Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

Oregon State University Results

(Student Affairs Research Report 01-07)

Presented by

Rebecca A. Sanderson, PhD.
Director
Student Affairs Research and Evaluation

March, 2007

Data in this publication were collected as part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... Executive Summary 1

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE 1

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR THE STUDY 1

METHODOLOGY 3

RESULTS 6

- Demographic Information 6
- Pre-college Experiences with Leadership 14
- Experiences with Issues of Diversity 17
- Overall Differences between the OSU Random Sample and the OSU Comparator Sample on the Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs 19
- Item Level Analysis of the Social Change Model of Leadership Values/ Constructs 20
- Relationship of Key Demographic Characteristics to the Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs 28
- Relationship of Key Environmental Variables to the Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs 33
- OSU Specific Questions 45

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 49

REFERENCES 57

APPENDICES 58

- Appendix A—Participating Institutions 58
- Appendix B—OSU Specific Questions 60
- Appendix C—MLS Survey Instrument 62
- Appendix D—Written Comments to OSU-Specific Questions from OSU Random Sample 68
- Appendix E—Written Comments to OSU-Specific Questions from OSU Comparative Sample 81
- Appendix F—Key Demographic Characteristic Tables 88
- Appendix G—Key Environmental Variable Tables 98

MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL STUDY OF LEADERSHIP

Oregon State University Results

(Student Affairs Research Report 01-07)

Presented by
Rebecca A. Sanderson, PhD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Oregon State University participated in the Multi-Institutional Leadership Study (MLS) during the spring term of 2006. A random sample of over 3000 undergraduate students were surveyed with an additional 500 students who held leadership positions on the campus added as a comparator sample. Nationally, over 63,000 students participated in the study at over 50 institutions who requested to be selected as part of the project hosted by the University of Maryland at College Park.

The purpose of the research from the perspective of the research team at the University of Maryland was to "enhance knowledge regarding college student leadership development as well as the influence of higher education on the development of leadership capacities" (Dugan, et al., 2006, p. 7). OSU's rationale for participating in the research, beyond contributing to the national effort to understand college student leadership development, was the specific opportunity to examine OSU student leadership development with a random sample of OSU students and a comparative sample of identified student leaders at OSU.

The MLS was administered entirely on the web. The research team at the University of Maryland was responsible for conducting the study and collecting the results. OSU received the raw data for the OSU random sample and the OSU comparator sample as well as comparisons made on specific key demographic and environmental variables thought to impact the eight values/constructs of the social change model (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change).

The response rate nationally, was 38%. OSU's response rate for the random sample was 30% (N = 982) while the response rate for the comparator sample was 49% (N = 243).

Some substantial differences between the OSU random sample respondents and the OSU comparator sample respondents existed which likely accounted for some of the difference in results between the two groups. For example, the comparator sample had more upper division students, more students of color, and more LGBT students than did the random sample. Further, 70% of the comparator group reported participating in at least one of the following: study abroad, internship, learning community, or senior capstone, while only 47% of the random sample reported likewise. The difference in participation likely was the result of differences in the number/percentage of upper division students rather than something related to the leadership model. This suggested that the two sets of respondents differed in some areas which could confound some of the findings.

Differences Between the OSU Random Group and the OSU Comparator Group

The following findings compare the OSU random respondents with the OSU comparator respondents.

Comparator sample students:

- Had significantly more involvement pre-college in volunteer work, student clubs/organizations, leadership positions, community organizations, and training or education in leadership skills. They also held significantly more leadership positions pre-college than did the random sample students.
- Reported significantly more interaction and engagement with other students about issues of diversity. They also reported significantly more learning in the area of diversity than the random sample.
- Reported significantly higher scores on all seven values/constructs of the social change model of leadership development.

Key Demographic Factors Affecting the Values/Constructs of the Social Change Model

In several key demographic areas, OSU did not have sufficient N for statistical analysis; therefore, the following findings pertain to the national sample unless otherwise specified.

- On each of the eight values/constructs students with higher classifications scored significantly higher than lower classifications.

- Women scored significantly higher than men or transgendered individuals on seven of the eight areas. The only area in which men scored significantly higher was change.

- Heterosexuals responded significantly higher than gay or bisexual or rather not say on self-understanding, congruence, commitment, collaboration, and common purpose. Gay or bisexual students responded higher on civility, citizenship, and change.

- Race mattered in terms of the ways in which different races responded relative to other races. Generally on all items Black, Latino, and Multiracial scored significantly higher than white or Asian students on the eight values/constructs.

- Non-first generation students scored significantly higher on self-understanding, congruence, common purpose and citizenship. While, first generation students scored higher on change.

Key Environmental Factors Affecting the Values/Constructs of the Social Change Model

Specific environmental/experiential factors were tested to determine the difference, if any, between having the experience and not having the experience on the eight values/constructs of the social change model of leadership. The following findings pertain to the national sample unless otherwise specified.

- Study abroad, internship, learning community, and senior capstone participants all showed significantly higher results on the eight values/constructs of the social change model of leadership than did non-participants.

- Those who reported much involvement in leadership positions in college organizations reported significantly higher scores on the eight values/constructs than did those who reported less experience.

- Students who reported many short-term leadership experiences had significantly higher results on all eight of the values/constructs than did those students who have fewer such involvements. The same was true of students who had moderate term experiences and longer term experiences.

- Participants in emerging new leaders programs had significantly higher results on the eight values/constructs than did those who were not participants.

- Students in peer leadership programs scored significantly higher than those not in such programs in the areas of collaboration, common purpose, citizenship, and change.

- Participants in Leadership certificate programs showed no differences from those not in such programs.

- Participants in multi-semester leadership programs reported significant difference's only on collaboration.

- Senior leadership capstone, Leadership minor, and leadership major reported results that suggested these programs were contraindicated in terms of the model. In each case non-participants in these programs reported significantly higher results than did participants.

- Participants in residential living learning leadership experiences reported significantly higher results on collaboration, commitment, civility, and citizenship than non-participants.

- Overall place of residence did seem to have some influence on the model. Generally students who lived in a private home reported higher scores than did those who lived in a parent's home. Likewise those living in a private home scored significantly higher than those who reported living in a residence hall, Greek Housing or other student housing.

OSU-Specific Questions

OSU added six questions to the survey. The following are highlights from these questions and pertain only to OSU students.

- Students in the random sample reported that their social group and organized clubs and groups have had the most influence on their personal leadership development. The comparator sample reported that OSU organized clubs and groups and OSU employment had the most influence on their personal leadership development.

- The random sample of students reported that the three most important things that they have learned from their involvement in student organizations were effective communication, teamwork, and people skills. The comparative sample reported likewise.

- The samples were asked what they wished they had learned from their involvement in student organizations or clubs. Both groups reported that they wished they had learned more business/technical skills and more healthy living skills.

- The four most selected items in terms of the student's motivation to participate in student organizations/clubs was the same for both groups:
    - Someone invited me
    - Wanted to make a difference
    - Wanted to be with people similar to me
    - Wanted to acquire or develop a skill

- The item selected most often for not becoming involved in a student organization or club for both groups was "didn't fit my schedule."

Discussion, Questions and Recommendations

The results of the study suggest that there are indeed differences between those students who are identified as student leaders and those who are not regarding the social change model of leadership values/constructs. Further there are differences in terms of both demographic factors and environmental factors that appeared to matter regarding the values/constructs as well.

This study was conducted by OSU to provide information about how the social change model of leadership may be reflected in our student leaders as well as students in general at OSU. To that end, the results will hopefully guide the thinking and work in developing programs and services that involve students and that are designed to develop leaders throughout the student body.

<u>Questions</u>

1. How can this information be used to develop experiences which foster leadership development in students who do not hold positional leadership?
2. Does Student Affairs have a leadership development model that guides the development of leadership programs and training? If not, how could one be developed?
3. Can Student Affairs engage in purposeful conversations about a leadership curriculum that will better develop students as leaders regardless of pre-college experiences and positional leadership?

<u>Recommendations</u>

1. Use literature and data from MLS to develop a model for leadership development at OSU and in Student Affairs in particular.

2. Engage in collaborative work with all available "leadership" training programs/trainers to develop curriculum for various levels of involvement.

3. Evaluate success of curriculum in delivering the intended leadership outcomes across areas and within areas.

4. Examine areas where the random sample and the comparator sample showed no significant differences and thus may be areas in which programs and services might be directed.

MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL STUDY OF LEADERSHIP

Oregon State University Initial Findings

(Student Affairs Research Report 01-07)

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Oregon State was invited to participate in a multi-institutional study of student leadership on college campuses during Fall, 2005. At that time OSU responded with an application for participation and was accepted as one of 54 institutions across the United States who would participate in this research sponsored by the University of Maryland at College Park (see Appendix A for participating institutions).

The purpose of the research from the perspective of the research team at the University of Maryland was to "enhance knowledge regarding college student leadership development as well as the influence of higher education on the development of leadership capacities" (Dugan, et al., 2006, p. 7). OSU's rationale for participating in the research, beyond contributing to the national effort to understand college student leadership development, was the specific opportunity to examine OSU student leadership development with a random sample of OSU students and a comparative sample of identified student leaders at OSU.

This is the first such study of student leadership development at OSU that has been done in at least 15 years. As such, it will provide much needed information about OSU's identified student leaders as well as OSU students in general with regard to leadership skills, beliefs, and practices. This information will be used to inform work that is being done to develop student leadership capacities here at OSU.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR THE STUDY

The development of leadership skills is one of the essential elements of a college education. Generally, two leadership paradigms exist: the industrial paradigm and the post-industrial paradigm.

The Industrial paradigm of leadership suggests that leadership is the domain of an individual. One individual provides leadership for the group. Leadership and management are used interchangeably and leadership pertains mostly to formal groups or organizations (Shertzer & Shuh, 2004). Beliefs and practices that would fit with this paradigm include such things as, leaders are born not made, personal charisma is needed for effective leadership, there is one way to lead, leaders are endowed with certain characteristics of strength that make them leaders.

The post-industrial paradigm, the social change model of leadership (Heri, 1996) posits that "leadership is a relational, transformative, process-oriented, learned, and change-directed phenomenon (Rost, 1993)" (Dugan, et al., p.8). It is the Social Change Model of Leadership (HERI, 1996) that served as the theoretical frame of reference for the study. The Social Change Model of Leadership suggests that post-industrial leadership can be done by anyone, is based upon relationships, and is meant to create change. Leadership does not reside solely in the individual but is a discipline that is teachable and occurs at all levels in an organization or group.

In essence, this model of leadership focuses on social responsibility and change for the common good (HERI). College graduates who operate within the social change model of leadership are exactly the kinds of leaders colleges and universities should be creating.

There are eight values or constructs associated with the Social Change Model of Leadership. The values/constructs are not mutually exclusive and inherently possess complex interactions (Tyree, 1998). These eight values/constructs along with definitions are contained in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs

Perspective	Values/ Constructs	Definition of Value/Construct
Individual	**Consciousness of Self**	Awareness of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action
	Congruence	Thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty towards others; actions are consistent with most deeply-held beliefs and convictions.
	Commitment	The psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort; implies passion, intensity, and duration, and is directed toward both the group activity as well as its intended outcomes.
Group	**Collaboration**	To work with others in a common effort; constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust.
	Common Purpose	To work with shared aims and values; facilitates the group's ability to engage in collective analysis of issues at hand and the task to be undertaken.
	Controversy with civility	Recognizes two fundamental realities of any creative group effort: that differences in viewpoints are inevitable, and that such differences must be aired openly, but with civility. Civility implies respect for others, a willingness to hear each others' views, and the exercise of restraint in criticizing the views and actions of others.
Community/ Society	**Citizenship**	The process whereby an individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity. To be a good citizen is to work for positive change on the behalf of others and the community.
All directed toward:	**Change**	The ability to adapt to environments and situations that are constantly evolving, while maintaining the core functions of the group.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

The Social Change Model of Leadership looks at leadership from three different perspectives: the individual, the group, and the community or society. At the individual level, the focus is on the skills or qualities to be developed for each person. At the group level, the focus is to foster

individual development while effecting group and social change. And, at the community/society level the focus is on responsible citizenship and positive change on the behalf of others.

This study at OSU sought to understand the leadership beliefs, skills, and attitudes held by OSU students in general as well as a select group of identified student leaders. Further the study sought to examine specific student and environmental characteristics and their relationship to the values/constructs of the social change model of leadership development.

METHODOLOGY

The University of Maryland selected a total of 54 schools to participate in the MSL. Schools were selected on the basis of established criteria for inclusion into the study which included such variables as: size, Carnegie type, geographic location, institution focus. The national research group focused on maximizing the variation of leadership programs that schools reported, including those with no programs and those that did not use the Social Change Model. Schools that participated in the study were asked to follow the study protocol which included instructions on drawing the sample, sample size, and other criteria for sample submission.

The Sample

OSU was asked to supply the University of Maryland research group with a random sample of 3,327 OSU undergraduate students along with their email addresses. In addition OSU opted to provide a comparator sample of 500 student leaders. Student leaders were defined as those students who had significant involvement in OSU leadership positions. These included some paid and some unpaid leadership positions. The departments/units listed below submitted a list of student leaders that they wished to be included. After the list was compiled, it was cleaned by eliminating duplicates and listing a person only once.

Table 2 below contains demographic information about the comparator sample that was submitted.

Table 2

Demographics of Comparator Sample of Student Leaders

Category		Number	Percent
	Total Number	**500**	
Gender	Male	211	42%
	Female	289	58%
Class Standing	Freshman	31	6%
	Sophomore	118	24%
	Junior	162	32%
	Senior	189	38%

Table 2 (continued)

Demographics of Comparator Sample of Student Leaders

Category		Number	Percent
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	53	10%
	Black/African American	32	6%
	Hispanic	24	5%
	Native American/ Alaskan Native	13	3%
	White	353	71%
	Decline to Respond	25	5
Departmental Affiliation	Diversity Development/Cultural Centers	36	7%
	LGBT Services	9	2%
	Memorial Union	23	5%
	Minority Education Offices	30	6%
	Greek Life	44	9%
	Recreational Sports	59	12%
	SOAR	75	14%
	Services for Students with Disabilities	17	3%
	Student Involvement	33	7%
	Student Media	2	<1%
	University Honors College	9	2%
	University Housing and Dining Services	154	31%
	Women's Center	9	2%

The OSU random sample as well as other institutional random samples "were standardized at a 95% confidence interval with a margin of error of $\pm$ 3 (Dugan, et al., p. 9). Researchers at the University of Maryland reported that the overall sample size was over 160,000 students. With this number of students and the diversity of institutions represented, they further reported that the national sample accurately represented demographics like gender, race, socio-economic status, etc. Additionally at the end of the data collection, the Maryland research team analyzed non-responders to account for variance in representation (Dugan, et al.).

Instrumentation

The survey used to collect data for this project was developed by the research team at the University of Maryland. It was based upon an earlier work by Tyree (1998). The initial version of the revised questionnaire was piloted and subsequent to data analysis further revised. The final instrument that was used for the study was a 68-item version by Dugan, 2006. Participating schools were also invited to add up to 10 additional questions that fit the format of the questionnaire. OSU submitted 6 such questions (See Appendix B).

Each of the eight constructs that were measured contained between 6 and 11 items. Participants were asked to report their responses using a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Reliabilities for each of the scales were tested. The Chronbach alphas ranged from a low of .71 to a high of .90. For the eight construct scales, the reliabilities ranged from .77 to .83 (Dugan, et al.). These reliability figures suggested a stable set of scales.

Data Collection

The MLS questionnaire was administered entirely on the web and for OSU during the months of January and February, 2006. Students were emailed and asked to participate. Institutions were able to customize the invitation according to institutional requirements or unique characteristics of the school. Students were directed to a secure web-site and were asked to provide their unique ID number that was generated by the MLS research team. Once the student entered their ID, the ID separated from the student's responses to the questionnaire in order to protect their confidentiality.

Generally, students were able to complete the questionnaire in less than 20 minutes. Students were sent up to three email reminders to complete the survey in order to increase response rates.

OSU received data on OSU students, both the random sample as well as the comparator sample. For some items OSU also received aggregate data from the national sample. However, most of the data collected from the national sample was not available to OSU.

Data Analysis

Analysis of OSU data occurred following data cleaning which was done to improve the reliability and generalizability of the findings. Analysis was conducted only on participants who completed the MSL questionnaire and who answered at least 90% of the questions contained in the Social Responsibility Leadership Scales (the eight constructs/values). Only responses from undergraduate students who indicated that they were freshmen, sophomore, junior, or seniors were included. Further no statistical analyses were done on variables with fewer than 30 respondents.

Means and frequency distributions were calculated for all variables on the questionnaire. Using MANOVA and appropriate follow-up analyses (e.g., t-test, Tukey's multiple comparison test) were used to determine statistically significant differences among mean scores within groups (i.e., OSU Random, OSU Comparator, National Sample) across varying levels of specific demographic and environmental variables that were determined by the University of Maryland research group to potentially have significant influence on the leadership model scales.

Further, independent t-tests were used to determine statistically significant differences between the OSU random sample and the OSU comparator sample on variables of interest to the OSU research group.

RESULTS

The response rate for the national sample for the MSL was 38% (63,095) while the response rate for the OSU random sample was only 30% (982). The OSU response rate for the comparative sample of identified student leaders was 49% (243) overall.

Because this study was a subset of the larger national study, OSU was asked by the research team at the University of Maryland not to release the specific numerical results for the national sample.

The remainder of the results section of this report is divided into the following categories: Demographic Information, Pre-College Experiences with Leadership, Experiences with Issues of Diversity, Overall Differences Between the OSU Random Sample and the OSU Comparator Sample on the Social Change Model, Item Level Analysis of Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs, Relationship of Key Demographic Characteristics to Social Change Values/Constructs, Relationship of Key Environmental Characteristics to Social Change Values/Constructs and OSU Specific Questions.

Demographic Information

The following tables (3A – 3I) contain demographic information on the national, OSU random, and OSU comparative respondents. Table 3A contains information on enrollment status, transfer status, class standing, age, and gender. In several areas the OSU random sample and the OSU comparative sample were comparable in terms of percentage in each category (e.g., Enrollment status). However, there were some areas where the differences were substantial. For example, 87% of the identified student leaders in the comparative sample were non-transfer students while for the OSU random sample only about 69% had started their college career at OSU. Additionally, the proportion of senior students who were in the identified student leader comparative group was substantially higher than in the random sample. The percentage of first year students also differed substantially from the comparative sample to the random sample with more first year students represented in the random sample than the comparative sample. Some of this difference in classification between the samples might be explained in terms of the higher likelihood of upper division students holding more leadership positions than first year students and thus would skew the class standing toward seniors for the comparative sample. The OSU random sample and the national sample appeared more balanced in terms of the classification of students.

Table 3A

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Enrollment Status				
	Full-time	**96.2**	**96.8**	**94.6**
	Part-time	**3.8**	**3.2**	**5.4**
Transfer Status				
	Started Here	**68.9**	**87.0**	**75.8**
	Started Elsewhere	**31.1**	**13.0**	**24.2**

Table 3A (continued)

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Class Standing				
	First Year	**20.1**	**0.8**	**23.3**
	Sophomore	**17.8**	**18.2**	**21.7**
	Junior	**27.5**	**29.1**	**26.3**
	Senior	**34.6**	**51.8**	**28.8**

Table 3B below contains information about the age of respondents, gender and sexual orientation. Again, the respondent categories for OSU random and comparative samples looked substantially different in terms of age categories with a much higher percentage of student leaders reporting being 20-24 years old compared to only about 59% in the random sample. This too likely reflected the difference in age in students who held positions of leadership on campus. These types of leadership positions would generally go to upper division students versus first year or younger students. There was no national data available to OSU for the national sample.

In both the OSU samples and the national sample, the percentage of female respondents was more than the male respondents. This is not atypical for responses to surveys. The percentage of heterosexual respondents did not differ greatly among the three samples; however, the percentage of gay/lesbian/bisexual students in the OSU student leader sample was substantially more than the OSU random sample and the national sample.

Table 3 B

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Age				**National data not provided to OSU**
	18-19	**30.4**	**14.2**	
	20-24	**58.7**	**80.4**	
	25-29	**5.8**	**4.0**	
	30-34	**1.6**	**0.4**	
	35-39	**1.1**	**0.0**	
	40-44	**1.0**	**0.0**	
	45-49	**1.0**	**0.0**	
	50 and over	**0.4**	**0.8**	

Table 3 B (continued)

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Gender				
	Female	**55.4**	**61.4**	**61.5**
	Male	**44.4**	**38.6**	**38.3**
	Transgender	**0.2**	**0.0**	**0.1**
Sexual Orientation				
	Heterosexual	**95.3**	**91.1**	**94.1**
	Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual	**2.0**	**6.5**	**3.4**
	Rather Not Say	**2.7**	**2.4**	**2.5**

Table 3C contains information on the citizenship status of students at OSU participating in the study. National data for this demographic category was not provided to OSU. Interestingly more students in the random sample group were at least 3rd generation U.S. citizens than in the student leader group. Likewise, though with a smaller difference, more OSU leaders reported being second generation U.S. citizens. The same was true of category three where at least one of their parents was born elsewhere (other than in the U.S.). The percentage of foreign born students in both samples showed little difference between samples.

Table 3 C

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Citizenship/ Generational Status				**National data not provided to OSU**
	Grandparents, parents, and you were born in the U.S.	**74.6**	**65.4**	
	Both of your parents and you were born in the U.S.	**9.9**	**11.8**	
	You were born in the U.S. but at least one of your parents was born elsewhere	**9.2**	**12.6**	
	You are a foreign born, naturalized citizen	**3.3**	**5.3**	

Table 3 C (continued)

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
	You are a foreign born, resident alien/permanent resident	**2.1**	**2.8**	
	You are on a student visa	**0.8**	**2.0**	

In terms of the racial make-up of the three samples, the OSU comparative sample appeared to have the greatest level of diversity in the sample with higher percentages of participation in the categories of African American/Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Multiracial or Multiethnic than either the OSU random sample or the national sample. The OSU comparator sample contained a higher percentage of African American/Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian American/Asian, Latino, and Multiracial or Multiethnic than did the OSU random sample. This too may have been an artifact of the selection process for the comparator sample since the OSU research group specifically targeted groups where the likelihood that a student of color would be in a leadership position.

No substantial differences were found among the three sets of respondents regarding disability status.

