AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Walter B. Sommers for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in College Student Services Administration presented on November 1, 1991.

Title: Relationship between College Student Organization Leadership Experience and Post-College Leadership Activity

Abstract approved: J. Roger Penn

J. Roger Penn

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between college student organization leadership experience and post-college leadership activity. A questionnaire was employed to gather data to determine if there were differences by gender, academic major, and last year of attendance at OSU among former student leaders in: post-collegiate leadership activity, motivation for participation, perception of leadership skills learned, leadership skills to be emphasized, and perception of the value of the collegiate leadership experience. The content and structure of the questionnaire were developed through a study of related literature and research which provided data and formats from similar surveys.

One-way analysis of variance and chi-square tests were used to determine whether there were differences among the respondents based on enrollment in a particular academic college. Questions about membership and leadership in college student organizations, membership and leadership roles in post-college organizations, and contribution to and emphasis on skill development were analyzed using the ANOVA.

Questions about motivation for participating in college student and post-college organizations were tested using repeated measures ANOVAs with the Newman-Keuls Multiple range test, with simultaneous adjustment for gender, academic college and last year of attendance. Post-college leadership scores were compared with the last year of attendance using a Pearson product-moment correlation. A multiple regression was performed to test post-college leadership activity against selected collegiate variables. Questions regarding involvement in college student organizations, leadership skill development, and political activity were analyzed using chi-square.

The last year of attendance for each respondent was measured in frequency distributions and plotted for each question. Correlation analysis was conducted with last year of attendance and post-college leadership activity.

Based on the results of the study, the factors that have the greatest influence on post-college leadership activities were the number of college leadership activities, the involvement level, and the level of degree attained. No significant differences existed between men and women or among academic colleges with regard to the frequency of post-college activities.

This study provided evidence that there is a relationship between college student organization leadership experience and post-college leadership activity.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE AND POST-COLLEGE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY

by
Walter B. Sommers

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed November 1, 1991

Commencement June 1992

APPROVED:

J. Roger Penn

Professor of College Student Services Administration in charge of major

J. Roger Penn

Director of College Student Service Administration Graduate Program

Chair of Counselor Education and College Student Services Administration

Dean of the College of Education

John C. Ringle

Dean of the Graduate School

Date thesis is presented: November 1, 1991

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, who loves learning so much that she has never stopped and who loves and believes in me.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to expresses appreciation to the many individuals who provided support and encouragement during this study:

To Roger Penn, my major advisor, and members of my doctoral committee, Alan Sugawara, Bob Rice, Ed Bryan, and Dow Poling, for their guidance , direction and suggestions.

To Suzi Maresh for her design and statistical assistance and for spending many a long hot summer afternoon patiently and with great good humor explicating the seemingly inexplicable.

To the staff of the Student Activities Center for their love, support and continued interest in my progress.

To Don Sanderson for his faith in me as a fellow trafficker in good humor and erstwhile co-believer in the goodwill of students.

To Sue Adams for allowing me to be part of her dissertation process and providing proof that completion is possible.

To the CSSA staff, faculty, and students for wonderful friendships, thought-provoking discussions, paradigm shifting revelations and an honest concern for my preparation for entry into the profession.

To the MU staff for the opportunity to expand my knowledge of operations and procedures.

To OSU student leaders past, present, and future, thank you for giving of yourself to help our world.

To Grace without whom this study would not have been completed nor seriously attempted.

To Lauren and Beth ever my haven and goad. My children are my burden as breath is burden to the lungs, as blood is burden to the heart.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE AND POST-COLLEGE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

There is an ongoing need for leadership development in all areas of society. The college campus has traditionally been a training ground for leaders. As Miller and Jones (1980) state: "Education for leadership has been an educational mission of American colleges since the American revolution" (p. 662). Participation in college student organizations is frequently cited as providing valuable training for citizenship, development of communication skills and experience in decision making and policy formulation, as well as contributing to the development of leaders and followers (Falvey, 1952).

Bass (1981) noted that co-curricular activities have long been considered an avenue through which leadership opportunities are provided. There is growing interest among post-secondary educational institutions in providing leadership education (Anthony-Gonzales & Roberts, 1981). Recent higher education journals have contained feature articles about this trend in the nation's colleges and universities ("The Chronicle of Higher Education," 1988; *Liberal Education*, 1987). Some

leadership development programs are housed in academic departments, while many programs are the province of student activities departments within the student affairs area (Spitzberg, 1987).

However, the roots of leadership development among college students can be traced to the medieval universities of the 13th and 14th centuries. Falvey (1952) pointed out that the students owned and operated the universities of Bologna and Paris. They hired faculty, dealt with the municipalities, formulated the rules that governed the schools and influenced matters within the curriculum.

Student life in the early American colleges was in direct contrast to the student organizations in the medieval university. Altbach (1974) attributes this to the doctrine of *in loco parentis* -- whereby the college authorities took on the responsibilities of the parent. The control exerted by the college on every aspect of student life left little time for organized co-curricular activities. It was not until the formation of the literary societies that student-initiated and organized events began to take place. The literary society was the pre-eminent undergraduate activity until well after the middle of the 19th century. The literary societies were debate clubs that provided an opportunity for free and unreserved expression outside of the classroom. "Moreover, public speaking played a prominent part in the various professional pursuits for which the students were preparing. Political oratory, sermonizing, pleading a case in court, and teaching were all activities which might play a vital role in the later lives of these youths" (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976, p.47).

Following the Civil War, the dominance of the literary society as a formal student organization declined, hastened by the growth of social fraternities and intercollegiate athletics (Brubacher & Rudy, 1974). In the later 19th century several colleges and universities established student self-government systems to consult with faculty on various matters and general disciplinary control over student life. At the same time, the YMCA became one of the leading prestige organizations on campus.

Social fraternities and sororities began to develop in earnest at the turn of the century. They provided outlets for social and cultural activities and provided a sense of belonging to their members at a time when the prevailing thinking in higher education had shifted from the colonial college *in loco parentis* mode to the German influenced *laissez-faire* attitude toward the students' out-of-class life (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Falvey, 1952; Rudolph, 1962).

The 20th century saw the beginnings of the student personnel movement as an outgrowth of the psychological testing done for the armed services during World War I (Yoakum, 1919). This coincided with the American "college union movement" as student union buildings began to appear on campuses. These facilities and their related programs were to serve as the focal point of students' co-curricular activities (Butts, 1964). The advent of the student personnel movement along with the appearance of college unions or student centers and the introduction of plans for student self-government were to distinguish the American

higher education system from any other in the world (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

With the current emphasis upon leadership training, development, and education, it seems timely to assess the effects of leadership experiences upon participating students. Nearly every college and university mission states that one of its main purposes is to train useful and effective citizens, with emphasis on leadership training for community, political, and vocational service (Minihan, 1957). At Oregon State University students are similarly guided, as stated in the preamble to *The Guidelines for Oregon State University*: "they [students] will acquire the knowledge, skills, and wisdom for (a) personal development and enrichment" and " (b) responsible participation in a democratic society" (*Oregon State University General Catalogue*, 1987).

Significance of the Study

Leadership has been studied extensively. For example Bass (1981) noted 5000 published references in this area. Moreover, leadership training or the application of that intensive research, is ubiquitous throughout all institutions of society.

Interest in leadership education on college campuses has increased in recent years. According to Spitzberg (1987) between 500 and 600 programs exist on college campuses which indicates that college administrators and faculty are "paying attention to developing their students as leaders, either in the classroom or through co-curricular activities and programs" (p. 24).

A considerable proportion of the leadership education that many college students obtain is through their experience as leaders and members of student organizations. Several studies have dealt with the effects of leadership training and educations with undergraduate nursing students (Jones, 1979); college residence hall student staff (Olson, 1982); student leaders at community colleges (Marchetti, 1985; Lamoureaux, 1984); and student union leaders (Minihan, 1957). However, these studies have not directly addressed the relationship between participation in leadership activities in college student organizations and post-college leadership activities.

Statement of the Problem

Participation in college student organizations has often been praised for the valuable training it provides for citizenship, including the development of responsibility and communication skills, experience in policy making, and contributions to the development of followers and leaders (Falvey, 1952; *Role of the Union*, 1956; Minihan, 1957).

The considerable interest in leadership development in the college setting (Spitzberg, 1986; Anthony-Gonzales & Roberts, 1981) has not engendered longitudinal research regarding the outcome of the collegiate leadership experience on post-collegiate leadership activities. The problem addressed in this study has been to determine if there is a relationship between college student leadership experience and post-collegiate leadership activity.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between college student organization leadership experience and post-college leadership activity. The central issue was to determine the level of differences in post-collegiate leadership activity, motivation for participation, perception of leadership Skills Learned, perception of leadership Skills To Be Emphasized, and perception of the value of the collegiate leadership experience by gender, academic major, and last year of attendance at OSU among these former leaders of college student organizations. The results of this study will contribute to the knowledge about leadership development in post-secondary education and may help leadership educators in college co-curricular programs to determine which leadership skills to emphasize. The perceptions of the respondents may cast some light on which aspects of student organization involvement should be emphasized in the development of the leaders in college student organizations.

Research Questions

The following research questions were explored in the study.

1. What is the level of post-college leadership activities among former OSU student leaders?

HO_1: There is no significant difference in mean post-college leadership activities frequency between men and women.

HO_2: There is no significant difference in the frequency of post-college leadership activities among academic colleges.

HO_3: There is no significant relationship between post-college leadership activities frequency and last year of attendance.

2. What collegiate factors influence the frequency of post-college leadership activities among former OSU student leaders?

HO_4: There is no significant relationship between post-college leadership activities and the following leadership collegiate variables:

a. gender

b. academic college

c. number of college leadership activities

d. level of college involvement

e. motivation for participation

f. degree(s) attained

3. What are the relationships between college and post-college motives (subscales of Affiliation, Achievement, and Power) for participation in leadership activities and is the relationship affected by gender, academic college, and last year of attendance of former OSU student leaders?

HO_5: Gender and setting (college and post-college) have no effects on motivation (Affiliation, Achievement, and Power) for participation in leadership activities.

HO_6: Academic college and setting (college and post-college) have no effects on motivation (Affiliation, Achievement, and Power) for participation in leadership activities.

HO_7: There is no significant difference among last year of attendance with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

4. What skills did former student leaders develop in college leadership activities and what skills do former leaders suggest to emphasize in college leadership activities?

Limitations of the Study

This study is not an attempt to measure the value of types of leadership in which the respondents may be engaged. Rather, it is designed to measure the respondents' perceptions of the value of co-curricular activities and the respondents' opinion of the leadership skills learned and former leaders' opinions on what leadership skills need to be stressed in college leadership activities.

This study attempts to ascertain a person's motives for seeking leadership positions in college student organizations and post-college life. The results will not prove or disprove that a person who is an appointed or elected leader in a college student organization will engage in leadership activities in post-college life. However, the study may suggest whether or not participation in leadership positions in college student organizations is the kind of activity which seems to encourage later leadership activity and whether or not college co-curricular leadership activities teach skills that are helpful in post-college leadership activities. The study is also limited by the fact that the data

for the study is self-reported. The focuses on the frequency of leadership activities and makes no attempt to ascertain the quality of the leadership activity.

It must be recognized that all of the participants in the study were Oregon State University alumni(ae) and therefore the results may not be generalized.

Definition of Terms

Achievement Motive: People high in the achievement motive seek out and do better at moderate challenging tasks, take personal responsibility for their performance, seek performance feedback on how well they are doing and try new and more efficient ways of accomplishing goals. Questions 11 and 12 items d, g, j, n, o, p, q, and t of the questionnaire attempt to ascertain achievement motivation for this study.

Affiliation Motive: People high in the affiliation motive learn social relationships more quickly, engage in more dialogue with others, and show signs of maintaining their connections with other people. Questions 11 and 12 items a, b, e, f, h, k, l, r and n of the questionnaire attempt to ascertain affiliation motivation for this study.

Altruism: People with high altruism direct their actions' to others, that is they are likely to act for the good of another or humanity.

Appointed Student Leader: A student given an official leadership function within a university-recognized student organization by an elected officer(s) with constitutional authority to appoint. Officers of a

university-recognized student organization must be currently enrolled for a minimum of six (6) credits as a undergraduate students (Oregon State University Student Life Policy and Regulations, 1989).

Associated Students of Oregon State University: All enrolled students of Oregon State University are members of The Associated Students of Oregon State University (Constitution for the Associated Students of Oregon State University).

Co-curricular Activities: All the educational offerings of the institution that do not receive credit in the curriculum or are not required for graduation (Miller & Jones, 1980).

Elected Student Leader: A student given a leadership function within a university recognized student organization by a constitutionally sanctioned election process. All officers of a university recognized student organization must be currently enrolled for a minimum of six (6) credits as an undergraduate student (Oregon State University Student Life Policy and Regulations, 1989).

Interfraternity Council: The fraternities governing body for Oregon State University. The Interfraternity Council's scope of authority is legislative, judicial, administrative, and advisory [for member fraternities]...and has the power to regulate all matters of interfraternity interest (Constitution and Bylaws Interfraternity Council, Oregon State University, revised April, 1990).

Leader: An individual who holds an elected or appointed office in a college student organization or post-college civic, service,

religious/church, vocational/professional, social/recreational, or political organization.

Leadership: A set of actions that influence members of a group to move toward goal setting and goal attainment.

Leadership development program: A program deliberately structured to assist college students in developing their leadership potential. Such programs may include leadership education, training and development offered through formal coursework, seminars, workshops, retreats, lectures, individual instruction or counseling, or actual practicum experience. These programs are usually developed and taught by leadership educators.

