to student involvement, persistence, and success, there is little research that examines the factors that detract students from student engagement in co-curricular activities. Simmons et al. (2017) conducted a study that examined the incentives and barriers for student involvement in out-of-class activities, specifically for students from engineering majors. This study collected data from multiple institutions, and the participants were undergraduate engineering majors. The study reported that some of the contributing factors to their personal on-campus engagement participants listed were to fulfill personal interests, gain experiences, and align their experiences with the goals of the organization or event. Additionally the study reported that the participants listed lack of time, and scheduling issues as their greatest detractions from involvement in on-campus activities. Furthermore, the researchers noted that this could be due to the fact that engineering students spend more time preparing for their courses than other majors due to the level of difficulty of their curriculum.

In 2019 Banks and Dohy conducted a comprehensive review that explored barriers to involvement and persistence for students of color in higher education, and strategies to mitigate these barriers. This review noted that African American students had the lowest graduation rates

(45.9%) among racial demographic groups, whereas Asian students had a graduation rate of 71.7%, White students had a graduation rate of 67.2%, and Hispanic students had a graduation rate of 55% (Shapiro et al., 2017). Some of the barriers to student success the researchers discussed were financial needs, lack of suitable mentors of color, and lack of programming directed and built by administrators of color for students of color. A possible solution to breaking down these barriers that the researchers posit is the use of a strengths-based approach to student involvement, noting a university in the Midwest that used the StrengthsFinder inventory, and encouraged students of color to engage in opportunities that utilized their strengths. The university that the researchers mentioned using this approach did see a slight increase in retention rates, reporting students who participated in the strengths based engagement model were retained at a rate of 91.5%, whereas students who did not participate were retained at a rate of 88% (Soria & Stubblefield, 2014).

Social Integration and Leadership Capacity Development

A student's social integration is his or her perception of socialization with other members of campus, and the similarities shared among the institution and the student are based on attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values of the university community (Braxton et al., 2014). Further, the researchers suggested a student's social integration within an institution is the primary indicator for student persistence. Research has found that social integration leads to higher levels of institutional commitment, resulting in higher retention rates (Willis, 2010). There is also evidence that socially integrated student's leadership capacity is positively influenced by on-campus leadership programs (Dugan & Komives, 2010).

According to their study, Dugan and Komives (2010) found that the three most significant experiences that develop student leadership capacity were engaging in socio-cultural

conversations with their peers, mentoring relationships with faculty and staff, and participation in community service. Based on this study, the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership were used as the outcome measures for this study: Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Citizenship, Collaboration, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility, and Change. Socio-cultural conversations with their peers was a significant predictor across all eight values, mentoring relationships with faculty and staff was a significant predictor in all values except collaboration, and participation in community service was significant in all values except consciousness of self and change. Additionally, this study also explored to what degree a student's level of self-efficacy explains the amount of variance across the outcome measures, and it was found that self-efficacy was a significant positive predictor across all eight outcomes and contributed to between 8% and 12% of the total variance explained in the models.

Leadership Development Programs

The development of future leaders has long been considered one of the core responsibilities of postsecondary institutions in the United States (Dugan & Komives, 2007). In these leadership development programs, social integration is accomplished by sending out student volunteers to serve with local non-profits, community organizations, and community development projects (Thomson et al., 2011). The rationale behind community-based leadership development programs in higher education is that they would cultivate community leadership early on in the undergraduate experience while also providing an opportunity for collaboration with peers and faculty/staff members, leading to a higher level of social integration (Salvador, 2017).

Leadership and community engagement programs have shown additional positive outcomes for students including identity development, moral development, political efficacy, and

civic responsibility (Bowman et al., 2010). Institutions have worked to increase the incorporation of leadership and community engagement programs in the undergraduate experience with the goal to enhance leadership skills and generate socially responsible graduates (Caulfield & Woods, 2013). Students who have participated in community engagement programs have reported an increased awareness of social issues (Mann & DeAngelo, 2016). Bowman et al. (2010) found that there was a positive relationship between an individual volunteering as a college student with that same individual volunteering as an adult.

There is also evidence that indicated that leadership and community engagement programs positively impact classroom performance and persistence in that students who had participated in a leadership and community engagement based experiential learning program scored on average 6.2% higher on their final course grade than their peers who did not participate in such an experience (Casile et al., 2011). Academic performance is a significant factor in a student's likelihood to return to his or her institution for their second year (Laskey & Hetzel, 2011). Bringle et al. (2010) reported that approximately 85% of first-year students who participated in a leadership and community engagement based experiential learning program returned to their same college for their second year. Lockeman and Pelco (2013) found that students who participated in leadership and community engagement programs had a graduation rate of 73% while students who did not participate in such programs had a graduation rate of 48%.

Studies have also shown that leadership and community engagement programs have a lasting impact beyond graduation, as students who have participated in on-campus leadership development programs have reported that they are using leadership competencies that they explored in these programs, in their work lives as young professionals (Egan et al., 2020).

Additionally, the researchers noted that some of these competencies include effective communication, diversity awareness, leveraging differences, emotional intelligence, and leadership confidence. These findings are not surprising as on-campus leadership opportunities have been associated with an increased ability for student collaboration (Dugan & Komives, 2010).

A challenge within these leadership opportunities is a lack of consensus regarding what these programs should be designed to teach (Eich, 2008). This lack of agreement on teaching outcomes may be related to the diversity of conceptualizations of the term “leadership”. Given the variation in how leadership is conceptualized, and the variety of learning outcomes in leadership opportunities, students who choose to participate in on-campus leadership programs likely differ in terms of what they are interested in learning within the context of their personal development as it relates to leadership (Rosch et al., 2014).

Student Leadership Positions

An institutional and societal mandate has called for colleges and universities to purposefully develop socially responsible leaders (Dugan & Komives, 2007). This mandate has formed over the last several years due to trends such as the paradigm shift in leadership theory to relational models (Northouse, 2007), a growing emphasis in business and industry on collaborative practices (Pearce & Conger, 2003), the empowerment of social identity groups and their distinct leadership needs (Bordas, 2007), and the professionalization of the student leadership educator role (Komives et al., 2006). Given this mandate, institutions are offering their students opportunities to engage in leadership learning through student leadership positions, and research has shown that these on campus leadership opportunities have had a positive impact on the development of leadership competencies within students (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

Research has also suggested that the more on campus leadership opportunities that a student engages in the more positive impact it will have on their leadership development (Gallagher et al., 2014). Additionally, in their study, the researchers used the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (S-LPI) to assess the leadership practices of college students. The S-LPI measures five practices of leadership that are defined in behavioral terms seen as practices that are used when leaders lead: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Their findings showed that students who did not participate in an on campus leadership opportunity had lower scores than those that did participate, and that students who participated in three or more leadership opportunities scored higher on most of the practices than students who only participated in one leadership opportunity. Additionally the study found that students who participated in leadership opportunities with a student organization were significantly correlated with four of the five practices.

There have been a number of studies that support the conclusion that on campus leadership opportunities, and on campus involvement are important for undergraduate leadership development (Burbank et al., 2015; Foreman & Retallick, 2013; Patterson, 2012). One study identified 15 experiences within an on campus leadership opportunity and used those experiences as independent variables with the S-LPI as the dependent variable (Frey, 2011). This research found that 13 of the 15 experiences had a significant correlation with some of the S-LPI leadership practices. Specifically, two of the experiences were found to have a significant impact on all five of the practices including on campus leadership opportunities that involved organizing members to execute an event and leading others through meetings or decision-making

conversations. These findings supported the findings of Gallagher et al. (2014) that suggested involvement in student organizations are significantly correlated with the practices of the S-LPI.

Leadership Perceptions among Demographics

There are significant differences in terms of students' leadership self-efficacy among demographic groups like race and gender (Soria et al., 2020). Researchers have observed that Black students have higher leadership self-efficacy scores compared to their peers, Asian students tend to have lower leadership self-efficacy scores than their peers, and females tend to have lower leadership self-efficacy scores than males (Kodama & Dugan, 2013; Nguyen, 2016). It has also been observed that international students reported a lower leadership self-efficacy score than their domestic student peers (Nguyen, 2016). Research has also shown that first-generation college students are 1.35 times less likely to participate in on campus leadership positions compared to non-first-generation-college students. Additionally students who come from low-income families are less likely to participate in leadership opportunities on campus than their peers from higher-income families (Soria et al., 2014).

In their 2009 study, Edwards and Jones found that male students attributed their involvement in undergraduate leadership opportunities to their personal gender identity development. One study found that there was a significant difference among gender in terms of personal leadership development goals of students participating in on-campus leadership opportunities (Rosch et al., 2014). That same study, however, found that there were no significant differences in terms of personal leadership development goals of students participating in on-campus leadership opportunities among race (Rosch et al., 2014). This study utilized a chi-square analysis to examine student's self-identified leadership goals to compare the differing frequencies, first with respect to gender, then with respect to race, and last with respect

to both gender and race. However there was one subset of race, White, that had a significant difference among gender. It was also noted that White males identified leadership as a set of skills, while White females identified leadership as behavior and traits (Rosch et al., 2014). Rosch et al. (2014) pointed out in their study that White females seemed more introspective, and group focused when they described leadership, while White males were more concerned with their personal development and not as concerned with organizational achievement.

According to Ostick and Wall (2011), consideration for a student's culture and social identity is noteworthy as factors for how a student conceptualizes, develops, and practices leadership. Students of Color have displayed vast differences in their self-reported leadership capacity based on their specific race and on the construct of leadership being measured (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Outside of higher education there is evidence that suggested differences in leadership goals among gender (Eagly & Carli, 2003), and among race and ethnicity (Bordas, 2007). Within the context of higher education research shows that differences exist among gender in terms of student leadership self-perceptions in leadership development programs (Yarrish et al, 2010). Another study reported that on a general measure of leadership ability, male students rated themselves higher than female students, and White students rated themselves higher than students of color (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000). Conversely there is evidence that shows that the leadership framework of a leadership program has an impact on gender differences in self-leadership perception. When using a relationship-oriented framework of leadership like the Social Change Model, females tend to score higher than males in quantitative measures of leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

Gallagher et al. (2014) conducted a study that used the S-LPI to assess leadership practices of college students with an intended goal of investigating demographic and experiential

factors that affect the five leadership practices within the S-LPI to include Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). The study had 1103 participants that were all undergraduate students at the same mid-size southern university. The survey administered collected demographic data such as race, gender, age, classification, and on campus leadership involvement information. Of the total participant population, 69.1% were female, and 30.4% were male. A large portion of the participants reported their race as White (80.5%), followed by African American (10.9%), other (4.9%), and Hispanic/Latino (1.9%). The study found that as females progressed in classification (freshman to junior to senior), their mean scores for the practices increased at every level and at every practice, while for males they only increased as they moved from a freshman to a junior, and they did not have a significant increase as they assimilated to a senior. The study did not find any significant differences in mean scores between student ages or race in terms of their leadership practices, however the racial identity breakdown in this study showed a lack of racial diversity within the sample population. The researcher acknowledges that there is limited research on these topics for individuals that identify as non-binary, however in an attempt to be inclusive and add to the existing research has included that as an option for the participants of this study.