Table 3 D

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Race				
	African American/Black	**0.5**	**2.4**	**5.2**
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	**0.4**	**1.6**	**0.3**
	Asian American/Asian	**6.3**	**8.5**	**7.9**
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	**0.1**	**0.0**	**0**
	Latino	**2.2**	**4.1**	**4.4**
	Multiracial or Multiethnic	**9.8**	**12.2**	**8.2**
	Race/ethnicity not included above	**1.6**	**3.3**	**2.3**
	White/Caucasian	**79.1**	**67.9**	**71.8**
Disability				
	Yes	**11.6**	**11.4**	**11.5**
	No	**88.4**	**88.6**	**88.5**

Respondents in the OSU samples were predominately Christian in religious preference with the second-most preference being none (see Table 3 E below). This was true of both the OSU Random sample and the OSU Comparative sample. Generally, the OSU Comparative sample reported a higher percentage for each religious preference than did the OSU random sample.

The political views of OSU students in the random sample were somewhat more conservative than those of the national random sample. The same was true of the OSU Comparative sample. The most endorsed political view was middle-of-the-road, which was true of each group.

Table 3 E

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		**OSU Random Sample %**	**OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %**	**National Sample %**
Religious Beliefs Students could select more than one category so will not total to 100%				**National data not provided to OSU**
	None	**23.0**	**14.2**	
	Agnostic	**9.1**	**7.3**	
	Atheist	**3.9**	**6.1**	
	Buddhist	**2.8**	**3.3**	
	Catholic	**16.4**	**16.7**	
	Hindu	**0.7**	**1.6**	
	Islamic	**0.5**	**1.2**	
	Jewish	**1.8**	**1.6**	
	Mormon	**2.1**	**1.6**	
	Quaker	**0.2**	**0.8**	
	Protestant	**19.4**	**27.2**	
	Other	**7.7**	**11.0**	
	Other Christian	**23.8**	**24.4**	
	Rather Not Say	**3.4**	**2.8**	
Political Views				
	Far left	**3.0**	**3.3**	**3.7**
	Liberal	**32.9**	**30.1**	**32.9**
	Middle-of-the-Road	**35.9**	**37.0**	**37.7**
	Conservative	**27.1**	**28.0**	**24.3**
	Far right	**1.1**	**1.6**	**1.4**

Most of the students in each of the samples had at least a 3.00 GPA (~70%) with a little higher percentage for the OSU Comparative sample, though not a substantial difference. The OSU Comparative sample had fewer students in that group with a 2.00 or less GPA, though again, the differences were not substantial.

The national sample reported about 36% of that sample as first generation college students. While, about 40% of the OSU samples reported being first generation college students.

Most of the students in the OSU samples reported that their parents had at least some college, nevertheless, nearly 21% also reported that their parents had a high school education or less.

Table 3 F

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
College Grades				
	3.50-4.00	**34.7**	**35.0**	**35.4**
	3.00-3.49	**37.8**	**40.7**	**37.7**
	2.50-2.99	**21.1**	**21.1**	**20.3**
	2.00-2.49	**5.4**	**3.3**	**5.4**
	1.99 or less	**0.9**	**0.0**	**1.1**
	No college GPA	**0.1**	**0.0**	**0.1**
First Generation				
	Yes	**40.5**	**43.6**	**35.6**
	No	**59.5**	**56.4**	**64.4**
Parent Education				**National data not provided to OSU**
	Don't know	**0.5**	**1.2**	
	Less than high school diploma or GED	**1.9**	**4.9**	
	High school diploma or GED	**9.6**	**14.6**	
	Some college	**20.2**	**16.3**	
	Associates degree	**8.5**	**7.3**	
	Bachelors degree	**30.5**	**25.6**	
	Masters degree	**20.3**	**21.5**	
	Doctorate or professional degree	**8.4**	**8.5**	

Table 3G below contains information on student residences and on-campus or off-campus residency. Approximately 60% of the OSU random sample lived in a private home, apartment, or room. This was a much higher percentage than for either the OSU comparative sample or the national sample which were 48% and 37% respectively.

As expected from the previous data, most students in the OSU random and comparative samples lived off campus. This was particularly true for the OSU random sample. The OSU comparative sample was more evenly split between living on-campus and living off campus.

This may be an artifact of the selection of student leaders since some were required to live on campus in order to hold their leadership position (e.g., Resident Assistant).

Table 3 G

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Place of Residence				
	Parent/guardian or other relative home	**4.4**	**1.2**	**13.9**
	Other private home, apartment, or room	**60.4**	**48.0**	**36.7**
	College/university residence hall	**23.5**	**29.7**	**38.5**
	Other campus student housing	**3.3**	**10.6**	**5.8**
	Fraternity or sorority house	**6.2**	**10.2**	**3.3**
	Other	**2.1**	**0.4**	**1.8**
On/Off campus				**National data not provided to OSU**
	On campus residence	**33.8**	**50.6**	
	Off campus residence	**66.2**	**49.4**	

Fewer OSU comparative sample students were employed off campus than either the OSU random sample or the national sample. Again, this may be an artifact of the campus leader sample selection process since some of the leadership positions were paid and thus considered on-campus employment which could have interfered with or prohibited any off-campus employment. Interestingly however, in all three samples, many more students were not employed off campus (range 65% - 85%).

Of the 25.7% of the OSU random sample respondents that worked off campus, most worked 11-20 hours per week. The second highest percent, 28.5%, worked 1-10 hours per week. Over one quarter of those that worked off campus worked more than 20 hours per week.

Of the 15.4% of the OSU Comparative Sample Respondents that reported working off campus, most (47.3%) worked 1-10 hours per week. Another 31.5% worked 11-20 hours per week and approximately 21% worked over 20 hours per week.

Interestingly, many more of the OSU Comparative sample respondents (73.7% versus 29.7%) reported working on campus. Again this may be due to an artifact of the selection process for the OSU Comparative Sample. However, it was interesting to note that the OSU random sample only had about 30% who reported working on campus while the Comparative sample had well over twice that amount.

Of those that reported working on campus most of the OSU comparative sample worked 11-20 hours per week as did the OSU random sample group, 50.4% and 48.7% respectively.

Table 3 H

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Employed Off Campus				
	Yes	**25.7**	**15.4**	**35.9**
	No	**74.3**	**84.6**	**64.1**
Hours worked off campus in typical week ?				**National data not provided to OSU**
	1-10	**28.5**	**47.3**	
	11-20	**43.0**	**31.5**	
	21-30	**19.2**	**13.1**	
	31-40	**7.1**	**7.9**	
	Over 40	**2.4**	**0.0**	
Employed On Campus				
	Yes	**29.7**	**73.7**	**26.7**
	No	**70.3**	**26.3**	**73.3**
Hours worked on campus in typical week ?				**National data not provided to OSU**
	1-10	**46.3**	**31.0**	
	11-10	**48.7**	**50.4**	
	21-30	**1.6**	**11.6**	
	31-40	**2.0**	**5.0**	
	Over 40	**0.6**	**2.3**	

The OSU Comparative group of OSU student leaders reported substantially more involvement in community service while in college than did either the OSU Random Sample group or the National Sample group. Nearly 70% of the OSU student leader group reported engaging in community service while only 48% of the OSU Random sample group and 52% of the National Sample reported likewise.

Further, about 70% of the OSU Comparative group of student leaders reported having participated in at least one of the following experiences: study abroad, internship, learning community, senior capstone experience. For the OSU Random sample group only 47.4% of these students reported participating in one of those activities. Again, this potentially was

affected by the selection method for OSU comparator group as the percentage of seniors is higher in the Comparative group which might account for some of the difference.

Table 3 I

Demographic Information on OSU Respondents and National Sample Respondents

Characteristics		OSU Random Sample %	OSU Comparative (OSU Student Leaders) %	National Sample %
Community Service while in College				
	Yes	**48.3**	**69.6**	**52.4**
	No	**51.7**	**30.4**	**47.6**
Participated in at least one of the following: study abroad, internship, learning community, senior capstone				**National data not provided to OSU**
	Yes	**47.4**	**70.4**	
	No	**52.6**	**29.6**	

Pre-Colleges Experiences with Leadership

Students were asked several questions about their pre-college experiences with leadership and beliefs about values/constructs related to the social change model of leadership. The following three tables contain the means, standard deviations and level of significance between the OSU random and comparative samples on each of the items.

The OSU comparative sample showed significantly more involvement in most of the items in Table 4 below. The only two areas in which there was no significant difference shown was involvement in varsity sports and activism. These results suggested that those students who were designated as student leaders in the comparative sample were involved to a greater degree in leadership and group organizations prior to their college involvements than their counterparts in the random sample.

Specific items of significance included:

- Volunteer work
- Student clubs/groups
- Leadership positions
- Community organizations
- Leadership in community organizations
- Participating in training or education that developed leadership skills.

Table 4

Before College How Often Did You Engage In . . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very often					
Volunteer work	Random	998	2.57	0.896	0.018
	Comparative	247	2.72	0.874	
Student clubs/groups	Random	998	2.69	1.002	0.000
	Comparative	247	3.03	0.954	
Varsity sports	Random	998	2.57	1.278	0.525
	Comparative	247	2.51	1.309	
Leadership positions	Random	998	2.46	1.079	0.000
	Comparative	247	2.80	1.084	
Community organizations	Random	998	2.45	1.121	0.009
	Comparative	247	2.65	1.086	
Leadership in community organizations	Random	998	1.84	1.022	0.000
	Comparative	247	2.17	1.043	
Activism	Random	998	1.44	0.706	0.264
	Comparative	247	1.50	0.770	
Participating in training or education that developed your leadership skills	Random	998	2.37	0.972	0.005
	Comparative	247	2.56	1.010	

Students were asked to think back before college and to respond to one question from each of the social change model of leadership scales. The questions in Table 5 below pertained to the scale listed in parentheses. In only three of the eight areas did the comparator and random sample students respond significantly differently. In each of those areas in which there was a significant difference, the comparator sample reported significantly more agreement with the statement than did the random sample. Items in which there was a significant difference included:

- Enjoyed working with others toward common goals (Collaboration),
- I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group (Common Purpose),
- I valued the opportunities that allowed me to contribute to my community (Citizenship).

Table 5

Before College What Was Your Level of Agreement With . . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree					
Hearing differences of opinions enriched my thinking (Controversy with civility)	Random	998	4.00	0.736	0.112
	Comparative	247	3.92	0.722	
I had low self-esteem (Consciousness of the self)	Random	998	3.50	1.124	0.650
	Comparative	247	3.47	1.154	
I worked well in changing environments (Change)	Random	998	3.60	0.851	0.866
	Comparative	247	3.59	0.841	
I enjoyed working with others toward common goals (Collaboration)	Random	998	3.97	0.696	0.035
	Comparative	247	4.08	0.709	
I held myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to (Commitment)	Random	998	4.27	0.744	0.965
	Comparative	247	4.27	0.695	
I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group (Common purpose)	Random	998	3.92	0.657	0.018
	Comparative	247	4.03	0.695	
My behaviors reflected my beliefs (Congruence)	Random	998	3.95	0.856	0.887
	Comparative	247	3.96	0.845	
I valued the opportunities that allowed me to contribute to my community (Citizenship)	Random	998	3.71	0.814	0.006
	Comparative	247	3.87	0.824	

Items contained in Table 6 below pertained to various pre-college experiences. In only one case did the two groups demonstrate a significant difference in responses. The comparator sample reported significantly more experience in leadership positions pre-college than did the random sample. In each of the other areas, there was no significant difference in responses.

Table 6

Before You Started College . . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
No experience 1 2 3 4 5 Extensive experience					
What was the amount of leadership experiences	Random	998	3.26	1.060	0.036
	Comparative	247	3.43	1.148	

Table 6 (continued)

Before You Started College . . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Frequently					
How often were you given positive feedback or encouraged about your leadership	Random	998	3.42	1.132	0.087
	Comparative	247	3.55	1.099	
Very uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5 Very comfortable					
What was your reaction to appointment as leader	Random	998	3.52	1.076	0.907
	Comparative	247	3.51	1.062	
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Frequently					
How often did you see others as effective leaders	Random	998	3.50	0.909	0.071
	Comparative	247	3.39	0.862	
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Frequently					
How often do you think of yourself as a leader	Random	997	3.29	1.092	0.598
	Comparative	247	3.25	1.093	

Experiences with Issues of Diversity

Diversity of opinions, backgrounds, cultures, belief systems, socioeconomic class, and life style are not uncommon in many groups to which students might affiliate while in college. Students were asked a series of questions to determine their experiences with and opinions about various issues involving diversity.

Table 7 below contains two items that students were asked to reflect upon in terms of their pre-college experiences. In both cases, there were no significant differences shown between the OSU random sample and the OSU comparative sample on either item.

Table 7

Before You Started College How Often Did You. . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often					
Get to know people from backgrounds different than your own	Random	998	2.82	0.864	0.089
	Comparative	247	2.71	0.961	
Learn about cultures different from your own	Random	998	2.72	0.881	0.788
	Comparative	247	2.70	0.958	

The following two tables contain information about first collegiate experiences and then about current opinions regarding some particular areas of diversity. Table 8 below contains the N's, means, standard deviations and levels of significance. For every experience, the comparative

sample reported significantly more interactions with other students in the areas listed than did the random sample group. This suggested that the comparator group of student leaders had a greater level of discussion and interaction around issues of diversity that did the random sample.

Table 8

In an Average College Year during Interactions with Other Students Outside of Class, How Often Have You. . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often					
Talked about different lifestyles/customs	Random	998	2.91	0.849	0.000
	Comparative	247	3.13	0.809	
Held discussions with students with values different than own	Random	998	2.87	0.867	0.000
	Comparative	247	3.14	0.765	
Discussed major social issues such as peace, human rights, and justice	Random	997	2.59	0.951	0.000
	Comparative	247	2.88	0.932	
Held discussions with students with very different religious beliefs from your own	Random	998	2.67	0.933	0.001
	Comparative	247	2.89	0.917	
Discussed your views about multiculturalism	Random	998	2.52	0.931	0.000
	Comparative	247	2.94	0.913	
Held discussions with students with very different political views from your own	Random	998	2.72	0.955	0.000
	Comparative	247	2.99	0.902	

Table 9 below contains information about students' opinions about their learning and their opinion about the campus commitment to diversity. Students in the random sample reported significantly more agreement with the statement that the campus commitment to diversity fostered more division among racial/ethnic groups than inter-group understanding. While the students in the comparative group reported significantly more learning about issues of diversity than did the random sample students. Students in the comparative sample reported that since coming to college they had:

- Learned a great deal about other racial/ethnic groups,
- Gained a greater commitment to their racial/ethnic identity, and
- Had become aware of the complexities of inter-group understanding.

Table 9

Extent to which you Agree or Disagree with . . .

	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree					
Since coming to college I have learned a great deal about other racial/ethnic groups	Random	995	2.80	0.774	0.000
	Comparative	247	3.13	0.672	
Have gained a greater commitment to my racial/ethnic identity since coming to college	Random	995	2.43	0.769	0.000
	Comparative	247	2.74	0.855	
My campus' commitment to diversity fosters more division among racial/ethnic groups than inter-group understanding	Random	993	2.56	0.747	0.009
	Comparative	247	2.42	0.807	
Since coming to college, I have become aware of the complexities of inter-group understanding	Random	995	2.76	0.683	0.000
	Comparative	247	3.05	0.623	

Overall Differences between the OSU Random Sample and the OSU Comparator Sample on the Social change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs

When the OSU random sample and the OSU comparator sample were analyzed in terms of the differences in means on each of the values/construct scales of the survey, the OSU comparator sample mean was significantly different. The scales were composed of between six and 11 items. The analysis of these results used a MANOVA with appropriate post-hoc tests in an attempt to account for the large sample sizes being analyzed. Also, the p value was set at .01.

Table 10 below contains the N, Mean, and Standard Deviation for the eight values/construct scales of the survey. Note than in every instance the Comparator sample of student leaders reported a higher mean than did the Random sample.

Table 11 below contains the direction of the significant difference in means with the Comparator sample resulting in a significantly higher mean in each area than the Random sample. These results suggested that the comparator group of student leaders reported more characteristics of the social change model of leadership development than did the random sample of OSU students.

Table 10

OSU Random Sample and Comparative Sample

OSU Random				OSU Comparators			
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree							
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Self-Understanding	982	3.9356	.49338	Self-Understanding	243	4.0453	.43332
Congruence	982	4.1586	.45501	Congruence	243	4.2740	.38661
Commitment	982	4.2245	.45129	Commitment	243	4.3217	.41795
Collaboration	982	3.9751	.44123	Collaboration	243	4.2099	.39536
Common Purpose	982	4.0075	.40198	Common Purpose	243	4.1728	.36503
Civility	982	3.8296	.40668	Civility	243	3.9865	.37376
Citizenship	982	3.8186	.43917	Citizenship	243	4.0658	.40390
Change	982	3.7581	.45965	Change	243	3.8789	.40035
Valid N (listwise)	982			Valid N (listwise)	243		

Table 11

Statistical Difference between OSU Random and Comparative Samples

VALUE/CONSTRUCT SCALE	STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE
Consciousness of Self	Comparative > Random
Congruence	Comparative > Random
Commitment	Comparative > Random
Collaboration	Comparative > Random
Common Purpose	Comparative > Random
Controversy with Civility	Comparative > Random
Citizenship	Comparative > Random
Change	Comparative > Random

Item Level Analysis of the Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs

In order to gain some understanding of the reasons why the comparator sample's means were significantly higher than the random sample of students, an item level analysis of the responses of each group to the scales was done. The following sections reported the mean for each item per OSU group as well as the level of significance of the difference in means.

Self-Understanding

Self-understanding was defined in the model as: Awareness of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action (HERI, 1996). Another term for this value/construct was consciousness of self.

Table 6 contains the N, mean, standard deviation, and p value for each item in the self-understanding scale for the two OSU sample types. The OSU comparative sample of student leaders showed significantly higher mean scores on four of the nine items. These included:

- I am able to articulate my priorities
- I am usually self-confident
- I can describe how I am similar to other people
- I am comfortable expressing myself.

On only one item did the random sample of OSU students report a significantly higher mean than the comparator sample. The random sample of students reported that their level of low self-esteem was significantly higher than the comparator sample.

No significant differences in means were found between samples on the remainder of the items on this scale.

Table 12

Self-Understanding

Self-Understanding	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
I am able to articulate my priorities	Random	998	4.034	0.6769	0.044	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.130	0.6177		
I have low self esteem	Random	998	3.836	0.9838	0.050	random > comparative
	Comparative	247	3.972	0.9344		
I am usually self-confident	Random	998	3.883	0.8132	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.093	0.6275		
The things about which I feel passionate have priority in my life	Random	998	4.272	0.7063	0.165	
	Comparative	247	4.340	0.6421		
I know myself pretty well	Random	998	4.134	0.6910	0.209	
	Comparative	247	4.194	0.5936		
I could describe my personality	Random	998	3.983	0.7736	0.409	
	Comparative	247	4.028	0.7672		
I can describe how I am similar to other people	Random	998	3.841	0.7261	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.012	0.6147		
Self-reflection is difficult for me	Random	998	3.487	1.0131	0.835	
	Comparative	247	3.502	1.0236		
I am comfortable expressing myself	Random	998	3.920	0.7972	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.130	0.6863		

Italicized statement reflects item reversal

Congruence

Congruence was defined in the model as: Thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty toward others; actions are consistent with most deeply-held beliefs and convictions (HERI, 1996). The comparative sample reported significantly

higher means than the random sample on all the items except one. Items that showed a significant difference included:

- My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs
- It is important to me to act on my beliefs
- My actions are consistent with my values
- Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me
- My behaviors reflect my beliefs
- I am genuine.

The only item that did not show a significant difference between means for each sample was: It is easy for me to be truthful.

Table 13

Congruence

Congruence	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs	Random	998	4.114	0.5882	0.002	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.247	0.5841		
It is important to me to act on my beliefs	Random	998	4.136	0.6669	0.020	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.235	0.5716		
My actions are consistent with my values	Random	998	4.075	0.6699	0.043	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.170	0.6144		
Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me	Random	998	4.359	0.7121	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.538	0.5609		
My behaviors reflect my beliefs	Random	998	4.048	0.6965	0.016	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.166	0.6382		
I am genuine	Random	998	4.182	0.6930	0.018	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.296	0.5961		
It is easy for me to be truthful	Random	998	4.150	0.7571	0.196	
	Comparative	247	4.219	0.6873		

Commitment

In the social change model of leadership, commitment was defined as: the psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort; implies passion, intensity, and duration, and is directed toward both the group activity as well as its intended outcomes (HERI, 1996).

Table 14 below contains the N, means, standard deviation and p value for the six items in this scale. A significant difference in means between the two samples occurred in only three of the six:

- I am willing to devote the time and energy to things that are important to me.
- I stick with others through difficult times
- I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to.

Items which showed no difference between the samples included:

- I am focused on my responsibilities
- I can be counted on to do my part
- I follow through on my promises.

Table 14

Commitment

Commitment	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
I am willing to devote the time and energy to things that are important to me	Random	998	3.986	0.6317	0.000	
	Comparative	247	4.271	0.5661		comparative > random
I stick with others through difficult times	Random	998	4.204	0.6630	0.016	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.316	0.6027		
I am focused on my responsibilities	Random	998	4.142	0.6504	0.193	
	Comparative	247	4.202	0.6435		
I can be counted on to do my part	Random	998	4.385	0.6208	0.404	
	Comparative	247	4.421	0.5710		
I follow through on my promises	Random	998	4.280	0.5984	0.928	
	Comparative	247	4.283	0.5918		
I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to	Random	998	4.306	0.6107	0.021	
	Comparative	247	4.405	0.5827		comparative > random

Collaboration

The social change model of leadership used in this study defined collaboration as: Working with others in a common effort; constituting the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust (HERI, 1996). In Table 9 below each of the items show a significant difference between the means for each item. This was one of two values/constructs where each item in the scale showed a significant difference in means between the two OSU groups.

Table 15

Collaboration

Collaboration	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
I am seen as someone who works well with others	Random	998	4.081	0.6525	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.279	0.5693		
I can make a difference when I work with others on a task	Random	998	4.058	0.5913	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.231	0.5252		

Table 15 (continued)

Collaboration

Collaboration	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
I actively listen to what others have to say	Random	998	4.109	0.6295	0.001	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.251	0.5274		
I enjoy working with others toward common goals	Random	998	4.076	0.6208	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.352	0.5571		
Others would describe me as a cooperative group member	Random	998	4.097	0.6121	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.259	0.5537		
Collaboration produces better results	Random	998	3.939	0.7313	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.138	0.7250		
My contributions are recognized by others in the groups I belong to	Random	998	3.621	0.7980	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.105	0.6416		
I am able to trust the people with whom I work	Random	998	3.788	0.7501	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.036	0.7004		

Common Purpose

Common Purpose in the context of the social change model of leadership was defined as: Working with shared aims and values; facilitating the group's ability to engage in collective analysis of issues at hand and the task to be undertaken (HERI, 1996). In this value/construct scale seven items out of nine had significant differences in means between the two groups. These included:

- I am committed to a collective purpose in those groups to which I belong
- I contribute to the goals of the group
- I think it is important to know other people's priorities
- I have helped to shape the mission of the group
- I know the purpose of the groups to which I belong
- I work well when I know the collective values of a group
- I support what the group is trying to accomplish.