Motivation: A reason for action. For the purpose of this study motivations consist of achievement, affiliation, and power as defined by selected items presented on the OSU Alumni Leadership survey

Memorial Union Program Council: Individuals who chair each of the Memorial Union activities committees. They shall be appointed along with other members of this Council by the Memorial Union President subject to the approval of the Board of Directors. The Program Council serves as an advisory body to the Memorial Union President. The term of office of each member of the Council shall begin at the time of appointment and continue until the end of spring term.

Panhellenic Council: The sororities governing body at Oregon State University. Panhellenic Council's scope of authority is legislative, judicial, administrative, and advisory [for member sororities]...and has the power to regulate all matters of intersorority interest. (Constitution

and Bylaws Panhellenic Council, Oregon State University, revised August, 1988).

Post-college: The period after the individual has left Oregon State University through graduation or some suspension of matriculation.

Power Motive: People high in the power motive tend to be more aggressive, have possessions that reflect prestige (eg. credit cards, expensive cars), and seek positions of public influence. Questions 11 and 12 items c, i, m, u, w and x of the questionnaire attempt to ascertain power motivation for this study.

Residence Hall Association: The student governing body that coordinates and sponsors activities common to the residence halls and represents the members of the RHA in all matters of concern to those members [all students who reside in the residence halls] (Residence Hall Association Constitution, Oregon State University, revised March, 1990).

Student Organization: An Oregon State University student organization is any group of OSU students living or acting together, electing officers, and/or assessing dues or fees for their mutual benefit and which has been officially recognized by Oregon State University.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Background

The purpose of the literature review was to establish a basis for this investigation of former leaders of college student organizations. The literature was explored for evidence that co-curricular activities and leadership experiences are forms of student involvement which produce growth and outcomes among college students. The review of previous research on the relationship between college leadership experiences and post-college leadership activity was undertaken to determine where this study parallels the existing body of literature.

A review of literature related to student leadership in college student organizations reveals a wealth of information on training programs (Clark, Freeman & Britt, 1987) and the philosophical underpinnings of leadership study (Gardner, 1986; Bass, 1981) but the review shows scant information about the long-term effects of student leadership experience (Swenson, 1983). Research on college student leadership has focused on the practical aspects of leadership training (Simond, 1979), or has attempted to identify the student leaders'

leadership style (Larkin, 1980), or has examined the effects of a particular leadership training method (Olson, 1982; Twale & Fogle, 1986; Newton, 1978). Previous studies point out that there are only a limited number of valid studies that deal specifically with measuring the relationship between college leadership activity and post-college leadership (Florestano, 1970; Schuh & Laverty, 1983; Downey, Bosco & Silver, 1984).

This review of literature consists of five sections related to the investigations of college student leadership. These sections include reviews of: (1) an overview of leadership theories and concepts; (2) an overview of student development theory; (3) leadership education in colleges and universities; (4) research studies concerning the motives of participants in college student organizations and post-college organizations, and (5) research studies concerning the relationship of college leadership participation and post-college leadership activities.

Leadership Theories and Concepts

Leadership is a sophisticated concept and as such seems to be open to interpretation. Bass (1981) says that "There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p.7). Stogdill (1974) after reviewing the leadership literature offered a broad definition that included the idea that leadership is an interaction between members of a group whereby the leader influences others' acts more than others' acts affect the leader. "Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the

motivation or competencies of others in the group" (p. 16). The operational definition for the purpose of this study is that a leader is an individual who holds an elected or appointed office in a college student organization or post-college civic, service, religious/church, vocational/professional, social/recreational, or political organization.

Stogdill (1974), in his comprehensive survey produced the following classifications of leadership: a focus of group process; personality and its effects; the art of inducing compliance; the exercise of influence; an act or behavior; a form of persuasion; a power relation; an instrument of goal achievement; an emerging effect of interaction; a differentiated role, and the initiation of structure (Bass, 1981). This list of leadership classifications is variously interwoven into leadership theories. From the list, this review will give cursory examination to the following theories of leadership: trait theory, leadership style/behavior theory, contingency theory, and exchange theory. The last two are a part of situational leadership theory.

Trait Theory

Trait theory with its corollary theories of the "great man" theory and environmental theories is perhaps the oldest of the leadership theories (Bass, 1981). Trait theory attributes leadership to the personality of the leader. Trait theory often viewed leadership in terms of individual versus the situation. Studies based on this theory attempted to identify universal traits which separated leaders from non-leaders. However, whether leadership traits are inborn-natural, or learned-

environmental, has been an ongoing controversy in management and psychology studies (Adams & Yoder, 1985; Bass, 1981). Reviews of trait studies have resulted, as Bass (1981) points out, in the suggestion "that leadership is not a matter of passive status nor mere possession of some combination of traits" (p.68). There are several limitations to the Trait Theory. First, a review of trait studies do not reveal which traits are most important for a leader, but only which traits were most often investigated by researchers. Second, the situational school of thought has pointed out that leaders who are successful in one situation may not be in another. Thus, the situation rather than inherent personal qualities may be more important to effective leadership (Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1987). More recently the study of leadership has not focused on personality traits. Social-psychological studies of group process have shown that what is effective with one group may not be effective with another (Bass, 1981).

Leadership, however, is not the result of individual personality traits but is the result of interaction between leader and follower according to Hersey & Blanchard (1988). The study of trait theory in the context of overall leadership research reveals that its greatest shortcoming is that it ignores the followers. According to Adams & Yoder (1985), researchers in the field have concluded that trait theory has not proven useful for the selection of leaders.

Leadership Style/Behavior

Recognition of the trait theory's lack of utility for identifying leaders caused research efforts to be directed at the study of leadership style and leadership behavior. Chief among the styles studied were those described on the autocratic-democratic-permissive continuum (Bass, 1981). According to Tannenbaum & Schmidt (1973) the autocratic leader retains the power. This leadership style is one in which the leader makes the decision and announces it. There is no opportunity for the members of the group to participate in the decision-making. Success or failure rests with the effectiveness of the autocratic leader. Democratic leaders provide opportunities for participative decision making. The democratic leader shares power and responsibility; decisions are a product of group participation, and communication is frequent and open. The group acts as a resource for the leader who still retains final decision making powers.

At the permissive end of the leadership continuum the leader defines the parameters of the group's role and refrains from interfering in the decision making. Frequently the leader relinquishes the mantle of authority and participates in goal setting and goal attainment as an equal member of the group (Tannenbaum & Schmidt,1973). Yukl (1981) points out that the typology developed by Tannenbaum & Schmidt (1973) is helpful for describing how a leader handles a particular decision at a particular time, but such typologies are not appropriate for classifying leaders in terms of their overall decision behavior. All leaders use a

variety of decision procedures depending on the type of decision and other aspects.

Situational Leadership

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) have proposed a theory of leadership that is the outgrowth of small group research. This theory, called situational leadership, describes leadership as a role. Roles arise from the social context in which they take place and not in isolation or not as a personality trait. They require interaction with the group. Two broad categories of leadership behavior are examined:

> Task Behavior: The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished.
>
> Relationship Behavior: The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes," and facilitating behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p.104).

Leadership is not static but changes with the variables of the situation, (i.e., the maturity of the group and the group's task orientation). Therefore, the leadership process is a function of a leader, the followers, and the situational variables.

According to Yukl (1981), situational leadership by focusing only on task and relationship variables, overlooks many different aspects of each kind of leadership behavior. Maturity is too broadly defined and does not discriminate between a confident subordinate with a difficult task, an insecure subordinate with an easy task, or a moderately secure subordinate with a moderately difficult task. The theory classifies each subordinate as equal, falling into the medium maturity classification.

The greatest contribution made by the Situational Leadership Theory is the emphasis on flexible, adaptable leadership behavior. The theory points out that it is essential to treat each subordinate differently, and to treat the same subordinate differently as the situation changes. The theory recognizes that leadership behavior can be exhibited in a skillful fashion. A particular style of leadership may be appropriate to a given situation but will only be effective if the leader has sufficient skill in using that style of leadership (Yukl, 1981).

Contingency Theory

Fiedler (1967) also focused on the situational aspects of leadership. Fiedler's model specifies a group's performance as the result of the agreement of the interaction between the leader's style and the leadership situation (Fiedler, 1967). His studies led him to conclude that it is easier to change the situation in which a leader functions than to change the basic personality style of the leader. The effective leader seeks a "fit" between self and situation. His contingency theory states that leaders' behaviors lie on a continuum from task orientation to

relationship orientation and that the most effective leadership is that which is appropriate to the particular situation. To measure leadership style, Fiedler developed the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC). This is a sixteen-item scale on which the leaders rate the one person in their life with whom they worked least well. If the least preferred co-worker is described in relatively favorable terms, the leader is concerned about good relationships with his fellow workers and is described by Fiedler as relationship-motivated. If the co-worker is described in relatively unfavorable terms, then the leader is task-motivated.

Fiedler's model has been criticized on several counts. Chief among these is that the LPC score has been frequently and arbitrarily reinterpreted. Also, since a leader is usually able to alter leader-member relations by acting more or less considerate toward subordinates, leader-member relations should be treated as an intervening variable rather than a situational variable (Yukl, 1981).

Exchange Theory

The transactional leadership theories recognize that leadership refers to the social exchange in which the leader and followers give and receive benefits. "The leadership relationship is maintained by this exchange, and also by the potential to have influence in both directions. That is, the leader is able to be influenced by followers as well as influencing them" (Hollander, 1978, p. 39).

Burns (1978) defines transactional leadership as occurring :

> when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature: a swap of goods or of one good for money; a trading of votes between a candidate and citizen or between legislators; hospitality to another person in exchange for willingness to listen to one's troubles. Each party to the bargain is conscious of the power resources and attitudes of the other... The bargainers have no enduring purpose that holds them together; hence they may go their separate ways. A leadership act took place, but it was not one that binds leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose. (p. 19)

Transactional leaders can be classified as opinion leaders, bargainers or bureaucrats, party leaders, legislative leaders, and executive leaders. Most experimental research has focused on transactional leadership (Bass, 1981).

Transformational Leadership

James McGregor Burns in his book Leadership (1978) proposed a theory of leadership that transcended previous theories. He assimilated the human development theory of Eriksen (1963), the motivation theory of Maslow's (1968) needs hierarchy, and Kohlberg's (1969) theory of cognitive moral development to construct a theory of transformational leadership.

He describes the transformational leader as one:

> who looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The results of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents (Burns, 1978, p. 4).

Burns, in using Maslow's needs hierarchy as the foundation of his theory of the transforming leader, points out that the follower cannot be concerned about an issue of a higher order when present needs exist at a lower level. According to Maslow (1968) needs range hierarchically from physiological needs to safety needs, to the need for affection and belongingness, to the need for esteem, and the need for self-actualization. As each need is met there is progress toward a higher level of need satisfaction. Leadership occurs when leaders respond to the needs of the followers. The role of the transformational leader is to raise the followers beyond their present needs and to interact or respond to a higher need; that is to transcend the current level and create change for the betterment of the follower (Burns, 1978).

Burns incorporates Kohlberg's (1969) theory of moral development into his theory of the transformational leader. Kohlberg identifies three general levels or moral thought: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional, with each level consisting of two stages. Each stage reflects a development in the ability to see the point of view of another stage, and an expanded view of what is fair.

Burns (1979) defines transactional leadership and transformational leadership as polar opposites. In defining the difference between transactional leadership in accordance with the cost-benefit, economic exchange theory and transformational leadership with elevation of need they are at opposite ends of the leadership continuum. Bass (1985) believes that a transformational leader must be transactional. He found that most leaders engage in both transactional and transformational behavior but in differing degrees. Bass (1981) further illustrates this point by giving the example of Franklin D. Roosevelt whose vision, encouragement of intellectual solutions to national problems, and charisma represent transformational leadership. At the same time Roosevelt was a master at the give-and-take, the transaction, of congressional politics; entering no battles, no matter how good the cause, unless he felt he could win.

Student Development and Student Involvement

Historically, higher education in the United States has taken responsibility for educating the whole student (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). The 1937 Student Personnel Point of View authored by the American Council of Education stated that "it was the task of colleges and universities to...assist the student in developing to the limits of his potentialities and in making his contribution to the betterment of society" (p.1). The student affairs profession assumed responsibility for developing out-of-class programs to assist in the developmental growth of the students.

Theories of human development were adapted to the postsecondary educational settings to provide theoretical bases for the programmatic models of student development. These works from such human development theorists as Eriksen, Kohlberg, and Piaget have provided the foundation for the the current student development theories and models. Rodgers (1980) has suggested four kinds of families of theory which could be used singly or in combination to provide understanding to student development. These families are cognitive development theories, psycho-social theories, person-environment interaction theories, and human/existential theories. The common theme among these theories emphasizes interaction with the environment in such a manner that the environment is both supportive and challenging. These families of theories provide the bases upon which programmatic models of intentional student development are constructed. Rodgers (1980) states that "Professionals base their practice on the best theory available and, as a consequence, hopefully are equipped to do better work, to understand why what they do works, and to have bases for adjusting to circumstances as they change" (p. 88).

Co-curricular activities have been singled out as an area where programs based upon student development theories are frequently effective in promoting student growth (Morrell & Morrell, 1986; Miller & Jones, 1980; Newton & Ender, 1978). Miller and Jones (1980) state that "research has repeatedly shown that out-of-class experience has a major impact on college students --emotionally, socially, morally, and physically as well as mentally" (p. 675). Involvement in co-curricular

activities can aid student development in self-direction, career planning, social relations, leadership, cultural awareness, recreation, and humanitarian concern (Miller & Jones, 1980). Astin (1977) found that organizational participation positively influences satisfaction with social life and instruction. Student development and learning experiences offered by campus activities and student organizations come primarily through interpersonal skills and organizational processes (Morrell & Morrell, 1986).