Self-Efficacy and Leadership Self-Efficacy

First introduced by Bandura (1977), self-efficacy refers to the belief that one has in their personal capabilities and resources to meet the demands of a specific task. It has been suggested that self-efficacy is malleable and can be altered through environmental conditions (Bandura, 1997). It has also been theorized that self-efficacy can be shaped by interventions such as, providing individuals with a more thorough understanding of the complexity of tasks, training to

improve an individual's ability in performing a task, and providing information that increases an individuals' understanding of strategies required to successfully achieve a task (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Self-efficacy has been shown to have an influence on academic achievement, career choice, athletic performance, decision making, drug and alcohol abstinence, stress tolerance, organizational functioning, and teaching performance (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, research findings have linked self-efficacy with self-hindering or self-aiding thought patterns, the extent to how well an individual responds to threatening circumstances, and the level of resilience a person has when faced with adverse situations or setbacks (Bandura, 1997).

While self-efficacy in a general sense is described as an individual's belief in their own competence to cope with a broad range of stressful challenges or demands (Luszczynska et al., 2005), there are more specific categories of self-efficacy. One of these categories is leadership self-efficacy. Leadership self-efficacy has been noted as a leader's estimate of his or her ability to fulfill the leadership role (Murphy & Johnson, 2016). Leadership self-efficacy has more specifically been described as, "a person's judgment that he or she can successfully exert leadership by setting a direction for the work group, building relationships with followers in order to gain their commitment to change goals, and working with them to overcome obstacles to change" (Paglis & Green, 2002, p. 217). Even though there are a variety of individual qualities that can contribute to success in leadership, scholars have documented the specific importance of leadership self-efficacy as a catalyst for motivating individuals to pursue complex challenges with confidence, mobilize individuals to take collective action, and influence social or organizational change (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Hannah et al., 2008).

Dugan et al. (2008) found that commuter students who participated in on campus leadership programs had a significantly higher self-efficacy than their peers. In another study it was found that participation in on campus leadership programs only positively associated with Latinx students' leadership self-efficacy (Kodama & Dugan, 2013). There is evidence that in addition to participating in on campus leadership programs, there is an importance of mentorship for college students' leadership self-efficacy (Rosch & Stephens, 2017). It was found that resident assistants who received mentorship had a significantly higher level of leadership self-efficacy than their peers that did not receive mentorship (Early, 2016). In terms of racial demographics, mentorship has been found to have different effects on students' leadership self-efficacy as only Black students who received mentorship significantly increased in their level of leadership self-efficacy (Kodama & Dugan, 2013). In their longitudinal study, Rosch & Collins (2019) found that a student's racial identity had the most influence on a student's leadership self-efficacy over any other involvement factors.

Given that efficacy beliefs are often derived from personal experiences (McCormick et al., 2002), it may be possible to increase a college student's leadership self-efficacy through co-curricular trainings, programs, or workshops (Soria et al., 2020). It has been suggested that participation in on campus leadership programs explain a more significant amount of variance in a student's leadership self-efficacy than other factors including pre-collegiate leadership experiences and beliefs, demographics, and other experiences in college (Soria et al., 2020). Additionally, it was noted that a student's participation in leadership programs was a greater predictor for their leadership self-efficacy than their demographics, or their pre-collegiate leadership experiences or beliefs.

COVID-19 Pandemic

Given the time and space that this study will take place, the researcher believes that it is important to acknowledge the COVID-19 (C19) Global Pandemic. The C19 pandemic was reported originally in December 2019, and was later declared a global pandemic by the World Health Organization in March 2020 (Rashid & Yadav, 2020). In an attempt to slow the spread of the C19 pandemic, government officials advised and in some instances mandated the closures of universities around the world, and moved curricular and co-curricular engagement to an online platform (Rashid & Yadav, 2020). At the time of this study the C19 pandemic is ongoing, and the impact of C19 on student engagement is unknown.

Theoretical Framework / Transformational Leadership

The theoretical framework for this study was transformational leadership. Transformational Leadership has been defined as "...the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower." (Northouse, 2016, p. 162). When Burns (1978) first introduced the groundwork for the concept of transformational leadership, it moved the emphasis of leadership development to be focused on meeting the needs of followers, instead of being leader-centric. Burns (1978) proposed that a leader should motivate their followers by paying attention to their needs, and their capability of increasing the integrity levels of their followers. Later, Bass (1985) expanded on Burns' work and developed a model of transformational leadership. This model focused on strategies for motivation that leaders could use to raise the expectation level of followers. Bass (1985) developed four dimensions of transformational leadership including idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. It has been stated that transformational leadership can be taught, therefore it should be integrated into leadership learning (Bass, 1990).

Kouzes and Posner (1987) made another significant contribution to the framework of transformational leadership when they developed a model of exemplary leadership. This model was based on research that they conducted where they asked business leaders to describe a time when they viewed themselves at their best as a leader. From the analysis of those responses, Kouzes and Posner (1987) developed the five practices of exemplary leadership: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. Kouzes and Posner developed a slightly modified version of this model specifically for students who many university leadership programs use today (Whitaker & Greenleaf, 2019). The modified model takes into account experiences that may resonate more with a student instead of a professional, such as serving in a campus organization versus serving on an executive board of directors.

Chapter Summary

In summary, student success in higher education has been a point of concern for colleges and universities across the United States for many years. Universities have identified student life initiatives such as undergraduate leadership development programs as a way to keep students engaged and improve their student success rates. In order to improve student success rates in college, it is important to understand some of the reasons why some students are and are not engaging in student life initiatives such as undergraduate leadership development programs. These programs aim to develop student leadership competencies such as leadership development, motivation, innovative changes, and ethics and integrity. Undergraduate student leadership programs help students increase their capacity for leadership development and aim to develop leadership self-efficacy. Both of these outcomes are factors that could help students perform better in the classroom and graduate from the university.

The previous findings on self-efficacy for college students, and the disparity in leadership self-efficacy scores between genders display the importance of this research topic. This study examined demographic data of undergraduate students participating in leadership development programs at a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States, in hopes of expanding the research on undergraduate leadership development programs. Specifically, this study aimed to explore why students choose to engage in an undergraduate leadership program as a motivator and potential barriers to joining these programs. There is little research that explores factors that motivated or detracted certain students to engage in an undergraduate leadership program. This study may serve as a starting point to help other practitioners within leadership education identify underrepresented identity groups in these programs, and understand some of the factors that led to participation. This study may provide some insight for higher education practitioners on possible programming initiatives that could help develop more targeted recruiting efforts to attract more participants from underrepresented groups and increase participation overall in these leadership initiatives.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

As declining enrollments remain a large concern for higher education administrators, student success rates such as first-year retention have become a high priority for most institutions, and a variety of focused programs have been developed for the purpose of retaining students (Bennett, 2017). On-campus leadership opportunities are one example of these types of programs that have been identified as a way to socially integrate students into the university and improve their student success measures (Bringle et al., 2010; Casile et al., 2011; Lockeman and Pelco, 2013). Considering these dynamics, this study sought to identify and measure the factors that contributed to and detracted from a student's participation in an on-campus student leadership program and identify some of the student demographics (gender, race, classification) that are underrepresented in these programs. This study examined the leadership self-efficacy of students who were currently participating in an on-campus leadership program, to add to the current literature, and potentially offer some strategies to increase participation among underrepresented student demographics in these leadership initiatives.

Based on the findings from the literature, the researcher used a modified leadership self-efficacy tool to measure the leadership self-efficacy of students that are currently participating in an on-campus leadership program and explore factors that contributed to and/or detracted from their participation. The existing leadership self-efficacy tool the researcher identified originally was used to develop and validate a leadership self-efficacy scale for students in engineering programs (Yoon et al., 2016). The researcher modified this tool by removing questions specifically geared toward students majoring in engineering, adding questions to collect

demographic data, and adding two questions that focus on factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in on-campus leadership programs.

The purpose of this quantitative, cross-sectional study utilizing correlational design coupled with survey methods allowed for the examination the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. The study was confined to current undergraduate students who attend a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States and have participated in an on-campus leadership opportunity. Insights on demographic groups that participated in these programs were gained from demographic questions within the survey, leadership self-efficacy of students participating in on-campus leadership programs were ascertained via Likert scale questions pertaining to leadership self-efficacy, and data on factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs was collected by two questions on the survey.

The goal of this study was to identify what demographic groups were underrepresented in on-campus leadership opportunities, and offer some potential strategies on how to increase student leadership engagement among these groups. Therefore, the overarching research question for this study was, To what extent do students in leadership programs perceive themselves to be self-efficacious? To further explore the answer to this question, three research sub-questions were developed: 1. What demographic characteristics are represented in leadership programs on campus?; 2. What are some of the factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs?; and 3. To what extent do factors that contribute to or

detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy?

This chapter details and addresses the research design, population, sample, and sampling, the survey instrument, data collection, and data analysis. This chapter will conclude with a chapter summary.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. The motivation of this quantitative study, cross-sectional survey utilizing a correlational design was to research some of the reasons students choose to participate in on-campus leadership programs, and the extent that these students perceive themselves to be self-efficacious. Given that this study centers on the predictability of participation in on-campus leadership programs, and the self-efficacy of student leaders, a quantitative study best fit the research design (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The use of quantitative research is supported if a study meets at least one of three factors that the problem calls for including the identification of factors that influence an outcome, the utility of an intervention, or understanding the best predictors of outcomes (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This study used a survey method to collect data and review the leadership self-efficacy of students participating in on-campus leadership programs. The utilization of a survey tool was appropriate for this study given the researcher's intent to collect leadership self-efficacy data on a select population of undergraduate student leaders (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

This study intended to collect data from one specific group of participants at one specific point in time. Therefore this study was conducted as a cross-sectional survey, and the data was collected via online survey methods that will be directed to undergraduate students currently participating in an on-campus leadership opportunity at a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States. A cross-sectional survey has been defined as a survey that collects data at one point in time (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In addition to descriptive statistics, a correlational design was employed. A correlational design has been defined as a means to describe and measure the degree or relationship between two or more variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The researcher used quantitative survey methods that were supported by descriptive statistics and correlation measurement to examine the extent contributing and detracting participation factors in leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, percentiles) and bivariate, zero-order correlations answered the first and second research sub-questions. Additionally, frequency counts were employed to quantify the magnitude of the presence of factors, which subsequently informed the descriptive statistics for research sub-question three. Finally, an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model was employed to answer the third research question, in which the factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in leadership programs served as predictors and leadership self-efficacy served as the criterion for the outcome.