The remaining two items did not demonstrate a significant difference in means between the two groups.

Table 16

Common Purpose

Common purpose	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
I am committed to a collective purpose in those groups to which I belong	Random	998	4.335	0.6303	0.002	
	Comparative	247	4.470	0.5614		comparative > random
It is important to develop a common direction in a group in order to get anything done	Random	998	4.043	0.7408	0.083	
	Comparative	247	4.134	0.7117		
I contribute to the goals of the group	Random	998	4.105	0.5735	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.247	0.5018		
I think it is important to know other people's priorities	Random	998	4.063	0.6342	0.000	
	Comparative	247	4.259	0.5463		comparative > random
I have helped to shape the mission of the group	Random	998	3.794	0.7287	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.069	0.5975		
Common values drive an organization	Random	998	3.881	0.7102	0.051	
	Comparative	247	3.980	0.7295		
I know the purpose of the groups to which I belong	Random	998	4.047	0.5777	0.000	
	Comparative	247	4.255	0.5370		comparative > random
I work well when I know the collective values of a group	Random	998	3.730	0.6796	0.000	
	Comparative	247	3.903	0.5970		comparative > random
I support what the group is trying to accomplish	Random	998	4.024	0.6393	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.215	0.5471		

Controversy with Civility

Controversy with civility was defined in the model as: Recognizing two fundamental realities of any creative group effort: differences in viewpoints are inevitable, and that such differences must be aired openly, but with civility. Civility implies respect for others, a willingness to hear each others' views, and the exercise of restraint in criticizing the views and actions of others (HERI, 1996). Of the eleven items making up this scale, nine of the eleven showed significant differences in means between the two groups with the comparator group showing higher means for the items.

Items with significant differences in means included:

- I am open to others ideas
- Creativity can come from conflict
- I value differences in others
- Hearing differences in opinions enriches my thinking
- Greater harmony can come out of disagreement
- I respect opinions other than my own
- When there is conflict between two people, one will win and the other will lose

- I am comfortable with conflict
- I share my ideas with others.

Interestingly, the results for the item: "When there is conflict between two people, one will win that the other will lose" were opposite to what the model would predict.

Table 17

Controversy with Civility

Civility	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
I am open to others ideas	Random	998	4.002	0.6763	0.029	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.105	0.6091		
Creativity can come from conflict	Random	998	3.750	0.8042	0.057	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.846	0.6812		
I value differences in others	Random	998	4.059	0.6700	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.259	0.5961		
Hearing differences in opinions enriches my thinking	Random	998	4.076	0.6735	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.247	0.5910		
I struggle when group members have ideas that are different from mine	Random	998	3.524	0.8337	0.472	
	Comparative	247	3.567	0.8426		
Greater harmony can come out of disagreement	Random	998	3.614	0.8273	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.923	0.7639		
I respect opinions other than my own	Random	998	4.201	0.6385	0.008	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.320	0.5693		
I am uncomfortable when someone disagrees with me	Random	998	3.420	0.9347	0.536	
	Comparative	247	3.377	0.9959		
When there is conflict between two people, one will win and the other will lose	Random	998	3.747	0.8381	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.960	0.8497		
I am comfortable with conflict	Random	998	3.806	0.7348	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.142	0.6566		
I share my ideas with others	Random	998	3.911	0.6800	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.101	0.5648		

Citizenship

The social change model of leadership defined citizenship as: The process whereby an individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity. To be a good citizen is to work for positive change on the behalf of others and the community (HERI, 1996).

Each item in the citizenship scale showed a significant difference in means between groups. The comparator sample reported a significantly higher mean on all of these items than did the

random sample. Citizenship was one of two scales where the comparator sample showed significant differences on all the items making up the scale. The other scale was Collaboration which was mentioned previously.

Table 18

Citizenship

Citizenship	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Differences
I believe I have responsibilities to my community	Random	998	3.748	0.7860	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.166	0.6382		
I give time to making a difference for someone else	Random	998	3.875	0.7273	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.130	0.6242		
I work with others to make my communities better places	Random	998	3.811	0.6991	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.988	0.6213		
I have the power to make a difference in my community	Random	998	3.939	0.7327	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.239	0.6952		
I am willing to act for the rights of others	Random	998	3.982	0.6284	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.154	0.5849		
I participate in activities that contribute to the common good	Random	998	3.804	0.6533	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.126	0.5526		
I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public	Random	998	3.991	0.6050	0.005	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.109	0.5775		
I value opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community	Random	998	3.385	0.9471	0.001	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.599	0.8585		

Change

Change was defined in the model as: The ability to adapt to environments and situations that are constantly evolving, while maintaining the core functions of the group (HERI, 1996). Half of the items in this scale showed a significant difference in means with the comparative sample reporting significantly higher scores on:

- Transition makes me uncomfortable
- I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking a things
- Change brings new life to an organization
- There is energy in doing something a new way
- I work well in changing environments.

There were no significant differences between group means in the remaining five items of this scale.

Table 19

Change

Change	Sample Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig	Direction of Difference
Transition makes me uncomfortable	Random	998	3.448	0.8883	0.036	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.579	0.8318		
I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking a things	Random	998	3.868	0.7295	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.049	0.6357		
Change brings new life to an organization	Random	998	3.912	0.6240	0.004	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.032	0.5693		
There is energy in doing something a new way	Random	998	3.870	0.6591	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	4.032	0.5622		
Change makes me uncomfortable	Random	998	3.514	0.9327	0.068	
	Comparative	247	3.630	0.8819		
New ways of doing things frustrates me	Random	998	3.701	0.7712	0.259	
	Comparative	247	3.757	0.6730		
I work well in changing environments	Random	998	3.737	0.7753	0.000	comparative > random
	Comparative	247	3.955	0.6518		
I am open to new ideas	Random	998	4.135	0.5931	0.226	
	Comparative	247	4.186	0.5893		
I look for news ways to do something	Random	998	3.874	0.7387	0.112	
	Comparative	247	3.951	0.6730		
I can identify the differences between positive and negative change	Random	998	3.520	0.7893	0.061	
	Comparative	247	3.619	0.7331		

Relationship of Key Demographic Characteristics to the Social Change Model of Leadership Values/Constructs

Several key demographic characteristics were compared within groups to determine if the presence or absence of these characteristics was significantly related the social model of leadership scales. The following section of the results contains the tables for the levels of significance within the OSU random sample, OSU comparative sample, and the national sample. Only those items with at least 30 in each cell were analyzed. Thus, for some of the items below, the OSU samples may not have had sufficient respondents in each cell to make the comparison. The p value was set at .01 for these comparisons. As stated earlier, the University of Maryland research team asked individual college and university participants not to disclose specific data regarding the national sample. Thus, while the OSU data for these comparisons is available and is contained in Appendix F the national data is not.

Table 20 below contains the results of these comparisons for class status. The OSU random sample showed no significant differences in the social change model scales among the four classes: Senior, Junior, Sophomore, and Freshman. The OSU comparative sample had

insufficient N's in the four class categories to do the comparison. The national sample reported significantly different levels of each construct/value based upon student classification. With the self-understanding scale, seniors reported significantly more self understanding than did juniors and juniors showed significantly more than sophomores and sophomores showed significantly more than freshman. This same pattern was true of each of the values/constructs in the model.

Thus, the national data suggested that class status did have an influence on the level of each construct/value in the model with the higher class status showing significantly greater levels of each of the eight scales.

Table 20

Class Status

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	No significant differences among class status on constructs of social change model	Insufficient N for analysis of significant difference between class status on constructs of social change model	Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Congruence			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Commitment			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Collaboration			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Common purpose			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Civility			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Citizenship			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman
Change			Senior >Junior>Sophomore>Freshman

The relationship of gender to the constructs/values for the OSU random sample suggested that females were significantly more aligned with common purpose than were males. Males however were significantly more aligned with change than were females. The OSU comparative sample had insufficient N's for analysis.

The national sample showed women scoring significantly higher than men on Self-Understanding, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose, Civility, and Citizenship than males. Males scored significantly higher than transgendered individuals on each of these items as well.

Males scored significantly higher than women on Change which was consistent with the OSU random sample results. Females scored higher than transgendered individuals on this item as well.

Table 21

Gender

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding		Insufficient N for analysis	Female > Male > Transgender
Congruence			Female > Male > Transgender
Commitment			Female > Male > Transgender
Collaboration			Female > Male > Transgender
Common purpose	Female > Male		Female > Male > Transgender
Civility			Female > Male > Transgender
Citizenship			Female > Male > Transgender
Change	Male > Female		Male > Female > Transgender

Table 22 below contains the results of the analysis for the influence of sexual orientation on the social model of leadership scales. For both of the OSU samples, there was not sufficient N for analysis. However, for the national sample students who self-identified as heterosexual reported significantly higher scores on self-understanding, congruence, commitment, and collaboration than did gay or bisexual students. Gay or bisexual students scored significantly higher on the same items than students who preferred not to declare their sexual orientation.

Heterosexual students and gay or bisexual students scored significantly higher on common purpose than students who preferred not to declare their sexual orientation. The area of civility showed a different pattern of responses with gay or bisexual students scoring significantly higher than heterosexual students. Heterosexual students scored significantly higher on this category than did those who preferred not to disclose their sexual orientation.

Regarding the Change scale, gay or bisexual students scored significantly higher than did either heterosexual or students who preferred not to disclose their sexual orientation.

Table 22

Sexual Orientation

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	Heterosexual > Gay or Bisexual > Rather not say
Congruence			Heterosexual > Gay or Bisexual > Rather not say
Commitment			Heterosexual > Gay or Bisexual > Rather not say
Collaboration			Heterosexual > Gay or Bisexual > Rather not say

Table 22 (continued)

Sexual Orientation

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Common purpose	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	Heterosexual, Gay or Bisexual > Rather not say
Civility			Gay or Bisexual > Heterosexual > Rather not say
Citizenship			Gay or Bisexual > Heterosexual > Rather not say
Change			Gay or Bisexual > Heterosexual, Rather not say

OSU samples had insufficient N's to do the analysis on the influence of race on the social change model of leadership scales. The national sample however did have sufficient N's and thus the results reported here referred only to the national sample (Table 17).

Black students scored significantly higher on self-understanding than did White, Asian, Latino, multiracial, or Not included. White, American Indian, Latino, Multiracial and Not Included scored significantly higher than Asian students on this scale.

In the area of congruence, White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, and Not Included scored significantly higher than Asian students. Additionally White, Black and Multiracial students scored significantly higher than students who reported that their race was not included in the listing.

White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, and Not Included scored significantly higher than Asian students on Commitment. White, Black and Multiracial students scored significantly higher than Not Included on commitment also.

On collaboration Black students scored significantly higher than White, Asian, Multiracial, and Not Included students. White, Black, Latino, Multiracial and Not Included scored significantly higher on collaboration than Asian students. Latino students scored significantly higher than White or Multiracial students on collaboration.

Black students scored significantly higher on common purpose than White, Asian, and Not Included students. White, Black Latino, Multiracial and Not Included students scored significantly higher than Asian students. Further Multiracial students scored significantly higher on common purpose than Not Included students scored.

The results for the civility scale showed that White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, and Not Included students scored significantly higher on civility than did Asian students. Black and Multiracial students scored significantly higher than White students and Multiracial students scored significantly higher than Latino students.

White, Black, Latino, Multiracial and Not Included students scored significantly higher than Asian students on citizenship. Black and Multiracial students scored significantly higher than

White students on citizenship and Black students scored significantly higher than Latino students on this same value/construct.

On the change scale Black students scored significantly higher than White, Asian, Latino, Multiracial, and Not Included students. Latino, Multiracial and Not included students scored significantly higher than White students on change. Additionally White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, and Not included scored significantly higher than Asian students.

Table 23

Race

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	Black>White, Asian, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included White, American Indian, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian
Congruence			White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian White, Black, Multiracial > Not included
Commitment			White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian White, Black, Multiracial > Not Included
Collaboration			Black> White, Asian, Multiracial, Not Included White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian Latino > White, Multiracial
Common purpose			Black> White, Asian, Not Included White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included >Asian Multiracial > Not Included
Civility			White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian Black, Multiracial > White Multiracial > Latino
Citizenship			White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian Black, Multiracial > White Black > Latino
Change			Black> White, Asian, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > White White, Black, Latino, Multiracial, Not Included > Asian

Table 24 below contains the interpretation of statistical significance for first generation student status. The OSU random sample showed no statistical significant difference between first generation and non-first generation students on any of the social change model of leadership scales. The OSU comparative sample had insufficient N for analysis.

Regarding the national sample, non-first generation students scored significantly higher than first generation students on self-understanding, congruence, common purpose, and citizenship. First generation students scored significantly higher than non-first generation students on change.

Table 24

First Generation Students

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	No statistical significance	Insufficient N for analysis	Non-First Generation > First Generation
Congruence			Non-First Generation > First Generation
Commitment			
Collaboration			
Common purpose			Non-First Generation > First Generation
Civility			
Citizenship			Non-First Generation > First Generation
Change			First Generation > Non-First Generation

Relationship of Key Environmental Variables to the Social Change Model of Leadership Valaues/Constructs

Specific environmental/experiential factors were tested to determine the difference, if any, between having the experience and not having the experience on the eight values/constructs of the social change model of leadership. The following tables contain the results of the analysis for each of the environmental/experiential items tested. Tables of means, standard deviations, and N's for those environmental variables tested for the OSU Random sample and the OSU Comparative sample are contained in Appendix G.

Study Abroad participants from the OSU random sampled scored significantly higher on the civility and the change scales than did those respondents who had not participated in study abroad. For the national sample, all eight of the values/constructs showed significantly higher means on each of the scales than did those who had not participated in study abroad. There were not enough respondents in the OSU comparative sample for an analysis to be conducted.

Table 25

Study Abroad Participant

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding		Insufficient N for analysis	Yes > No
Congruence			Yes > No
Commitment			Yes > No
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			Yes > No
Civility	Yes > No		Yes > No
Citizenship			Yes > No
Change	Yes > No		Yes > No

Participants in internship programs for the OSU random sample and the national sample scored significantly higher on all eight of the values/construct scales. Interestingly, there were no significant differences in these scales with the OSU comparative sample.

Table 26

Experienced Internship

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Yes > No	No significant differences	Yes > No
Congruence	Yes > No		Yes > No
Commitment	Yes > No		Yes > No
Collaboration	Yes > No		Yes > No
Common purpose	Yes > No		Yes > No
Civility			Yes > No
Citizenship	Yes > No		Yes > No
Change	Yes > No		Yes > No

The National sample respondents who had participated in a learning community scored significantly higher on all eight of the values/constructs than those who had not had this experience. The OSU sample participants, random and comparative, did not show any significant difference in means for any of the scales.

Table 27

Learning Community Participant

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	No significant difference	No significant difference	Yes > No
Congruence			Yes > No
Commitment			Yes > No
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			Yes > No
Civility			Yes > No
Citizenship			Yes > No
Change			Yes > No

Senior capstone participants in the national sample scored significantly higher on each of the eight values/construct scales. The OSU samples did not show any significant difference between participants in a senior capstone and those who did not participate.

Table 28

Senior Capstone Participant

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	No significant difference	No significant difference	Yes > No
Congruence			Yes > No
Commitment			Yes > No
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			Yes > No
Civility			Yes > No
Citizenship			Yes > No
Change			Yes > No

National sample respondents who reported much involvement in college organizations scored significantly higher than those who reported many involvements. Many reported significantly higher scores than those with only some involvement, one involvement or no involvement in all eight value/construct scales. The OSU random sample showed a similar pattern with more involvement being significantly different than the decreasing levels of involvement. In all cases in both the OSU random sample and the national sample, it appeared that some involvement in college organizations was significantly better than no involvement regarding the development of values related to the social change model of leadership.

Table 29

Involvement in College Organizations

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Much > Never, One, Some	Insufficient N for Analysis	Much > Many > Some > One, Never
Congruence	Much > Never		Much > Many > Some > One, Never
Commitment	Much > Never		Much > Many > Some > One > Never
Collaboration	Some, Many, Much > Never		Much > Many > Some > One, Never
Common purpose	Many > Never Much > Never, One, Some		Much > Many > Some > One, Never
Civility	Many > Never Much > Never, One		Much > Many > Some > One, Never
Citizenship	Some > Never Many > Never, One Much > Never, One, Some		Much > Many > Some > One > Never
Change	Many > Never, One		Much > Many > Some > One > Never

Overall, respondents who reported more leadership positions in college organizations in the national sample or the OSU random sample reported significantly higher scores on the social change model of leadership scales than did those who had a lesser degree of experience in leadership positions.

Table 30

Leadership Positions in College Organizations

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Much > Never, One	Insufficient N for analysis	Much, Many, Some > Never Much > Many > Some, One
Congruence	Much > Never, Some		Much > Many > Some, One, Never
Commitment	Much > Never, One, Some		Much > Many > Some, One, Never
Collaboration	Many > Never Much > Never, One, Some		Much > Many > Some, One, Never
Common purpose	Many > Never Much > Never, One, Some		Much > Many > Some, One, Never
Civility	Much > Never, One, Some		Some, Many, Much > Never Much > Many > One, Some

Table 30 (continued)

Leadership Positions in College Organizations

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Citizenship	Many > Never Much > Never, One, Some, Many		Much > Many > Some > One > Never
Change	Much > Never, One, Some		Much > Many > Some, One, Never Some > Never

Respondents in the national sample who had engaged in short-term leadership experiences more frequently reported significantly higher means on each of the social change model of leadership scales. Similarly, OSU random sample respondents who had participated in several or many such experiences tended to report a significantly higher score on the self-understanding, congruence, common purpose, civility, and change scales. Those who reported having participate in many such experiences reported significantly higher scores on commitment, collaboration, and citizenship than those who had only several of those experiences. In all cases respondents having several or many of these experiences reported higher scores on the scales than did those who reported only one or never having had those experiences.

Table 31

Short-Term Leadership Experiences

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Several, Many > Never, One	Insufficient N for Analysis	Many > Several > One > Never
Congruence	Several, Many > Never, One		Many > Several > One, Never
Commitment	Many > Several > Never, One		Many > Several > One, Never
Collaboration	Many > Several > Never, One		Many > Several > One > Never
Common purpose	Several, Many > Never, One		Many > Several > One > Never
Civility	Several, Many > Never, One		Many > Several > One > Never
Citizenship	Many > Several > Never, One		Many > Several > One > Never
Change	Several, Many > Never, One		Many > Several > One > Never

Respondents in the national sample who reported many moderate term leadership experiences scored significantly higher on the eight scales than did those who reported only several experiences. Likewise, those who reported several scored significantly higher than did those who reported only one experience. The same was true for those who had only one experience.

They reported significantly higher scores than those who reported never having had a moderate term leadership experience.

The OSU random sample respondents reported similar results to the national sample overall. Many moderate term experiences were significantly higher overall than never having had those experiences. Though in the case of collaboration, common purpose, civility, and change, having had several or even one experience was significantly higher than never having had that experience.

For the OSU comparative sample, having had many moderate term leadership experiences scored significantly higher than having had only one such experience in seven of the eight scales. The self-understanding scale respondents did not score significantly differently for different levels of experience.

Table 32

Moderate Term Leadership Experiences

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Many, One> Never		Many > Several > One > Never
Congruence	Many > Never	Many > One	Many > Several > One, Never
Commitment	Many > Several, Never	Many > One	Many > Several > One, Never
Collaboration	Many, Several, One > Never	Many > Several >Never > One	Many > Several > One, Never
Common purpose	Several, One,> Never Many > Never, One, Several	Many > One	Many > Several > One, Never
Civility	Many, Several, One > Never	Several > One Many > One, Never	Many > Several > One, Never
Citizenship	Several, One > Never	Many > Several > One > Never	Many > Several > One, Never
Change	Many, Several, One > Never	Many > One > Never	Many > Several > One, Never

The respondents in both of the OSU samples reported no significant difference in any of the social change model of leadership scales concerning the number of long-term leadership experiences. The national sample respondents who had many long term leadership experiences scored significantly higher on all eight scales than did those who had several, one, or none of these experiences.

Table 33

Long-Term Leadership Experiences

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	No significant difference	No significant difference	Many > Several, One, Never Several > One
Congruence			Many > Several, One, Never Several, Never > One
Commitment			Many > Never > Several , One
Collaboration			Many > Several > One > Never
Common purpose			Many > Several > One, Never
Civility			Many > Never, Several > One
Citizenship			Many > Several > One > Never
Change			Many > Several > One, Never

Regarding the influence of an emerging new leaders program, the OSU samples had an insufficient number of respondents to execute the analysis. The national sample respondents who reported participating in an emerging new leaders program reported significantly higher scores on each of the eight social change model of leadership scales.

Table 34

Emerging New Leaders Program

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for Analysis	Insufficient N for Analysis	Yes > No
Congruence			Yes > No
Commitment			Yes > No
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			Yes > No
Civility			Yes > No
Citizenship			Yes > No
Change			Yes > No

OSU respondents in both the random sample and the comparative sample reported no significant differences between those who had peer leadership program experience and those who did not. With the national sample those who had experienced a peer leadership program reported significantly higher scores on collaboration, common purpose, citizenship, and change than those who had not had that experience.

Table 35

Peer Leadership Program

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	No significant difference	No significant difference	
Congruence			
Commitment			
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			Yes > No
Civility			
Citizenship			Yes > No
Change			Yes > No

There were insufficient numbers of respondents from both OSU samples to execute the analysis on participation in a leadership certificate program (Table 30 below). The national sample reported no difference in scores between those who had participated in a leadership certificate program and those who had not participated.

Table 36

Leadership Certificate Program

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	No significant difference
Congruence			
Commitment			
Collaboration			
Common purpose			
Civility			
Citizenship			
Change			

There were insufficient numbers of respondents from both OSU samples to execute the analysis on participation in a multi-semester leadership program (Table 37 below). The national sample reported no difference in scores between those who had participated in a multi-semester leadership program and those who had not participated on all but one scale, collaboration. Those who reported that they had participated in a multi-semester leadership program reported significantly higher score on collaboration than those who had not had that experience.

Table 37

Multi-Semester Leadership Program

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	
Congruence			
Commitment			
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			
Civility			
Citizenship			
Change			

There were insufficient numbers of respondents from both OSU samples to execute the analysis on participation in a senior leadership capstone (Table 32 below). The national sample reported no difference in scores between those who had participated in a senior leadership capstone program and those who had not participated on all but one scale, congruence. Those who reported that they had NOT participated in a senior leadership capstone reported a significantly higher score on collaboration than those who had participated in a senior capstone experience..