There is the implication that co-curricular programs based upon the student development theory will result in intentional student development. Astin's student involvement theory provides further insights into student development as it relates to participation in various college experiences.

According to Astin (1985) a highly involved student is one who is likely to spend much time studying, is frequently on campus, is active in student organizations and meets with faculty or other students often. An uninvolved student spends little time studying, makes infrequent visits to campus, ignores student organizations and makes no attempt to interact with faculty or other students. Astin (1985) defines student involvement as "the quantity and quality of physical and psychological energy the student invests in the college experience" (pp. 156-7).

Astin (1984) offers these basic postulates of student involvement:

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various "objects." The objects may be

highly generalized (the student experience) or highly specific (preparing for a chemistry exam).

2. Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum. Different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.

3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features. The extent of a student's involvement in, say, academic work can be measured quantitatively (how many hours the student spends studying) and qualitatively (does the student review and comprehend reading assignments, or does the student simply stare at the textbook and daydream?).

4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.

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

Astin examined several types of student activity including academic participation, place of residence, part-time campus employment, athletic involvement, and student government involvement. Astin (1985) cites previous research on college drop-outs (Astin, 1975), college environment (Astin, 1968), and type of college (Astin, 1977) to show that in each case "virtually every significant effect could be rationalized in terms of the involvement concept, that is, every positive factor was likely to increase

student involvement in the undergraduate experience, whereas every negative factor was likely to reduce involvement" (p. 146). Miller and Jones (1980) point out that it is relatively easy to see why the co-curriculum has a major impact on college students, since "Even students who are enrolled full-time spend only a few hours a week in the classroom, while spending the majority of their time in other pursuits" (p. 657).

The theories of student development and student involvement have found their greatest application in the co-curriculum (Morrell & Morrell, 1986; Miller & Jones, 1980; Roberts, 1981). Participation in student activities and student organizations have been seen as a major avenue for growth (Chickering, 1981; Astin, 1977). Colleges have for many years offered students ample opportunity to get involved and take more leadership in student activity programs and student government.

Leadership Education

Leaders of college student organizations have historically learned leadership skills while in the leadership position or through consultation with an activities advisor (Newton, 1975). More recently systematic efforts have been made to construct comprehensive leadership programs and delivery systems (Janosik & Lina, 1988). Spitzberg (1987) notes that there are two categories of campus-based leadership education programs: (1) the co-curricular leadership development program, most often a function of the student affairs division; and, (2) the academic course that draws mainly on social-

psychological and management studies. According to Duvall and Ender (1978) in their survey of leadership education programs, it is essential that leaders of student organizations learn group skills to be effective.

Anthony-Gonzales and Roberts (1981) have differentiated between leadership training, leadership education, and leadership development. Training consists of those activities designed to improve performance of individuals in the roles presently occupy. Education, on the other hand, represents those activities designed to improve the overall leadership competence of individuals beyond the roles presently occupy. Development consists of those activities designed to provide an interactionist environment which encourages development in an ordered hierarchical sequence of increasing complexity.

The Anthony-Gonzales and Roberts Leadership Program Model (1981) was developed to integrate the various goals and purposes of leadership programming. The methods employed in the delivery of leadership training, leadership education and leadership development may be a series of workshops, retreats, credit and non-credit courses, weekly seminars before or after business meetings, various daylong workshops, and a wide range of educational sessions on student leadership. Another method is the informal training that occurs as part of the experience in the leadership position. This approach typically includes individual meetings with the student leaders to assist them in learning individual task skills and in learning their role in group processes (Morrell & Morrell, 1986).

Motives for Involvement in College Leadership and Post-College Leadership

Cultivating the character and civic commitment of students is one of the main charges of American education. Teaching responsibility for the common good, developing independent thinking, and providing for economic contributions to society are companion goals of the academy (Krehbiel & Mackay, 1988).

The data in the book The American Freshman: Twenty Year Trends, 1966-1985 (Astin, Green & Korn, 1987) indicate that entering college students have several opinions about whether they will be involved in student organizations or participate in volunteer activities. In 1985 50.9% of the freshman college students responding felt that their leadership ability was above average or in the top ten percent; 3.4% of the respondents believed they would be elected to a student office; and 17.9% expected to join a social fraternity, sorority, or club. Becoming a community leader was important to 14.9% of the freshman responding; 15.6% responded that they considered it to be essential or very important to influence the political structure; 32.9% considered it to be essential or very important to influence social values; and 22.8% felt it was important to participate in a community action program. The respondents reported previous experiences of performing volunteer work at 70% and 26.7% reported they had served as president of one or more student organizations.

The study of motives for involvement in organizations has focused on the college campus and in the community. For the most part these

studies have centered upon the field of volunteerism. Allen (1971) points out that in the late 1960s and early 1970s, student involvement in volunteer agencies like Volunteers In Service To America and the Peace Corps spurred the study of college students' motivation.

The reported reasons for voluntary involvement include a desire to help others, an interest in the activity, and enjoyment of the work (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1986). Those who have studied altruism, voluntary action and prosocial behavior provide many reasons for individual involvement in voluntary activities. Fitch (1987) points out that most studies indicate that these motives for involvement can be divided into three categories:

> (a) altruistic, with the goal of increasing others welfare; (b) egoistic, with a goal of increasing the helper's welfare; (c) social obligation, with a goal of repaying a debt to society (p. 425).

Green (1984) examined the relationship between two types of motivation (altruistic and non-altruistic) and the perception of the volunteer experience. Forty-three college student volunteer workers at a mental hospital completed pre- and post-experience questionnaires. The pre/post-test assessed the importance of ten motivational indicators encouraging students to volunteer. Non-altruistic (e.g., useful experience for the future) were stronger than altruistic motive indicators in positive overall evaluation.

A study of college student values was conducted at Virginia Commonwealth University using a focus group of 21 students, and a 95-item questionnaire which was administered to 210 students. In the

section on altruism, 83% of the respondents felt it was essential or very important to help others who are in difficulty (McMillan, 1989).

Sergent & Sedlacek (1990) conducted a study that examined college students from four different campus volunteer organizations: Program Board, Campus Recruitment, Peer Counseling, and Service Fraternity. The subjects (N=199) responded to the Adjective Checklist (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). The results of the responses to the Adjective Checklist indicated that the volunteers differed significantly from other students on seven of the 15 motivational need subscales. Volunteers were significantly higher on heterosexuality, exhibition, autonomy, and change scales. This suggests that the act of volunteering and participating in volunteer organizations was instrumental in meeting these motivational needs.

Erwin and Marcus-Mendoza (1988) in a study of the motivation and students' participation in leadership and group activities focused on the Kuhl's theory of action versus state orientation. In this study students reported their perception of their leadership abilities, and their participation in community and church activities.

Action control, Kuhl's concept of the process that mediates between motivation and performance, has been quantified in Kuhl's Action Control Scale. The results of this study indicate that action-oriented students were more committed to making decisions in their lives, more confident in their leadership abilities, and more likely to have held office.

Fitch (1987), in a study of the characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering for community service, discovered that the students indicated that their motives for involvement in community service were both egoistic and altruistic. The sample consisted of 76 students who were members of registered student organizations whose primary aims were to provide service to the community. The author designed the Student Community Involvement Survey which contained 20 items that were possible reasons for volunteering. Three constructs -- altruistic, egoistic, and social obligation motivations -- were used as guidelines to develop the items in this section.

The results of the motivation portion of the survey showed that the respondents rated the egoistic response significantly higher than the other responses. The author suggests that this is indicative of the importance of self-interest in volunteer activities. He further suggests that it is helpful to think of volunteerism as it relates to social exchange theory, in which the exchange of costs (the altruistic or giving aspect of volunteering) and benefits (the egoistic or receiving aspect of volunteering) is basic to all interactions. Fitch concluded that volunteers in this sample may have been involved for altruistic reasons but it seems the benefits of involvement were also important to them.

According to McClelland s (1985) theory, motives drive, orient, and select behavior. The theory states that persons are motivated to do something (work, participate, or lead) based on what they hope to gain from the experience. Further, this theory of motivation is based upon the idea that people believe their behavior will lead to a desired reward or

goal (McClelland, 1985). The primary motives studied by McClelland are achievement, power and affiliation, which are defined as:

> Achievement: To accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate, or organize physical objects, human beings, or ideas. To do this as rapidly and independently as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel oneself. To rival and surpass others. To increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent.
>
> Affiliation: To draw near and enjoyably cooperate or reciprocate with an allied other (an other who resembles the subject or who likes the subject). To please and win affection of a cathected object. To adhere and remain loyal to a friend.
>
> Power: To control one's human environment. To influence or direct the behavior of others by suggestion, seduction, persuasion, or command. To dissuade, restrain, or prohibit (p. 46).

Research on achievement (McClelland, 1985) indicates that people high in achievement tend to seek out and do better at moderately challenging tasks, take personal responsibility for their performance, seek performance feed back on how well they are doing, and try new or more efficient ways of doing things. Investigations in power (McClelland, 1985) shows that people high in power tend to be more aggressive, have possessions that reflect prestige (eg. credit cards, expensive cars), and seek positions of public influence. People high in affiliation learn social relationships more quickly, engage in more dialogue with others, and

show signs of maintaining their connections with other people (McClelland, 1985).

The leadership motive pattern high in power and greater than affiliation but with controlled assertiveness or activity inhibition is typical of managers and leaders. Winter, McClelland, and Stewart (1984) found that persons who showed the leadership motive pattern in college behaved more responsibly in life ten years afterward. They had joined more voluntary organizations, were more likely to have held office in them, and participated in more political activities.

A study of the motivations of volunteers in town governments in Vermont (Luloff, Chittenden, Kriss, Weeks & Brushett, 1983) determined that the primary motives for service were "personal prestige motives" and "community service motives." McClelland has identified prestige with power. "One way individuals high in power can appear powerful in a socially acceptable way is to collect symbols of power or prestige power possessions" (McClelland, 1985, p.284). Further, leadership motive pattern investigations have shown that those identified as having leadership motive syndrome traits were more involved and joined more voluntary organizations, were more likely to have held office in them, and participated in more political activities (Winter, McClelland, & Stewart, 1984) which seems to correlate with Luloff s, et al (1983) community service motive dimensions.

Henderson (1982) in a study on the motivations and perceptions of 4-H leaders used as the basis of her inquiry McClelland's theory cited above. She attempted to discover whether the 4-H leaders were

"motivated more by power, affiliation, or achievement needs." The survey used in this study measured the direction and intensity of motivation using a seven-point Likert scale. The motivation statements were grouped into equal numbers of statements regarding power, affiliation, and achievement needs.

Henderson concluded that volunteers in 4-H were significantly more affiliation motivated than achievement or power motivated. They were most motivated by their concern about their relationships to others.

Relationship between College Leadership Experience and Post-College Leadership Activity

An early study by Bridgman (1930) for the Bell Telephone system looked at the relationship of college success to later vocational success. Approximately 3800 supervisors and executives of the Bell Telephone system were studied. The purpose of the study was to determine whether high scholarship and substantial campus achievement could be used to predict vocational success in the Bell system. Examination of the college activity record resulted in three categories of participation: substantial, some, or none being identified. These categories were based on the number of activities participated in and the degree of participation. Success criterion was annual salary adjusted to the number of years since college graduation. The study reported a significant trend for higher salaried supervisors and executives to be those subjects who participated more frequently in co-curricular activities.

In a review of research literature on the relationship of co-curricular participation to adult leadership Krumboltz (1957) noted the results of Bridgman's 1930 study as showing

> a clear and consistent trend for people with "substantial" college extra-curricular [co-curricular] achievement to receive more of the higher salaries and for people with no extra-curricular [co-curricular] achievement to receive more of the lower salaries (p.310).

Krumboltz noted that no test of significance was carried out by Bridgman and he re-computed Bridgman's data using a chi-square test. The resultant chi-square of 23.768 was significant at the .001 level, and supported Bridgman's conclusion that for college educated executives and supervisors in the Bell Telephone System, co-curricular activities were significantly related to success as measured by adjusted income.

A study reported by Minihan (1957) investigated the relationship of union committee experience at the University of Wisconsin to post-college citizenship. She polled by mail 206 former Wisconsin Union leaders and a matched group of other Wisconsin graduates beginning with the class of 1926 and concluding with the class of 1950. She found that those graduates who were involved in union activities indicated they were more active politically, benefitted more from their college activities, and identified the union activity as the most important cause for their civic and community interest.

Roskens (1958) studied the relationships between measures of co-curricular leadership and participation in college and measures of

leadership and participation in activities subsequent to graduation. For 896 subjects, data were collected from the undergraduate history on major, grade-point average, activity participation, and leadership participation and from the post-college leadership areas of occupational and military activities, political and civic activities, fraternal and religious activities, and social and recreational activities. Roskens' findings indicated that there was a positive relationship between college co-curricular leadership and participation subsequent to graduation.

In contrast, testing the hypothesis that there was a relationship between campus leadership and post-college leadership Burton (1974) matched elected campus leaders with non-leaders by semester of graduation, gender, approximate grade point-average and undergraduate degrees received. Analysis of the data collected from a mailed survey indicated that campus leaders did not hold positions of leadership in post-college organizations more frequently than did the non-leaders.