Population, Sample, and Sampling

The participants in this study were undergraduate students at a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States that were currently participating in an on-campus leadership opportunity. Access to the email contact information of

the potential participants was given to the researcher by a variety of administrators at the university who work with student leaders.

Instrumentation

The research tool selected for this study was a modified leadership self-efficacy survey composed of three sections (see Appendix A). The Student Leader Self-Efficacy Survey is a modified version of an existing assessment tool comprised of a series of questions on leadership self-efficacy and questions that focus on motivation and barriers to join on-campus undergraduate leadership programs (Yoon et al., 2016). This leadership self-efficacy survey tool had an overall reliability of Cronbach's $\alpha = .973$ from $N = 173$, and all items on the survey were worthy of retention because the removal of any item would not have increased the reliability coefficient of Cronbach's α . Yoon et al. (2016) originally included a sixth leadership self-efficacy construct on Engineering Practices, however for the purposes of this study, those specific questions were not relevant to the study and the researcher made the decision to exclude that section due to lack of relevance, not the lack of reliability.

The first five questions served to collect demographic data such as classification, gender identity, racial identity, first-generation college status, and type of undergraduate leadership opportunity. Questions 6 thru 33 were Likert-scale questions that focus on leadership self-efficacy categories including leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity. The Likert-scale ranges from one (1) representing strongly disagree, to five (5) representing strongly agree. The final two questions on the survey serve to collect data on factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs.

The first section of the survey collected data on demographics to include gender identity, racial identity, classification, first generation status, and the leadership program the student is participating in (orientation leaders, peer mentors, tutors, campus ambassadors, student workers, peer educators, emerging leaders, resident assistants, student government association, student organization officer, and campus programming board members). The second section of the survey served to assess the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders by using a portion of Yoon et al's. (2016) Engineering Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale (ELSS). In this survey the participants answered 28 Likert-scale questions regarding their leadership self-efficacy. These questions are sorted by five constructs of leadership self-efficacy: leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity. For this section of the survey, a 5-point Likert-scale will be used: 1 represents Strongly Disagree, 2 represents Disagree, 3 represents Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 represents Agree, and 5 represents Strongly Agree. The third section of the survey included two questions where participants were asked to respond to prompts that seek to identify some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participating in on-campus leadership programs. The participants were asked the following two questions: "What were some of the reasons you were motivated to engage in a student leadership opportunity?" and "Did you experience any roadblocks, or barriers prior to engaging in a student leadership opportunity? If so, please describe." Including these questions will give the participants an opportunity to elaborate on what motivated them to join a leadership program, and explain any barriers they may have faced along the way.

Data Collection

Prior to any contact with participants for this study, the researcher requested and received permission for this study from the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board

(IRB). Potential participants included any current undergraduate student attending the large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States that was currently participating in an on-campus leadership opportunity. The researcher initially contacted campus administrators who work with student leaders to gather contact information for potential participants. Once the list of potential participants was gathered, the initial invitation to participate began. This study utilized a four-part request to survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) to include an advance notice alerting potential participants of the survey, a notice requesting participation in the survey, a follow-up notice approximately one week after the survey notice, and personalized contact to all potential participants approximately three weeks after the survey notice. The invitation to participate in the survey indicated the purpose and significance of the research, approval from IRB, anonymity assurance, implied consent, voluntary participation, the rights of the participants, associated risks no greater than that of everyday life, and a link to the QualtricsTM survey. The survey was voluntary, and participants had the right to ask questions about the survey, skip over survey questions, or opt out of the survey at any time. There was no penalty to the participants for deciding not to participate in the study. Participants had the right to ask questions and contact the researcher as any questions or needs pertaining to the study arose.

Data Analysis

The researcher used quantitative survey methods that were supported by descriptive statistics and correlation measurement to examine the extent contributing and detracting participation factors in leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. These statistical measurements and means, as well as overall data analyses were used to answer the overarching research question and the three corresponding research sub-questions. The survey included demographic questions, Likert-scale questions focused on leadership self-

efficacy, and two questions focused on factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in on-campus leadership opportunities. Through a repeated review of the data, the researcher identified themes that emerged from the final two questions on the survey.

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, percentiles) and bivariate, zero-order correlations answered the first and second research sub-questions. The researcher reported descriptive statistics and correlation measurements with total scale scores in tables. Finally, an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model was employed to answer the third research question, in which the factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in leadership programs served as predictors and leadership self-efficacy served as the criterion as the outcome. An OLS regression model was used to estimate the parameters in the regression model by minimizing the sum of the squared residuals.

Chapter Summary

The researcher used this quantitative, cross-sectional study utilizing a correlational design via survey methods to examine leadership self-efficacy as predicted by a student's participation in an on-campus leadership program. The data were collected online and the participants were undergraduate students engaged in an on-campus leadership program at one large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States. The findings from this study sought to reveal the degree to which factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in on-campus leadership programs predicted student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. The findings were presented through descriptive statistics and correlational measurement in tables and charts. The goal of this research was to use data analysis and related discussion to inform higher education administrators on ways they can engage more students in leadership programs, specifically from demographic groups that may be underrepresented.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This quantitative, cross-sectional study utilizing a correlational design via survey methods was designed to measure the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate student leaders, identify demographic characteristics that are underrepresented within undergraduate leadership programs, and explore some of the motivators (contributed to) and barriers (detracted from) to participating in on-campus leadership programs. For the purposes of this study, the researcher recruited participants, employed a survey to collect data, and conducted a number of statistical analyses to synthesize the data that were collected. The goal of this study was to gain a better understanding of the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders on-campus and to explore the potential impact that may have on their participation in student leadership programs.

This chapter serves to report the data collected to address a series of research questions regarding student leader demographics, leadership self-efficacy of student leaders, and factors that contributed to and detracted from student participation in on-campus leadership programs. In addition, this chapter will explain the research procedures and design, as well as the findings from the data collected from a modified leadership self-efficacy instrument.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. Therefore, the overarching research question for this study was, To what extent do students in leadership programs perceive themselves to be self-efficacious? To further explore the answer to this question, the following research sub-questions

were developed: 1. What demographic characteristics are represented in leadership programs on campus?; 2. What are some of the factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs?; and 3. To what extent do factors that contribute to or detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy?

Research Design

This quantitative, cross-sectional study utilizing a correlational design via survey methods was intended to research some of the reasons students choose to participate in on-campus leadership programs and the extent that these students perceive themselves to be self-efficacious. A quantitative study best fit the research design since this study centers on the predictability of participation in on-campus leadership programs and the self-efficacy of student leaders. This study used a survey method to collect data and review the leadership self-efficacy of students participating in on-campus leadership programs, which was an appropriate tool for this study given the researcher's intent to collect leadership self-efficacy data on a select population of undergraduate student leaders (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This study collected data from one specific group of participants at one specific point in time, therefore this study was conducted as a cross-sectional survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The eligible participants in this study were undergraduate students at one large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States that had participated in an on-campus leadership opportunity. The survey tool selected for this study was a modified instrument composed of three sections titled: demographics, leadership self-efficacy, and narrative (see Appendix A). The first section collected demographic data such as classification, gender identity, racial identity, first-generation college status, and type of undergraduate

leadership opportunity. The second section was comprised of Likert-scale questions that focused on leadership self-efficacy categories that was a modification of Yoon et al's. (2016) Engineering Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale (ELSS). The third and final section served to collect data on factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in undergraduate leadership programs. Prior to contacting prospective participants, the researcher requested and received approval to conduct the study from the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Additionally, the researcher requested and received permission to use the internal email system to contact participants from the Georgia Southern University Office of Institutional Research. Using email, the researcher recruited, invited, and followed up with potential participants for the study (see Appendices B – E). Eligible participants were informed of the purpose and significance of this research, approval from the IRB, anonymity assurance, implied consent, participant rights, notification that risks for completing this survey were no more than risks associated with daily life experiences and a link to the survey using Qualtrics™.

The researcher reached out to several different departmental administrators at the institution that worked with student leaders to inform them about the study, and recruit eligible participants. In total 341 student leaders were invited to participate in this study. Of these, 95 individuals participated in the study, however only 87 individuals completed the entire survey, so eight individuals were omitted from data analysis. This yielded a response rate of 27.9%. The internal consistency of the leadership self-efficacy survey for this sample was .94.

Data Analysis

Overarching Research Question

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participate in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student

demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. The overarching research question for this study is, to what extent do students in leadership programs perceive themselves to be self-efficacious? The overarching research question was answered by calculating mean scores for the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders on campus, contributing factors to participation in leadership programs, and detracting factors to participation in leadership programs. The factors that were examined in this study were parental influence, alignment with personal goals, mentors, ability to invest time, academic achievement, social engagement, ability to afford college, and academic major.

The internal consistency of the leadership self-efficacy for the present sample was .94. The mean Leadership Self-Efficacy score for participants in this study was 4.54 out of a 5.0 point scale, with a standard deviation of 0.41. The mean score for number of factors that contributed to participation in leadership programs was 4.01 out of an 8.0 point scale, with a standard deviation of 1.55. The mean score for the number of factors that detracted from participation in leadership programs was 1.45 out of an 8.0 point scale, with a standard deviation of 0.76. Table 1 includes these descriptive statistics including the mean scores as well as the standard deviation.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency Reliability

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α
Leadership Self-Efficacy Score	4.54	.41	.94
Factors that Contribute to Participation	4.01	1.55	
Factors that Detract from Participation	1.45	.76	

N = 87

Questions 6 thru 33 on the survey were Likert-scale questions that focused on leadership self-efficacy categories including leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity. The Likert-scale included options of one (1) representing strongly disagree, two (2) representing disagree, three (3) representing neither agree nor disagree, four (4) representing agree, and five (5) representing strongly agree. The participants in this study self-reported a high level of leadership self-efficacy across all 28 of the Likert-Scale responses, with 26 of the responses having at least 90% of the responses being agree or strongly agree. The only two responses that did not have at least 90% of the participants agree or strongly agree were “I can clearly visualize a project goal even when limited information is available” (84.5%) and “I can take on responsibilities that are not assigned to me” (88.2%). Table 2 includes the data collected on the Leadership Self-Efficacy of the participants in the study.