Table 38

Senior Leadership Capstone

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	
Congruence			No > Yes
Commitment			
Collaboration			
Common purpose			
Civility			
Citizenship			
Change			

There were insufficient numbers of OSU random sample respondents to calculate levels of significance for the residential living learning leadership experience (Table 33 below). The OSU comparative sample reported no significant difference between those who had participated in a residential living learning leadership experience and those who had not. The national sample respondents reported significantly higher scores on commitment, collaboration, civility, and citizenship than did respondents who had not had the residential living learning leadership experience.

Table 39

Residential Living Learning Leadership Experience

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	No significant difference	
Congruence			
Commitment			Yes > No
Collaboration			Yes > No
Common purpose			
Civility			Yes > No
Citizenship			Yes > No
Change			

Respondents in the national sample who had NOT experienced a leadership minor reported significantly higher scores on all eight of the social change model of leadership scales. For both of the OSU samples, there were an insufficient number of respondents to conduct the analysis.

Table 40

Leadership Minor

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	No > Yes
Congruence			No > Yes
Commitment			No > Yes
Collaboration			No > Yes
Common purpose			No > Yes
Civility			No > Yes
Citizenship			No > Yes
Change			No > Yes

Respondents in the national sample who had NOT experienced a leadership major reported significantly higher scores on all eight of the social change model of leadership scales (Table 35 below). For both of the OSU samples, there were an insufficient number of respondents to conduct the analysis.

Table 41

Leadership Major

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding	Insufficient N for analysis	Insufficient N for analysis	No > Yes
Congruence			No > Yes
Commitment			No > Yes
Collaboration			No > Yes
Common purpose			No > Yes
Civility			No > Yes
Citizenship			No > Yes
Change			No > Yes

The OSU random sample respondents reported significantly higher scores on the change scale of the social change model of leadership if they lived in other, private home, apartment, or room rather than a residence hall. The OSU comparative sample respondents reported no significant difference regarding residence on the eight scales.

For the national sample respondents:

- For self-understanding, those who lived in a private home, other student housing, Greek housing reported significantly higher scores than those who lived in a parent home. Likewise those who lived in a private home scored significantly higher than those who lived in a residence hall, other student housing, or other. Similarly, those who lived in other student housing or Greek housing reported significantly higher scores than those who lived in a residence hall.

- For congruence, those who lived in a private home showed significantly higher scores than those who lived in a parent home, residence hall, Greek housing or other. Further those who lived in other student housing reported significantly higher scores than those who lived in a residence hall.

- For commitment, those who lived in a private home, residence hall, or other student housing reported significantly higher scores than other. Likewise those who lived in a private home or other student housing scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home or residence hall.

- For collaboration, those who lived in a private home, other student housing, Greek housing scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home or other. Private home and other student hosing residents scored significantly higher than did residence hall residents.

- For common purpose, those who lived in a private home, residence hall, other student housing or Greek housing scored significantly higher than other. Those who lived in a private home, other student housing and Greek hosing scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home or a residence hall.

- For civility, those who lived in a private home scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home, residence hall, other student housing, Greek housing or other. Those who lived in other student housing scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home.

- For citizenship, those who lived in a private home or Greek housing scored significantly higher than those who lived in other. Those who lived in a parent home, private home, Greek housing scored significantly higher than those who lived in a residence hall. Likewise those who lived in a private home, Greek housing or other student housing scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home.

- For change, those who lived in a private home scored significantly higher than those who lived in a parent home, residence hall, other student housing or Greek housing. Those who lived in other student hosing, Greek Housing or other scored significantly higher than those who lived in a residence hall.

Table 42

Place of Residence

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	**Statistical Significance**	**Statistical Significance**
Self-understanding		No significant difference	Private Home, Other Student Housing, Greek Housing > Parent Home Private Home > Residence Hall, Other Student Housing, Other Other Student Housing, Greek Housing > Residence Hall
Congruence			Private Home > Parent Home, Residence Hall, Greek Housing, Other Other Student Housing > Residence Hall
Commitment			Private Home, Residence Hall, Other Student Housing > Other Private Home, Other Student Housing > Parent Home, Residence Hall
Collaboration			Private Home, Other Student Housing, Greek Housing > Parent Home , Other Private Home, Other Student Housing > Residence Hall
Common purpose			Private Home, Residence Hall, Other Student Housing, Greek Housing > Other Private Home, Other Student Housing, Greek Housing > Parent Home, Residence Hall

Table 42 (continued)

Place of Residence

Constructs	OSU Random	OSU Comparative	National
	Statistical Significance	Statistical Significance	Statistical Significance
Civility		No significant difference	Private Home > Parent Home, Residence Hall, Other Student Housing, Greek Housing, Other Other Student Housing > Parent Home
Citizenship			Private Home, Greek Housing > Other Parent Home, Private Home, Greek Housing > Residence Hall Private Home, Greek Housing, Other Student Housing > Parent Home
Change	Other, Private home, Apartment, or room > Residence Hall		Private home > Parent Home, Residence Hall, Other Student Housing, Greek Housing Other Student Housing, Greek Housing, Other > Residence Hall

OSU Specific Questions

The OSU partners in this project were able to add six questions to the survey that was administered to OSU samples. Appendix B contains the OSU-specific questions. The following tables contain the percentage of respondents in each OSU sample who endorsed the item.

Table 37 below contains the percentage of respondents who endorsed each of the choices available for the question about what experience had the most influence on their personal leadership development. The three most endorsed influences by the random sample respondents were social group, organized groups and academic courses. The comparator sample which was composed of identified student leaders endorsed organized groups, employment at OSU, and other as the experiences that most influenced their leadership development. In addition respondents in both groups had the opportunity to write in other influences. These can be found in Appendices D and E.

The three least endorsed items for the random sample group were employment at OSU, staff advisor or mentor, or training program while at OSU. For the comparative group, their least endorsed items included involvement outside of OSU, academic courses, high school, and training program while at OSU.

Table 43

Most Influence on Personal Leadership Development

While at OSU, what has had the most influence on your personal leadership development?	OSU Random %	OSU Comparative %
Social group (friends/classmates)	22.3	11.1
Organized groups (Club/organization members, hall council)	16.3	32.8
Academic courses	13.8	3.7
High school	10.3	3.7
Haven't really developed any leadership skills	9.6	0.0
Other (specify)	8.6	13.9
Involvement outside of OSU (church, service group)	7.4	3.3
Employment at OSU	6.0	20.1
Staff advisor or Mentor	4.9	7.8
Training program while at OSU (peer health advocates, START leader, etc.)	0.8	3.7

The most recent on-campus work experience for the OSU random sample was “didn’t work on campus” while for the comparative group the most recent experience was in University Housing and Dining Services.

Table 44

Most Recent On-Campus Work

If you have worked on campus during your time at OSU, where have you worked most recently?	OSU Random %	OSU Comparative %
Didn’t work on campus	**58.4**	15.6
Other (specify)	17.0	18.9
Individual college or academic department	8.7	7.4
University Housing and Dining Services	7.2	**26.2**
Dixon Recreation Center	2.6	6.6
Memorial Union	1.7	5.3
Student Involvement	1.0	6.6
Valley Library	1.0	0.4
Cultural Center	0.6	4.5
Financial Aid	0.6	0.4
SOAR/Enrollment Services	0.4	3.7
MEO or EOP	0.3	2.9
Student Health Services	0.2	0.0
Women’s Center	0.2	1.6
Career Services	0.1	0.0

Respondents in the random sample reported that the three most important things that they learned from participating in a club or organization at OSU were effective communication, teamwork, and people skills. For the comparator group the three most important things they learned were effective communication, people skills, and teamwork.

Table 45

Most Important Things Learned from Being in a Club or Organization at OSU

If you have been involved in a club or organization at OSU, what are the three most important things you learned? Multiple responses possible	**OSU Random %**	**OSU Comparative %**
Effective communication	**34.6**	**55.3**
Didn't participate in a club or organization at OSU	34.5	6.6
Teamwork, working in a group	**34.3**	**42.2**
People skills (customer service, conflict resolution, listening)	**25.1**	**45.1**
Self confidence	21.6	29.1
Working with others who have a different perspective	17.0	24.6
Healthy Living Skills (time management, stress management, life balance, self-care)	12.4	18.0
Critical thinking, analytical skills	12.2	16.4
Citizenship, community building	9.9	18.9
Authenticity, acting consistently with your values	7.5	14.8
Business or Technical Skills (organization, computer systems)	5.8	2.5
Other (specify)	2.7	0.4

When both the random sample and the comparative sample were asked to select the one thing that they wished they had learned from their involvement in a club or organization, the agreed that they would like to have learned more about Business or technical skills and Healthy living skills.

Table 46

Wished Had Learned by Being Involved in a Club or Organization at OSU But Didn't

If you have been involved in a club or organization, what is one thing you didn't learn but wanted to learn more about?	**OSU Random %**	**OSU Comparative %**
Not applicable	23.6	20.7
Business or Technical skills (organization, computer systems	**19.4**	**26.4**
Healthy Living skills (time management, stress management, l	**14.0**	**14.5**
Critical thinking, analytical skills	7.6	8.4
Citizenship, community building	6.8	4.4

Table 46 (continued)

Wished Had Learned by Being Involved in a Club or Organization at OSU But Didn't

If you have been involved in a club or organization, what is one thing you didn't learn but wanted to learn more about?	OSU Random %	OSU Comparative %
Self-confidence	6.7	4.4
Effective Communication	5.0	5.3
Working with others who have a different perspective	4.8	5.3
Authenticity, acting consistent with your values	4.7	6.6
People skills (customer service, conflict resolution, listen	4.5	3.5
Teamwork, working in a group	1.9	0.0
Other (specify)	0.9	0.4

Students were asked to select those experiences or beliefs that motivated them to participate in a club or organization. Both the OSU random sample and the comparative sample's most selected items included: someone invited me, I wanted to be with other people similar to myself, and I wanted to make a difference.

Table 47

Motivation to Participate in Club or Organization

If you have been involved in a club or organization, what motivated you to participate? Multiple responses possible	OSU Random %	OSU Comparative %
Someone invited me	**41.9**	**44.9**
I wanted to be with other people similar to myself	**28.9**	**39.9**
I wanted to make a difference	**25.5**	**51.4**
I wanted to acquire or develop a skill	25.3	35.0
I wanted to enhance or develop my resume	24.7	32.9
It was related to my intended profession	23.6	19.8
I was involved in a similar group before college	16.1	26.3
My friends were joining	12.7	16.5
I wanted to learn about another culture and/or experience others who are different from me	10.9	20.2
Other (specify)	10.4	7.8
Someone in my major recommended it	9.7	6.2
It was recommended by my parents	3.5	3.7

In order to try to understand why a student would choose not to participate in a club or organization, students were asked to select reasons why. The two most selected reasons for both samples was didn't fit into my schedule and other.

Table 48

If Not Involved In a Club or Organization at OSU, Why Not?

If you HAVE NOT been involved in a club or organization while at OSU, why not? Multiple responses possible	**OSU Random %**	**OSU Comparative %**
Didn't fit into my schedule	**24.0**	**24.2**
Other (specify)	**22.4**	**31.3**
Wanted to focus on my academics	18.2	12.3
Wasn't sure how much time I had to be involved	17.1	11.9
Other commitments off campus	10.1	10.1
Not really interested in being involved on campus	8.1	4.4
Wasn't aware of the opportunities	7.8	3.5
No one invited me to participate	5.9	4.0
Didn't think I had the skills	2.0	1.8

For each of the OSU-specific questions, students were provided with an opportunity to write comments. These can be found in Appendices D and E.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Oregon State University participated in the Multi-Institutional Leadership Survey (MLS) during the spring term of 2006. A random sample of over 3000 undergraduate students were surveyed with an additional 500 students who held leadership positions on campus were added as a comparator sample. Nationally, over 63,000 students participated in the study at over 50 institutions who requested to be selected as part of the project.

The MLS was administered entirely via the web. Students were provided with an individualized login to a secure web site. The research team at the University of Maryland was responsible for conducting the study and collecting the results. They then send specific sets of data to participating schools. OSU received the raw data for the OSU random sample and the OSU comparator sample as well as comparisons made on specific key demographic and environmental variables thought to impact the eight values/constructs of the social change model.

In addition, participating schools could submit up to 10 questions that were institution-specific. OSU submitted six such questions and received the raw data for the OSU random and comparative samples.

The overall response rate was 38% for the national sample while the response rate for the OSU random sample was only 30% (982). The response rate for the OSU comparative sample was 49% (243) overall.

Demographic factors

Several of the demographic factors between the OSU random sample and the OSU comparator sample of student leaders showed some substantial differences which likely may pose questions as to why this difference exists. The following are highlights of these differences:

- There were about 20% more transfer students in the random sample than in the comparative sample. This suggested that the pathways for transfer student involvement in leadership positions may be limited. While there may be other explanations like off campus work, family commitments, etc. the comparator sample had mostly upper division students in the sample which could have similar kinds of life demands as the transfer student. At this time, little is know about how transfer students find their way into student organizations and leadership positions at OSU.

- The comparative sample had more upper division students than did the random sample. This makes some sense as upper division students are more represented in positions of leadership at OSU.

- Both samples were over-represented in terms of women respondents. This is common in terms of responses to surveys as women tend to respond to surveys more often than men.

- The comparator sample of respondents contained 4% more students who identified as LGBT than did the random sample. Likewise the comparator sample contained about 10% more students of color than did the random sample. These could be artifacts of the comparator sample selection process since groups who were more likely to have a GLBT student or a student of color were solicited for their involvement in the study. It is not clear whether participation would have occurred at these levels had not this group been encouraged to participate.

- More comparator students live on campus while more of the random sample lived off campus. This too could be an artifact of the selection process for the comparator sample since many students were required to live on campus as a condition of their leadership position. Nevertheless 50% the leadership comparative respondents lived on campus vs. 34% of the random sample respondents. This is interesting given that there was a preponderance of upperclassmen in the comparative sample (81% Juniors and Seniors).

- About 74% of the comparator sample worked on campus while only 30% of the random sample did so. Many of the student leadership positions are paid positions, and thus would be considered as on campus employment.

- The comparator group reported more community service than did the random group.

- Over 70% of the comparator group reported having participated in at least one of the following: study abroad, internship, learning community, or senior capstone. Only 47% of the random sample reported these involvements.

Pre-College Experiences

Several areas of the survey showed significant differences between the OSU random sample and the OSU comparator sample of student leaders. In particular the pre-college leadership experiences were examined as well as collegiate experiences with diversity. The following are highlights from these two areas:

- The OSU comparative group reported significantly more involvement pre-college than did the OSU random sample in volunteer work, student clubs/organizations, leadership positions, community organizations, leadership in community organizations, and participating in training or education that developed leadership skills.

- The OSU comparator group reported significantly more involvement in the number of leadership positions held pre-college than did the random sample.

Diversity Experiences and Opinions

In the area of diversity and engagement with other students about issues of diversity, the comparative sample reported significantly more interaction than the random sample.

- Specifically, in talking about differences in lifestyles and customs, talking with other students about differences in values, discussing major social issues, holding discussions with students of differing religious beliefs, expressing personal views on multiculturalism, and discussing political views with others who differ from you. In each of the areas asked, the comparator sample reported significantly more involvement in these activities than did the random sample. Whether this was a result of their leadership experiences or was a reason they were selected for leadership was not explored.

- Further, the comparative sample reported significantly more learning about issues of diversity than did the random sample. This was particularly true in the areas of:
    - Learned a great deal about other racial/ethnic groups,
    - Gained a greater commitment to racial/ethnic identity,
    - Became aware of the complexities of inter-group understanding.

In only one area did the random sample report significantly more agreement than did the comparative sample and this was with regard to the campus' commitment to diversity fostering more division among racial/ethnic groups than inter-group understanding. The random sample agreed significantly more with this statement than did the comparator sample

Social Change Values/Construct Comparisons

Overall, the OSU comparator sample responded significantly better on the eight values/constructs of the social change model than did the OSU random sample. This suggested that the students in leadership positions at OSU do differ significantly from the student in general in some very specific ways with regard to their beliefs and understanding of leadership from a social change perspective.

In order to understand these differences better, an item level analysis was done to determine which specific items on each of the values/construct scales were significantly different between groups.

The OSU comparator group scored significantly higher on the following items:

Self-Understanding Value/Construct

- I am able to articulate my priorities
- I am usually self-confident
- I can describe how I am similar to other people
- I am comfortable expressing myself.

Congruence Value/Construct

- My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs
- It is important to me to act on my beliefs
- My actions are consistent with my values
- Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me
- My behaviors reflect my beliefs
- I am genuine.

Commitment Value/Construct

- I am willing to devote the time and energy to things that are important to me
- I stick with others through difficult times
- I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to.

Collaboration

- I actively listen to what others have to say
- I enjoy working with others toward common goals
- Others would describe me as a cooperative group member
- Collaboration produces better results
- My contributions are recognized by others in the groups I belong to
- I am able to trust the people with whom I work.

Common Purpose

- I am committed to a collective purpose I those groups to which I belong
- I contribute to the goals of the group
- I think it is important to know other people's priorities
- I have helped to shape the mission of the group
- I know the purpose of the groups to which I belong
- I work well when I know the collective values of a group
- I support what the group is trying to accomplish.

Controversy with Civility

- I am open to others ideas
- Creativity can come from conflict
- I value differences in others

- Hearing differences in opinions enriches my thinking
- Grater harmony can come out of disagreement
- I respect opinions other than my own
- When there is conflict between two people, one will win and the other will lose (contraindicated by the model)
- I am comfortable with conflict
- I share my ideas with others.

Citizenship

- I believe I have responsibilities to my community
- I give time to making a difference for someone else
- I work with others to make my communities better places
- I have the power to make a difference in my community
- I am willing to act for the rights of others
- I participate in activities that contribute to the common good
- I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public
- I value opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community.

Change

- Transition makes me uncomfortable
- I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking at things
- Change brings new life to an organization
- There is energy in doing something a new way
- I work well in changing environments.

Key Demographic Factors Within Groups

Several demographic and environmental factors were examined within groups to determine if they had any affect on any of the values/constructs of the social change model of leadership. For many of the items, OSU did not have sufficient N to conduct the analysis. Therefore the results reported here pertain to the national sample unless otherwise specified.

The following demographic characteristics did seem to make a difference in the value/constructs of the model.

- The higher the classification (Senior, Junior, Sophomore, Freshman) the greater the level of significant difference within the group in each of the eight values/constructs.

- Women scored significantly higher than men or transgendered individuals on seven of the eight areas. The only area in which men scored significantly higher was change.

- Heterosexuals responded significantly higher than gay or bisexual or rather not say on self-understanding, congruence, commitment, collaboration, and common purpose. Gay or bisexual students responded higher on civility, citizenship, and change.

- Race mattered in terms of the ways in which different races responded relative to other races. Generally on all items Black, Latino, and Multiracial scored significantly higher than white or Asian students.

- Non-first generation students scored significantly higher on self-understanding, congruence, common purpose and citizenship. While, first generation students scored higher on change.

Key Environmental Factors

Specific environmental/experiential factors were tested to determine the difference, if any, between having the experience and not having the experience on the eight values/constructs of the social change model of leadership.

- Study abroad participant, internship participant, learning community participant, and senior capstone participant all showed significantly higher results on the eight values/constructs of the social change model of leadership than did non-participants.

- Those who reported much involvement in leadership positions in college organizations reported significantly higher scores on the eight values/constructs than did those who reported less experience.

- Students who reported many short-term leadership experiences had significantly higher results on all eight of the values/constructs than did those students who have fewer such involvements. The same was true of students who had moderate term experiences and longer term experiences.

- Participants in emerging new leaders programs had significantly higher results on the eight values/constructs than did those who were not participants.

- Students in peer leadership programs scored significantly higher than those not in such programs in the areas of collaboration, common purpose, citizenship, and change.

- Participants in Leadership certificate programs showed no differences from those not in such programs.

- Participants in multi-semester leadership programs reported significant difference's only on collaboration.

- Senior leadership capstone, Leadership minor, and leadership major reported results that suggested these programs were contraindicated in terms of the model. In each case non-participants in these programs reported significantly higher results than did participants.

- Participants in residential living learning leadership experiences reported significantly higher results on collaboration, commitment, civility, and citizenship than non-participants.

- Overall place of residence did seem to have some influence on the model. Generally students who lived in a private home reported higher scores than did those who lived in a parent's home. Likewise those living in a private home scored significantly higher than those who reported living in a residence hall, Greek Housing or other student housing.

OSU-Specific Questions

OSU added six questions to the survey. The following are highlights from these questions.

- Students in the random sample reported that their social group and organized clubs and groups have had the most influence on their personal leadership development. The comparator sample reported that OSU organized clubs and groups and OSU employment had the most influence on their personal leadership development.

- The random sample of students reported that the three most important things that they have learned from their involvement in student organizations was effective communication, teamwork, and people skills. The comparative sample reported likewise.

- The samples were asked what they wished they had learned from their involvement in student organizations or clubs. Both groups reported that they wished they had learned more business/technical skills and more healthy living skills.

- The four most selected items in terms of the student's motivation to participate in student organizations/clubs was the same for both groups:
    - Someone invited me
    - Wanted to make a difference
    - Wanted to be with people similar to me
    - Wanted to acquire or develop a skill

- The item selected most often for not becoming involved in a student organization or club for both groups was didn't fit my schedule.

The results of the study suggest that there are indeed differences between those students who are identified as student leaders and those who are not regarding the social change model of leadership values/constructs. Further there are differences in terms of both demographic factors and environmental factors that appeared to matter regarding the values/constructs as well.

This study was conducted by OSU to provide information about how the social change model of leadership may be reflected in our student leaders as well as students in general at OSU. To that end, the results will hopefully guide the thinking and work in developing programs and services that involve students and that are designed to develop leaders throughout the student body.

Questions

1. How can this information be used to develop experiences which foster leadership development in students who do not hold positional leadership?

2. Does Student Affairs have a leadership development model that guides the development of leadership programs and training? If not, how could one be developed?

3. Can Student Affairs engage in purposeful conversations about a leadership curriculum that will better develop students as leaders regardless of pre-college experiences and positional leadership?

Recommendations

1. Use literature and data from MLS to develop a model for leadership development at OSU and in Student Affairs in particular.

2. Engage in collaborative work with all available “leadership” training programs/trainers to develop curriculum for various levels of involvement.

3. Evaluate success of curriculum in delivering the intended leadership outcomes across areas and within areas.

4. Examine areas where the random sample and the comparator sample showed no significant differences and thus may be areas in which programs and services might be directed.

REFERENCES

Dugan, J. P. (2006). *SRLS-Rev2: The second revision of SRLS.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Dugan, J. P., Komives, S. R., & Associates. (2006). *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership: Oregon State University findings report.*

Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook, version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearing House for Leadership Programs.