Florestano (1970) measured the relationship of college leadership and post-college leadership with the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and a leadership inventory. He concluded that former college leaders in post-college settings scored higher than matched college non-leaders on the leadership inventory. Use of the t-test indicated that four of the seven sub-scales for leadership activity successfully differentiated between leaders and non-leaders at .05 level of significance.

Schuh and Laverty (1983) surveyed former student leaders from three colleges to study their perceptions of the long-term influence of holding a significant leadership position. The focus of the study was

three-pronged: 1) an examination of the perceived influence of significant student leadership experiences on selected life activities of former student leaders; 2) a determination of the perceived influence of significant student leadership experiences on selected skills of former students, and 3) an analysis of the effects of significant leadership experiences on former student leaders from three diverse institutions of higher education.

The first section of the Schuh and Laverty questionnaire surveyed the effect student leadership experiences had on selected major activities in students lives, such as marriage, career plans, and involvement with civic organizations. The second section of the questionnaire asked the former student leaders to report their perceptions of the influence the student leadership position had on selected skills such as budgeting, organizing, and planning. Demographic information collected included the leadership position each subject had held, as well as the subject's gender and current occupation.

The results of the study led Schuh and Laverty to conclude that holding a leadership position provided similar experiences even though the postions were in three diverse colleges . Further, the former student leaders perceived their experiences to have a greater effect on their skills than on the selected activities in their later lives.

Swenson (1983) conducted a follow-up study of former student leaders from three universities (ten students were selected from each year from 1956 to 1981 for a total of 250). The response rate was 57% (143 questionnaires returned). The subjects included student government

officers, committee chairs, club presidents, residence hall officers, and fraternity officers.

The study assessed whether co-curricular participation and leadership made a positive contribution to the professional, personal, and community life of the former student leaders. Swenson concluded that former student leaders have done well in their jobs: 81% were earning more than $21,000 -- the average salary of a college graduate according to Pace (1979) -- and none of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction with their present employment. He found that the former student leaders participate actively in community affairs with an average participation of 3.52 civic organizations per respondent. The study showed that these former leaders perceived that much of the credit for their development in civic activities and job satisfaction was due to their participation in co-curricular activities.

Co-curricular activities participation was rated second in importance behind the type of degree obtained, and ahead of the academic record for experience necessary for obtaining the first professional position. In a ranking of important college experiences student leaders rated co-curricular activity participation first, student government second, academic program third, and courses in their major fourth.

Swenson did not use a comparison group of former students who were not involved of student organizations to contrast his findings. He, instead, drew upon the studies of Schuh and Laverty (1983) and Minihan (1957) and concluded that the student leaders did feel that co-curricular

activities participation made a positive contribution to their professional, personal, and community lives.

The long-term outcomes of participation in student government were studied by Downey, Bosco, and Silver (1984). "The study was undertaken to document whether or not student government association participation results in more social and personal benefits after leaving the university" (p.246).

Elected student government officers for the years 1976-1979 were selected for the study. The former student government officers (N=281) were matched with non-student government former students (N=129) on the basis of year of graduation, gender, college major, and grade point average. The response rate was 49.5% (203). A questionnaire was developed to measure college experiences including accomplishments in leadership, music, drama, literature, art and science, and employment history. Downey, Bosco, and Silver (1984) found strong evidence that students who were satisfied with their jobs had experienced a high level of student activity in college. They concluded that "although SGA membership did not contribute to life accomplishments and job factors in any systematic fashion, they were and are associated with general satisfaction in college and contribute to students feeling of well-being as do numerous other types of student activity" (p. 250).

The Human Resources Study Group of AT&T (1984) conducted a study of the relationship between various college experiences and management potential of AT&T managers. Five types of college characteristics were studied independently and in combination -- level of

education, grades, quality of undergraduate institution, major field of study and co-curricular activities.

Three separate samples were used, one longitudinal study conducted in the Bell System, one study that sampled middle-aged managers, and one study of young managers. The latter two samples were in 10 organizations outside the telephone business. The total sample size was 1,110. The data were gathered by questionnaire, interview and essay techniques.

For co-curricular activities subjects were asked to give the number of activities in which they participated for nine different categories: athletic, social, scholastic, musical, special interests, student government, school newspaper, debating, and other. Participants were also asked the number of activities in which they had leadership positions in seven categories: athletic, social, scholastic, special interests, student government, school newspaper, and other.

The results of the study indicated that the undergraduate major was the strongest predictor of managerial performance and progress, and that co-curricular activities were the second-best predictor. Such activities were related to administrative and interpersonal abilities as well as to motivation, work, and career advancement.

Summary

The studies reviewed here indicate that there is still considerable question whether participation in leadership positions in college student organizations does in fact have a relationship to post-college leadership

activities. Further, the studies on motivation for participation in college student organizations and post-college leadership activities have not been directly applied to this possible relationship. Burton (1974) did not obtain data which supported the hypothesis that there are any long-term outcomes associated with holding leadership positions in college student organizations. On the other hand, the studies of Bridgman (1930), Krumboltz (1959), Minihan (1957), Roskens (1958), Florestano (1970), Swenson (1983), Schuh and Laverty (1983), Downey, Bosco, and Silver (1984) and the Human Resources Study Group of AT&T (1984) indicated that there is a relationship between college student leadership and post-college leadership activities.

III. METHODOLOGY

The present study examined the relationship between co-curricular involvement in student organizations and post-college leadership behavior. This chapter describes the population and sample of the study, the questionnaire used to gather information on leadership, the method and collection of data, and the types of statistical analyses used to test the hypotheses developed for this investigation.

Description of Population

The population for this study consisted of former students leaders at Oregon State University from 1960 to 1985. Specifically, the population consisted of 2542 elected and appointed student officers. The population represented all student officers of the (1) Associated Students of Oregon State University, (2) the Memorial Union Program Council, (3) Residence Hall Association, (4) Interfraternity Council and (5) Panhellenic Council (see Definition of Terms pages 8-10 for descriptions of the above mentioned student organizations). Oregon State University is a co-educational post-secondary institution that through-out the

period of time studied here maintained a medium-sized enrollment (between 8,000 and 17,000 students). Oregon State University is a land-grant, sea-grant, and space grant institution which offers courses of study for baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees. The university is located in the city of Corvallis, Oregon (population approximately 43,000).

The population consisted of elected and appointed officers of (1) Associated Students of Oregon State University, (2) the Memorial Union Program Council, (3) Residence Hall Association, (4) Interfraternity Council and (5) Panhellenic Council

The OSU Alumni Office rolls revealed mailing addresses for 1388 of the 2542 former student leaders.

Selection of Sample

The sample comprised 400 randomly selected from the 1388 former student leaders who had addresses available in the Alumni Office Sample size was based on Cohen s (1969) sample size tables at .80 level of confidence and .05 level of significance.

The procedure for selecting the sample was as follows: utilizing Oregon State University's archival records, yearbooks, organizations' records and a table of random numbers subjects were selected at a number approximately equal in each organization ((1) Associated Students of Oregon State University, (2) the Memorial Union Program Council, (3) Residence Hall Association, (4) Interfraternity Council and (5) Panhellenic Council). The *Beaver Yearbook* for 1960 to 1985 was

used to determine the officers and members of the five student organizations. The OSU Alumni Office had records of mailing addresses for those former ASOSU and MUPC student leaders but did not have categories for the remaining three student organizations. Former Panhellenic and Interfraternity Council student leaders' mailing addresses were found by searching all the sorority and fraternity mailing addresses for 1960 to 1990. Former Residence Hall Association student leaders were found by a computer search of all alumni from 1960 to 1990 (the search was extended to 1990 when it was discovered that the subject may have been a former student leader in 1985 but not left school until as late as 1990).

The OSU Alumni Leadership Survey was mailed to each of the 400 subjects (description of this procedure to follow). The return rate was 60% (239). Four questionnaires were considered unusable -- two because the respondents had not served as student leaders at OSU between 1960 and 1985 and two which were returned uncompleted. The remaining 235 or 59% were usable.

Development of the Questionnaire

The data-gathering instrument employed in this study (Appendix B) was a questionnaire with seventeen individual questions. The first sections asked the number of college and post-college leadership activities the subject engaged in and the level of involvement in college and preferred level of involvement in college. The following section used a 4-point scale (1 = Slight, 2 = Moderate, 3 = Prominent, 4 = Great) to

rate co-curricular leadership experience for specific leadership skills and a similar 4-point scale to measure the amount of emphasis that leaders thought should be placed on specific leadership skills. Another section of the questionnaire solicited information regarding current or past membership in civic, religious/church, vocational/professional, service, social/recreational or political organizations, and college student organization leadership experiences. Another section of the questionnaire used a 4-point scale (1 = Not Very Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Important, 4 = Very Important) to ask respondents to rate their reasons (motivation) for participation in leadership activities at OSU and post-OSU leadership activities. For the basis of analysis concerning motivational levels, items in questions 11 and 12 were categorized into Affiliation, Achievement, and Power. Motivation for participation consisted of three subscales Affiliation, Achievement and Power as operationally defined in the Definition of Terms pages 9-13. The final section sought general demographic information regarding last year of attendance at OSU, gender, and area of study by academic college at Oregon State University.

The content and structure of the questionnaire were developed through a study of related literature and research which provided data and formats from similar surveys (Minihan, 1957; Henderson, 1981; Schuh & Laverty, 1983, Downey, Bosco, & Silver, 1984). The sections dealing with the specific leadership skills were adapted from Downey, Bosco, and Silver (1984). The questions seeking information regarding current or past membership in civic, religious/church,

vocational/professional, service, social/recreational or political organizations, and college student organization leadership experiences followed the format of research conducted by Minihan (1957). Specific definitions of civic, religious/church, vocational/professional, service, social/recreational or political organizations were supplied on the questionnaire for clarification and were not in Minihan's (1957) original study. Demograhic questions were developed to reflect the subjects' academic college.

The questionnaire was then submitted to a jury of ten student service professionals for the purpose of evaluating it for appropriate content and clarity. This committee consisted of two student union directors, two directors of student leadership development programs, one vice-president for student affairs, two directors of student activities, one director of residence life and campus activities, one student affairs counselor, and one assistant director of union programs. The revised form used by the members of the panel is found in (Appendix F). Several of the items were revised for clarity based on the experts suggestions. The final instrument used in the study is found in (Appendix B).

Collection of the Data

The format of the survey and the strategy for the collection of data were conducted in accordance with the methods developed by Dillman (1978). The first mailing, including a cover letter (Appendix A), the data gathering instrument (Appendix B), and postage paid business reply envelopes, was done in early April, 1990. The subjects were asked to

return the instrument as soon as possible. The first mailing was followed one week later by a post-card (Appendix C) which expressed thanks to those who had returned the instrument and urged those who had not to do so.

The instrument, coded so that nonrespondents could be sent follow-up reminder letters (Appendix D) which included a second copy of the instrument, was mailed three weeks after the initial mailing. The end of May was chosen as the cut-off date to receive returned questionnaires.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

Returned instruments were assigned a code number, and then the responses were entered into a data base so that the SPSS/PC+ V3.0 computer program could be utilized.

Initially, descriptive statistics including, ranges, means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions were developed for each independent variable. The choice of the statistical procedure was determined by whether the response to the question was nominal (chi-square) or interval (t-test). The data regarding the membership and leadership roles in college student organizations, contribution to and emphasis on skill development, motivation for participation in college student and post-college organizations, and membership and leadership roles in post-college organizations were analyzed using the t-test. Questions regarding involvement in college student organizations

leadership skill development, and political activity were analyzed using chi-square.

One-way analysis of variance and chi-square tests were used to examine the differences among the respondents based on enrollment in an academic college. Questions about membership and leadership in college student organizations, memberships and leadership roles in post-college organizations, contribution to and emphasis on skill development were analyzed using the ANOVA. Repeated measures ANOVAs with the Newman-Keuls Multiple Range test were used to compare questions about motivation for participation in college student and post-college organizations while simultaneously adjusting for gender, academic college and, last year of attendance. A Pearson product-moment correlation was used to compare post-college leadership scores with last year of attendance. A multiple regression was performed on post-college leadership activity and selected collegiate variables. Questions regarding involvement in college student organizations, leadership skill development and political activity were analyzed using chi-square.

The last year of attendance for the respondent was measured in frequency distributions and plotted for each question. Correlation analysis was conducted with last year of attendance and post-college leadership activity.

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter includes the following: (1) A demographic analysis of respondents; (2) A comparison of respondents and nonrespondents; (3) An analysis of the findings concerning the four research questions

This study is concerned with the relationship between college and post-college leadership activities among former Oregon State University student leaders from 1960 to 1985. The sample was drawn from student leaders who were members of five identified student organizations whose current addresses were listed with the OSU Alumni Office.

The student leaders chosen for investigation in this research were selected from the Oregon State University undergraduate classes of 1960 through 1985. The sample comprised 400 subjects who had served in co-curricular activities as elected or appointed leaders of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, the Memorial Union Program Council, the Residence Hall Association, the Interfraternity Council, or the Panhellenic Council.

Utilizing the Oregon State University archival records, yearbooks and the organizations' records, a list of 2,542 leaders names were compiled. A review the OSU Alumni Office rolls revealed mailing

addresses for 1388 of the 2542 former student leaders. The sample size of 400 was based on Cohen s (1969) sample size tables at .80 level of confidence and .05 level of significance. A table of random numbers was used to select the sample of 400.

Demographic Analysis of Respondents

A questionnaire was mailed to each of the 400 subjects. The return rate was 60% (239). Four questionnaires were considered unusable -- two because the respondents had not served as student leaders at OSU between 1960 and 1985 and two which were returned uncompleted. The remaining 235 or 59% were usable. The number of surveys returned by academic college is summarized in Table 1, by gender in Table 2 and by last year of attendance in Table 3.