Table 2

Participant Leadership Self-Efficacy Responses by Percentage

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I can attempt to develop my leadership skills.	3.4	0.0	0.0	23.9	72.7
I can strive to develop my leadership.	3.4	0.0	1.1	22.7	72.7
I can actively seek leadership opportunities in and out of the classroom.	3.4	2.3	3.4	27.3	63.6
I can exhibit leadership skills when necessary.	3.4	0.0	2.3	26.1	68.2
I can actively seek opportunities to demonstrate my leadership.	3.4	2.3	3.4	30.7	60.2
I can learn how to lead a team.	3.4	0.0	0.0	29.6	67.1
I can encourage my team members to think of new ways of doing things.	0.0	0.0	3.7	40.7	55.6
I can fulfill my responsibilities to my team members.	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.0	63.0
I can find several ways to motivate people on a team.	0.0	1.2	3.7	37.0	58.0
I can influence my team members to work together.	0.0	0.0	1.2	42.0	56.8
I can actively encourage others to solve problems.	0.0	0.0	2.5	38.3	59.3
I can encourage my team members to get involved in a project.	0.0	0.0	3.7	39.5	56.8
I can lead others to develop and apply their talents for the established goals.	0.0	1.2	1.2	40.7	56.8
I can develop plans for change that will take my team in important new directions.	0.0	1.2	4.9	39.5	54.3
I can influence others to be enthusiastic about working toward the established goals.	0.0	1.2	6.2	34.6	58.0
I can influence others to take positive action to further the team's reputation and interests.	0.0	0.0	2.5	37.0	60.5
I can provide flexibility to enhance and encourage new thinking.	0.0	0.0	6.5	29.9	63.6

I can restructure and challenge the traditional methods of accomplishing a team goal.	0.0	1.3	7.8	35.1	55.8
I can explore ways to implement innovation for the team benefit.	0.0	1.3	2.6	44.2	52.0
I can exhibit leadership to improve effectiveness of the team.	0.0	0.0	3.9	35.1	61.0
I can seek continuous improvement in the way that work gets done.	0.0	0.0	3.9	32.5	63.6
I can lead a team toward my vision for the team goals.	0.0	1.3	5.2	42.9	50.7
I can clearly visualize a project goal even when limited information is available.	0.0	1.3	14.3	33.8	50.7
I can seek innovative ways to improve the team performance.	0.0	0.0	6.5	33.8	59.7
I can apply different ethical frameworks to analyze a problem of my team.	0.0	0.0	5.3	40.8	54.0
I can take ownership of a project which I am involved.	1.32	2.6	2.6	38.2	55.3
I can take responsibility for the success and failure of a project.	0.0	0.0	2.6	27.6	69.7
I can take on responsibilities that are not assigned to me.	0.0	1.3	10.5	29.0	59.2

N = 87

Research Sub-Question 1

In an attempt to gain a better understanding of what types of students are participating in these undergraduate leadership opportunities, research sub-question 1 was developed: What demographic characteristics are represented in leadership programs on campus? Of the 87 participants in the study, 56 (64.4%) identified as White, 26 (29.9%) identified as Black or African American, 3 (3.4%) identified as other, 1 (1.1%) identified as Asian, and 1 (1.1%) identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Additionally respondents were asked to provide information on their classification, and 23 (26.4%) were seniors, 22 (25.3%) were freshman, 22 (25.3%) were sophomores, 19 (21.8%) were juniors, and 1 (1.1%) listed 5th year or more. Information was also collected on gender identity and 67 participants (77%) identified as

female, 18 (20.7%) identified as male, and 2 (2.3%) identified as non-binary/other. Lastly, the first section of the instrument collected information on first-generation college student status. The responses revealed that 11 (12.6%) participants identified as first-generation college students and 76 (87.4%) did not identify as first-generation college students. See Table 3 for an overview of the demographic data collected for the participants of this study.

Table 3

Demographics of student participants

	<i>n</i>	%
Racial Identity		
White	56	64.4
Black or African American	26	29.9
Asian	1	1.1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1.1
Other	3	3.4
Classification		
Freshman	22	25.3
Sophomore	22	25.3
Junior	19	21.8
Senior	23	26.4
5 th year or more	1	1.1
Gender Identity		
Male	18	20.7
Female	67	77.0
Non-binary/other	2	2.3
First-generation College Student		
Yes	11	12.6
No	76	87.4

N = 87

Research Sub-Question 2

An exploration of the factors that impact participation in on-campus leadership programming was a major part of this study. Therefore, a second research sub-question was developed: What are some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in

undergraduate leadership programs? Data were collected by two open-ended questions in the last section of the survey that explored these factors. Through a repeated review of the data, a theme that emerged with the contributing factors to participation was *alignment with personal goals*, as 74.7% of participants reported that as a contributing factor. Responses that supported that theme from the narrative data collected included, “growing my personal development”, “being well-rounded and more attractive to potential employers”, and “to build myself during my time here”. Participants indicated other contributing factors to participation in leadership programs including social engagement (56.3%), academic achievement (55.2%), ability to invest time (39.1%), parental influence/expectation (36.8%), mentors (31%), college major (29.9%), and ability to afford college (12.6%).

A theme that emerged with the detracting factors from participation was a *lack of time to invest in the opportunity*, with 50.6% of participants reporting that as a factor that detracted them from participation. Participants indicated other detracting factors to participation in leadership programs including ability to afford college (17.2%), social engagement (16.1%), academic achievement (10.3%), college major (6.9%), alignment with personal goals (4.6%), parental influence/expectation (3.5%), and mentors (2.3%). Another data point of notice was, there were 304 individual responses out of a possible 696 (43.7%) individual responses among the participants for factors that contributed to participation, and 110 individual responses out of a possible 696 (15.8%) individual responses among the participants for factors that detracted from participation. Table 4 provides data collected on the contributing and detracting factors and the selection breakdown of these factors from the participants.

Table 4

Contributing and Detracting Factor Data

	Contributing Factors		Detracting Factors	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Parental Influence/Expectation	32	36.8	3	3.5
Alignment with Personal Goals	65	74.7	4	4.6
Mentors	27	31.0	2	2.3
Ability to Invest Time	34	39.1	44	50.6
Academic Achievement	48	55.2	9	10.3
Social Engagement	49	56.3	14	16.1
Ability to Afford College	11	12.6	15	17.2
College Major	26	29.9	6	6.9
Other	9	10.3	12	13.8

N = 87

Research Sub-Question 3

In order to investigate the relationship between the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders and their motivators or barriers to join on-campus leadership programs a third research sub-question was developed: To what extent do factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy? This third research sub-question was answered by employing a Hierarchical Linear regression model. In this Hierarchical Linear regression model the factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in leadership programs served as predictors and leadership self-efficacy score served as the criterion for the outcome. As a collective group, factors that contributed to participation were positive predictors and were significant, whereas a collective group factors that detracted from participation were negative predictors and were not significant. Table 5 presents the results of the predictive effects of factors that contributed to participation in leadership programs on leadership self-efficacy scores.

Table 5

Hierarchical Linear Regression Results of the Predictive Effects of Factors that Contributed to and Detracted from Participation in Leadership Programs on Leadership Self-efficacy Scores

Predictor	β	t	p
Leadership Self-Efficacy Score			
Factors that Contribute to Participation	.38	3.43	< .001*
Factors that Detract from Participation	-.04	-.323	.748

$N = 87$

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study is to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. The research questions developed for this study were answered through a series of data analyses collected from a survey of undergraduate student leaders at a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States. In order to answer the overarching research question, a mean score for leadership self-efficacy was calculated and found that student leaders had a mean score of 4.54 on a 5.0-point scale. Demographic data were collected and reported in a table to answer research sub-question 1. A section of the survey was developed to collect open-ended responses to answer research sub-question 2, and the researcher reviewed the narrative data to explore and report on themes that emerged. And lastly, a Hierarchical Linear regression model was employed, and revealed that factors that contributed to participation were positive predictors and were significant, whereas factors that detracted from participation were negative predictors and were not significant. The most significant factors that contributed to student participation in leadership

programs were alignment with personal goals (74.7%), social engagement (56.3%), and academic achievement (55.2%). The only factor that detracted from participation in leadership programs that had over a 50% response rate from participants was the ability to invest time (50.6%).

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Undergraduate student leadership development has served as a central purpose in higher education for many years. That purpose is becoming more evident as there has been an increase in undergraduate leadership development programs across the United States (Astin & Astin, 2000). Institutions nationwide are facing pressure to meet enrollment and retention goals, as budget cuts become more of a reality. Undergraduate leadership development programs have been shown to have a positive influence on a student decision to stay at their particular institution and thus be retained. Students participating in an undergraduate leadership development program or assuming an on-campus leadership position often results in higher rates of student success. Understanding some of the factors that motivate students to participate in leadership programs is important, as it will add to the current research on undergraduate leadership development. Additionally, this current research is important as it sought to identify underrepresented demographics in these types of programs. While there is a significant amount of research on student leadership development, there is limited research on leadership self-efficacy of participants in undergraduate leadership development programs.

This chapter contains a review of the literature, the methodology of the research, and the findings of this study on the extent that contributing and detracting factors to participation predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. This chapter will also cover the discussion of results, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.

Review of Literature

There has been increasing attention on college student leadership development since the early 1990s (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Many institutions offer a vast array of student-led and university-sponsored student leadership opportunities that encourage students to engage with others, engage with thoughts and ideas, and engage with on-campus and off-campus entities. These leadership opportunities include serving as campus ambassadors, becoming orientation leaders, acting as peer mentors for first-year programs, participating in service programs, joining the student government association, and serving on student organization committees to name a few (Haber-Curran, 2019). While many of these programs are often initially associated with student life offices, they also exist in a number of pockets across campus such as academic colleges, career centers, and admission offices (Haber-Curran, 2019). These experiences can vary from active experiences such as leading a group or being more passive in nature like attending a speaker workshop series (Haber-Curran, 2019). Individuals serving as student organization leaders are a great example of how on-campus student leaders are engaging in leadership practices and behaviors because they are called on to make decisions for their organizations, develop and implement policies, and empower members of their groups (Mainella, 2017).