.

Tyree, T. M., (1998). *Designing an instrument to measure socially responsible leadership using the social change model of leadership development*. Doctoral Dissertation. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Schools Participating in the Study

INSTITUTION	CARNEGIE TYPE	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE	SIZE
Auburn University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
Brigham Young University	Research Extensive	Private	Large
California State University, Northridge	Masters	Public	Large
California State University, San Marcos	Masters	Public	Medium
Claflin University	Baccalaureate	Private	Small
Colorado State University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
DePaul University	Research Intensive	Private	Medium
Drake University	Masters	Private	Medium
Drexel University	Research Intensive	Private	Medium
Elon University	Masters	Private	Medium
Florida International University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
Florida State University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
Franklin College	Baccalaureate	Private	Small
Gallaudet University	Masters	Private	Small
George Mason University	Research Intensive	Public	Large
Georgia State University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
John Carroll University	Masters	Private	Medium
Lehigh University	Research Extensive	Private	Medium
Marquette University	Research Extensive	Private	Medium
Meredith College	Masters	Private	Small
Metro State University	Baccalaureate	Public	Large
Miami University of Ohio	Research Intensive	Public	Large
Monroe Community College	Associates College	Public	Large
Montgomery College	Associate College	Public	Large
Moravian College	Baccalaureate	Private	Small
Mount Union College	Baccalaureate	Private	Small
North Carolina State University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
Northwestern University	Research Extensive	Private	Medium
Oregon State University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
Portland State University	Research Intensive	Public	Large
Rollins College	Masters	Private	Small
Simmons College	Masters	Private	Small
St. Norbert College	Baccalaureate	Private	Small
State University of New York at Geneseo	Masters	Public	Medium

Schools Participating in the Study (continued)

INSTITUTION	CARNEGIE TYPE	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE	SIZE
Susquehanna University	Baccalaureate	Private	Small
Syracuse University	Research Extensive	Private	Large
Texas A & M University	Research Extensive	Public	Large
Texas Woman's University	Research Intensive	Public	Medium
University of Arizona	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of Arkansas	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of California, Berkeley	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of Maryland Baltimore County	Research Extensive	Public	Medium
University of Maryland College Park	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Research Intensive	Public	Medium
University of Minnesota	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of Nevada Las Vegas	Research Intensive	Public	Large
University of New Hampshire	Research Extensive	Public	Large
University of North Carolina, Greensboro	Research Intensive	Public	Large
University of North Dakota	Research Intensive	Public	Large
University of Rochester	Research Extensive	Private	Medium
University of Tampa	Masters	Private	Medium

Appendix B

OSU-Specific Questions

1. While at OSU, what has had the <u>most</u> influence on your personal leadership development? (Choose one)

A. Training programs while at OSU (peer health advocates, leadership conference)
B. Organized group (Club/organization members, hall council)
C. Social Group (friends, classmates)
D. Faculty/Staff Advisor or Mentor
E. Academic Courses
F. Employment at OSU
G. Involvement outside of OSU (church, service group)
H. High school
I. Haven't really developed any leadership skills
J. Other (please specify) _____

2. If you have worked on campus during your time at OSU, where have you worked most recently? (Choose only one)

A. Didn't work on campus
B. Memorial Union
C. Student Health Services
D. Dixon Recreation Center
E. Career Services
F. SOAR/Enrollment Services
G. MEO or EOP
H. Cultural Center
I. Women's Center
J. University Housing and Dining Services
K. Financial Aid
L. Student Involvement
M. Valley Library
N. Individual college or academic department
O. Other (please specify) _____

3. If you have been involved in a club or organization at OSU, what are the <u>three most important</u> things you learned? (select no more than three)

A. Didn't participate in a club or organization at OSU ***(skip to question #6)***
B. Effective communication
C. Critical thinking, analytical skills
D. Citizenship, community building
E. Self-Confidence
F. Working with others who have a different perspective
G. Teamwork, working in a group
H. Authenticity, acting consistent with your values
I. People skills (customer service, conflict resolution, listening…)
J. Business or Technical Skills (organization, computer systems)
K. Healthy Living Skills (time management, stress management, life balance, self-care)

L. Other (please specify) _____

4. If you have been involved in a club or organization, what is one thing you didn't learn but wanted to learn more about? (Choose one)

A. Effective communication
B. Critical thinking, analytical skills
C. Citizenship, community building
D. Self-Confidence
E. Working with others who have a different perspective
F. Teamwork, working in a group
G. Authenticity, acting consistent with your values
H. People skills (customer service, conflict resolution, listening…)
I. Business or Technical Skills (organization, computer systems)
J. Healthy Living Skills (time management, stress management, life balance, self-care)
K. Other (please specify) _____

5. If you have been involved in a club or organization, what motivated you to participate? (Choose all that apply)

A. Someone invited me
B. I wanted to make a difference
C. I wanted to be with other people similar to myself
D. I wanted to learn about another culture and/or experience others who are different from me
E. I wanted to enhance or develop my resume
F. I wanted to acquire or develop a skill
G. I was involved in a similar group before college
H. My friends were joining
I. It was related to my intended profession
J. Someone in my major recommended it
K. It was recommended by my parents
L. Other (please specify) _____

6. If you <u>have not</u> been involved in a club or organization while at OSU, why not? (choose all that apply)

A. Not really interested in being involved on campus
B. Wasn't sure how much time I had to be involved.
C. Wasn't aware of the opportunities
D. Didn't fit into my schedule
E. Wanted to focus on my academics
F. Didn't think I had the skills
G. No one invited me to participate
H. Other commitments off campus
I. Other (please specify) _____

Appendix C

Survey instrument

THE MSL INSTRUMENT

The MSL instrument was administered on the web; in that format items to be skipped did not appear to the respondent if they were not applicable. This version of the MSL instrument was formatted as a paper/pencil version particularly for use in IRB approval processes.

Please be advised that the MSL 2005-2006 instrument is the property of the MSL Research Team and University of Maryland, College Park. ***The instrument may not be copied, disseminated, or used in part or in whole, for any purposes without the express written permission of the co-principal investigators.***

NOTE:
Shaded sections/ items comprise sub-studies and were not administered to all participants. Approximately 25% of the total sample from each participating campus was selected for each of the sub-studies.

NOTE:
This is a paper and pencil version of what will be presented as an on-line web survey. Skip patterns will automatically take the respondent to the appropriate section. Shaded sections/ items will be used in split samples and will not be asked of all participants.

COLLEGE INFORMATION

1. Did you begin college at your current institution or elsewhere? (Choose One)

- ○ Started here
- ○ Started elsewhere

2. Thinking about this academic term, how would you characterize your enrollment? (Choose One)

- ○ Full-Time
- ○ Less then Full-Time

3. What is your current class level? (Choose One)

- ○ First year/freshman
- ○ Sophomore
- ○ Junior
- ○ Senior
- ○ Graduate student
- ○ Other

4. Are you currently working OFF CAMPUS?
(Circle one) YES NO
If NO skip to #5

4a. Approximately how many hours do you work off campus in a typical 7 day week?

[ ]

4b. In your primary off campus position, how frequently do you: (Circle one for each item)

1 = Never	**3 = Often**
2 = Sometimes	**4 = Very Often**

Perform repetitive tasks	1	2	3	4
Consider options before making decisions	1	2	3	4
Perform structured tasks	1	2	3	4
Have the authority to change the way some things are done	1	2	3	4
Coordinate the work of others	1	2	3	4
Work with others on a team	1	2	3	4

5. Are you currently working ON CAMPUS?
(Circle one) YES NO
if NO skip to #6

5a. Approximately how many hours do you work on campus in a typical 7 day week?

[ ]

5b. In your primary position, how frequently do you:
(Circle one for each item)

1 = Never	**3 = Often**
2 = Sometimes	**4 = Very Often**

Perform repetitive tasks	1	2	3	4
Consider options before making decisions	1	2	3	4
Perform structured tasks	1	2	3	4
Have the authority to change the way some things are done	1	2	3	4
Coordinate the work of others	1	2	3	4
Work with others on a team	1	2	3	4

6. In an average academic term, do you engage in any community service?
YES NO
if NO skip to #7

In an average academic term, approximately how many hours do you engage in community service? (circle one for each category).

As part of a class
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

With a student organization
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

As part of a work study experience
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

On your own
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

7. Check all the following activities you engaged in <u>during your college experience</u>.

- ○ Studied abroad
- ○ Experienced a practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical experience
- ○ Participated in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together.
- ○ Enrolled in a culminating senior experience (capstone course, thesis etc.)

○ None of the above

YOUR PERCEPTIONS BEFORE ENROLLING IN COLLEGE

8. Looking back to *before you started college*, how confident were you that you would be successful at the following:
(Circle one response for each.)

1 = Not at all confident 3 = Confident
2 = Somewhat confident 4 = Very confident

Handling the challenge of college-level work	1	2	3	4
Feeling as though you belong on campus	1	2	3	4
Analyzing new ideas and concepts	1	2	3	4
Applying something learned in class to the "real world"	1	2	3	4
Enjoying the challenge of learning new material	1	2	3	4
Appreciating new and different ideas, beliefs	1	2	3	4
Leading others	1	2	3	4
Organizing a group's tasks to accomplish a goal	1	2	3	4
Taking initiative to improve something	1	2	3	4
Working with a team on a group project	1	2	3	4

9. Looking back to *before you started college*, how often did you engage in the following activities:
(Circle one response for each.)

1 = Never 3 = Often
2 = Sometimes 4 = Very Often

Performing volunteer work	1	2	3	4
Participating in student clubs/ groups	1	2	3	4
Participating in varsity sports	1	2	3	4
Took leadership positions in student clubs, groups or sports	1	2	3	4
Participating in community organizations (e.g. church youth group, scouts)	1	2	3	4
Taking leadership positions in community organizations	1	2	3	4
Participating in activism in any form (e.g. petitions, rally, protest)	1	2	3	4
Getting to know people from backgrounds different than your own	1	2	3	4
Learning about cultures different from your own	1	2	3	4
Participating in training or education that developed your leadership skills	1	2	3	4

10. Looking back to *before you started college*, please indicate your agreement with the following items by choosing the number that most closely represented your opinion about that statement AT THAT TIME:
(Circle one response for each.)

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

Hearing differences in opinions enriched my thinking	1	2	3	4	5
I had low self esteem	1	2	3	4	5
I worked well in changing environments	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoyed working with others toward common goals	1	2	3	4	5
I held myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to	1	2	3	4	5
I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group	1	2	3	4	5
My behaviors reflected my beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
I valued the opportunities that allowed me to contribute to my community,	1	2	3	4	5
I thought of myself as a leader ONLY if I was the head of a group (e.g. chair, president)	1	2	3	4	5

11a. Before you started college, **how would you describe the amount of leadership experience you have had (e.g., student clubs, performing groups, service organizations, jobs)?** Please circle the appropriate number
No experience 1 2 3 4 5 Extensive experience

11b. Before you started college, **how often did others give you positive feedback or encourage your leadership ability (e.g., teachers, advisors, mentors)?**
Please circle the appropriate number
Never 1 2 3 4 5 frequently

11c. Before you started college, **How would you have reacted to being chosen or appointed the leader of a group?** Please circle the appropriate number
Very uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5 very comfortable

11d. Before you started college, **how often did you see others be effective leaders?**
Please circle the appropriate number
Never 1 2 3 4 5 frequently

11e. Before you started college, **how often did you think of yourself as a leader**
Please circle the appropriate number
Never 1 2 3 4 5 frequently

YOUR EXPERIENCE IN COLLEGE

12. How often have you engaged in the following activities during your college experience:
(Circle one for each item)

1 = Never 3 = Often
2 = Sometimes 4 = Very Often

Paid attention to national issues	1	2	3	4
Paid attention to global issues	1	2	3	4
Was aware of the current issues facing the community surrounding your institution	1	2	3	4
Signed a petition or sent an email about a social or political issue	1	2	3	4
Bought or did not buy a product or service because of your views about the social or political values of the company that produces or provides it	1	2	3	4
Contacted a public official, newspaper, magazine, radio, or television talk show to express your opinion	1	2	3	4
Took part in a protest, rally, march, or demonstration	1	2	3	4

13. Since starting college, how often have you:

been an involved member or active participant in college organizations?
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Much of the time

held a leadership position in a college organization? (for example, serving as an officer or a club or organization, captain of an athletic team, first chair in a musical group, section editor of the newspaper, chairperson of a committee)
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Much of the time

been an involved member or active participant in an off-campus community organization (e.g. PTA, church group)?
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Much of the time

held a leadership position in a community organization? (for example, serving as an officer or a club or organization, leader in a youth group, chairperson of a committee)
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Much of the time

YOUR STUDENT GROUP INVOLVEMENTS

14. Which of the following kinds of student groups have you been involved with during college?
(Check all the categories that apply)

- ○ Academic/ Departmental/ Professional (e.g., Pre-Law Society, an academic fraternity, Engineering Club)
- ○ Arts/Theater/Music (e.g., Theater group, Marching Band)
- ○ Campus-wide programming groups (e.g., program board, film series board, a multicultural programming committee)
- ○ Cultural/ International (e.g., Black Student Union, German Club)
- ○ Honor Society (e.g., Omicron Delta Kappa [ODK], Mortar Board, Phi Beta Kappa)
- ○ Living-learning programs (e.g., language house, leadership floors, ecology halls)
- ○ Leadership (e.g., Peer Leadership Program, Emerging Leaders Program)
- ○ Media (e.g., Campus Radio, Student Newspaper)
- ○ Military (e.g., ROTC)
- ○ New Student Transitions (e.g., admissions ambassador, orientation advisor)
- ○ Para professional group (e.g., Resident assistants, peer health educators)
- ○ Political/ Advocacy (e.g., College Democrats, Students Against Sweatshops)
- ○ Religious (e.g., Campus Crusades for Christ, Hillel)
- ○ Service (e.g., Circle K, Alpha Phi Omega [APO])
- ○ Culturally based fraternities and sororities (e.g., National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) groups such as Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Inc., or Latino Greek Council groups such as Lambda Theta Alpha)
- ○ Social fraternities or sororities (e.g. Panhellenic or Interfraternity Council groups such as Sigma Phi Epsilon or Kappa Kappa Gamma)
- ○ Sports- Intercollegiate or Varsity (e.g., NCAA Hockey, Varsity Soccer)
- ○ Sports- Club (e.g., Club Volleyball)

- Sports- Leisure or Intramural (ex: Intramural flag football, Rock Climbing)
- Special Interest (ex: Comedy Group)
- Student governance group (ex: Student Government Association, Residence Hall Association, Interfraternity Council) IF CHECKED go to item 14A

14A. Were you involved in your campus-wide student government association? (Circle one) YES NO

If No, skip to item 15.

Thinking about your student government experience, indicate your level of agreement with the following items:
(Circle one response for each.)

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

I found it hard to represent my constituents' concerns	1	2	3	4	5
I successfully initiated change on behalf of my constituents (e.g., policy, institutional, or social)	1	2	3	4	5
My motivation for involvement was about gaining influence	1	2	3	4	5
My motivation for involvement was to receive recognition	1	2	3	4	5
My motivation for involvement was to help others	1	2	3	4	5
I have witnessed effective constituency-based efforts for change	1	2	3	4	5
Effective constituency-based efforts for change have influenced my own actions	1	2	3	4	5
I held a constituency-based position prior to this college SGA experience (e.g. high school or other governance group)	1	2	3	4	5
Experience with previous constituency based positions did NOT make me more effective in my college SGA work	1	2	3	4	5

15. At any time <u>during your college experience</u>, how often have you been in mentoring relationships where another person intentionally assisted your growth or connected you to opportunities for career and personal development?
Indicate how many times

Student affairs staff
(e.g., a student organization advisor, career counselor, the Dean of Students, or residence hall coordinator):
..... never once several many

Faculty ..... never once several many

Employers ..... never once several many

Community members ..... never once several many
Other students ..... never once several many

16. During interactions with other students outside of class, how often have you done each of the following in an average school year? (Circle one for each.)

1 = Never 3 = Often
2 = Sometimes 4 = Very Often

Talked about different lifestyles/ customs	1	2	3	4
Held discussions with students whose personal values were very different from your own	1	2	3	4
Discussed major social issues such as peace, human rights, and justice	1	2	3	4
Held discussions with students whose religious beliefs were very different from your own	1	2	3	4
Discussed your views about multiculturalism and diversity	1	2	3	4
Held discussions with students whose political opinions were very different from your own	1	2	3	4

DEVELOPING YOUR LEADERSHIP ABILITIES

17. **<u>Since starting college</u>, how many times have you participated in the following types of training or education that developed your leadership skills (ex: courses, Resident Assistant training, organization retreats, job training)** (Circle one for each.)

17a- Short-Term Experiences (ex: individual or one-time workshops, retreats, conferences, lectures, or training)

Never	once	several	many

17b-Moderate-Term Experiences (ex: a single course, multiple or ongoing retreats, conferences, institutes, workshops, and/or training.

Never	once	several	many

If NEVER skip to 17c:

Did your experience involve any academic courses?
YES NO

If no, skip to 17c

a. How many leadership courses have you completed?

b. How many other courses have you taken that contributed to your leadership abilities (e.g. ethics course, personal development courses, management courses)? *Keep in mind you might have taken such a course but it did not contribute to your leadership.*

17c- Long-Term Experiences (ex: multi-semester leadership program, leadership certificate program, leadership minor or major, emerging leaders program, living-learning program),

Never once several many

if NEVER skip to 18

Which of the following Long-Term Activities did you experience? (check all that apply)

- o Emerging or New Leaders Program
- o Peer Leadership Program
- o Leadership Certificate Program
- o Multi-Semester Leadership Program
- o Senior Leadership Capstone Experience
- o Residential Living-learning leadership program
- o Leadership Minor
- o Leadership Major
- o Other

ASSESSING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

18. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following items by choosing the number that most closely represents your opinion about that statement.
(Circle one response for each.)

***For the statements that refer to a group, think of the most effective, functional group of which you have been a part.* This might be a formal organization or an informal study group. For consistency, use the same group in all your responses.**

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

I am open to others' ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Creativity can come from conflict	1	2	3	4	5
I value differences in others	1	2	3	4	5
I am able to articulate my priorities	1	2	3	4	5
Hearing differences in opinions enriches my thinking	1	2	3	4	5
I have low self esteem	1	2	3	4	5
I struggle when group members have ideas that are different from mine	1	2	3	4	5
Transition makes me uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5
I am usually self confident	1	2	3	4	5
I am seen as someone who works well with others	1	2	3	4	5
Greater harmony can come out of disagreement	1	2	3	4	5
I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking at things	1	2	3	4	5
My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
I am committed to a collective purpose in those groups to which I belong	1	2	3	4	5
It is important to develop a common direction in a group in order to get anything done	1	2	3	4	5
I respect opinions other than my own	1	2	3	4	5
Change brings new life to an organization	1	2	3	4	5
The things about which I feel passionate have priority in my life	1	2	3	4	5
I contribute to the goals of the group	1	2	3	4	5
There is energy in doing something a new way	1	2	3	4	5
I am uncomfortable when someone disagrees with me	1	2	3	4	5
I know myself pretty well	1	2	3	4	5
I am willing to devote the time and energy to things that are important to me	1	2	3	4	5
I stick with others through difficult times	1	2	3	4	5
When there is a conflict between two people, one will win and the other will lose	1	2	3	4	5
Change makes me uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5
It is important to me to act on my beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
I am focused on my responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
I can make a difference when I work with others on a task	1	2	3	4	5
I actively listen to what others have to say	1	2	3	4	5
I think it is important to know other people's priorities	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D

Written Comments to OSU-Specific Questions from OSU Random Sample

Q130_2.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have worked on campus during your time at OSU, where have you worked most recently?	
	Frequency
Academic Success Center	2
accounting	1
Administration Building	1
Admissions Office	3
Admissions, as TOUR Coordinator	1
ALS building, in a lab	1
Alumni Association	1
alumni center	1
Ambassador	1
Animal Lab Resources	1
Animal Sciences, accounting office	1
Arnold Country Store	1
ASOSU	1
ASOSU Safe Ride	1
ASOSU Saferide	1
Athletics	2
Barometer	2
Bates Hall	1
Bates Child Development Center	1
Borer-Seabloom Lab	1
Building Supervisor	1
business affairs payroll	1
campus maintenance	1
campus recycling	1
Campus Recycling	1
CEM Office	1
Central Analytical Lab	1
CGRB core Laboratories	1
Chemical Engineering Department	1
club rugby	1
CMC dept	1
CMC, in the Valley Library	1
COB Deans office	1
College of Forestry	1
College of Liberal Arts Advising	1
College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences	1
College of Science	1
COSINe	1
Crops Dept	1
Daily Barometer	1

Delta Gamma	1
Dept. of Public Safety	1
Diversity Development and College of Liberal Arts	1
Dr. Giovanonni's lab	1
eCafe in Kelley Engineering Center	1
Education Department (Winter Wonderings)	1
Engineering buildings	1
Engineering IT	1
English Language Institute	1
Facilities Services	1
Facilities Services	1
Facility Services	1
faculty senate office	1
Forestry Bldg - Student Resource Room	1
forestry lab	1
Gill, OSU Surplus	1
greenhouses	1
have never worked on campus	1
HDFS	1
horticulture farms	1
horticulture research	1
Hovland computer lab, Wireless Helpdesk, Forestry Computing Helpdesk	1
Hovland Computer Labs	1
human resources	1
IM Sports	1
Information Systems	1
International Programs	1
Intramural Sports Referee	1
Java 2	1
KBVR	2
KBVR television station	1
Kelley Engineering Center	1
Kelly Engineering center	1
Kerr Administration Building	1
Kid Spirit	2
kidspirit	1
KidSpirit	3
lab	1
Lab animal Resources	1
Laboratory	1
laboratory of animal resources center	1
Laboratory	1
LARC, Graduate Senate	1
LaSells Stewart Center	1
Linus Pauling Institute	1
market place west	1
McNary dining center	1

McNary Dining Hall	1
media services	1
Media Services	1
Milam	1
Milne computer lab	1
MU retail food services	1
N/A	1
No one will hire	1
Note taker for SSD department	1
NROTC	1
O.H. Hinsdale Wave Research Laboratory	1
Office of Admissions	1
Office of International Education	1
Office of the Provost	1
OSU Alumni Center	1
OSU Bookstore	2
OSU Catering	1
OSU Extension	1
OSU Foundation	3
OSU Library	1
OSU ranches	1
OSU VTH	1
Outdoor Recreation Center (Part of Dixon)	1
Printing and Mailing	1
Psychology Department	1
Radio and TV Station (KBVR)	1
Registrar's Office	1
research	1
Research Department, Kerr	1
Research Lab	1
Research Lab, TA	1
residence hall	1
RHA	1
Rogers Hall & Hovland Lab	1
Services for Students with Disabilities	2
sheep research center	1
Simonich lab	1
sports marketing office	1
SSD	2
SSS tutoring	1
Strand Ag.	1
Student Athletic Academic Services	1
Student Computer Facility	1
student computing	1
Student Computing Facilities	4
Student Support Services	1
Tekbots	1