Table 1: Questionnaire Return Rates by Academic College

Academic College	Sent	Return	Percent Return College	Percent Return Sample
Agriculture	30	17	57.67	7.23
Business	90	54	60.00	22.98
Education	45	30	66.67	12.77
Engineering	47	26	55.32	11.06
Forestry	6	4	66.67	1.70
Health & Human Performance	7	3	42.86	1.28
Home Economics	45	33	73.33	14.40
Liberal Arts	56	34	60.71	14.47
Pharmacy	6	5	83.33	2.13
Veterinary	--	--	--	--
Oceanography	--	--	--	--
Science	46	29	63.04	12.34
No declared major	22	--*		--
Total	400	235		

*Note: Return rate may be due to difference between Alumni Office records and respondents belief that they had a major, therefore the responses are blended into the major categories. These are former student leaders who left school before completing a degree at OSU.

Table 2: Questionnaire Return Rates by Gender

Gender	Sent	Returned	Percent Returned	Percent of total Sample
Women	185	110	59.46	46.8
Men	215	125	58.14	53.2
Total	400	235		

Table 3: Questionnaire Return Rates by Last Year of Attendance

Year	Sent	Returned	Percent Years	Percent of total Sample
1960-64	100	47	47.00	20.00
1965-69	111	61	54.95	25.96
1970-74	41	30	73.17	12.77
1975-79	52	33	64.16	14.04
1980-84	80	51	63.75	21.70
1985-	16	13	81.25	5.53
Total	400	235		

Note: Some former student leaders served prior to 1985 but continued to attend after 1985.

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Nonresponse bias was tested for the three variables of gender, academic college, and last year attended. A chi-square analysis was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the men and women who responded and those men and women who did not. No statistically significant difference was found between respondents and non-respondents (p=.80 and a chi-square of .0630). A chi-square was also performed on the variable of academic colleges. No statistically significant difference was found between respondents and non-respondents (p=.44 and a chi-square of .6.620). A t-test was used to analyze the data for non-response bias for last year of attendance. No statistically significant difference was found between respondents and non-respondents (p=.81 and a t-value of .24), that is there was no significant difference in distribution between in the last year of attendance of respondents and non-respondents

This study was designed around four research questions, three of which have derived hypotheses, outlined in chapter one. Following are the statistical analyses as they relate to each question and hypothesis.

Analysis of Research Questions

Question One: What is the level of post-college leadership activities among former OSU student leaders?

HO_1: There is no significant difference in mean post-college leadership activities frequency between men and women.

A t-test was used to test HO_1. The overall total of post-college leadership activities mean was 10.97 with a standard deviation of 10.30. Numerically the men's post-college leadership score of 11.46 was nearly one point higher than that of the women (10.48), however, the difference was not statistically significant p=.47 (Table 4). The null hypothesis was retained.

Table 4: Post-College Leadership Activities by Men and Women

Gender	Mean	N	SD	t
Women	10.48	110	9.61	.72
Men	11.46	124	10.93	

HO_2: There is no significant difference in the frequency of post-college leadership activities among academic colleges.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to test HO_2. Table 5 presents the mean post-college leadership scores by academic colleges. Numerically there were differences among the colleges with the lowest value for the College of Health and Human Performance at 5.67, and the College of Agriculture scoring the highest with 17.53. The ANOVA indicates these differences were not statistically significant with an of F=.08 . The null hypothesis was retained.

Table 5: Post-College Leadership Activities by Academic College

Academic College	Mean	N	SD
Agriculture	17.53	17	13.16
Business	10.44	54	10.26
Education	9.93	30	10.43
Engineering	7.15	26	5.41
Forestry	7.75	4	4.57
Health & Human Performance	5.67	3	3.05
Home Economics	9.79	33	6.27
Liberal Arts	11.62	34	10.32
Pharmacy	12.60	5	11.86
Science	13.93	29	14.10
Total	10.97	235	10.30

HO3: There is no significant relationship between post-college leadership activities frequency and last year of attendance.

Post-college leadership scores were plotted against last year of attendance to obtain a visual description of the relationship between post-college leadership and last year of attendance and then compared using a Pearson product-moment correlation. The resulting estimated correlation coefficient is .14 with a corresponding p-value of p=.30 (Table 6).

Table 6: Correlation Coefficient for Post-College Leadership and Last Year of Attendance

Correlation	R^2	Significance
.14	.02	.035

This result indicated that the greatest number of post-college leadership activities were reported by former student leaders who have been away the longest from OSU . The null hypothesis was rejected.

Question Two: What factors influence post-college leadership activities among former OSU student leaders?

$H0_4$: There is no significant relationship between post-college leadership activities and the following variables:

a. gender

b. academic college

c. number of college activities

d. level of college involvement

e. motivation for participation

f. degree(s) attained

The procedure followed here was to first investigate any individual effect of each variable on post-college leadership activities and then to assess the combined effect of only the statistically significant variables on post-college leadership activities

Relationship between Post-College Leadership Activities and Gender

A t-test was performed on the relationship of gender to post-college leadership activities revealing no statistically significant difference (Table 7). The mean for men was 11.46 nearly a full point higher than the 10.48 mean for women but the women had a the smaller standard deviation. The null hypothesis for gender is retained.

Table 7: Gender and Post-College Leadership Activities

Gender	Mean	N	SD	t
Women	10.48	110	9.61	.72
Men	11.46	124	10.93	

Relationship between Post-College Leadership Activities and Academic College

To test for the effect of academic college on post-college leadership activities a one-way analysis of variance was performed. The corresponding F was .08 indicating no relationship between college and

post-college leadership activities (see Table 5). The null hypothesis for academic colleges is retained.

Relationship between Post-College Leadership Activities and College Leadership Activities

To assess the relationship between college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities, a correlation coefficient was computed. The resulting coefficient (r=.36) and corresponding p-value ($p \leq .001$) suggested significant positive value correlation between college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities. As college leadership activities increase so do post-college leadership activities. The null hypothesis for college activities is rejected.

Relationship between Post-College Leadership Activities and College Involvement

The level of college involvement includes college involvement--the weekly, number of hours involved by the former student leaders and preferred college involvement--the level of involvement the respondent would have liked to have had. The degree of involvement included: (1) Very Involved (more than 7 hours per week) ; (2) Somewhat Involved (3 to 7 hours per week); (3) Not Too Involved (1 to 2 hours per week); (4) Not At All Involved. An ANOVA was performed for both levels of involvement. College involvement was found to be statistically significant at p=.02 (Table 8), while the preferred college involvement was not significant at p=.93(Table 9). The null hypothesis was rejected for college involvement

and retained for the preferred college involvement(Table 8). A Newman-Keuls Multiple Range Test was performed on the means of the Involvement Levels to determine where the significant differences were. The result showed that the Involvement Level mean for Very was significantly greater than that for Not At All. The Involvement Level means of Somewhat. and Not Too were not statistically different from the means of Not At All or Very (Table 8).

Table 8: Effect of Level of College Involvement on Post-College Leadership Activities

Involvement Level	N	Mean	SD	
Very	109	13.04	11.64	a
Somewhat	96	8.65	11.35	a,b
Not Too	25	10.52	12.20	a,b
Not At All	5	12.80	8.56	b

Note: Means followed by the same letter are not significantly statistically different. by Newman-Keuls. p=.05.

Table 9: ANOVA for Preferred College Involvement

Source of Variation	Df	SS	MS	F-ratio	F-prob.
Between Groups	2	15.27	7.64	.07	.93
Within Groups	232	24836.57	107.05		
Total	234	24851.85			

Relationship between Post-College Leadership Activities and Motivation for Participation

Motivation for participation consisted of three subscales defined in chapter I: Affiliation. Achievement. and Power. The subjects' scores were based upon responses to questions 11 and 12 of the questionnaire. Items d. g. j. n. o. p. q. and t pertained to Achievement motivation: items a. b, e, f, h. k. l. r and n pertained to Affiliation motivation and; items c, i, m, u. w and x pertained to Power motivation. A correlation coefficient was calculated between each motivation subscale and the frequency of post-college leadership activity. All three coefficients were statistically significant with $p \leq .01$ (Table 10). Post-college leadership activities increases as Affiliation. Achievement or Power increase. The null hypothesis for each subscale of motivation is rejected.

Table 10: Correlation Between Motivation and Post-College Leadership Activities

	Affiliation	Achievement	Power
Post-College Leadership Activities	.20	.15	.23
P-value	$p \leq .01$	$p \leq .01$	$p \leq .01$

Relationship between Post-College Leadership Activities and Degrees Attained

Degrees attained were examined by a one-way analysis of variance and found to be statistically significant with $p \leq .01$. The mean post-college leadership activities are presented in Table 11. As can be seen in Table 11 the mean of post-college leadership activities increases as the the level of the degree increases, with the doctorate the highest at 13.17. A Newman-Keuls analysis shows those leaders with Other and Doctorate degrees are significantly higher in post-college leadership activities means than leaders with Bachelor or Masters degrees.

Table 11: Degree and Post-College Leadership Activities

Degrees	N	Mean	
Bachelor	153	7.74	a
Master	41	8.90	a
Other	17	11.35	a,b
Doctorate	23	13.17	b

Note: Means followed by the same letter are not significantly statistically different, by Newman-Keuls, p=.05.

The Combined Effect of Collegiate Factors on Post-College Leadership Activities

A multiple regression was performed with the frequency of post-college leadership activities as the dependent variable and the following independent variables: motivation for participation subscales (Affiliation, Achievement, and Power), degree(s) attained, college involvement (hours per week), and number of college leadership activities. This procedure allows one to assess combined effects of these variables on post-college leadership activities. The resulting R square was .23. Twenty-three percent of the variability post-college leadership activities can be explained by the factors above. The greatest correlation existed between number of college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities followed by degree attained and affiliation (Table 12).

Table 12: Multiple Regression for the Combined Effect of Collegiate Factors on Post-College Leadership Activities

Source	Df	Sum of Squares	RSq Chg	F	Sig F
Achievement	1	88.69	.004	1.02	.31
Affiliation	1	373.27	.015	4.31	.039*
Power	1	298.01	.01	3.44	.065
Degree Attained	3	877.88	.04	3.38	.02*
College Involvement	3	443.85	.02	1.71	.17
OSU Leader Activity	1	1839.04	.08	21.22	.00*
Regression	10	5522.93		6.37	.00
Residual	217	18810.48			
Total	227	24333.42			

* Significant at =.05

Question Three: What are the relationships between college and post-college motives (subscales of Affiliation, Achievement, and Power) for participation in leadership activities and is this relationship affected by the gender, academic college, and last year of attendance of former OSU student leaders?

A two-factor repeated measures analysis of covariance design was used to test the above question. The between-groups factors were gender

and academic college. Last year of attendance was treated as a covariate which remains constant over levels of the within-subjects factor. The model does not include interactions among the between-groups factors because the data were too sparse to permit estimation of these effects. The within-subjects factor was setting (college and post-college). Each component of the motivation (subscale Affiliation, Achievement and Power) was analyzed separately by this method. Table 13 presents an overview of the results.

Table 13: Two Factor Repeated Measures Analysis of Covariance Design for Investigating Motivation

Effect	Affiliation	Achievement	Power
Gender	.04*	.47	.61
College	.13	.20	.87
Year	.60	.04*	.77
Setting	.49	.053	.0014**
Setting by Gender	.23	.79	.23
Setting by College	.46	.38	.053

* Significant at =.05

** Significant at =.01

HO_5: There is no significant difference between women and men with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

A statistically significant effect for gender was found for Affiliation p=.04, while gender appears to have no effect on Achievement or Power. An examination of the means for Affiliation, Achievement and Power scores (Table 14) for men and women indicates that women were more motivated by Affiliation for participation in leadership activities than men when scores are averaged over both college and post-college settings. The lower means indicate that men are less motivated by Achievement and Power after college than in college. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 14: Motivation and Gender

Gender	N	Affiliation		Achievement		Power	
		OSU	Post	OSU	Post	OSU	Post
Women	104	2.66*	2.66*	2.76	2.72	2.42	2.30
Men	122	2.44	2.50	2.77	2.66	2.51	2.37

* Significant at =.05

HO_6: There is no significant difference among academic colleges with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

There were no differences among academic colleges with respect to Affiliation, Achievement and Power. The null hypothesis was retained.

HO_7: There is no significant difference among last year of attendance with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

No relationship exists between last year of attendance and Affiliation or Power but last year of attendance was related to Achievement at p=.04. Further examination revealed a statistically significant correlation of .20 with $p \leq .01$ between year and Achievement over college and post-college settings.

The results revealed no significant difference between Affiliation in the college setting and Affiliation in the post-college setting. Although no significant difference between the college setting and post-college setting for Achievement was found, there was a p-value of p=.053. The mean Achievement scores by setting indicated that Achievement was higher for the college setting than the post-college setting (Table 15).

Table 15: Effect of Setting on Achievement Score

Setting	Mean	N
College	2.79	212
Post-College	2.69	212

Question Four: What skills did former students develop in college leadership activities and what skills need to be emphasized?

The data were rank ordered for all responses (Table 16) and rank ordered for men and women (Tables 17 & 18). Table 16 shows there is substantial agreement between skills that were learned and those the respondents felt should be emphasized as is shown those ranked within the first five. However, as can be seen by the comparing means for Skills Learned and Skills To Be Emphasized the respondents felt more strongly about the rankings in the Skills To Be Emphasized category. Group Decision-making and Assertiveness which were in the top five of Skills Learned were replaced by Understanding Others and Oral Communication in the top five of Skills To Be Emphasized. Among the lowest ranked Skills Learned in college leadership experiences when compared to the lowest ranked Skills To Be Emphasized Written Communication is replaced by Developing Personal Values.