Self-efficacy refers to a person's belief in their capability of completing a task and influences their thoughts, emotions, behaviors, and motivations (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy beliefs are typically concerned with individuals' own judgments based on how well they can execute the actions required to meet a certain goal or achievement (Ozdemir & Yalcin, 2018). There can be many forms or specific types of self-efficacy, such as leadership self-efficacy.

Leadership self-efficacy is a key predictor of development in leadership capacity as well as a factor in whether or not students actually engage in leadership behaviors (Dugan et al., 2013).

Students with lower leadership self-efficacy could be less likely to engage in leadership opportunities to further develop their leadership skills because they do not believe they have the ability to be successful as a leader (Dugan et al., 2013). Leadership self-efficacy is critical to students as it can contribute to increased motivation to engage in leadership behaviors, and development in leadership performance and leadership capacity is imperative to student success (Dugan et al., 2013). A critical experience for students to develop leadership self-efficacy that has been identified is a positional leadership opportunity, as these experiences allow students to put into practice leadership behaviors, and thus develop more confidence for future leadership opportunities (Dugan et al., 2013).

In their 2011 study, Demetriou and Schmitz-Sciborski reviewed theories that linked to student aspiration as it relates to student success and academic persistence, and noted that student self-efficacy beliefs are a significant predictor in improving student behaviors associated with purpose and could encourage participation in more positive and meaningful experiences for college students. Demetriou and Schmitz-Sciborski (2011) identified five factors related to student persistence that include academic preparation, academic engagement, social engagement, financing college, and demographic characteristics. While there are several studies that explore some of the contributing factors to student involvement, persistence, and success, there is little research that examines the factors that detract students from student engagement in co-curricular activities. In 2019 Banks and Dohy conducted a comprehensive review that explored barriers to involvement and persistence for students of color in higher education and strategies to mitigate these barriers. Some of the barriers to student success the researchers discussed were financial

needs, lack of suitable mentors of color, and lack of programming directed and built by administrators of color for students of color.

There are significant differences in terms of students' leadership self-efficacy among demographic groups like race and gender (Soria et al., 2020). Researchers have observed that Black students have higher leadership self-efficacy scores compared to their peers, Asian students tend to have lower leadership self-efficacy scores than their peers, and females tend to have lower leadership self-efficacy scores than males (Kodama & Dugan, 2013; Nguyen, 2016). It has also been observed that international students reported a lower leadership self-efficacy score than their domestic student peers (Nguyen, 2016). Research has also shown that first-generation college students are 1.35 times less likely to participate in on campus leadership positions compared to non-first-generation-college students. Additionally students who come from low-income families are less likely to participate in leadership opportunities on campus than their peers from higher-income families (Soria et al., 2014).

Methodology

This quantitative, cross-sectional study utilizing a correlational design via survey methods was intended to research some of the reasons students choose to participate in on-campus leadership programs and the extent that these students perceive themselves to be self-efficacious. Therefore, the overarching research question for this study was, to what extent do students in leadership programs perceive themselves to be self-efficacious? To further explore the answer to this question, the following research sub-questions were developed: 1. What demographic characteristics are represented in leadership programs on campus?; 2. What are some of the factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership

programs?; and 3. To what extent do factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy?

Given that this study centers on the predictability of participation in on-campus leadership programs and the self-efficacy of student leaders, a quantitative study best fit the research design as this study collected data from one specific group of participants at one specific point in time, therefore this study was conducted as a cross-sectional survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The participants in this study were undergraduate students currently participating in an on-campus leadership opportunity at a large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States.

The Student Leader Self-Efficacy Survey (see Appendix A) is a modified version of an existing assessment tool comprised of a series of questions on leadership self-efficacy and questions that focus on motivators and barriers to join on-campus undergraduate leadership programs (Yoon et al., 2016). The first five questions serve to collect demographic data such as classification, gender identity, racial identity, first-generation college status, and type of undergraduate leadership opportunity. Questions 6 thru 33 are Likert-scale questions that focused on leadership self-efficacy categories including leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity. The Likert-scale included options of one (1) representing strongly disagree, two (2) representing disagree, three (3) representing neither agree nor disagree, four (4) representing agree, and five (5) representing strongly agree. The final two questions on the survey served to collect data on factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs.

Findings

The researcher used quantitative survey methods that were supported by descriptive statistics and correlation measurement to examine the extent contributing and detracting participation factors in leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. These statistical measurements and means, as well as overall data analyses were used to answer the overarching research question, and the three corresponding research sub-questions. The survey included demographic questions, Likert-scale questions focused on leadership self-efficacy and two questions focused on factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in on-campus leadership opportunities.

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, percentiles) and bivariate, zero-order correlations answered the first and second research sub-questions. An ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model was employed to answer the third research question, in which the factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in leadership programs served as predictors and leadership self-efficacy served as the criterion for the outcome.

The researcher reached out to several different departmental administrators among the institution that worked with student leaders to inform them about the study, and recruit eligible participants. This yielded a response rate of 27.9%. The internal consistency of the leadership self-efficacy survey for this sample was .94.

To gain a better understanding of the types of students participating in undergraduate leadership programs, research sub-question 1 was developed: What demographic characteristics are represented in leadership programs on campus? Of the participants in the study 64.4% identified as White, 29.9% identified as Black or African American, 3.4% identified as other, 1.1% identified as Asian, and 1.1% identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Additionally respondents were asked to provide information on their classification, and 26.4%

were seniors, 25.3% were freshman, 25.3% were sophomores, 21.8% were juniors, and 1.1% listed 5th year or more. Information was also collected on gender identity and 77% of the participants identified as female, 20.7% identified as male, and 2.3% identified as non-binary/other. The first section of the instrument also collected information on first-generation college student status. The responses revealed that 87.4% did not identify as first-generation college students, and 12.6% participants identified as first-generation college students. Lastly, participants were able to self-identify which type of student leadership opportunities they had participated in. Of the participants 56 were engaged in a leadership development program, 51 were student organization members, 33 were student workers, 20 were campus ambassadors, 13 were Greek life leaders, 9 were peer mentors, 8 were peer tutors, 7 were orientation leaders, 5 were peer educators, 4 were campus programming members, 3 were resident assistants, and 3 were student government officers.

A second research sub-question was developed to explore the factors that impact participation in on-campus leadership programming: What are some of the factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs? This data were collected by two open-ended questions in the last section of the survey that explored these factors. Through a repeated review of the data, a theme that emerged with the contributing factors to participation was alignment with personal goals, with 74.7% of participants reported that as a contributing factor. A theme that emerged with factors that detract from participation was a lack of time to invest in the opportunity, with 50.6% of participants reporting that as a factor that detracted them from participation. Another data point of notice was, there were 304 individual responses out of a possible 696 (43.7%) individual responses among the participants for factors that contributed to participation, and 110 individual responses out of a possible 696 (15.8%)

individual responses among the participants for factors that detracted from participation. The contributing factors that were measured included alignment with personal goals (74.7%), social engagement (56.3%), academic achievement (55.2%), ability to invest time (39.1%), parental influence (36.8%), mentors (31.0%), college major (29.9%), and ability to afford college (12.6%). These categories were also measured as detracting factors, including ability to invest time (50.6%), ability to afford college (17.2%), social engagement (16.1%), academic achievement (10.3%), college major (6.9%), alignment with personal goals (4.6%), parental influence (3.5%), and mentors (2.3%).

A third research sub-question was developed to investigate the relationship between the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders, and their motivations to join on-campus leadership programs: To what extent do factors that contribute to or detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy? This third research sub-question was answered by employing a Hierarchical Linear regression model. In this Hierarchical Linear regression model the factors that contributed to or detracted from participation in leadership programs served as predictors and leadership self-efficacy score served as the criterion/outcome. Factors that contribute to participation were positive predictors and were significant ($\beta = .38, t = 3.43, p = <.001*$), whereas factors that detract from participation were negative predictors and were not significant ($\beta = -.04, t = -0.323, p = .748$).

Discussion

The findings from this study are intended to add to the current literature and fill in some of the gaps for the current assessment of undergraduate leadership development programs. Additionally the findings from this study explored how factors to participation in leadership programs predicted student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. This study had student leaders

assess themselves on areas such as leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity, and then discuss some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from their participation in a leadership development opportunity. This study helped identify some of the underrepresented demographics in these programs, as well as explore the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders.

The responses to the survey revealed that female (77%) students participate in these programs at a much higher rate than male (20.7%), or non-binary (2.3%) students. In their 2014 study that explored demographics and leadership practices with college students, Gallagher et al. had a similar level of participation among gender with 69.1% of participants being female and 30.4% being male. The results of the current survey also indicated that White (64.4%) students participate at a higher rate than non-White students (35.6%). Black (29.9%) students participated at the highest rate among non-white participants, followed by Asian (1.1%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (1.1%). Again the Gallagher et al. (2014) study had similar participation among the ranking of racial identity, but had a larger percentage of White (80.5%) students compared to non-White (19.5%) students. Additionally, in the current study first-generation college students (12.6%) participated in these programs less than students who were not first generation college students (87.4%). This finding is consistent with Soria et al. (2014) findings that showed that first-generation college students are 1.35 times less likely to participate in on campus leadership positions compared to non-first-generation-college students. The distribution among classification was pretty equal among participants that listed a classification between freshman and senior, while 5th year or more only accounted for 1.1% of the participants.

A theme that emerged with the contributing factors to participation was alignment with personal goals, where 74.7% of participants in the current study reported that as a contributing

factor. This finding is similar to the findings of Simmons et al. (2017) who surveyed undergraduate engineering students who listed a major factor to on-campus engagement was the alignment of experiences and personal goals. In the same study (Simmons et al., 2017) participants reported a lack of time as their greatest detraction from on-campus involvement, which was a major theme that emerged from this study with 50.6% of participants listing a lack of time to invest in the opportunity. An important thing to note was that there were 304 individual responses among the participants for factors that contributed to participation, and 110 individual responses among the participants for factors that detracted from participation. This suggests that the participants had more factors that were encouraging them to participate, than discouraging them.

Exploring how the factors that contributed to and detracted from leadership development participation showed that contributing factors were a positive and significant predictor in leadership self-efficacy. For every one unit increase in contributing factors, leadership self-efficacy scores increased by $\beta = .38$ standard deviations. The significance of this predictor compliments Soria et al.'s 2020 study that noted a student's participation in leadership programs was a greater predictor for their leadership self-efficacy than their demographics or their pre-collegiate leadership experiences or beliefs. Given that all of the participants were student leaders, this could explain why the contributing factors were so significant. The finding of detracting factors noted as not being significant could be explained by the fact that participants were student leaders and may have not faced as many detractions or barriers to participation.