The Barometer (Cartoonist)	1
The Daily Barometer	1
Theatre	1
Ticketing Office	1
University Marketing	1
Valley Football Center	1
Veterinary Teaching Hospital	1
Veterinary teaching hospital	1
Virology Laboratory - Dryden 313	1
Wave Lab	1
Withycombe Theater	1
Writing center	1
Zoology labs	1

Q130_3.12.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have been involved in a club or organization at OSU, what are the three most important things you learned?
academic
Broaden your horizons
Creativity
Did not learn much in clubs
Dodge ball skills
Faith
forest rec. club
Friendship
gaining friends
How to be a better Christian
How to initiate a club and use resources
I haven't improved upon any characteristics while attending OSU, in fact, OSU, has made me less self confident and less active in my community.
kindness and consideration for those around you
Networking
no others apply
none
outdoor safety
patience
reliability
Self reliance
Using tools, auto design and parts (SAE)
When not to rock the boat.
will participate in a club soon

Q130_6.9.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have not been involved in a club or organization while at OSU, why not?	
	Frequency
already involved	1
am involved	1
Am involved	2
been involved	1
But I WAS involved...	1
couldn’t afford it	1
did participate	1
didn't know about it	1
does not apply	3
have been	1
have been involved	1
have been involved in a club	1
hey you guys are racist you didn't put Arab as a possibility for ethnicity	1
I've always been involved with at least one organization	1
i've been involved	1
i've been involved in an organization at OSU	1
I *have* been involved in a club or organization while at OSU	1
I am	2
I am in a club	1
i am involved	1
I am involved	1
I am involved in a club	2
I AM involved in a club/organization while at OSU	1
I am involved in organizations	1
I am involved on campus	2
I am part of a club	1
I an in a campus organization	1
I did participate	1
I did participate in a club	1
i did participate in a club (AIChE)	1
I have been	1
I have been in a club while at OSU	1
I have been in a group	1
I have been involved	4
I have been involved in a club/organization while at OSU...	1
I have been involved, so none of these answers apply...	1
I have been involved, when I go to the next page; the questionnaire asks me to return to answer this question. How can I answer this question if I have been involved. This is a bad question not having an answer that states, ?I have been involved.?	1
I have been.	2
I joined a club	1
I participated	1
i was	1
I was	1

i was in a club	1
I was in a group...	1
i was in clubs!	1
I was in Hall Council	1
i was involved	2
I was involved	8
I was involved in an organization	2
I was involved in clubs	1
I was involved!	1
I was involved, so that question is invalid	1
I was involved.	1
I was involved. Please see previous questions!	1
in a club	1
in club	1
involved	1
Involved In A Club	1
involved in as much as time allows	1
involved	1
Mobility Issues related to Blindness	1
n/a	4
N/A	1
non applicable	1
none	1
not applicable	3
Not applicable	2
Not Applicable	1
stopped going- no time, busy work/school/homework schedule	1
that would be the only reason I wasn't involved	1
This question does not apply to me. I am involved in a club.	1
Varsity Athlete.	1
was	1
was in a club	1
was in many org/clubs	1
Was involved	2
WAS INVOLVED	1
will join a on campus org soon	1

QEND: Please enter any additional comments you may have after taking this survey.
A lot of similar questions in the middle portion. I also feel that this survey has not really provided an accurate depiction of my leadership abilities, there is much more to leadership than campus organizations and clubs. A lack of involvement regardi
A lot of the questions ask the same stuff over and over again
A lot of the questions were repeated.
As a 'stay at home parent' it was hard to gauge my off campus work hours since parenting is a 24 hour job so my # may throw off your results. Being an 'older than average student' also affects many of the answers I would give such as how my leadership sk

As a freshman coming to college its a big step. My advisor for the first year of my time here I don't think knew my name and never led me in a direction.
As a starting freshman haven't had the time to be involved in much yet.
As far as the community service questions go, I think it is important to say that community service requires a community. I've only been in Corvallis for two years so i don't have very strong ties yet, which makes community service less likely.
As I have a low self esteem many of my answers may not be truthfully representative of my abilities or as how others might see me.
Attending OSU is a great experience for me. I enjoy the atmosphere and am working to achieve my life goals.
Because it sounded like it would be fun .
College is learning how to be a robot and answer the right questions on a test. Students here think they get good grades and they will be rich or they want to be rich. I just want to keep learning and get my piece of paper.
college is the place you begin to find out who you are and what you want. People, places and experiences help start this learning experience
During the 'You and Leadership' section, it seemed as if I were answering the same questions, just rephrased, over and over again.
Even though OSU is a large school, it has always felt very homey and comfortable to me.
Good questions, I thought the survey taught me a little more about what I thought about my college life.
Good questions. Took longer than twenty minutes.
good survey
Good survey, hope it helps!
hey guys I think that mentors make the biggest difference and I've gotten lucky and found several on campus. Other are not so lucky. but it does matter when some one tells you you can do anything
hope this is what you wanted
How can I remember personality traits when I was in high school? why were the questions repeated over and over again?
How will i get entered into a drawing if you don’t know who i am!!! I hope u didn’t lie to me to take this quiz. Also it is very hard to get involved with groups on campus if you are not in a sorority or know someone in the group.
I'd would have to say that the skills I have learned in high school greatly impact the way that I am developed as a leader today.
I'm not involved
I've never been involved in a club. Going to college sapped all my extra time. In fact, my community involvement is virtually nil since I started college. I have a family and college clubs are not geared for 41 year old women. Besides, I've never really
I've noticed that at OSU clubs are advertised but how to participate and get involved is not always made clear or made easily accessible. (I do have a pretty full schedule and may have just missed most of the windows of opportunity)
I am a developing leader. I am gaining confidence in becoming a leader slowly but surely. If I were more active I would be more of a leader.
I am a married student
I am a non-traditional student, a full time student, a mother, a homeowner & head of household. I do not have time for on-campus groups- so my leadership skills have come from life experience before enrolling at OSU.
I am an older distance ed student.
I am an older student with two children therefore I have very little time for extracurricular activities outside of course work.
i am in clubs/organizations

I am interested in the final outcome of the survey/study. Please contact me if further information is available. - Dan (tremblad@onid.orst.edu)
I am not a traditional student. I am 48 years old and am attending OSU part Time while working full time. I also attended college 20+ years ago and I am now finishing up my degree.
I am not in a club.
I am very interesting in leadership opportunities with in OSU, and am looking forward to becoming more involved.
I better win the ipod because this wasted a lot of time
I did not participate in a group at OSU
i did participate, this question is not applicable to me
i didn't answer the last question because i have participated in campus organizations
i didn't attend any clubs
I don't have time to participate in student organizations, because I commute and work off campus.
I don’t like to lead, but if I have to, I will. Sometimes it happens. This term in particular it happened with a project I am working on. The guy that wanted to be the team leader can’t be and no one else wanted the position, so I stepped up... Diversity s
I don’t think there are a lot of leadership opportunities and if there are they are not broadcasted well, i think people in sororities know more about the stuff and the university needs to make it more well know to the general student body.
i enjoyed it
I feel as though I have had a lot of leadership experience prior to college considering I joined the US Air Force right out of high school. So comparatively my growth in leadership has not grown that much since attending college. This is also the reason f
I feel OSU helped me gain more confidence and skill to lead
I feel that the campus probably does a great job at providing leadership opportunities for those in the main stream, but those of us over the age of 25, who cannot participate in athletic activities due to disabilities, who are on the peripheral, have a
I feel that the fact that I am married has had a very huge impact on my decisions and beliefs. My wife has helped to shape me into who I am. As I see it, she completes me. Without her, I would not truly be able to be the man that I am today. Her infl
I felt like I had more opportunities in high school to develop leadership skills. Now there is not enough time, or opportunities that fit my schedule.
I found that it is difficult to find a job on campus if you can’t work through the summer. I was very disappointed since I didn’t qualify for work/study program and couldn't find employment.
I have gained an incredible amount of self-confidence, perspective, life skills and well-roundedness because of my involvement. But, I do understand that leadership is not for everyone. I am lucky enough to have found a great school, a great community
I have made the attempt to contact various clubs and organizations, but they never got back to me.
I have not been in a club
I have only been at OSU for a short time. I work and have a family with three children and a husband. I commute an hour each way every day so my time has been fairly limited to those responsibilities so far. I am looking for a group to become a member
I haven't joined any clubs since starting at OSU
I haven’t been at OSU very long only one term, so I am still new to what they offer but I am working on familiarizing myself.
I hope I win one of the ipods.
I hope it helps
I like college life here at OSU.

I love OSU
I think OSU is really trying help turn out well-rounded individuals. From what I can see and experience, the college and people here are doing a good job, despite the fact that Corvallis isn't exactly a heap of diversity compared to others places. They
I think OSU should work on minority retention more because I see a lot of African American students enrolling each year, but not that many stay
I think that age of a person not just whether or not they are attending college could have some influence on some of these questions.
I think that its important to note self-motivation. A lot of students don't have any family members paying for anything... rent, food, tuition, insurance. I am one of those students, and it would be interesting to know how many other students are in th
I think that OSU has done a wonderful job with supporting a diversity of groups on campus.
I thought that some of the questions were very repetitive. Also, I thought that having all of those long questions in a row made it hard to keep focused on what I was doing and I got really tired of answering questions. It would have been better if there
I was not in a group
I was not involved in a club.
I was on the student programming board at LBCC. There I coordinated events from sports events to multicultural banquets. There I learned a lot I think. I was able to get out of the small town mentality that I had from where I grew up. I have not done
I wasn't involved and there was no answer for that
I would be involved more at OSU if I didn't have to work off campus to pay for our expensive tuition that keeps going up! I'm really tired of everyone expecting that we can afford to study abroad, join more than one group, and still have time to study and
If you have any clubs or organizations i may be interested in, contact me.
Include more choices for political affiliation. I hate democrats and republicans both equally. Please include apathetic and other
Institutional support was there, but I often felt that the Administration didn't support it.
Interesting survey. I can see how it might be useful, but many of the questions about group work were repetitive.
Interesting survey. I'd be interested to see the data collected as well as the conclusions drawn.
interesting.
It asked a lot of the same questions!
It ignored my religious affiliation selection, and there was no choice for 'did not participate in an extracurricular group' when it asked what group I participated in.
It is really hard to participate with any clubs or organizations when you are a commuter. I always thought that they should have a live link for meetings, then more people that cannot drive over just for one meeting can become involved in various activit
it made you think about your college experience.
It seems there are a lot of clubs and activities you can be participate in at OSU but there isn't much awareness of these clubs, nor is there follow through on the clubs part
it was easy
It was great for me to evaluate and reflect my time at Oregon State University.
It was very apparent that you were asking the same questions over and over (worded differently) to try and see if there was any difference in the answers. This may throw some bias into your outcome. Thanks for the survey.
It would be nice to be involved in some out of school groups, but i just don't have the time. my major is very demanding as is my work.

It would be nice to have seminars on campus for the students who are in the leadership position to enhance their skills. I believe that many leaders are seeking those opportunities.
Leadership has shaped who I am today. I attend conferences and meet people through the many mentors I've had through the Women's Studies and Liberal Arts programs. The student organizations taught me so much outside of the classroom. I feel as though I r
Leadership is a function that all members of the team must posses. The responsibility lies with the group, not just the project head. All involved must display some initiative and leadership skills in order for an effective group to work.
Leadership is important and all, but right now my two main goals are to make friends and pass my classes. Yeah maybe everyone should have some leadership experience in them, but consider this; it's over-zealous leaders who are causing all the problems in
Leadership is very important for any community to function properly. But I have noticed that many leaders this days are in for self-promotion rather than service to humanity. I sincerely believe that leadership should be to serve humanity. Also, I think
Leadership skills can be developed, but the leader has to be there first.
long
Making more pages with less questions will make the survey less daunting.
Man, that was really long. Thanks for including me.
Many of the same questions, worded differently. But, thank you for the opportunity to voice an opinion.
Many of these questions can cause errors in the validity of this survey. There were many questions that were so open-ended, that no single answer applied. I could have justified my answer to these questions no matter which option I chose. I know that
military vet, single father of three
Most of my leadership experience came from my five year stay with the US Navy. There are no questions in this survey regarding traditional students or nontraditional students.
Most parts of the survey are very culture-specific. Those that indicated that leadership is performed at each level spoke to me best. Those that indicated that it is nothing but 'taking charge' and 'making a difference' do not. I think it is very importa
motivating.
Moving through the coursework for my degrees encouraged and developed my confidence and leadership abilities.
N/A
na
no answer
No club invitations
No comment
no comments
No comments
NOLS has an awesome leadership program, and they are researching this same topic. They are working in conjunction with the University of Utah to generate a data set of pre and post activity questions as to the effectiveness of the program. If you would
none
None
None.
Not everyone fits on the political spectrum you outlined. Politics are as varied as the people who espouse them. I would have chosen libertarian if it were offered, but with some reservation.
Not involved in club/organization.
Now as a senior though i am getting more involved with on campus volunteering and internships

Oregon State does a terrible job of making students aware of social inequalities that exist in our communities and this university. It is frustrating living in a community that doesn't foster any sort of diversity of opinion or background. There is no
OSU has provided many great experiences that have led to furthering my leadership abilities, as well as showing me my limitations.
OSU is a great place and thank you!
OSU is far less diverse than my Portland inner-city high school / upbringing. It's disappointing there is such a cultural similarity between the majority of the students. It is also disappointing that I am bogged down with academics (Electrical Engineeri
Overall, college has made me grow into someone I am proud of. I am ready to graduate and go into the real world.
Perhaps you might want to add a category that says-were leadership skills gained outside of the university environment and after HS? And ask where/how. I gained NO skills from school. They were gained on the job and from life experience.
poop
some of the questions were hard to answer
Some of the questions were very repetitive.
Sometimes I don't feel old enough to be leading people! My age and inexperience make me insecure about taking and learning leadership roles at the expense of the organization and those involved.
Stop asking the same questions over and over again.
stop with all the repeated questions. i know that there are many ways to ask if someone's behaviors reflect their beliefs...but really the answer will be the same every time. just stop it. i want a nano.
stop with the repetitive questions. the last two pages of the college experience section i didnt even read because you kept rephrasing the same questions over and over again!
Student Involvement has changed my life for the better!!! A lot of that has to do with my exposure to working with the different Cultural Centers as well as Womens Center and Pride Center. I have always been supportive of these communities, but now I a
Student Involvement provided wonderful leadership development through their PRIDE/Bridges Staff.
Thank you for selecting me to take this survey. I hope that my answers will help you in your current goal. Feel free to contact me in the future.
thank you for this survey, it brought out alot of questions that i had never thought of before and showed me what i need to do and how i am as a person, thanks
Thank you. I realized lot of stuff that I didn't realize.
THANKS
thanks for the memories
thanks, hope this helps. nicely done questions.
That’s all I wanted to say. Arabs are people too, and they're not all terrorists so get over it and if you really appreciate different people 'diversity' and want to categorize all of us by our differences, put Arab on your list too. That's an ethnic group
The biggest change to my leadership and personality has come through working at Hovland lab. I began there my freshman year first term since I knew someone that told me about it and I applied ahead of time. Jim Buckley has been my boss there these las
the campus is very poor on diversity. I believe that it is groups such as the groups in ISOSU that make the differences. The school in general needs to participate in these kind of cultural activities more often to make a difference. Still today I still se
The continual focus on discerning between being identified as a 'leader' and 'everybody in the group is a leader' was quite irritating. How many more different ways could that question have been asked?!
The intended purpose of the survey wasn't clearly defined. What will it be used for and why is my heterosexuality, religion, and income of my parent's important for the survey?

The last question created a bias. I was forced to answer it, but I am involved in a club. The answer stated 'if you are not involved in a club.' Also, the questions that were asked about before you were in college are bias. I am 2 7 and don't remember t
the last question did not have an option for those who were involved on campus.
the last question doesn't apply to me because i have been involved... so change the answers to include a 'have been involved' or change the wording of the question!
The last question was improperly worded, and its choices were not sufficient. Otherwise, very thorough but lengthy survey. I hope my time will assist you in your research!
The OSU study abroad system needs to be more flexible towards foreign college received GPAs.
The rephrasing of questions made things tedious and some questions were too generic for the best possible fit concerning my experiences but I hope my information benefits.
There are a lot of opportunities available to students at OSU. Looking at things now, I wish I were a little more involved on campus than I had been. Even after being a 3rd year student, there are still things on campus that I'm sure I don't know about.
There is a lack of continuity in advising and a lack of requirement for small classes that focus on leadership skills and actually applying them.
There should be an option about the high school question, I only finished 9th grade. I think the question on parent's ed should be separated - my dad may have gotten a masters but was not involved in life while mom only finished high school and was involved
There were four questions that bothered me, or I should say the answers bothered me. 1. ?How would you characterize your political views?? The answers only had a two dimensional political spectrum. The two dimensional spectrum is great for mass media
there were no other choices to pick but this one that fit my answer
This exam was interesting, but a lot of the questions seemed repetitive. I hope my answers help shed light on whatever you are looking for. When will I find out if I won any of the prizes?
this is VERY long
this survey had a lot of related questions that were sometime repeated(may not have been worded the same)... although interesting (self evaluation)
This survey is obviously slanted towards traditional students and away from older than average students. There was little opportunity to explain or clarify my viewpoint, and I had many questions where my answer only slightly aligned with my viewpoint an
This survey is silly- instead of focusing on how students are or are not becoming leaders in college we should instead focus on how students are going to be able to afford to go to school.
This survey sucks! It was way to long and the questions were boring. Thanks, but never send me any crap like that again. :)
This was a long survey
This was a really interesting survey. It made me think a lot about the time I've spent here at Oregon State.
This was great
Though I am, by credit standing, a senior, I have only attended OSU for one term and, therefore, have not had much chance to do many of the things mentioned in this survey. Because of this I may have outlying results on some points.
To many questions that were saying the same thing.
Too long
Too long, asked too many of the same questions.
too long.
too long. too many repeating questions
Twas fun
um, your questions were too repetitive

Way too lengthy and some questions appeared redundant
Way too many questions in the 'You and Leadership' section. You may want to think about taking out some of the different questions asking basically the same thing.
We live in a capitalist society where the illusion of leadership misleads human beings into believing we are working toward progress. Until we, as a group, reevaluate our idea of success, our 'leaders' will continue to lead us into the ground. The first
what cultural diversity? The Corvallis Police harass minorities, all the fraternaties/sororities are white with a token ethnic, and the greek/athletic community represents our school as drunken, irresponsible spoiled brats with little respect for communi
What exactly is this data collected being used for? ...that's all I really have.
When you work as much as I do and you are a full-time student being a part of clubs/organizations can be very difficult if not impossible. But it is not the involvement in these groups that makes one person a more effective leader than another, it's each
Where's the cream filling?
why ask the same question a dozen times with different wording? it was sort of annoying. we are busy and don't have time for word games. the club I was referring to was a church organization, not a campus organization. no organization on campus caugh
why do you ask the same questions over and over again? Very tedious.
Why is the Christian category listed with the 'other' option. It has been like that on every survey I've taken. The Christian religion should have its own category just like Catholic or Buddhism. Think about it. Christianity is one of the biggest religion
wow, i feel like a loser for not having been in any clubs or developed any leadership skills. where did all the time go...
Ya, the 'you and your leadership' had way too many repetitive questions; I just about closed out and didn't finish this because of it.