Table 16: Five Highest and Five Lowest Ranked Means of Skills Learned and Skills to be Emphasized Overall

Rank	Skills Learned	Mean	Skills Emphasized	Mean
	Five Highest Ranked Means			
1	Taking Responsibility	3.21	Taking Responsibility	3.48
2	Getting Along With Others	3.15	Understanding Others	3.41
3	Organizing Work	3.06	Getting Along With Others	3.39
4	Group Decision-making	3.04	Organizing Work	3.29
5	Learning Assertiveness	2.94	Oral Communications	3.25
	Five Lowest Ranked Means			
14	Specialized Knowledge	2.23	Developing Personal Values	2.80
15	Help Others with Life Problems	2.18	Budgeting Finances	2.63
16	Written Communication	2.06	Specialized Knowledge	2.51
17	Budgeting Finances	2.04	Help Others with Life Problems	2.33
18	Technical Tasks	1.96	Technical Tasks	2.08

Table 17: Five Highest and Five Lowest Ranked Means of Skills Learned for Women and Men

Rank	Women	Mean	Men	Mean
		Five Highest Ranked Means		
1	Taking Responsibility	3.21	Taking Responsibility	3.21
2	Getting Along With Others	3.12	Getting Along With Others	3.16
3	Organizing Work	3.09	Group Decision-making	3.06
4	Group Decision-making	3.02	Organizing Work	3.02
5	Learning Assertiveness	2.94	Understanding Others	2.98
		Five Lowest Ranked Means		
14	Specialized Knowledge	2.18	Specialized Knowledge	2.27
15	Help Others with Life Problems	2.16	Help Others with Life Problems	2.21
16	Technical Tasks	2.04	Budgeting Finances	2.20
17	Written Communication	2.03	Written Communication	2.10
18	Budgeting Finances	1.87	Technical Tasks	1.88

Table 18 : Five Highest and Five Lowest Ranked Means of Skills to be Emphasized for Women and Men

Rank	Women	Mean	Men	Mean
	Five Highest Ranked Means			
1	Taking Responsibility	3.51	Taking Responsibility	3.45
2	Getting Along With Others	3.46	Understanding Others	3.38
3	Understanding Others	3.43	Oral Communications	3.33
4	Organizing Work	3.33	Getting Along With Others	3.33
5	Delegating Authority	3.23	Group Decision-making	3.26
	Five Lowest Ranked Means			
14	Developing Personal Values	2.77	Developing Personal Values	2.85
15	Budgeting Finances	2.67	Budgeting Finances	2.61
16	Specialized Knowledge	2.60	Specialized Knowledge	2.44
17	Help Others with Life Problems	2.35	Help Others with Life Problems	2.32
18	Technical Tasks	2.17	Technical Tasks	2.01

The first four positions.of Skills Learned have the same Skills Learned for both women and men. Taking Responsibility and Getting Along With Others were ranked first and second. Women ranked Organizing Work third and Group Decision-making fourth. Men ranked Group Decision-making third and Organizing Work fourth. In the fifth position women ranked Learning Assertiveness while men ranked Understanding Others. Skills to be Emphasized show a greater difference

between men and women for the top five. They agree on Taking Responsibility, Understanding Others, and Getting Along With Others. Women rank Organizing Work and Delegating Authority in the top five while men rank Oral Communications and Group Decision Making among the top five skills.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between college student organization leadership experience and post-college leadership activity. Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What is the level of post-college leadership activities among former OSU student leaders?
2. What collegiate factors influence post-college leadership activities among former OSU student leaders?
3. What are the relationships between college and post-college motives (subscales of Affiliation, Achievement, and Power) for participation in leadership activities and are these relationship affected by gender, academic college, and last year of attendance of former OSU student leaders?
4. What skills did former students develop in college leadership activities and what skills need to be emphasized?

The focus in this study was to determine whether there is a relationship between college student leadership experience and post-collegiate leadership activity. The subjects for investigation in this research were selected from the Oregon State University undergraduate and graduate classes of 1960 through 1985. The sample consisted of 400 students who had served in co-curricular activities as elected or appointed leaders of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, the Memorial Union Program Council, Residence Hall Association, Interfraternity Council, or Panhellenic Council.

The nature of the investigation required the assessment of post-college leadership activities, motivation for participation in leadership activities, college leadership variables, and the former student leaders' perception of leadership skills learned and leadership skills to be emphasized. Using previous research in the field of leadership study, an instrument was developed to collect these data.

Descriptive statistics, including means, ranges, standard deviations, and frequency distributions were developed for each independent variable. The choice of the statistical procedure was determined by whether the response to the question was nominal (chi-square) or interval (t-test). The data regarding the membership and leadership roles in college student organizations, contribution to and emphasis on skill development, motivation for participation in college student and post-college organizations, and membership and leadership roles in post-college organizations were analyzed using the t-test. A correlation coefficient was computed for the subscales of motivation for

participation and a multiple regression was performed with gender, academic college, last year of attendance, and the subscales of motivation for participation.

One-way analysis of variance and the chi-square test were used to examine the differences among the respondents based on academic college. Questions about membership and leadership in college student organizations, membership and leadership roles in post-college organizations, and contribution to and emphasis on skill development were analyzed using the ANOVA. Questions about motivation for participating in college student and post-college organizations were tested using repeated measures ANOVAs with the Newman-Keuls Multiple range test, with simultaneous adjustment for gender, academic college and last year of attendance. Questions regarding involvement in college student organizations, leadership skill development, and political activity were analyzed using chi-square.

Frequency distributions and plots of the last year of attendance for the respondent were taken for each question. Frequency distributions were found for questions regarding political involvement. A confidence level of .05 was used for testing the null hypotheses for all statistical tests.

Null hypothesis one stated there is no significant difference in frequency of post-college leadership activities between men and women. Numerically the men's post-college leadership score was nearly one point higher than that of the women; however, the difference was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis is retained. One possible

interpretation for the differences between men and women may be viewed by examining differences between the means and the standard deviations. Although the men's mean was 11.46 the standard deviation was 10.93, while the women's mean was 10.48 with a standard deviation of 9.61. The greater difference between mean and standard deviation for women may indicate that there are more women involved in post-college leadership activities but that they are involved in fewer activities. On the other hand the smaller difference between mean and standard deviation for men may indicate there are fewer men involved in post-college leadership activities but each individual is involved in more activities.

Null hypothesis two stated there are no significant differences in post-college leadership activities frequency among students enrolled in different academic colleges. Analysis to test null hypothesis two showed that there were differences among the respondents enrolled in different colleges. Numerically, the College of Health and Human Performance had the lowest value at 5.67, while the College of Agriculture was highest at 17.53. These differences were not statistically significant; therefore the null hypothesis is retained. Due to the small numbers of student leaders surveyed in some of the academic colleges it was very difficult to acquire an accurate picture of the real differences among the colleges. The range of means suggests, however, that post-college leadership activity leadership exists among alumni of all the academic colleges.

Null hypothesis three stated there is no relationship between post-college leadership activities frequency and last year of attendance. Post-

college leadership scores were plotted against last year of attendance to obtain a visual depiction of the relationship between the two. The estimated correlation co-efficient=.14 with a corresponding p-value of p=.035 was found. The results indicated that a greater number of post-college leadership activities were reported by former student leaders who have been away from OSU longest. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Swenson s (1983) study of former student leaders from three universities over a period of 25 years reports a mean of 3.52 for post-college leadership activities. The overall mean for post-college leadership activities for the present study was 10.97, considerably higher than Swenson's findings. An examination of Swenson's study shows that his survey assessed whether co-curricular activities made a positive contribution to the professional, personal, and community life of the former student leaders. The present study focused on college and post-college leadership activities (past and current) and, by specifying and naming possible community activities, may have stimulated the respondents' recall and therefore generated a more accurate picture.

Null hypothesis four stated there is no relationship between the frequency of post-college leadership activities and the following variables: gender, academic college, number of college activities, level of college involvement, motivation for participation, and degree(s) attained. First, the individual effects of each variable on post-college leadership activities were investigated and then the combined effect of only the statistically significant variables on post-college leadership activities was assessed. A t-test performed on the relationship between a person's gender and post-

college leadership activities revealed no statistically significant difference. The null hypothesis for gender is retained. See null hypothesis one above.

To test for the effect of academic college on post-college leadership activities, a one-way analysis of variance was performed. No relationship between the respondents' academic college and post-college leadership activities was found. The null hypothesis for academic colleges was retained.

To assess the relationship between college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities a correlation coefficient was computed. A positive value correlation between the two variables was found. As college leadership activities increase so do post-college leadership activities. The null hypothesis for college activities was rejected.

Examination of college involvement by the former student leaders looked at the issues of college involvement (the number of hours former student leaders were involved per week) and preferred college involvement (the level of involvement the respondents would have liked). In indicating the level of involvement, respondents had four choices: Very Involved (more than seven hours per week), Somewhat Involved (three to seven hours per week), Not Too Involved (one to two hours per week), and Not At All Involved. College involvement was found to be statistically significant at $p=.02$, while the preferred college involvement was not significant at $p=.93$. The null hypothesis was rejected for college involvement and retained for the preferred college involvement.

Motivation for participation consists of three subscales: Affiliation, Achievement, and Power. A correlation coefficient was calculated for each motivation subscale for post-college leadership activities. All three coefficients were statistically significant. Post-college leadership activities increase as Affiliation, Achievement, or Power increases. The null hypothesis for each subscale of motivation is rejected.

Degrees attained was examined by a one-way analysis of variance and found to be statistically significant. The mean of post-college leadership activities increased as the the level of the degree increased, with the doctorate being the highest. The null hypothesis for degrees attained was rejected.

A multiple regression was performed with post-college leadership activities the dependent variable and the following independent variables: motivation for participation subscales (Affiliation, Achievement, and Power), degree(s) attained, college involvement (hours per week), and number of college activities. This procedure allowed assessment of the combined effects of these variables on post-college leadership activities. It was found that twenty-three percent of the variability of post-college leadership activities could be explained by the factors above.

Null hypothesis five stated there is no significant difference between women and men with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

Null hypothesis six stated there is no significant difference among academic colleges with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

Null hypothesis seven stated there is no significant difference for the last year of attendance with respect to motivation for participation in leadership activities in either the college or post-college setting.

A two-factor repeated measures analysis of covariance design was used to test hypotheses five and six. The between-groups factors were gender and academic college. Last year of attendance was treated as a covariate and remained constant over levels of the within-subjects factor. The within-subjects factor was setting (college and post-college). Each component of the motivation subscale (Affiliation, Achievement and, Power) was analyzed separately by this method.

A statistically significant effect of the respondent's gender was found for Affiliation while the respondent's gender appears to have no effect on Achievement or Power. The mean Affiliation scores for men and women indicate that women are more motivated by Affiliation for participation in leadership activities than men in both college and post-college settings. Null hypothesis five was rejected.

There were no differences among academic colleges with respect to Affiliation and Achievement. There was no main effect of academic college for Power. Null hypothesis six was retained.

No relationship existed between last year of attendance and Affiliation or Power but last year of attendance was related to Achievement. Further examination revealed a statistically significant correlation between last year of attendance and Achievement over college and post-college settings. The results revealed no significant difference between Affiliation in the college setting and Affiliation in the post-

college setting. There did not exist a significant difference between the college setting and post-college setting for Achievement. The mean Achievement scores by setting indicated that Achievement was higher for the college setting than the post-college setting. Null hypothesis seven was retained.

Conclusions

This research focused on determining whether a relationship existed between college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities. Table 4 (page 51) shows the post-college leadership activities means: 11.46 for men and 10.48 for women. This number of post-college leadership activities would seem to indicate that, in fact, participation in college leadership activities will lead to participation in post-college leadership activities. This supports the studies of Minihan (1957) who found that former student leaders of the Wisconsin Union indicated they were more active politically, benefited more from their college activities, identified the union activity as the most important cause for their civic and community interest, and were more active in post-college leadership activities than a control group. In addition, Roskens (1958) found a positive relationship between college co-curricular leadership and participation in post-college leadership activities subsequent to graduation. Swenson's (1983) follow-up study of former student leaders from three universities from 1956 to 1981, found the former student leaders participated actively in community affairs with an average

participation of 3.52 civic organizations per respondent. The conclusion from these studies is that participation in college leadership activities will lead to participation in post-college leadership activities.

Whether the former student leader is a man or woman has no significant impact on the number of post-college leadership activities; nor does the academic college from which the student received his or her degree significantly effect the number of post-college leadership activities.

The factors that seemed to have the greatest influence on post-college leadership activities were the number of college leadership activities, the involvement level, and the level of degree attained. A higher number of college leadership activities indicates a greater the number of post-college leadership activities. Likewise the greater number of hours a student was involved in weekly, the greater the number of post-college leadership activities the person was likely to be involved in. And, the higher the degree a respondent earned, the greater the number of post-college leadership activities he or she was likely to be involved in.

Assessment of motivation for participation in college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities indicated that women are more likely than men to be motivated by Affiliation. Henderson (1982) concluded that volunteers in 4-H were significantly more motivated by Affiliation than by Achievement or Power. They were most motivated by their concern about their relationships to others.

In the Power means, there were significant differences among respondents based on the academic college from which they earned their degrees. The Power means for post-college leadership activities were less

than for college leadership activities, however, indicating that Power was less of a motivation for participating in leadership activities after college than during college. This finding may be suspect due to the small N for some colleges making accurate comparison difficult. The composite college/post-college setting for Achievement did not indicate that Achievement motivation was greater for college leadership activities than for post-college leadership activities, although there was a p-value of p=.053.