Implications for Practice

This study produced some valuable insight into on-campus leadership development programs and opportunities, and the student leaders that are engaging in these opportunities.

Institutional leaders, student affairs practitioners, and leadership development program managers may consider the information that came from this study to reflect on their own programs, and their efforts to grow, or shape their student leadership development programs. The results of this study showed which specific demographics are underrepresented in these programs. Program administrators can consider using these results to build recruitment and retention strategies that may appeal to these demographics. Male students are one of the biggest demographic areas that are underrepresented in these programs, followed by non-White students, and first-generation students. Program administrators who are looking to build their leadership programs should look to these groups for opportunities for growth.

With contributing factors to participation shown to be a significant positive predictor to a student leaders' leadership self-efficacy, program administrators should consider these factors as strategies for potential growth, recruitment and retention. These factors include things such as aligning opportunities with personal goals, suitable mentors, and social engagement. During the recruitment and admission stage of the leadership program, program administrators could collect information from potential participants regarding their personal goals, and their motivation for joining the leadership program. This could give insight on how to deliver or market certain elements within the program to make it be perceived as more valuable by students. Additionally, program administrators should consider developing a network of mentors made up of diverse individuals who would be suitable mentors for underrepresented students. These mentors could be among the faculty and staff of the institution or could be peer mentors.

Although factors that detracted from participation was not a significant predictor to leadership self-efficacy, program administrators could still consider a lack of time as a factor that is detracting students from participating in leadership development programs. As the landscape

of higher education continues to shift, program administrators should look to their students to gather information on how to maximize their available time. Short programs during the day, virtual workshops, and self-paced elements should be considered to provide the greatest amount of accessibility to their student leaders.

The results of this study also revealed that students who participate in on-campus leadership development programs, have a high leadership self-efficacy score. The mean self-efficacy score for the total population of this study was 4.54 out of a 5.0 point scale. Given that efficacy beliefs are often derived from personal experiences (McCormick et al., 2002), this finding further compliments Soria et al.'s (2020) suggestion that it may be possible to increase a college student's leadership self-efficacy through co-curricular trainings, programs, or workshops. Soria et al. (2020) also suggested that participation in on campus leadership programs explain a more significant amount of variance in a students' leadership self-efficacy than other factors including pre-collegiate leadership experiences and beliefs, demographics, and other experiences in college.

The current study provides valuable information for leadership educators who work in student leadership programming. While there is a significant amount of research on student leadership development, there is little existing research on leadership self-efficacy of participants in undergraduate leadership development programs, and the underrepresented demographics of these programs. This study encourages leadership educators to examine their own leadership development programs, and build recruitment strategies and programs that seek to increase engagement among male students, non-White students, and first-generation college students.

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

This quantitative study was limited in its generalizability as it examined students from one specific large public comprehensive research university in the southeastern United States. A delimitation in this study is that it did not include the students who did not participate in an undergraduate leadership opportunity. The researcher chose not to include these students due to the feasibility of including every student who attends the university. Additionally the study is limited due to the fact that there will be several different student leadership positions represented with different purposes and outcomes in terms of leadership learning. This study assumed that a self-efficacy tool displayed an accurate depiction of a student's leadership self-efficacy because the students would be self-reporting on their own beliefs about their leadership self-efficacy. This study also assumed that the participants were honest in their answers to the survey questions. Lastly, the study is limited because it occurred at only one institution, and may not represent the population of other institutions.

Recommendations for Future Research

In order to address some of the limitations listed, the researcher recommends further research be conducted in order to provide a broader scope on demographic participation in leadership programming and the factors to participation. Given that this study only examined students who participate in leadership programming, there were more insights on the factors that led them to participate in leadership programming. If students who did not participate in leadership programs were included, more valuable insights on the motivators and the barriers that students face to participating in leadership programs could be gathered. This information would be valuable to leadership educators as they try to grow their programs numerically, or grow access to their programs.

Given that this study identified some of the underrepresented demographics within undergraduate leadership programs, future research could dive further into the specific barriers that each demographic may face when considering participation in leadership programming. Future research could further explore gender differences and why females are more likely to participate in leadership programs than males, or why White students participate at higher rates than non-White students. This research will be particularly important as institutions become more and more diverse.

Additionally, future research could conduct a longitudinal study that looks at student self-efficacy as it changes over time while student leaders participate in these programs. This could give further evidence that these programs can be attributed to an increase in student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. Showing how leadership self-efficacy correlates to student success and persistence could be a great way to further communicate the value of on-campus leadership programming to institutions of higher education. Additionally, further research could examine how the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders impacts individuals beyond graduation as alumni and young professionals, as individuals who have participated in on-campus leadership development programs have reported that they are using leadership competencies that they explored in these programs, in their professional lives (Egan et al., 2020).

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students who participated in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contributed to and detracted from participation in these programs. The results of this study showed that factors to participation in on-campus leadership development opportunities were significant predictors in

the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders. Additionally, this study showed that male students, non-White students, and first-generation college students are vastly underrepresented in these leadership programs and opportunities. This study provided valuable information for higher education administrators in terms of student success and retention, as well as information for leadership educators that are looking to grow their leadership programs in terms of participants and accessibility. It is the hope of the researcher that this study will encourage leadership educators to focus on building a more diverse and inclusive leadership program in the future, and it further communicates the value of leadership education to the student experience, and the overall mission of higher education.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Omary, A. A. (2009). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: The case of Jordanian schools. *Journal of Leadership Education, 7*(2), 265-283.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L.E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Retrieved from http://www.cep.edu.rs/public/Altbach,_Reisberg,_Rumbley_Tracking_an_Academic_Revolution,_UNESCO_2009.pdf
- Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader*. McGraw-Hill.
- Bailey, T. R., Leinback, T., & Jenkins, D. (2006). Is student success labeled institutional failure? Student goals and graduation rates in the accountability debate at community colleges. *Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University*.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*, 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. H.W. Freeman.
- Banks, T., Dohy, J. (2019). Mitigating barriers to persistence: A review of efforts to improve retention and graduation rates for students of color in higher education. *Higher Education Studies, 9*(1), 118-128.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bennett, E. A. (2017). *The relationship between first-year student retention and type of faculty at a four-year public research university: A profile of three academic colleges*. (Doctoral dissertation). Ohio University.
- Bordas, J. (2007). *Salsa, soul, and spirit: Leadership for a multi-cultural age*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Bowman, N., Brandenberger, J., Hill, P., Lapsley, D., & Quaranto, J. (2010). Serving in college, flourishing in adulthood: Does community engagement during the college years predict adult well-being? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being*, 2(1), 14-34.
- Braxton, J. M., Doyle, W. R., Hartley III, H. V., Hirschy, A. S., Jones, W. A., & McLendon, M. K. (2014). *Rethinking college student retention*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bingle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Muthiah, R.N. (2010). The role of service-learning on the retention of first-year students to second year. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 38-49.
- Burbank, M., Odom, S. F., & Sandlin, M. R. (2015). A content analysis of undergraduate students' perceived reasons for changes in personal leadership behaviors. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 14(2) 182-197.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

- Campus Compact. (2016). *Campus compact member survey*. Retrieved from <http://compact.org/initiatives/membership-survey/>
- Casile, M., Hoover, K. F., & O'Neil, D. A. (2011). Both-and, not either-or: Knowledge and service-learning. *Education and Training, 53*, 129- 139.
- Caulfield, J., & Woods, T. (2013). Experiential learning: exploring its long-term impact on socially responsible behavior. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 13*(2), 31–48.
- Checkoway, B. (2018). Inside the gates: First-generation students finding their way. *Higher Education Studies, 8*(3), 72-84.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, R., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). Educating undergraduates for responsible citizenship. *Change, 35*(6), 40-48.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study. A Report from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.).
- Day, P. D., Dungy, G. J., Fried, J., Komives, S. R., McDonald, W. M., & Salvador, S. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. American College Personnel Association and the Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.
- Dean, L. (2006). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (6th ed.). Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

- Demetriou, C., Schmitz-Sciborski, A. (2011). Integration, motivation, strengths and optimism: Retention theories past, present and future. *National Symposium on Student Retention, 2011*, 300–312.
- Dugan, J. P., Kodama, C., Correia, B. & Associates. (2013). Multi-institutional study of leadership insight report: Leadership program delivery.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. A Report from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influence on college students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(5), 525-549.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 335-343.
- Dugan, J. P., Garland, J. L., Jacoby, B., & Gasiorski, A. (2008). Understanding commuter student self-efficacy for leadership: A within-group analysis. *NASPA Journal*, 45(2), 282-310.
- Eagan, K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Bates, A. K., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2015). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2015*. Cooperative Institutional Research Program & Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Egan, J., Mcbrayer, J.S., Tolman, S., & Wells, P. (2020). Exploring alumni valuation of an undergraduate leadership program. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 19(4), 68-83.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 807-834.

- Early, S. L. (2016). An examination of mentoring relationships and leadership capacity in resident assistants. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*, 42(3), 52–65.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). “Putting my man face on”: A grounded theory of college men’s gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development* 50(2), 210-226.
- Eich, D. (2008). A grounded theory of high-quality leadership programs: Perspectives from student leadership development programs in higher education. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 176.
- Foremen, E. A., & Retallick, M. S. (2013). Undergraduate participation in extracurricular activities and leadership development. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 12(2), 56-73.
- Fraser, M., & Garg, R. (2011). Educational aspirations. In R. J. R. Levesque (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of adolescence*, 807–812. Springer
- Frey, J. A. (2012). Exploring the relationship between college leadership experiences and the practice of effective leadership behaviors. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Exploring-the-Relationship-between-College-Student-Frey/e78e7a266c7276065cbc52c11bd836ca40e05793>
- Gallagher, M. L., Marshall, J. C., Pories, M. L., & Daughety, M. (2014). Factors effecting undergraduate leadership behaviors. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(1), 46-56.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 183-211.
- Haber-Curran, P. (2019). Co-curricular involvement and student leadership as catalysts for student learning. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2019(188), 33-41.