Appendix E

Written Comments to OSU-Specific Questions from OSU Comparative Sample

Q130_1.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - While at OSU, what has had the most influence on your personal leadership development?	Frequency
AFROTC	1
all of the above except haven't really developed	1
Alpha Phi	1
ASOSU	1
Associated Students of Oregon State University	1
Being an RA in McNary	1
campus crusade for christ	1
coordinator of undergrad research in Bulgaria	1
Discrimination	1
Fraternity	2
Greek Life	1
ICSP	1
Kappa Delta Sorority	1
Navy ROTC	1
NROTC	1
on-campus job as Community Outreach Coordinator at a cultural center	1
peer leader, Taught Odyssey class for 2 years	1
RA-ing	1
RA	1
Resident Assistant Position and continued employment with Residential Life	1
Resident Assistant Position, University Leadership Positions	1
rotc	1
Sigma Phi Epsilon	1
Sorority	3
START Leader	1
student housing executive council	1
teaching Odyssey	1
Teaching Odyssey	1
The ASOSU	1
UHDS RA	1
working at on campus Cultural Center	1
Total	247

Q130_2.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have worked on campus during your time at OSU, where have you worked most recently?	Frequency
Accounts Payable/Travel	1
Admissions, as TOUR Coordinator	1
As a Resident Assistant	1
ASOSU- office of legal advocacy	1
ASOSU	4
ASOSU PMC	1
Associate Students of Oregon State University	1
Athletic Department	1
Barometer	1
Callahan Hall, RA	1
Co op Exec	1
college of forestry	1
Community Outreach Program	1
Dixon Lodge Exec Council	1
Extension	1
Extension Family & Community Development	1
Facility Services	1
For the Students (RHA)	1
ISOSU	1
Java II in Valley Library	1
Kidspirit	1
Lab Animal Resource	1
Milam hall	1
OSU Extension Services (Administration)	1
OSU Foundation	1
Property Management	1
Residence Hall Association	1
Residential Assistant	1
School of Education	1
Services for Students with Disabilities	3
SSD	3
Strand Ag Hall	1
Student Involvement	1
Student Media	2

The ASOSU	1
The Writing Center	1
UHDS/ Kidspirit	1
Writing Center	1
Total	247

Q130_3.12.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have been involved in a club or organization at OSU, what are the three most important things you learned?	**Frequency**
positive, proactive attitude	1
Total	247

Q130_4.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have been involved in a club or organization, what is one thing you didn't learn but wanted to learn more about?	**Frequency**
after College Application of skills	1
Total	247

Q130_6.9.TEXT: Description of Other (specify) - If you have not been involved in a club or organization while at OSU, why not?	**Frequency**
(I have been involved, where is that box?)	1
am already in club	1
did participate	1
have been in groups	1
have been involved	1
have been involved.....should have made that an option huh?	1
have been very involved	1
I'm involved	1
i am	2
I am heavily involved around campus	1
i am involved	1
I am involved	1
i am involved and there was no not applicable check box	1
I am quite involved at OSU	1
I did participate	1
i have	1
I have been	1
I have been involved in a club and organization	1
i have been involved	1
I have been involved	3
I have been involved and this question is irrelevant.	1

I have been involved in a club	1
i was	1
I was a peer leader	1
i was in a club	1
I was in a club	1
I Was in a Club, but had to check something to continue with the survey	1
i was involved	3
I was involved	5
I was involved but I had to tick one box off or this survey won't let me continue	1
i was involved with clubs and organizations	1
n/a	2
N/A	1
NA	1
not applicable	1
Question N/A I HAVE been involved in organizations while at OSU	1
This question doesn't apply to me, morons...I just spent 10 minutes answering questions about why I DID get involved, and now there's not even an option for 'this question doesn't apply.'	1
was involved in clubs	1
Total	247

QEND: Please enter any additional comments you may have after taking this survey.	Frequency
A few questions claimed that I had answered nothing when, in fact, I had answered the question. Perhaps the survey should be checked for bugs more thoroughly in the future?	1
Although I've always wound up in a leadership position, I haven't actively tried for it. I just get frustrated that it takes so long for people to make up their minds so I listen to what they're all saying, summarize to myself what it sounds like they w	1
Although OSU has come a long way in understanding and promoting racial, sexual orientation, and gender differences, there is much more that needs to occur. The students on campus tend to be rather conservative in their social opinions which is fine becau	1
Being an Odyssey instructor has made me a better person and I'm very happy with that. I also love working for OSU Student Foundation. I think the reason I got into being involved is that I took an Odyssey w/ Footsteps class my freshman year, and it rea	1
Being on Hall Council in my residence hall, being a Resident Assistant, and being a Cooperative House Director for an on campus university run house has shaped my college experience and allowed me many opportunities I would have otherwise not beel allowe	1
Great Survey	1
Hope this helps!	1
I am not sure I am very representational of the average student leader!	1
I feel that we are always leading others by example, when we realize it and when we don't	1
I have learned amazing leadership skills while at OSU and the knowledge and experience I have gained are invaluable! Thanks to all those who contributed!!!	1
I hope I win one of your Ipods.	1
I think it might be a good idea to have more than a couple of selections for political beliefs. I noticed that you prefer not to say and others for a lot of categories, might as well do it with politics as well.	1
I want my IPOD...hehe	1
I wish that I had been more involved in clubs related to my major. Many are available, but my responsibilities as a UHDS student staff member have made it difficult to find the time to be involved in other organizations.	1
I would have to say this was a great survey! Also the best thing that Oregon State had to offer me was Greek life and it is really something I would like the see the university advise more students to participate in because it has developed my social, le	1
intriguing, would love to see the outcomes of the study	1
it is really long	1

It seemed like a very repetitious survey but interesting. I think that some of the questions were very thought provoking.	1
It was kinda long	1
It wasn't very specific in some areas.	1
Its was way too long and repetitive	1
Leadership is a choice not a position. Also, we should let freshman know, the hotdogs on campus cost money but the condiments are free! If only I knew that profound wisdom upon entrance, life would have been easier. The statistician that disregards th	1
Long survey with too many similar questions	1
My time that I have spent at OSU as it applies to developing leadership skills has been absolutely invaluable.	1
N/A	1
nice survey	1
no comment	1
no further comments, thank you.	1
none	2
none, thanks!	1
OSU has really given me a chance to grow and explore as a person, being gave me the chance to get involved with not necessarily with OSU but with the student groups that are independent from the school.	1
So whose thesis were we proving here? Why was it necessary to answer the same questions, phrased differently, at least five different times? Why did I spend more than a half hour of my life helping you with this exercise in futility? Three questions I	1
some questions were very redundant. Others were very difficult to understand because of different names that are not currently used at this school. If this survey is going to be used in the future I recommend editing it and including more samples	1
sounds interesting- thank you!	1
Studying abroad also played a major role in my path to self-discovery and learning about different cultures	1
Survey was great!	1
thanks	1
The repetitiveness of these questions was getting on my nerves.	1
this is a really long survey	1
This seems like a very good survey that could be useful to many of the student leadership groups. You should allow access to these questions to these groups so that they can help analyze themselves and try and improve their leadership development!	1
This survey made me reflect on some of the things that have changed about myself since I've been in college.	1

too long with too many similar questions	1
too many repetitive questions, I got 3 itterances of the same question on multiple occasions, and I know that other people would let their frustration get away with them by quitting the survey because of their frustration.	1
Unless OSU undertakes major improvements in academic integrity as well as better serving the majority of its students, I will not send my children to this institution.	1
Why could I not just check Other Christian on the religion question and have the system allow me to continue? That is a major problem that should be fixed.	1
You should fix that have you been/not been in a club/organization bug.	1
Total	247

Appendix F

Key Demographic Characteristic Tables

Table F1

Class Status--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Class Status		**Freshman**				**Sophomore**				**Junior**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9007	0.5308	197	20.1%	3.8820	0.5107	177	18.0%	3.9563	0.4761	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	4.1111	0.0000	2	0.8%	3.9778	0.4134	45	18.2%	4.0000	0.4043	72	29.1%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1226	0.5137	197	20.1%	4.1356	0.4096	177	18.0%	4.1503	0.4334	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	4.5000	0.1010	2	0.8%	4.2413	0.3946	45	18.2%	4.2063	0.3330	72	29.1%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2132	0.4776	197	20.1%	4.2222	0.4372	177	18.0%	4.1957	0.4035	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	4.7500	0.3536	2	0.8%	4.2519	0.4123	45	18.2%	4.2569	0.3875	72	29.1%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9410	0.4837	197	20.1%	3.9450	0.4253	177	18.0%	3.9671	0.3919	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	4.3750	0.3536	2	0.8%	4.1944	0.3698	45	18.2%	4.1181	0.3896	72	29.1%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9718	0.4499	197	20.1%	3.9793	0.3797	177	18.0%	4.0100	0.3612	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	4.2222	0.4714	2	0.8%	4.1530	0.3377	45	18.2%	4.0941	0.3648	72	29.1%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8006	0.4249	197	20.1%	3.7535	0.4130	177	18.0%	3.8595	0.3856	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	4.1364	0.0643	2	0.8%	3.9192	0.4185	45	18.2%	3.9444	0.3451	72	29.1%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7912	0.4643	197	20.1%	3.7655	0.4166	177	18.0%	3.8338	0.4306	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	3.9375	0.4419	2	0.8%	4.0417	0.3750	45	18.2%	4.0573	0.3902	72	29.1%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7060	0.4585	197	20.1%	3.6814	0.4332	177	18.0%	3.7996	0.4420	270	27.5%
	OSU Compare	3.8000	0.1414	2	0.8%	3.9125	0.4537	45	18.2%	3.8375	0.3679	72	29.1%
	National												

Table F1 (continued)

Class Status--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)									
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1									
Class Status		**Senior**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9675	0.4733	338	34.4%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0920	0.4669	128	51.8%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.0%
	National								
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1982	0.4572	338	34.4%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.3069	0.4220	128	51.8%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.0%
	National								
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2554	0.4782	338	34.4%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.3659	0.4462	128	51.8%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.0%
	National								
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0170	0.4589	338	34.4%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.2578	0.4173	128	51.8%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.0%
	National								
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0411	0.4135	338	34.4%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.2179	0.3863	128	51.8%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.0%
	National								
Civility	OSU Random	3.8625	0.4042	338	34.4%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0305	0.3873	128	51.8%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.0%
	National								
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8502	0.4409	338	34.4%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0771	0.4373	128	51.8%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.0%
	National								
Change	OSU Random	3.7956	0.4810	338	34.4%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.0%
	OSU Compare	3.8922	0.4087	128	51.8%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.0%
	National								

Table F 2

Gender--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs																	
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1																	
Gender		**Female**				**Male**				**Transgender**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9391	0.4665	542	55.4%	3.9333	0.5220	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	3.9362	0.4922	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0375	0.4143	151	61.4%	4.0503	0.4774	95	38.6%					4.0425	0.4389	246	100.0%
	National																
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1726	0.4246	542	55.4%	4.1438	0.4832	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	4.1591	0.4534	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.2781	0.3710	151	61.4%	4.2496	0.4286	95	38.6%					4.2671	0.3936	246	100.0%
	National																
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2408	0.4272	542	55.4%	4.2080	0.4745	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	4.2252	0.4516	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.3543	0.4191	151	61.4%	4.2544	0.4341	95	38.6%					4.3157	0.4269	246	100.0%
	National																
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9869	0.4183	542	55.4%	3.9652	0.4609	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	3.9755	0.4412	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.2020	0.3769	151	61.4%	4.2066	0.4405	95	38.6%					4.2038	0.4018	246	100.0%
	National																
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0318	0.3843	542	55.4%	3.9788	0.4204	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	4.0078	0.4023	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.1862	0.3575	151	61.4%	4.1403	0.3984	95	38.6%					4.1685	0.3737	246	100.0%
	National																

Table F 2 (continued)

Gender--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)																	
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1																	
Gender		**Female**				**Male**				**Transgender**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Civility	OSU Random	3.8454	0.3798	542	55.4%	3.8142	0.4353	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	3.8310	0.4062	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	3.9880	0.3648	151	61.4%	3.9828	0.4109	95	38.6%					3.9860	0.3825	246	100.0%
	National																
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8220	0.4294	542	55.4%	3.8175	0.4508	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	3.8192	0.4395	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0579	0.3886	151	61.4%	4.0697	0.4473	95	38.6%					4.0625	0.4114	246	100.0%
	National																
Change	OSU Random	3.7177	0.4568	542	55.4%	3.8110	0.4526	435	44.4%			2	0.2%	3.7589	0.4599	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	3.8735	0.4046	151	61.4%	3.8817	0.4016	95	38.6%					3.8767	0.4027	246	100.0%
	National																

Table F 3

Sexual Orientation--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs																	
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1																	
Sexual Orientation		**Heterosexual**				**Gay or Bisexual**				**Rather Not Say**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9457	0.4847	935	95.5%	3.9298	0.5870	19	1.9%	3.5867	0.5805	25	2.6%	3.9362	0.4922	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0382	0.4386	224	91.1%	4.2639	0.3343	16	6.5%	3.6111	0.3768	6	2.4%	4.0425	0.4389	246	100.0%
	National																
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1658	0.4509	935	95.5%	4.1128	0.5483	19	1.9%	3.9429	0.4325	25	2.6%	4.1591	0.4534	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.2672	0.3939	224	91.1%	4.4286	0.3042	16	6.5%	3.8333	0.2916	6	2.4%	4.2671	0.3936	246	100.0%
	National																
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2335	0.4471	935	95.5%	4.1140	0.5959	19	1.9%	4.0000	0.4462	25	2.6%	4.2252	0.4516	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.3125	0.4212	224	91.1%	4.5313	0.4092	16	6.5%	3.8611	0.3402	6	2.4%	4.3157	0.4269	246	100.0%
	National																
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9834	0.4333	935	95.5%	3.8224	0.6268	19	1.9%	3.7950	0.5265	25	2.6%	3.9755	0.4412	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.1914	0.3969	224	91.1%	4.4922	0.3749	16	6.5%	3.8958	0.2786	6	2.4%	4.2038	0.4018	246	100.0%
	National																
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0114	0.3992	935	95.5%	4.0058	0.5257	19	1.9%	3.8711	0.4078	25	2.6%	4.0078	0.4023	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.1657	0.3645	224	91.1%	4.3611	0.4341	16	6.5%	3.7593	0.1780	6	2.4%	4.1685	0.3737	246	100.0%
	National																
Civility	OSU Random	3.8323	0.3994	935	95.5%	3.8708	0.5816	19	1.9%	3.7527	0.5024	25	2.6%	3.8310	0.4062	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	3.9700	0.3811	224	91.1%	4.2727	0.3096	16	6.5%	3.8182	0.3042	6	2.4%	3.9860	0.3825	246	100.0%
	National																

Table F 3 (continued)

Sexual Orientation--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)																	
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1																	
Sexual Orientation		**Heterosexual**				**Gay or Bisexual**				**Rather Not Say**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8226	0.4357	935	95.5%	3.7763	0.5426	19	1.9%	3.7250	0.5000	25	2.6%	3.8192	0.4395	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	4.0502	0.4058	224	91.1%	4.3828	0.3009	16	6.5%	3.6667	0.3926	6	2.4%	4.0625	0.4114	246	100.0%
	National																
Change	OSU Random	3.7619	0.4548	935	95.5%	3.7316	0.6642	19	1.9%	3.6680	0.4776	25	2.6%	3.7589	0.4599	979	100.0%
	OSU Compare	3.8659	0.4092	224	91.1%	4.1000	0.2280	16	6.5%	3.6833	0.3312	6	2.4%	3.8767	0.4027	246	100.0%
	National																

Table F 4

Race--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Race		**White**				**African American/ Black**				**American Indian**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9524	0.4779	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	4.0213	0.3984	167	67.9%	4.0000	0.6441	6	2.4%	3.7500	0.6931	4	1.6%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1692	0.4375	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	4.2241	0.3570	167	67.9%	4.3810	0.6619	6	2.4%	4.2500	0.5134	4	1.6%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2366	0.4417	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	4.2784	0.4047	167	67.9%	4.3889	0.5837	6	2.4%	4.1250	0.6292	4	1.6%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9726	0.4310	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	4.1385	0.3778	167	67.9%	4.3542	0.6094	6	2.4%	4.1875	0.2976	4	1.6%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0120	0.3950	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	4.1144	0.3341	167	67.9%	4.3889	0.5611	6	2.4%	4.0278	0.2922	4	1.6%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8342	0.4046	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	3.9390	0.3701	167	67.9%	4.0606	0.5740	6	2.4%	3.8182	0.4635	4	1.6%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8273	0.4350	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	4.0097	0.3890	167	67.9%	4.2500	0.7159	6	2.4%	3.7188	0.4375	4	1.6%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7518	0.4550	770	79.1%			5	0.5%			4	0.4%
	OSU Compare	3.8345	0.3775	167	67.9%	4.0000	0.6000	6	2.4%	3.6500	0.4203	4	1.6%
	National												

Table F 4 (continued)

Race--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Race		**Asian American**				**Latino**				**Multiracial**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.8152	0.5464	62	6.4%	3.9646	0.4343	22	2.3%	3.9322	0.5547	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	3.8254	0.4283	21	8.5%	3.9667	0.5187	10	4.1%	4.2852	0.4508	30	12.2%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.0530	0.5597	62	6.4%	4.0844	0.5116	22	2.3%	4.1835	0.4814	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	4.0544	0.3951	21	8.5%	4.2286	0.3027	10	4.1%	4.5190	0.3816	30	12.2%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.1532	0.5567	62	6.4%	4.1212	0.3923	22	2.3%	4.2211	0.4711	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	4.0952	0.4034	21	8.5%	4.5000	0.3928	10	4.1%	4.4833	0.4091	30	12.2%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9456	0.4842	62	6.4%	4.1531	0.3780	22	2.3%	4.0000	0.4769	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	4.1488	0.4043	21	8.5%	4.4000	0.3900	10	4.1%	4.3667	0.3869	30	12.2%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9480	0.4743	62	6.4%	4.0859	0.3954	22	2.3%	4.0187	0.4005	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	4.0793	0.3914	21	8.5%	4.5000	0.3600	10	4.1%	4.3000	0.4280	30	12.2%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.7771	0.4199	62	6.4%	3.8512	0.3533	22	2.3%	3.8294	0.4171	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	3.8831	0.3463	21	8.5%	4.1364	0.3742	10	4.1%	4.1727	0.3388	30	12.2%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7238	0.4545	62	6.4%	3.8409	0.4435	22	2.3%	3.8289	0.4692	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	3.9286	0.3762	21	8.5%	4.2750	0.4158	10	4.1%	4.2833	0.3550	30	12.2%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7452	0.4272	62	6.4%	3.8314	0.5130	22	2.3%	3.7989	0.5268	95	9.8%
	OSU Compare	3.6762	0.3846	21	8.5%	4.0500	0.2273	10	4.1%	4.0733	0.4085	30	12.2%
	National												

Table F 4 (continued)

Race--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)									
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1									
Race		**Not included**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.6389	0.4977	16	1.6%	3.9383	0.4914	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.4167	0.3744	8	3.3%	4.0425	0.4389	246	100.00%
	National								
Congruence	OSU Random	4.0000	0.4107	16	1.6%	4.1597	0.4533	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.7500	0.2727	8	3.3%	4.2671	0.3936	246	100.00%
	National								
Commitment	OSU Random	4.1042	0.4630	16	1.6%	4.2257	0.4525	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.8542	0.1391	8	3.3%	4.3157	0.4269	246	100.00%
	National								
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.8359	0.5491	16	1.6%	3.9768	0.4408	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.7500	0.2004	8	3.3%	4.2038	0.4018	246	100.00%
	National								
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.8403	0.4057	16	1.6%	4.0088	0.4019	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.5278	0.3014	8	3.3%	4.1685	0.3737	246	100.00%
	National								
Civility	OSU Random	3.7330	0.4296	16	1.6%	3.8310	0.4062	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3750	0.2933	8	3.3%	3.9860	0.3825	246	100.00%
	National								
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.6092	0.3124	16	1.6%	3.8198	0.4392	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.4531	0.2667	8	3.3%	4.0625	0.4114	246	100.00%
	National								
Change	OSU Random	3.7438	0.3932	16	1.6%	3.7597	0.4605	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3500	0.3338	8	3.3%	3.8767	0.4027	246	100.00%
	National								

Table F 5

First Generation--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
First Generation Student Status		**First Generation**				**Non-First Generation**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9166	0.4792	393	40.3%	3.9503	0.5009	581	59.7%	3.9367	0.4923	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0818	0.4482	106	43.6%	4.0114	0.4335	137	56.4%	4.0421	0.4405	243	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1574	0.4449	393	40.3%	4.1628	0.4579	581	59.7%	4.1606	0.4525	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3032	0.4092	106	43.6%	4.2409	0.3783	137	56.4%	4.2681	0.3924	243	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2248	0.4503	393	40.3%	4.2295	0.4522	581	59.7%	4.2276	0.4512	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3836	0.4341	106	43.6%	4.2640	0.4130	137	56.4%	4.3162	0.4257	243	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9596	0.4198	393	40.3%	3.9895	0.4547	581	59.7%	3.9774	0.4410	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2488	0.3883	106	43.6%	4.1706	0.4064	137	56.4%	4.2047	0.3997	243	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9816	0.3848	393	40.3%	4.0284	0.4122	581	59.7%	4.0095	0.4018	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2201	0.3879	106	43.6%	4.1330	0.3618	137	56.4%	4.1710	0.3751	243	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8100	0.3924	393	40.3%	3.8461	0.4147	581	59.7%	3.8316	0.4060	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0069	0.3499	106	43.6%	3.9715	0.4101	137	56.4%	3.9869	0.3846	243	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7891	0.4395	393	40.3%	3.8419	0.4390	581	59.7%	3.8206	0.4398	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1026	0.4129	106	43.6%	4.0383	0.4077	137	56.4%	4.0664	0.4104	243	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7359	0.4653	393	40.3%	3.7749	0.4562	581	59.7%	3.7591	0.4601	974	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9274	0.3735	106	43.6%	3.8348	0.4223	137	56.4%	3.8752	0.4036	243	100.00%
	National												

Appendix G

Key Environmental Factors

Table G 1

Studied Abroad--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Studied Abroad		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9372	0.4886	886	90.20%	3.9213	0.5383	96	9.80%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0374	0.4397	220	89.07%	4.1029	0.4390	27	10.93%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1619	0.4609	886	90.20%	4.1280	0.3974	96	9.80%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2688	0.3965	220	89.07%	4.2540	0.3681	27	10.93%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2231	0.4534	886	90.20%	4.2378	0.4331	96	9.80%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3220	0.4156	220	89.07%	4.2716	0.5109	27	10.93%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9669	0.4464	886	90.20%	4.0508	0.3846	96	9.80%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2045	0.4078	220	89.07%	4.2222	0.3707	27	10.93%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0078	0.4082	886	90.20%	4.0046	0.3412	96	9.80%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1566	0.3774	220	89.07%	4.2798	0.3281	27	10.93%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8165	0.4062	886	90.20%	3.9508	0.3926	96	9.80%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9785	0.3818	220	89.07%	4.0471	0.3819	27	10.93%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8112	0.4421	886	90.20%	3.8867	0.4072	96	9.80%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0608	0.4163	220	89.07%	4.0880	0.3715	27	10.93%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7381	0.4622	886	90.20%	3.9427	0.3917	96	9.80%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8780	0.4034	220	89.07%	3.8889	0.4145	27	10.93%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National												

Table G 2

Experienced Internship--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Experienced Internship		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9121	0.4953	637	64.90%	3.9791	0.4876	345	35.10%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0021	0.3927	107	43.32%	4.0770	0.4704	140	56.68%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1330	0.4553	637	64.90%	4.2058	0.4513	345	35.10%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2323	0.3813	107	43.32%	4.2939	0.4007	140	56.68%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.1983	0.4470	637	64.90%	4.2729	0.4559	345	35.10%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2664	0.4294	107	43.32%	4.3548	0.4212	140	56.68%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9374	0.4393	637	64.90%	4.0445	0.4370	345	35.10%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1857	0.3969	107	43.32%	4.2223	0.4087	140	56.68%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9762	0.3910	637	64.90%	4.0654	0.4159	345	35.10%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1371	0.3452	107	43.32%	4.1952	0.3935	140	56.68%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8118	0.4200	637	64.90%	3.8625	0.3794	345	35.10%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9677	0.3326	107	43.32%	4.0000	0.4160	140	56.68%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7724	0.4318	637	64.90%	3.9040	0.4406	345	35.10%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0572	0.3901	107	43.32%	4.0688	0.4276	140	56.68%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7311	0.4583	637	64.90%	3.8081	0.4586	345	35.10%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8585	0.3986	107	43.32%	3.8950	0.4084	140	56.68%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National												

Table G 3

Learning Community Participant--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Learning Community Participant		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9272	0.4994	840	85.50%	3.9850	0.4549	142	14.50%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0453	0.4317	184	74.49%	4.0423	0.4639	63	25.51%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1590	0.4609	840	85.50%	4.1559	0.4198	142	14.50%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2756	0.3848	184	74.49%	4.2426	0.4174	63	25.51%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2232	0.4523	840	85.50%	4.2324	0.4469	142	14.50%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3243	0.4320	184	74.49%	4.2937	0.4112	63	25.51%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9633	0.4494	840	85.50%	4.0448	0.3832	142	14.50%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1977	0.4043	184	74.49%	4.2321	0.4021	63	25.51%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0027	0.4028	840	85.50%	4.0360	0.3971	142	14.50%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1757	0.3670	184	74.49%	4.1534	0.3953	63	25.51%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8251	0.4134	840	85.50%	3.8560	0.3643	142	14.50%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9867	0.3785	184	74.49%	3.9841	0.3937	63	25.51%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8077	0.4494	840	85.50%	3.8829	0.3678	142	14.50%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0455	0.4152	184	74.49%	4.1171	0.3971	63	25.51%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7521	0.4647	840	85.50%	3.7936	0.4286	142	14.50%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8775	0.4104	184	74.49%	3.8841	0.3870	63	25.51%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National												