The means for Skills Learned and the Skills To Be Emphasized were high, indicating that former student leaders felt strongly that the skills area of college student leadership experience was valuable to them and is valuable to current and future students. Responses by both men and women were very similar in ranking the Skills Learned and the Skills To Be Emphasized. Since Skills Learned and Skills To Be Emphasized both involve skills in dealing with people, it appears that upon reflection the respondents determined that such skills are most necessary in leadership positions. There is great congruence between the Skills Learned and Skills To Be Emphasized; however, an examination of the means suggests that the respondents felt the skills they selected should receive even greater emphasis. Among the five highest ranked Skills Learned, women included Learning Assertiveness and men included Understanding Others. Among the five highest ranked Skills To Be Emphasized, women included Delegating Authority and men included Oral Communications. It appears that the subjects believed the Skills To Be Emphasized and those Skills Learned are very congruent. Schuh

and Laverty (1983), in their study of the former student leaders' perceptions of the long-term influence of holding a significant leadership position, found the former student leaders perceived their experiences to have a greater effect on their skills than on selected activities in their later lives. Swenson's (1983) follow-up study of former student leaders from three universities from 1956 to 1981, found the former student leaders attributed much of the credit for their development in civic activities and job satisfaction to their participation in co-curricular activities. An inference from the Swenson study could be that this satisfaction is due to skills learned during their student leadership experience.

The findings of this research support the studies of Bridgman (1930), Krumboltz (1959), Minihan (1957), Roskens (1958), Florestano (1970), Swenson (1983), and Human Resources Study Group of AT&T (1984) that there is a positive relationship between college student leadership and post-college leadership activities.

Implications

The level of post-college activities found by this study confirms the research of Bridgman (1930), Krumboltz (1959), Minihan (1957), Roskens (1958), Florestano (1970), Swenson (1983), and Human Resources Study Group of AT&T (1984) that there does exist a positive relationship between college leadership activities and post-college leadership activities. Of the factors tested in the present study that contributed to

the 23% correlation, the frequency of student leadership activities was the strongest.

This study is unique in its attempt to examine student leaders by academic major. The findings were inconclusive, primarily due to the small number of subjects in some of the colleges. It would be of interest to examine these questions with a larger sample from those colleges.

One of the objectives of the study was to identify factors that promote leadership development and would be useful for student affairs divisions in colleges and universities in developing their leadership education programs. College student leadership activities are often allowed to happen without legitimate educational objectives and without feedback from former student leaders. The information about the perceptions of former student leaders regarding Skills Learned and Skills to be Emphasized collected through this study can assist the planners of leadership courses and advisors to student organizations. Accordingly, courses, workshops, consultation on organizational development, and people management skills are important aspects to stress, while the technical skills of budget management are less important. The comments of the respondents generally indicate that the college leadership experience was most valuable in teaching them to work with and manage others, while the classroom and laboratory experiences provided the technical skills they needed.

As Miller and Jones (1980) state "Education for leadership has been an educational mission of American colleges since the American revolution" (p. 662). Participation in college student organizations is

frequently cited as providing valuable training for citizenship, development of communication skills, experience in decision making and policy formulation, and contributions to the development of leaders and followers (Falvey, 1952). The changing demographics of higher education require that student affairs staffs broaden the horizons of the leadership experience and reach those non-traditional students so that higher education's tradition of education for leadership can be an opportunity in which all student populations may participate. The findings from this study support the value of participation in college leadership activities and reinforce the necessity of student affairs and academic affairs to create an educational environment to guide leadership development.

In Chapter II, the link between student development and leadership development was examined and established. Intentional development for students and student leaders has firm foundations in educational theory (Astin, 1985; Anthony-Gonzales & Roberts, 1981; Miller & Jones, 1980). Education for leadership and leadership development should continue to be recognized as a central mission for higher education.

An important finding of this study is that the longer the former student leaders have been out of college the more active they have become in post-college leadership activity. It would then appear that the life-long implication is that this pattern for leadership involvement continues through out the former student leaders' lives.

Recommendations

The study of leadership has a long history as is shown in Chapter II. More recently, leadership development on college campuses has become the focus of much study. However, there is a paucity of research about the relationship between college leadership activity and post-college leadership. In order to expand this body of knowledge and to continue the effort to learn more about college student leadership and its influence on participation in leadership activities after college, the following research is recommended:

1. Replicate the present study using samples from other colleges and universities so the results can be generalized to groups other than OSU students.
2. Change the research design to add a control group of former OSU students who were not participants in college leadership activities in order to determine if there is difference in post-college leadership activities between leaders and non-leaders.
3. Investigate the relationship between the motivation subscales for leadership activities separately for each type of post-college organization identified (civic, religious/church, vocational/professional, service, social/recreational, political).
4. Replicate the present study using other student populations that participate in less traditional college leadership activities. Research could be conducted with

college athletes, student food service employees, and residence hall assistants, for example.

5. Replicate the present study using other student populations that participate in college leadership activities. Research could be conducted with ethnic minority students and international students.

6. Replicate the present study to determine if the findings can be reproduced.

It is further recommended, in order to broaden the opportunities for leadership, that the following programmatic suggestions be given serious consideration:

1. An extensive credit-bearing new student orientation course should be instituted that focuses not only on the technical and social skills of college survival but on promoting and sustaining leadership activities. Particular emphasis should be placed on encouraging the emerging student leader from non-traditional student populations.

2. The concept of leadership as service could and should be emphasized through a strong program of volunteer service. This could be further enhanced through credit-bearing internships and practicums in the appropriate disciplines.

3. Leadership education for college student leaders should be a multi-faceted learning experience combining people management skills with technical expertise in an environment that promotes experimentation and risk. A co-curricular program that supports leadership education must combine student development theory and leadership theory.

4. For women, recruitment for participation in co-curricular activities should emphasize affiliation aspects, and training should stress affiliation techniques.

5. Alumni should be invited to share their experiences as student leaders and how those skills acquired in co-curricular activities have assisted them in their personal, civic, and professional lives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. & Yoder, J. (1985). *Effective leadership for women and men.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press.

Allen, K. (1971). What motivates volunteers. *Synergist, 1*(1), 49-54.

Altbach, P. G.. (1974). *Student policies in America.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Anthony-Gonzales, P.& Roberts, D.C. (1981) A comprehensive leadership program model. In D. Roberts (Ed.) *Student leadership programs in higher education.* Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association.

Astin, A. W. (1968). *The college environment.* Washington D.C.: American College Council Education.

Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297-308.

Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., Green, K. C. & Korn, W.S. (1987). *The American freshmen: Twenty year trends, 1966-1985.* Los Angeles: American Council on Education and University of California at Los Angeles.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership.* New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation.* New York: The Free Press.

Bridgman, D. S. (1930). Success in college and business. *Personnel Journal,* 9(1), 1-19.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition.* New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, G. P. (1978). *The principles of leadership.* San Antonio, TX: Our Lady of the Lake University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 154 700)

Burton, A. S. (1974). *A comparative study in post-college leadership activities between college graduates selected as leaders and non-leaders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Butts, P. (1964). The college union story. *Journal of the American Institute of Architects*, March, 59-67.

Chickering, A. W. (1981). Potential contributions of college unions to student development. In W. M. Klepper (Ed.), *The impact of college unions and their programs on today's student.* Stanford, CA: Association of College Unions - International.

The Chronicle of Higher Education (1988). 35(7).

Clark, M. B., Freeman, F. H. & Britt, S. K. (1987). *Leadership education, '87: A sourcebook for those planning programs and teaching courses in leadership.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Cohen, J. (1969) *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences.* New York: Academic Press.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Downey, R.G., Bosco P. & Silver, J. (1984). Long-term outcomes of participation in student government. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(3), 245-250.

Duvall, W. H. & Ender, K. L. (1978). A training model for developing leadership awareness. In F. B. Newton & K. L. Ender (Eds.), *Student development practices: Strategies for making a difference.* (pp. 145-168). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Eriksen, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society.* New York: Norton.

Erwin, T. D., & Marcus-Mendoza, S.T. (1988). Motivation and participation in leadership and group activities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 28, 356-361.

Falvey, F. E. (1952). *Student participation in college administration.* New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fitch, R. T. (1987. Characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering for community service. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28, 428-430.

Florestano, T. E. (1970). *The relationship of college leadership and post-college leadership as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and a leadership inventory.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Gardner, J. W. (1986). The nature of leadership: Introductory considerations. *Leadership papers/1*, Washington, D. C.: Independent Sector.

Gough, N. G. &Heilbrun, A. B. (1983). *The adjective checklist manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Green, S. (1984). *Volunteer motivation and its relationship to satisfaction and future volunteering.* In paper presented at the 92nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association.. Toronto, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 251 640)

Henderson, K. A. (1981). Motivations and perceptions of volunteerism as a leisure activity. *Journal of Leisure Research, 13*(3), 209-218.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior.* (rev. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hillway, T. (1969). *Handbook of educational research.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hodgkinson, V. A., & Weitzman, M. S. (1986). *Dimensions of the independent sector: A statistical profile.* Washington, D. C.: Independent Sector.

Hollander, E. P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics.* New York: The Free Press.

Hollander, E. P. (1987). Social psychological perspectives on leadership. *Liberal Education, 73*(2), 9-15.

Human Resources Study Group of AT&T (1984). *College experiences and managerial performance.* New York: Author.

Janosik, S. M., & Lina, J. A. (1988). A comprehensive planning model and delivery system for leadership training programs. *National Association Student Personnel Administrators, 25*(3), 180-184.

Jones, L. K. (1979). *The effect of a management course on leadership knowledge and behavior of baccalaureate nursing students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis OR.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-development approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research,* pp. 347-480. New York: Rand McNally.

Krehbiel, L. E., & Mackay, K. (1988). Volunteer work by undergraduates. *ERIC Digest*: Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 308 801)

Krumboltz, J. D. (1957). The relation of extracurricular participation to leadership criteria. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 35, 307-314.

Lamoureaux, G. P. (1984). *Leadership training: A special focus on Berkshire community college student leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Larkin, W. D. (1980). *The leadership skills needed by 4-H club members to become effective leaders as perceived by 4-H extension agents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Liberal Education (1987). *Association of American Colleges*, 71(2).

Luloff, A. E., Chittenden, W. H., Kriss, H., Weeks, S., & Brushett, L. (1983). *Characteristics, motivations, and costs to the community of town government volunteers*. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire, Durham Agricultural Experiment Station. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 274 492)

Marchetti, J. J. (1985). *Leadership training programs for student leaders on two-year college/university campuses (extracurricular, programming, student development)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, & Co.

McMillan, J. H. (1989). *Conceptualizing and assessing college student values.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco: CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 306 274)

Miller, T. K., & Jones, J. D. (1980). Out-of-class activities In A. Chickering (Ed.) *The modern American college.* (pp 675-671). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Minihan, A., (1957). *The college union and preparation for citizenship.* Ithica, NY: Association of College Unions-International

Morrell, S. A., & Morrell, R. C. (1986). Learning ;through student activities. In P. S. Breivik (Ed.), *New directions in higher education: Managing programs for learning outside the classroom,* pp. 77-87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newton, F. B., & Ender, K. L. (Eds.) (1978). *Student development practices: Strategies for making a difference.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Newton, F. B. (1981). Process of building leadership programs. In D. Roberts (Ed.) *Student leadership programs in higher education.* Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association.

Olson, A. (1982). *The effects of leadership training and leadership experiences on student development.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, Seattle, WA.

Pace, C. R. (1979). *Measuring college outcomes.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roberts, D. C. (Ed.) (1981). *Student leadership programs in higher education.* Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association.

Rodgers, R. F. (1980). Underlying student development. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), *Student development in higher education: Theories, practices, and future directions.* (pp. 10-96). Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association.

Roskens, R. W. (1958). *The relationship between leadership participation in college and after college.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university, a history.* New York: Knopf.

Sergent, M. T. & Sedlacek, W. E. (1990). Volunteer motivations across student organizations: A test of person environment fit theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*(3), 255-61.

Schuh, J. H., & Laverty, M. (1983). The perceived longterm influence of holding a significant student leadership position. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*(1), 28-32.

Simond, P. W. (1979). *Leadership training programs for college student leaders: A descriptive study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, New York.

Spitzberg, I. J. (1987). Paths of inquiry into leadership. *Liberal Education, 73*(2), 24-34.

Stogdill. R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Swenson, M. (1983). Follow-up on student activities leaders. *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International*, pp. 85-87.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H, (1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 51, 162-180.

Twale, D., & Fogle, R. (1986). Learning leadershop develops students, builds group unity. *Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International*, 54(4), 8-10.

Winter, D. G., McClelland, D. C., & Stewart, A. J. (1984). *A new case for the liberal arts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yoakum, C. S. (1919). Plan for a personnel bureau in educational institutions. In G. L. Saddlemire & A. L. Rentz (Eds.) *Student affairs - a professions heritage: Significant articles, authors, and documents*. (pp. 4-8). Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Cover Letter

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Student Organization Development Program
Memorial Union East/Student Activities Center
Corvallis, OR 97331

Dear

In the past few years there has been a lot of discussion about leadership in America. Some of the questions being asked include these: who will our future leaders be; how do they come into leadership roles; and what can be done to prepare them. We are conducting this study because we feel that you, having held a leadership position in college, are uniquely qualified to provide insights into leadership preparation.