- Hagood, L. P. (2019). The financial benefits and burdens of performance funding in higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 41*, 189–213.
- Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(6), 669-692.
- Harrison, N., & Waller, R. (2018). Challenging discourses of aspiration: The role of expectations and attainment in access to higher education. *British Educational Research Journal, 44*(5), 914–938.
- Hershan, R., & Lauderdale, C.L. (2018). *Trends in higher education: 2018 outlook*. Retrieved from https://www.alvarezandmarsal.com/sites/default/files/article/pdf/trends_in_higher_education_2018_outlook.pdf
- Jafee, D. (2007). Peer cohorts and the unintended consequences of freshman learning communities. *College Teaching, 55*(2), 65-71.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Berkowitz-King, R. (2002). Age and college completion: A life-history analysis of women aged 15-44. *Sociology of Education, 75*(3), 211–230.
- Jacobs, J., & Archie, T. (2008). Investigating sense of community in first-year college students. *Journal of Experiential Education, 30*, 282-285.
- Johnson, S. R., & Stage, F. K. (2018). Academic engagement and student success: Do high-impact practices mean higher graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education, 89*(5), 753–781.
- Kezar, A. J., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our Understanding of Student Leadership Development: A Study Exploring Gender and Ethnic Identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 55-69.

- Kodama, C. M., & Dugan, J. P. (2013). Leveraging leadership efficacy for college students: Disaggregating data to examine unique predictors by race. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 46*(2), 184-201.
- Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., Owen, J. E., Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (2006). *Handbook for student leadership programs*. National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S., Owen, J. O., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 401-418.
- Komives, S.R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. (2013). (Seemiller, 2013). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: how to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations (2nd ed)*. Jossey- Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2008). *The student leadership challenge: Five practices for exemplary leaders*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G., Cruce, T., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 79*(5), 540-563.
- Laskey, M. L., & Hetzel, C. J. (2011). Investigating factors related to retention of at-risk college students. *Learning Assistance Review, 16*(1), 31-43.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking Leadership to Student Learning: The Contributions of Leader Efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 496-528.

- Lockeman, K. S., & Pelco, L. E. (2013). The relationship between service-learning and degree completion. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 20*(1), 18-30.
- Lopez, M. H., & Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2014). Women's college enrollment gains leave men behind. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/03/06/womens-college-enrollment-gains-leave-men-behind/>
- Luszczynska, A., Scholz, U., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). The general self-efficacy scale: Multicultural validation studies. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 139*, 439–457.
- Machida, M., & Schaubroeck, J. (2011). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in leader development. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 18*(4), 459-468.
- Mainella, F. C. (2017). Intentional design of student organizations to optimize leadership development. *New Directions for Student Leadership, 155*, 33–43.
- Mann, J., & DeAngelo, L. (2016). An examination of the transformative learning potential of alternative spring breaks. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 53*(4), 416-428.
- Marshman, E. M., Kalender, Z. Y., Nokes-Malach, T., Schunn, C., & Singh, C. (2018). Female students with A's have similar physics self-efficacy as male students with C's in introductory courses: A cause for alarm? *Physical Review of Physics Education Research, 14*(2), 020123-1-020123-17.
- Maya, I., & Uzman, E. (2019). The predictive power of university students' self-leadership strategies on their self-efficacy. *Educational Research and Reviews, 14*(11), 372-379.
- McBrayer, J. S., Akins, C., Gutierrez, A. B., Cleveland, R., & Pannell, S. (2020). Instructional leadership practices and school leaders' self-efficacy. *School Leadership Review, 15*(1).

- McCormick, M. J., Tanguma, J., Lopez-Forment, A. S. (2002). Extending self-efficacy theory to leadership: A review and empirical test. *Journal of Leadership Education, 1*(2), 34-49.
- Moody, S., Bowden, R., Brock, J., & Bunch, P. (2020). College student aspiration as a motivation for engagement: The road to academic success? *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 0*(0), 1-23.
- Murphy, S., & Johnson, S. (2016). Leadership and leader developmental self-efficacy: Their role in enhancing leader development efforts. *New Directions for Student Leadership, 2016*(149), 73–84.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *Undergraduate retention and graduation rates*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *Undergraduate retention and graduation rates*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.asp
- Nguyen, D. H. K. (2016). Student success through leadership self-efficacy: A comparison of international and domestic students. *Journal of International Students, 6*(4), 829-842
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (7th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Ober, D. R., Beekman, J. A., & Pierce, R. L. (2018). Analyzing four-year public university and two-year college graduation rates. *Journal of Education and Training Studies 6*(4), 221-247.

- Ortagus, J. C., Kelchen, R., Rosinger, K., & Voorhees, N. (2020). Performance-based funding in American higher education: A systematic synthesis of the intended and unintended consequences. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42(4), 520-550.
- Ostick, D. T., & Wall, V. A. (2011). Considerations for culture and social identity dimensions. In S. R. Komives, J. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Handbook For Student Leadership Programs (2nd ed.)*. Jossey-Bass.
- Ozdemir, N., & Yalcin, M. T. (2018). An evaluation of principals' leadership practices on assistant principals' leadership self-efficacy. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 9(32), 1298-1318.
- Paglis, L. L., & Green, S. G. (2002). Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 215-235.
- Panke, S., & Stephens, J. (2018). Beyond the echo chamber: Pedagogical tools for civic engagement discourse and reflection. *Educational Technology & Society*, 21(1), 248–263.
- Patterson, B. (2012). Influence of student organizational leadership experiences in college students leadership behaviors. *E-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Sage.
- Poynton, T. A., DeFouw, E. R., & Morizio, L. J. (2019). A systematic review of online response rates in four counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 97(1), 33-42.

- Pryor, J.H., Hurtado, S., Saenz, V.B., Santos, J.L., & Korn, W.S. (2007). *The American freshman: Forty year trends*. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Rashid, S., & Yadav, S. S. (2020). Impact of Covid-19 pandemic on higher education and research. *Indian Journal of Human Development, 14*(2), 340-343.
- Rosch, D. M., Boyd, B. L., & Duran, K. M. (2014). Students' self-identified long-term leadership development goals: An analysis by gender and race. *Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(3), 17-30.
- Rosch, D. M., & Stephens, C. M. (2017). Campus involvement as a predictor for durable leadership development in conjunction with leadership program participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 58*(7), 1107–1112.
- Rosch, D. M., & Collins, J. D. (2019). Peaks and valleys: A two-year study of student leadership capacity associated with campus involvement. *Journal of Leadership Education, 18*(1), 68-80.
- Rosinger, K. O., Ortagus, J. C., Kelchen, R., Cassell, A., & Voorhees, N. (2020). The landscape of performance-based funding in 2020. *InformedED States: Higher Education Policy Initiative*.
- Saleh, A., & Bista, K. (2017). Examining factors impacting online survey response rates in educational research: Perceptions of graduate students. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation, 13*(29), 63-74.
- Salvador, C. (2017). *First-year students involved in civic engagement more likely to have higher retention rates*. Retrieved from <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/First->

Year-Students-Involved-in-Civic-Engagement-More-Likely-to-Have-Higher-Retention-Rates.aspx

- Seemiller, C. (2013). *The student leadership competencies guidebook: Designing intentional leadership learning and development*. Jossey-Bass.
- Senemoglu, N. (2004). Teachers' professional development needs and the systems that meet them. *Creative Education*, 5(16).
- Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Huie, F., Wakhungu, P., Yuan, X., Nathan, A & Hwang, Y., A. (2017). A national view of student attainment rates by race and ethnicity. National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.
- Simmons, D. R., Ye, Y., Ohland, M. W., & Garahan, K. (2017). Understanding students' incentives for and barriers to out-of-class participation: Profile of civil engineering student engagement. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 144(2).
- Simpkins, S. D., Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2012). Charting the Eccles' expectancy value model from mothers' beliefs in childhood to youths' activities in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 48(4), 1019–1032.
- Soria, K. M., & Thomas-Card, T. (2014). Relationships between motivations for community service participation and desire to continue service following college. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(2), 53-64.
- Soria, K. M., Kaste, K., Diekemper, K. M., Blamo, M., Belrose, M. R., & Brazelton, G. B. (2020). Enriching college students' leadership efficacy. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 19(4), 87-95.

- Soria, K. M., Hussein, D., & Vue, C. (2014). Leadership for whom? Socioeconomic factors predicting undergraduate students' leadership participation. *Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(1), 14-26.
- Soria, K. M., & Stubblefield, R. (2014). First-year college students' strengths awareness: Building a foundation for student engagement and academic excellence. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition, 26*(2), 69-88.
- Spera, C., Wentzel, K. R., & Matto, H. C. (2009). Parental aspirations for their children's educational attainment: Relations to ethnicity, parental education, children's academic performance, and parental perceptions of school climate. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(8), 1140–1152.
- The Almanac of Higher Education. (2018). *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 64*(14).
- Thomson, A., Smith-Tolken, A., Naidoo, A., & Bringle, R. (2011). Service learning and community engagement: A comparison of three national contexts. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations, 22*(2), 214-237.
- Turner, P., & Thompson, E. (2014). College retention initiatives meeting the needs of millennial freshman students. *College Student Journal, 48*, 94-104.
- Umbricht, M. R., Fernandez, F., & Ortagus, J. C. (2017). An examination of the (un)intended consequences of performance funding in higher education. *Educational Policy, 31*(5), 643–673.
- Van Duser, K. E., Lucas, C., & Cohen, S. (2020). The influence of rising tuition on first-year students' enrollment and persistence intentions. *College Student Journal, 54*(4), 421-430.