You, a former student leader, are one of the small number of qualified students being asked to give your opinion and information on this matter. In order that the results will be truly representative of the thinking of past college student leaders from OSU , it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this questionnaire will be made available to the administrators and staff in the Memorial Union and the division of Student Affairs at OSU to help us fine tune our current leadership training programs. You may receive a summary of the results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing you name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (503) 737-2101.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Walt Sommers
Program Director

Appendix B
Questionnaire

Oregon State University Alumni Leadership Survey

Q-1. Please indicate the number of college student organizations at Oregon State University in which you held membership.

Number of Organizations _____

Q-2. Please indicate the number of leadership roles which you held in college student organizations at Oregon State University (i.e., committee chair, president, or executive officer, board member, project director, etc.).

Number of Leadership Roles _____

Q-3. Using the following scale, how involved were you in college student organizations at OSU? (Circle one number)

1. Very Involved (more than 7 hours per week)
2. Somewhat Involved (2 to 7 hours per week)
3. Not Too Involved (1 to 2 hours per week)
4. Not at All Involved (less than 1 hour per week)

Q-4. Looking back, if you had it to do over again, how involved would you become in student organizations? (Circle one number)

1. Same Involvement
2. More Involvement
3. Less Involvement

→ → Q-4a. Briefly, why is that?

Q-5. Did your participation in the leadership role in student organizations at OSU contribute slightly, moderately, prominently, or greatly to your development of the following skills? (Circle one number for each)

	Level of Contribution			
	Slight	*Moderate*	*Prominent*	*Great*
a. Oral communication	1	2	3	4
b. Written communication	1	2	3	4
c. Taking responsibility	1	2	3	4
d. Delegating authority	1	2	3	4
e. Understanding the point of view of others	1	2	3	4
f. Organizing (work, projects)	1	2	3	4
g. Thinking on your feet	1	2	3	4
h Getting along with others	1	2	3	4

(Please turn the page)

	Level of Contribution			
	Slight	*Moderate*	*Prominent*	*Great*
i. Contributing to group decision making	1	2	3	4
j. Thinking independently	1	2	3	4
k. Solving problems	1	2	3	4
l. Performing technical tasks	1	2	3	4
m. Using specialized knowledge to advise policy makers or planners	1	2	3	4
n. Developing personal values	1	2	3	4
o. Budgeting finances	1	2	3	4
p. Helping others with life's problems	1	2	3	4
q. Developing self-awareness	1	2	3	4
r. Learning assertiveness	1	2	3	4

Q-6. How much emphasis do you believe should be placed on the development of the following leadership skills while participating in college student organizations? (Circle one number for each)

	Level of Emphasis			
	Slight	*Moderate*	*Prominent*	*Great*
a. Oral communication	1	2	3	4
b. Written communication	1	2	3	4
c. Taking responsibility	1	2	3	4
d. Delegating authority	1	2	3	4
e. Understanding the point of view of others	1	2	3	4
f. Organizing (work, projects)	1	2	3	4
g. Thinking on your feet	1	2	3	4
h. Getting along with others	1	2	3	4
i. Contributing to group decision making	1	2	3	4
j. Thinking independently	1	2	3	4
k. Solving problems	1	2	3	4
l. Performing technical tasks	1	2	3	4
m. Using specialized knowledge to advise policy makers or planners	1	2	3	4
n. Developing personal values	1	2	3	4
o. Budgeting finances	1	2	3	4
p. Helping others with life's problems	1	2	3	4
q. Developing self-awareness	1	2	3	4
r. Learning assertiveness	1	2	3	4

(Please go on to the next page)

Q-7. Please indicate the number of memberships and leadership posts (committee chair, president, or executive officer, board member, project director) which you currently hold or have held in these or similar organizations, if any, since you left college. If none please write zero (0).

	Number of Memberships	Number of Leadership Posts
a. CIVIC (Chamber of Commerce, Board of Education).	_____	_____
b. RELIGIOUS/CHURCH (Knights of Columbus, Church)	_____	_____
c. VOCATIONAL/PROFESSIONAL (American Institute of CPA's, Oregon Education Association)	_____	_____
d. SERVICE (Altrusa, Rotary, Kiwanis)	_____	_____
e. SOCIAL/RECREATIONAL (Community Theater Group, Community LaCrosse League).	_____	_____
f. POLITICAL (State Democratic Club, County Republican Club)	_____	_____

Q-8. Did you vote in the most recent local, state, national elections? (Circle one number for each)

	YES	NO
a. Local	1	2
b. State	1	2
c. National	1	2

Q-9. Did you campaign in the most recent local, state, national levels elections or have you campaigned in past elections for or against ballot measures and/or candidates? (Circle one number for each)

	YES	NO
a. Local	1	2
b. State	1	2
c. National	1	2

Q-10. Were you ever been a candidate for elected office at any of the following levels? (Circle one number for each)

	YES	NO
a. Local	1	2
b. State	1	2
c. National	1	2

Q-11. Thinking about your reasons for involvement in student organizations while at OSU, please indicate if you feel the following reasons were very important, important, somewhat important, or not very important reasons for your participation in student organizations. (Circle one number for each)

	Level of Importance			
	Not Very Important	*Somewhat Important*	*Important*	*Very Important*
a. I participated because I liked helping people.....	1	2	3	4
b. I participated because I liked associating with others.....	1	2	3	4

(Please turn the page)

	Level of Importance			
	Not Very Important	*Somewhat Important*	*Important*	*Very Important*
c. I participated because I wanted to have influence on OSU	1	2	3	4
d. I participated because it was a way to improve OSU	1	2	3	4
e. I participated because it was a way I could express my caring and concern for others	1	2	3	4
f. I participated because it gave me a chance to meet others	1	2	3	4
g. I participated because I wanted to learn new things	1	2	3	4
h. I participated because I preferred to work with groups of people rather than alone	1	2	3	4
i. I participated because I wanted to teach and lead others	1	2	3	4
j. I participated because I liked the challenge of the task	1	2	3	4
k. I participated because I felt needed in the organization	1	2	3	4
l. As a participant in an organization, it was important that people liked me	1	2	3	4
m. I participated because I had goals I wanted to accomplish within the organization	1	2	3	4
n. I participated because I it was a constructive use of my leisure time	1	2	3	4
o. As a participant, I liked to receive feedback from members of the organization	1	2	3	4
p. I participated because I liked to be involved in making decisions and program planning	1	2	3	4
q. I participated because it was a task I could do well	1	2	3	4
r. I participated because I felt an obligation to the organization because of what it has done for me	1	2	3	4
s. As a participant, I enjoyed being able to "do my own thing" within the organization	1	2	3	4
t. I participated because I liked to be responsible for the organization's programs	1	2	3	4
u. I participated because I received status in my community/ from my college peers as a member of the organization	1	2	3	4
v. I participated because I couldn't say "no" when asked	1	2	3	4
w. I participated because I liked to receive recognition for being a member of the organization	1	2	3	4
x. I participated because I wanted to have influence over others	1	2	3	4
y. I participated in order to gain experience and skills which might lead to employment	1	2	3	4
z. I participated because I wanted to be with my (at the time) significant other	1	2	3	4

(Please go on to the next page)

Q-12. Thinking about your reasons for involvement in voluntary organizations, if any, please indicate if you feel the following reasons were very important, important, somewhat important, or not very important reasons for your participation in voluntary organizations since leaving OSU. (Circle one number for each)

	Level of Importance			
	Not Very Important	*Somewhat Important*	*Important*	*Very Important*
a. I participate(d) because I like(d) helping people	1	2	3	4
b. I participate(d) because I like(d) associating with others	1	2	3	4
c. I participate(d) because I want(ed) to have influence on my community	1	2	3	4
d. I participate(d) because it was a way to improve my community	1	2	3	4
e. I participate(d) because it is/was a way to express my caring and concern for others	1	2	3	4
f. I participate(d) because it gives/gave me a chance to meet others.	1	2	3	4
g. I participate(d) because I want(ed) to learn new things	1	2	3	4
h. I participate(d) because I prefer(ed) to work with groups of people rather than alone	1	2	3	4
i. I participate(d) because I want(ed) to teach and lead others.	1	2	3	4
j. I participate(d) because I like(d) the challenge of the task	1	2	3	4
k. I participate(d) because I feel/felt needed in the organization	1	2	3	4
l. As a participant in an organization, it is important that people like me	1	2	3	4
m. I participate(d) because I have/had goals I want(ed) to accomplish within the organization	1	2	3	4
n. I participate(d) because I it is a constructive use of my leisure time	1	2	3	4
o. As a participant, I like(d) to receive feedback from members of the organization	1	2	3	4
p. I participate(d) because I like(d) to be involved in making decisions and program planning	1	2	3	4
q. I participate(d) because it is/was a task I can/could do well	1	2	3	4
r. I participate(d) because I feel/felt an obligation to the organization because of what it has done for me	1	2	3	4
s. As a participant, I enjoy(ed) being able to "do my own thing" within the organization	1	2	3	4
t. I participate(d) because I like(d) to be responsible for the organization's programs	1	2	3	4
u. I participate(d) because I receive(d) status in my community as a member of the organization	1	2	3	4
v. I participate(d) because I can't/couldn't say "no" when asked	1	2	3	4
w. I participate(d) because I like(d) to receive recognition for being a member of the organization	1	2	3	4

(Please turn the page)

	Level of Importance			
	Not Very Important	*Somewhat Important*	*Important*	*Very Important*
x. I participate(d) because I want(ed) to have influence over others	1	2	3	4
y. I participate(d) in order to gain experience and skills which might lead to employment	1	2	3	4
z. I participate(d) because I want(ed) to be with my family/significant other	1	2	3	4

Q-13. What was the last year you attended Oregon State University:

Last Year Attended _____

Q-14. What is your sex? (Circle number)

1. Female
2. Male

Q-15. What was your major academic college at Oregon State University: (Circle number)

01 Agricultural Sciences
02 Business
03 Education
04 Engineering
05 Forestry
06 Health and Human Performance (Physical Education)
07 Home Economics
08 Liberal Arts
09 Oceanography
10 Pharmacy
11 Science
12 Veterinary Medicine
13 Other (Specify) .....

Q-16. Please indicate highest degree attained. (Circle number)

1. Certificate
2. Associate Degree
3. Bachelor's Degree
4. Master's Degree
5. Doctoral Degree
6. Other (Specify) .....

(Please go on to the next page)

Q-17. These questions asked you to think about your college leadership experiences and your post-collegiate participation and leadership experiences, if any. Do you have any comments you wish to make regarding the subjects covered in this questionnaire? (Please use the space below and the next page, if necessary).

Thank you for your assistance.
Please mail the survey in the enclosed envelope or return to:

Walt Sommers
Memorial Union
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 9731

Appendix C
Thank You/Follow-up Notice

Dear Participant: May 20, 1991

Last week you were mailed a questionnaire about your leadership experiences at OSU and your leadership experiences after college, if any.

If you have completed and returned the questionnaire to us please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not , please do so today. Because it was sent to only a representative sample of former OSU student leaders it is extremely important that we get your opinions and information.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now (503)737-2101 and I will get another in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Walt Sommers, Program Director

Appendix D
Follow-Up Letter

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Student Organization Development Program
Memorial Union East/Student Activities Center
Corvallis, OR 97331

Dear

I am writing to you about our study of college student leadership experiences. We have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

The large number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. But whether we will be able to describe accurately how former OSU student leaders feel about their college leadership experiences and information about their post-college leadership activities, if any, depends upon you and others who have not yet responded. Those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaire may hold quite different opinions regarding these leadership experiences and activities than those who have responded.

This is the first former OSU student leader study of this type that has ever been done. Therefore, the results are of particular importance to helping guide the future direction of many of the programs in student activities, the Greek system, the residence hall system, and the Memorial Union. The usefulness of our results depends on how accurately we are able to describe how the former OSU student leaders feel bout their college leadership experiences and whether they are now using those skills.

It is for these reasons that I have included another copy of the questionnaire. May I urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible in the postage paid business reply envelope.

Your contribution to the success of this study will be appreciated greatly.

Most Sincerely,

Walt Sommers
Program Director

Appendix E
Cover Letter to Experts

Dear Expert:

You have been identified as part of a select panel knowledgeable on the topic of student leadership. This panel includes student activities, student affairs, and student union personnel in four Pacific Northwest and Western States. It is hoped that as a member of this panel you will consent to contribute a small amount of your time and your considerable knowledge to this project.

As you know, education for leadership has been an educational mission of American colleges since the American revolution. Participation in college student organizations is frequently cited as providing valuable training for citizenship, development of communication skills, experience in decision making and policy formulation, and contributing to the development of leaders and followers There is data to show what college students do as leaders of college student organizations but little data exists regarding their post-college leadership activities. You and your fellow panelists are asked to review and comment on a survey instrument that seeks to identify former college student leaders post-college leadership activities.

With the enclosed Research Questions in mind, please review the survey and comment on the Experts Revision Form provided. Due to the time sensitive nature of this project **please respond at your earliest convenience** using the address on the Experts Revision Form.

Thank you very much for your kind support. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Walt Sommers, Program Advisor
Student Activities Center
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

Appendix F
Experts Revision Form

Jury of Experts Revision Form

From: _____ _____
name date

Subject: Suggested Revisions to Former Student Leaders Survey

Question No.	Item No.	Suggested Revision
_____	_____	_____
		_____
		_____
_____	_____	_____
		_____
		_____
_____	_____	_____
		_____
		_____

Suggested Additions
(new items)

Additional Comments

Note: If additional space is needed, please use additional sheets.

PLEASE RETURN AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE TO:

Walt Sommers
Program Advisor
Student Activities Center
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331