- Webber, K.L., Krylow, R.B., & Zhang, Q. (2013). Does involvement really matter? Indicators of college student success and satisfaction. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*(6), 591-611.
- Weidner, J.B., Stone, R.C., Latimer-Cheung, A.E., & Tomasone, J.R. (2018). Comparing experiences and vocational benefits of service-learning and community service volunteering in a community-based exercise program. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement, 9*(2), 66-86.
- Whitaker, B. L., & Greenleaf, J. P. (2019). Using course packs to address limitations of traditional textbooks in leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education, 18*(3), 176-183.
- Willis, J. (2010). The impact of social integration on subsequent institutional commitment conditional on gender. *Research in Higher Education, 51*(7), 687-700.
- Yarrish, K. K., Zula, K., & Davis, E. (2010). An exploration of differences of leadership perceptions related to a student's gender within the College of Business at a small liberal arts institution. *American Journal of Business Education, 3*(11), 69-76.
- Yoon, S. Y., Imbrie, P.K., & Reed, T. (2016). Development of the leadership self-efficacy scale for engineering students. *American Society for Engineering Education: Annual Conference & Exposition.*

APPENDIX A

STUDENT LEADER SELF-EFFICACY LETTER OF CONSENT AND SURVEY

Letter of Informed Consent:

My name is Benjamin Smith Phillips, and I am a student of Georgia Southern University in the College of Education, Educational Leadership. For my doctorate, I am conducting a research project examining the leadership self-efficacy of students in leadership positions on campus. The purpose of this study is to examine the leadership self-efficacy of undergraduate students that participate in on-campus leadership development opportunities, identify student demographics in these programs, and explore some of the factors that contribute to and detract from participation in these programs. Participation in this research will include completion of a survey entitled “Student Leader Self-Efficacy Survey”. Risks for completing the survey are “no more than risks associated with daily life experiences.” There are no acknowledged individual or participant benefits. Time to complete the survey is approximately 10 minutes. Data collected in this survey is anonymous and will be kept confidential and only shared with the research committee. The survey is voluntary, and respondents have the right to ask questions about the survey, skip over survey questions, or opt out of the survey at any time. There is no penalty for deciding not to participate in the study. Participants have the right to ask questions and contact may be made to me as the researcher, Benjamin Phillips, at bphillips@georgiasouthern.edu, or my faculty advisor, Dr. Juliann Sergi McBrayer at jmcbrayer@georgiasouthern.edu. For questions concerning an individual’s rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board at 912-478-5465.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, click on the arrows below to signify your informed consent to participate in the survey. By completing the survey, you are signifying your informed consent to participate in the survey. If you do NOT agree to participate in this study, close this browser window at this time. If at any time you wish to end your participation in the survey, close the browser. Non-participation, skipping over questions, or ending the survey will not result in any penalty. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H22197.

Principal Investigator: Benjamin Smith Phillips, bphillips@georgiasouthern.edu
Co-Investigator: Juliann Sergi McBrayer, jmcbrayer@georgiasouthern.edu

Start of Block: Block 1

If you agree to participate in this study, click on the arrows below to complete the survey.

If you do NOT agree to participate in this study, close this browser window at this time.

Page Break

Student Leader Self-Efficacy Survey (Yoon et al., 2016):

The Student Leader Self-Efficacy Survey is a modified version of an existing assessment tool comprised of a series of questions on leadership self-efficacy and open-ended questions that focus on motivation and barriers to join on-campus undergraduate leadership programs (Yoon et al., 2016). This leadership self-efficacy survey tool had an overall reliability of Cronbach's $\alpha = .973$ from $N = 173$, and all items on the survey were worthy of retention because the removal of any item would not have increased the reliability coefficient of Cronbach's α . The first five questions serve to collect demographic data such as classification, gender identity, racial identity, first-generation college status, and type of undergraduate leadership opportunity. Questions six thru thirty-three are Likert-scale questions that focus on leadership self-efficacy categories including leadership opportunity, goal setting, team motivation, innovative changes, and ethical actions and integrity. The Likert-scale ranges from one (1) representing strongly disagree, to five (5) representing strongly agree. The final two questions on the survey serve to collect open-ended data on factors that contribute to and detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs.

Q1 What is your current classification?

- Freshman (1)
- Sophomore (2)
- Junior (3)
- Senior (4)

Q2 What is your gender identity?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Non-binary / other (3)

Q3 How would you describe your racial identity?

- White (1)
- Black or African American (2)
- American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
- Asian (4)
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)
- Other (6)

Q4 Are you a first generation college student? (First generation college student means neither of your parents or legal guardians hold at least a bachelor's degree.)

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)

Q5 What types of on-campus leadership opportunities have you engaged in? (Select all that apply)

- Orientation Leader (1)
- Peer Mentor (2)
- Peer Tutor (3)
- Campus Ambassador (4)
- Student Worker (5)
- Peer Educator (6)
- Leadership Development Program (7)
- Resident Assistant/Housing (8)
- Student Government Association (9)
- Student Organization Member (10)
- Campus Programming Board (11)
- Other: (12) _____

Q6 I can attempt to develop my leadership skills.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q7 I can strive to develop my leadership.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 I can actively seek leadership opportunities in and out of the classroom.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9 I can exhibit leadership skills when necessary.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q10 I can actively seek opportunities to demonstrate my leadership.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11 I can learn how to lead a team.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12 By demonstrating leadership, I can encourage my team members to think of new ways of doing things.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 By demonstrating leadership, I can fulfill my responsibilities to my team members.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q14 By demonstrating leadership, I can find several ways to to motivate people on a team.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15 By demonstrating leadership, I can influence my team members to work together.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q16 By demonstrating leadership, I can actively encourage others to solve problems.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q17 By demonstrating leadership, I can encourage my team members to get involved in a project.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q18 I can lead others to develop and apply their talents for the established goals.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 By demonstrating leadership, I can develop plans for change that will take my team in important new directions.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20 By demonstrating leadership, I can influence others to be enthusiastic about working toward the established goals.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q21 By demonstrating leadership, I can influence others to take positive action to further the team's reputation and interests.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q22 By demonstrating leadership, I can provide flexibility to enhance and encourage new thinking.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q23 By demonstrating leadership, I can restructure and challenge the traditional methods of accomplishing a team goal.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q24 By demonstrating leadership, I can explore ways to implement innovation for the team benefit.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q25 I can exhibit leadership to improve effectiveness of the team.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q26 By demonstrating leadership, I can seek continuous improvement in the way that work gets done.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q27 I can lead a team toward my vision for the team goals.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q28 By demonstrating leadership, I can clearly visualize a project goal even when limited information is available.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q29 By demonstrating leadership, I can seek innovative ways to improve the team performance.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q30 By demonstrating leadership, I can apply different ethical frameworks to analyze a problem of my team.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q31 By demonstrating leadership, I can take ownership of a project which I am involved.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q32 By demonstrating leadership, I can take responsibility for the success and failure of a project.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q33 By demonstrating leadership, I can take on responsibilities that are not assigned to me.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Select one (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q34 What were some of the reasons you were motivated to engage in a student leadership opportunity? (Select all that apply)

- Parental Influence/Expectations (7)
- Opportunity aligned with personal goals (8)
- Mentors (9)
- Ability to invest time in the opportunity (10)
- Academic Achievement (11)
- Enjoy social engagement (12)
- Ability to afford college (13)
- College Major (14)
- Other: (15) _____

Q35 Did you experience any roadblocks, or barriers prior to engaging in a student leadership opportunity? (Select all that apply)

- Opportunity did not align with personal goals (7)
- Parental Influence/Expectations (8)
- Ability to afford college (9)
- Do not enjoy social engagement (10)
- Academic Achievement (11)
- Mentors (12)
- Lack of time to invest in the opportunity (13)
- College Major (14)
- Other: (15) _____

APPENDIX B

RECRUITMENT AND ADVANCE INFORMATION EMAIL

Dear Student Leader,

My name is Benjamin Phillips, and I am a student of Georgia Southern University in the College of Education, Educational Leadership. I am leading a research project and quantitative study examining the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders and factors that contribute and detract from student leadership participation. This project is in partial fulfillment of the requirements set forth by Georgia Southern University to earn a Doctorate in Educational Administration. You are receiving this email because I have learned you serve or have served as a student leader at Georgia Southern University. I would like to invite you to participate in this survey that will support my investigation of leadership self-efficacy of student leaders and the degree to which factors that contribute to or detract from participation in undergraduate leadership programs predict student leaders' leadership self-efficacy. In approximately one week, I will share an invitation to a survey which will include additional information regarding the survey as well as a link to the survey.

I would like to confirm your contact information and role as a student leader. If you are no longer serving, or have never served as a student leader, please let me know.

Thank you in advance for participating in this survey of leadership self-efficacy of student leaders.

Ben Phillips
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

APPENDIX C

INVITATION TO SURVEY EMAIL

Dear Student Leader,

I am leading a research project and quantitative study examining the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders and factors that contribute and detract from student leadership participation. This project is in partial fulfillment of the requirements set forth by Georgia Southern University to earn a Doctorate in Educational Administration. I invite you to participate in this survey.

In this anonymous, online survey using Qualtrics™, you will be asked to respond to questions regarding your leadership self-efficacy and factors that contribute and detract from student leadership participation.. The survey is voluntary, and respondents have the choice to ask questions about the survey, skip over survey questions, or opt out of the survey. If you choose to participate, please complete the survey with the understanding that your completion serves as informed consent. The survey should be completed at one time and should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Participation in the survey has minimum risks, no more than those associated with daily life experiences, and data collected is anonymous and will be held confidential, only shared with my research committee (Georgia Southern University College of Education Dissertation Committee). All results will be compiled and presented as generalizable findings.

To complete the survey, please visit this link:

https://georgiasouthern.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_09s404sLWS4EXR4. As the survey window is January 17 - February 4, 2022, please submit answers to the survey by Friday, February 4, 2022

As a participant, you have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the study, please contact me, Ben Phillips, at bphillips@georgiasouthern.edu or my faculty advisory, Dr. Juilann Sergi McBrayer at jmcbrayer@georgiasouthern.edu. If the survey or a question or a portion of the survey causes any discomfort, please contact Dr. McBrayer or me at the information above. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Georgia Southern University Office of Research Integrity at irb@georgiasouthern.edu. Regardless of your participation in the survey, please email me if you would like a summary of findings.

Thank you in advance for participating in this survey of leadership self-efficacy of student leaders.

Ben Phillips
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

APPENDIX D

REMINDER AND FOLLOW UP EMAIL

Dear Student Leader,

Approximately one week ago, I shared the following email with you as an invitation to participate in a survey regarding a research project and quantitative study examining the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders and factors that contribute and detract from student leadership participation. I am sending this email as a reminder of this invitation. Please see the full invitation below.

Thank you in advance for participating in this survey of leadership self-efficacy of student leaders.

If you have already completed the survey, I appreciate your participation.

Ben Phillips
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

(included original invitation to survey email)

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL REMINDER AND FOLLOW UP EMAIL

Dear Student Leader,

Approximately two weeks ago, I shared the following email with you as an invitation to participate in a survey regarding a research project and quantitative study examining the leadership self-efficacy of student leaders and factors that contribute and detract from student leadership participation. If you have already completed the survey, I appreciate your participation. If you have not completed the survey, I wanted to follow up with you to remind you of this invitation and request for your participation. Please see the full invitation below.

Thank you in advance for participating in this survey of instructional leadership practices and leadership self-efficacy.

Ben Phillips
Student
Georgia Southern University
College of Education, Educational Leadership

(included original invitation to survey email)