Table G 4

Senior Capstone Participant--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Senior Capstone Participant		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9369	0.49732	910	92.70%	3.9198	0.44336	72	7.30%	3.9356	0.49338	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0330	0.4327	212	85.83%	4.1143	0.4771	35	14.17%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1586	0.45697	910	92.70%	4.1587	0.43261	72	7.30%	4.1586	0.45501	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2540	0.3969	212	85.83%	4.3469	0.3622	35	14.17%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2273	0.44809	910	92.70%	4.1898	0.49196	72	7.30%	4.2245	0.45129	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3105	0.4273	212	85.83%	4.3524	0.4235	35	14.17%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9728	0.44183	910	92.70%	4.0035	0.43553	72	7.30%	3.9751	0.44123	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1899	0.4110	212	85.83%	4.3071	0.3408	35	14.17%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0041	0.40016	910	92.70%	4.0509	0.42482	72	7.30%	4.0075	0.40198	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1556	0.3754	212	85.83%	4.2571	0.3563	35	14.17%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8312	0.41036	910	92.70%	3.8093	0.35885	72	7.30%	3.8296	0.40668	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9734	0.3784	212	85.83%	4.0623	0.3980	35	14.17%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8195	0.44128	910	92.70%	3.8073	0.41428	72	7.30%	3.8186	0.43917	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0525	0.4145	212	85.83%	4.1321	0.3882	35	14.17%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7513	0.46227	910	92.70%	3.8444	0.41855	72	7.30%	3.7581	0.45965	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8607	0.4092	212	85.83%	3.9914	0.3543	35	14.17%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National												

Table G 5

Involvement in College Organizations--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Involvement in College Organizations		**Never**				**One Time**				**Sometimes**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.8811	0.4871	244	24.80%	3.8881	0.5583	138	14.10%	3.9280	0.5022	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.2500	0.5319	4	1.62%	3.9259	0.5066	12	4.86%	3.9349	0.3911	58	23.48%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1095	0.4575	244	24.80%	4.1429	0.4906	138	14.10%	4.1491	0.4812	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.3214	0.2440	4	1.62%	4.0952	0.4886	12	4.86%	4.1552	0.3335	58	23.48%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.1626	0.4460	244	24.80%	4.1969	0.5294	138	14.10%	4.2201	0.4457	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.1667	0.5774	4	1.62%	4.0417	0.5601	12	4.86%	4.1897	0.3892	58	23.48%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.8505	0.4221	244	24.80%	3.9556	0.5092	138	14.10%	3.9848	0.4247	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.2188	0.5437	4	1.62%	4.0104	0.5041	12	4.86%	4.0690	0.3027	58	23.48%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9144	0.3698	244	24.80%	3.9750	0.4689	138	14.10%	3.9920	0.4018	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.1944	0.6043	4	1.62%	3.9907	0.4250	12	4.86%	4.0306	0.2852	58	23.48%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.7458	0.3854	244	24.80%	3.7830	0.4668	138	14.10%	3.8346	0.4063	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.2273	0.5222	4	1.62%	3.7424	0.4534	12	4.86%	3.8197	0.3220	58	23.48%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.6844	0.3806	244	24.80%	3.7654	0.5022	138	14.10%	3.8275	0.4406	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.0938	0.6404	4	1.62%	3.7188	0.5744	12	4.86%	3.9526	0.3503	58	23.48%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.6893	0.4279	244	24.80%	3.6783	0.5444	138	14.10%	3.7545	0.4499	321	32.70%
	OSU Compare	4.1500	0.3109	4	1.62%	3.5969	0.5708	12	4.86%	3.7810	0.3446	58	23.48%
	National												

Table G 5 (continued)

Involvement in College Organizations--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Involvement in College Organizations		**Many Times**				**Much of the Time**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9704	0.4457	154	15.70%	4.0711	0.4382	125	12.70%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0469	0.4318	64	25.91%	4.1070	0.4498	109	44.13%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1837	0.3976	154	15.70%	4.2651	0.3894	125	12.70%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2701	0.4034	64	25.91%	4.3421	0.3951	109	44.13%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2706	0.4162	154	15.70%	4.3307	0.4038	125	12.70%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3490	0.4144	64	25.91%	4.4006	0.4083	109	44.13%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0698	0.4247	154	15.70%	4.0980	0.3986	125	12.70%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1973	0.4358	64	25.91%	4.3062	0.3907	109	44.13%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0854	0.3619	154	15.70%	4.1689	0.3695	125	12.70%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1563	0.3627	64	25.91%	4.2712	0.3814	109	44.13%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.9085	0.3923	154	15.70%	3.9345	0.3545	125	12.70%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0213	0.3763	64	25.91%	4.0717	0.3664	109	44.13%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9131	0.4221	154	15.70%	4.0000	0.3994	125	12.70%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0918	0.4029	64	25.91%	4.1433	0.3919	109	44.13%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8766	0.4485	154	15.70%	3.8440	0.4165	125	12.70%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9219	0.3906	64	25.91%	3.9275	0.4046	109	44.13%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National												

Table G 6

Leadership Position in College Organization--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Leadership Position in College Organization		**Never**				**One Time**				**Sometimes**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9051	0.5107	569	57.90%	3.8909	0.5146	110	11.20%	3.9647	0.4573	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	4.0202	0.4847	33	13.36%	4.0261	0.4401	17	6.88%	3.9979	0.4314	52	21.05%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1429	0.4797	569	57.90%	4.1532	0.4163	110	11.20%	4.1059	0.4182	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	4.2121	0.4547	33	13.36%	4.2185	0.3850	17	6.88%	4.2198	0.3459	52	21.05%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2094	0.4608	569	57.90%	4.1894	0.4316	110	11.20%	4.1751	0.4461	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	4.2626	0.4146	33	13.36%	4.1275	0.5353	17	6.88%	4.2692	0.4356	52	21.05%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9346	0.4496	569	57.90%	3.9568	0.4251	110	11.20%	3.9712	0.4092	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	4.1098	0.3518	33	13.36%	4.0735	0.4028	17	6.88%	4.1899	0.3667	52	21.05%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9660	0.4104	569	57.90%	3.9727	0.3656	110	11.20%	4.0019	0.3893	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	4.0539	0.3169	33	13.36%	4.0784	0.3943	17	6.88%	4.1196	0.3601	52	21.05%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.7943	0.4126	569	57.90%	3.8479	0.4347	110	11.20%	3.8247	0.3860	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	3.8898	0.3987	33	13.36%	3.9037	0.3124	17	6.88%	3.9720	0.3913	52	21.05%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7619	0.4378	569	57.90%	3.7795	0.4674	110	11.20%	3.8615	0.4059	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	3.8750	0.4075	33	13.36%	3.9191	0.3643	17	6.88%	4.0865	0.4071	52	21.05%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7165	0.4604	569	57.90%	3.7436	0.4783	110	11.20%	3.7532	0.4621	139	14.20%
	OSU Compare	3.8080	0.4193	33	13.36%	3.8471	0.3826	17	6.88%	3.7654	0.4163	52	21.05%
	National												

Table G 6 (continued)

Leadership Position in College Organization--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Leadership Position in College Organization		**Many Times**				**Much of the Time**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9974	0.4736	86	8.80%	4.1011	0.3697	78	7.90%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9967	0.4559	68	27.53%	4.1328	0.4059	77	31.17%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.2043	0.4331	86	8.80%	4.3242	0.3710	78	7.90%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2500	0.4313	68	27.53%	4.3488	0.3556	77	31.17%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2984	0.4115	86	8.80%	4.3910	0.4229	78	7.90%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3064	0.4613	68	27.53%	4.4221	0.3437	77	31.17%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0916	0.4499	86	8.80%	4.1746	0.3766	78	7.90%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1618	0.4882	68	27.53%	4.3279	0.3387	77	31.17%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.1021	0.3596	86	8.80%	4.2650	0.3478	78	7.90%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1422	0.3843	68	27.53%	4.2987	0.3646	77	31.17%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8827	0.3689	86	8.80%	4.0117	0.3465	78	7.90%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9505	0.3810	68	27.53%	4.0862	0.3692	77	31.17%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9099	0.4002	86	8.80%	4.1106	0.3698	78	7.90%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0294	0.4331	68	27.53%	4.1916	0.3665	77	31.17%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8360	0.4090	86	8.80%	4.0050	0.3944	78	7.90%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8603	0.4111	68	27.53%	4.0104	0.3586	77	31.17%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National												

Table G 7

Short-Term Leadership Experiences--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Short-Term Leadership Experiences		**Never**				**One Time**				**Several Times**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.8862	0.4915	416	42.40%	3.8656	0.5351	253	25.80%	4.0252	0.4359	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	4.1429	0.4802	14	5.67%	4.0331	0.4563	47	19.03%	4.0036	0.4279	124	50.20%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1336	0.4531	416	42.40%	4.0791	0.5072	253	25.80%	4.2299	0.3996	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	4.3571	0.4031	14	5.67%	4.2614	0.3978	47	19.03%	4.2316	0.3673	124	50.20%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2015	0.4373	416	42.40%	4.1238	0.5053	253	25.80%	4.3134	0.3948	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	4.3333	0.4030	14	5.67%	4.2589	0.4282	47	19.03%	4.2890	0.4366	124	50.20%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.8954	0.4309	416	42.40%	3.9121	0.4562	253	25.80%	4.1001	0.3988	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	4.2500	0.3798	14	5.67%	4.1383	0.4245	47	19.03%	4.1462	0.3907	124	50.20%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9450	0.3806	416	42.40%	3.9404	0.4219	253	25.80%	4.1049	0.3699	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	4.1111	0.3946	14	5.67%	4.1513	0.3666	47	19.03%	4.1299	0.3600	124	50.20%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.7788	0.4061	416	42.40%	3.7567	0.4066	253	25.80%	3.9292	0.3672	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	3.9286	0.4569	14	5.67%	3.9226	0.3469	47	19.03%	3.9304	0.3783	124	50.20%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7203	0.4083	416	42.40%	3.7554	0.4605	253	25.80%	3.9552	0.3957	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	4.0536	0.4094	14	5.67%	3.9468	0.4513	47	19.03%	3.9950	0.3756	124	50.20%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.6892	0.4451	416	42.40%	3.6893	0.4909	253	25.80%	3.8880	0.4309	251	25.60%
	OSU Compare	3.9357	0.4909	14	5.67%	3.8099	0.4161	47	19.03%	3.8355	0.4073	124	50.20%
	National												

Table G 7 (continued)

Short-Term Leadership Experiences--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)									
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1									
Short-Term Leadership Experiences		**Many Times**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	4.1900	0.4174	62	6.30%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1129	0.4383	62	25.10%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National								
Congruence	OSU Random	4.3618	0.3497	62	6.30%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3226	0.4343	62	25.10%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National								
Commitment	OSU Random	4.4301	0.3999	62	6.30%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.4113	0.4023	62	25.10%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National								
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.2601	0.3870	62	6.30%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3690	0.3784	62	25.10%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National								
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.3065	0.3768	62	6.30%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2778	0.3890	62	25.10%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National								
Civility	OSU Random	4.0645	0.4067	62	6.30%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1584	0.3511	62	25.10%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National								
Citizenship	OSU Random	4.1835	0.3938	62	6.30%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2923	0.3663	62	25.10%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National								
Change	OSU Random	3.9758	0.3524	62	6.30%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0065	0.3411	62	25.10%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National								

Table G 8

Moderate-Term Leadership Experiences--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Moderate-Term Leadership Experiences		**Never**				**One Time**				**Several Times**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.8903	0.4836	631	64.30%	4.0147	0.4961	166	16.90%	3.9900	0.5339	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	4.0067	0.4817	50	20.24%	3.9871	0.4720	69	27.94%	4.0474	0.3669	89	36.03%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1279	0.4444	631	64.30%	4.2186	0.4484	166	16.90%	4.1771	0.5009	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	4.2743	0.4080	50	20.24%	4.1449	0.3954	69	27.94%	4.2777	0.3515	89	36.03%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.1957	0.4268	631	64.30%	4.2631	0.4650	166	16.90%	4.2409	0.5227	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	4.3367	0.4103	50	20.24%	4.2005	0.4956	69	27.94%	4.3052	0.3703	89	36.03%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9133	0.4162	631	64.30%	4.0565	0.4638	166	16.90%	4.0796	0.4732	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	4.1200	0.3920	50	20.24%	4.1159	0.4030	69	27.94%	4.2163	0.3879	89	36.03%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9566	0.3697	631	64.30%	4.0803	0.4185	166	16.90%	4.0609	0.4663	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	4.1422	0.3777	50	20.24%	4.0998	0.3691	69	27.94%	4.1698	0.3609	89	36.03%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.7805	0.3945	631	64.30%	3.9211	0.4194	166	16.90%	3.8989	0.4049	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	3.9218	0.4319	50	20.24%	3.8656	0.3928	69	27.94%	4.0276	0.3029	89	36.03%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7369	0.4069	631	64.30%	3.9360	0.4480	166	16.90%	3.9332	0.4694	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	3.9225	0.4545	50	20.24%	3.9511	0.4197	69	27.94%	4.1011	0.3280	89	36.03%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.6951	0.4567	631	64.30%	3.8542	0.4833	166	16.90%	3.8623	0.4111	146	14.90%
	OSU Compare	3.7780	0.4316	50	20.24%	3.7835	0.4578	69	27.94%	3.9382	0.3113	89	36.03%
	National												

Table G 8 (continued)

Moderate-Term Leadership Experiences--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)									
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1									
Moderate-Term Leadership Experiences		**Many Times**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	4.1282	0.3751	39	4.00%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1880	0.4582	39	15.79%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National								
Congruence	OSU Random	4.3297	0.4212	39	4.00%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.4505	0.3954	39	15.79%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National								
Commitment	OSU Random	4.4658	0.4192	39	4.00%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.5214	0.3651	39	15.79%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National								
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.2372	0.4013	39	4.00%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.4551	0.3564	39	15.79%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National								
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.3219	0.3692	39	4.00%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3304	0.3724	39	15.79%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National								
Civility	OSU Random	3.9744	0.4294	39	4.00%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1865	0.3701	39	15.79%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National								
Citizenship	OSU Random	4.2115	0.3774	39	4.00%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3590	0.3479	39	15.79%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National								
Change	OSU Random	3.9795	0.3736	39	4.00%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0436	0.3872	39	15.79%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National								

Table G 9

Long-Term Leadership Experiences--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Long-Term Leadership Experiences		**Never**				**One Time**				**Several Times**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9284	0.4921	827	84.20%	3.9443	0.4482	80	8.10%	3.9082	0.5820	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	4.0312	0.4628	139	56.28%	4.0450	0.3605	37	14.98%	4.0528	0.4358	40	16.19%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1586	0.4417	827	84.20%	4.1071	0.4678	80	8.10%	4.1273	0.6276	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	4.2528	0.4114	139	56.28%	4.2471	0.3590	37	14.98%	4.2679	0.3871	40	16.19%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2207	0.4342	827	84.20%	4.2021	0.4822	80	8.10%	4.2065	0.6705	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	4.2986	0.4435	139	56.28%	4.2658	0.3798	37	14.98%	4.3125	0.4172	40	16.19%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9583	0.4207	827	84.20%	4.0531	0.4663	80	8.10%	4.0107	0.6486	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	4.1817	0.4149	139	56.28%	4.1723	0.3272	37	14.98%	4.2031	0.4355	40	16.19%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9935	0.3788	827	84.20%	4.0208	0.4240	80	8.10%	4.0628	0.6435	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	4.1687	0.3838	139	56.28%	4.1592	0.3287	37	14.98%	4.1333	0.4359	40	16.19%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8218	0.3968	827	84.20%	3.8455	0.4452	80	8.10%	3.8609	0.4910	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	3.9686	0.4134	139	56.28%	3.9631	0.3295	37	14.98%	3.9545	0.3203	40	16.19%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7943	0.4207	827	84.20%	3.9125	0.4800	80	8.10%	3.9239	0.5866	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	4.0261	0.4541	139	56.28%	4.0236	0.3521	37	14.98%	4.0781	0.3211	40	16.19%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7422	0.4547	827	84.20%	3.8288	0.4598	80	8.10%	3.7955	0.4718	46	4.70%
	OSU Compare	3.8594	0.4462	139	56.28%	3.8649	0.3409	37	14.98%	3.8675	0.3385	40	16.19%
	National												

Table G 9 (continued)

Long-Term Leadership Experiences--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)									
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1									
Long-Term Leadership Experiences		**Many Times**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	4.1609	0.4673	29	3.00%	3.9356	0.4934	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0932	0.4361	31	12.55%	4.0445	0.4392	247	100.00%
	National								
Congruence	OSU Random	4.3498	0.4478	29	3.00%	4.1586	0.4550	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3548	0.3574	31	12.55%	4.2672	0.3928	247	100.00%
	National								
Commitment	OSU Random	4.4253	0.3873	29	3.00%	4.2245	0.4513	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.4624	0.3984	31	12.55%	4.3165	0.4262	247	100.00%
	National								
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.1810	0.4882	29	3.00%	3.9751	0.4412	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3629	0.3699	31	12.55%	4.2065	0.4032	247	100.00%
	National								
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.2835	0.4056	29	3.00%	4.0075	0.4020	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2366	0.2908	31	12.55%	4.1700	0.3738	247	100.00%
	National								
Civility	OSU Random	3.9592	0.4268	29	3.00%	3.8296	0.4067	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1320	0.3456	31	12.55%	3.9860	0.3817	247	100.00%
	National								
Citizenship	OSU Random	4.0862	0.4446	29	3.00%	3.8186	0.4392	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2621	0.3233	31	12.55%	4.0638	0.4110	247	100.00%
	National								
Change	OSU Random	3.9586	0.5329	29	3.00%	3.7581	0.4597	982	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0000	0.3396	31	12.55%	3.8792	0.4038	247	100.00%
	National								

Table G 10

Emerging New Leaders Program--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Emerging New Leaders		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9676	0.5018	134	86.50%	4.0159	0.4985	21	13.50%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1001	0.3766	81	75.00%	3.9465	0.4808	27	25.00%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1343	0.5261	134	86.50%	4.3129	0.4773	21	13.50%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3210	0.3474	81	75.00%	4.1799	0.4148	27	25.00%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2376	0.5444	134	86.50%	4.2937	0.4741	21	13.50%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3560	0.3743	81	75.00%	4.2901	0.4861	27	25.00%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0485	0.5441	134	86.50%	4.1667	0.4300	21	13.50%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2423	0.3504	81	75.00%	4.2269	0.4891	27	25.00%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0688	0.5054	134	86.50%	4.1693	0.4889	21	13.50%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1742	0.3388	81	75.00%	4.1646	0.4318	27	25.00%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8593	0.4697	134	86.50%	3.9481	0.3469	21	13.50%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0067	0.3213	81	75.00%	4.0135	0.3871	27	25.00%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9347	0.5283	134	86.50%	4.0357	0.3604	21	13.50%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1003	0.3238	81	75.00%	4.1481	0.4029	27	25.00%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8313	0.4912	134	86.50%	3.9190	0.3842	21	13.50%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8926	0.3570	81	75.00%	3.9407	0.2952	27	25.00%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 11

Peer Leadership Program-Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Peer Leadership Program		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9821	0.5211	119	76.80%	3.9475	0.4287	36	23.20%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0886	0.3919	74	68.52%	4.0033	0.4423	34	31.48%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1381	0.5656	119	76.80%	4.2262	0.3370	36	23.20%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3031	0.3515	74	68.52%	4.2479	0.4061	34	31.48%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2129	0.5675	119	76.80%	4.3519	0.3940	36	23.20%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3604	0.3902	74	68.52%	4.2941	0.4343	34	31.48%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0116	0.5604	119	76.80%	4.2394	0.3714	36	23.20%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2584	0.3674	74	68.52%	4.1949	0.4299	34	31.48%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0551	0.5259	119	76.80%	4.1728	0.4110	36	23.20%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1741	0.3533	74	68.52%	4.1667	0.3861	34	31.48%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8584	0.4823	119	76.80%	3.9141	0.3531	36	23.20%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9951	0.3414	74	68.52%	4.0374	0.3305	34	31.48%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9128	0.5486	119	76.80%	4.0660	0.3266	36	23.20%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1267	0.3378	74	68.52%	4.0809	0.3600	34	31.48%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8395	0.5118	119	76.80%	3.8553	0.3492	36	23.20%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9311	0.3503	74	68.52%	3.8471	0.3203	34	31.48%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 12

Leadership Certificate Program--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Leadership Certificate Program		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9696	0.4960	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0682	0.4088	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1469	0.5190	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2758	0.3699	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2389	0.5306	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3251	0.4092	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0559	0.5313	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2290	0.3845	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0769	0.5041	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1683	0.3637	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8764	0.4607	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9982	0.3401	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9397	0.5175	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0965	0.3381	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8321	0.4776	143	92.30%			12	7.70%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8950	0.3451	101	93.52%			7	6.48%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 13

Multi-Semester Leadership Program--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Multi-Semester Leadership Program		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9785	0.5080	140	90.30%	3.9333	0.4320	15	9.70%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0644	0.4093	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1449	0.5364	140	90.30%	4.2857	0.3457	15	9.70%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2817	0.3679	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2298	0.5502	140	90.30%	4.3889	0.3313	15	9.70%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3364	0.4044	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0598	0.5486	140	90.30%	4.1083	0.3234	15	9.70%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2348	0.3873	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0722	0.5181	140	90.30%	4.1778	0.3248	15	9.70%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1703	0.3635	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8653	0.4703	140	90.30%	3.9273	0.2796	15	9.70%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0042	0.3359	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9518	0.5217	140	90.30%	3.9167	0.3829	15	9.70%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1086	0.3434	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8428	0.4901	140	90.30%	3.8467	0.3583	15	9.70%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9000	0.3401	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 14

Senior Leadership Capstone--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Senior Leadership Capstone		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9940	0.4933	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0604	0.4130	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1866	0.5040	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2885	0.3737	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2676	0.5193	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3495	0.4066	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0858	0.5195	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2379	0.3943	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.1051	0.4905	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1726	0.3668	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8928	0.4476	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0150	0.3361	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9677	0.4990	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1080	0.3497	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8584	0.4744	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9087	0.3384	103	95.37%			5	4.63%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 15

Residential Living Learning Leadership Program--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Residential Living Learning Leadership Program		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9751	0.5136	130	83.90%	3.9689	0.4321	25	16.10%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0822	0.4011	73	67.59%	4.0190	0.4257	35	32.41%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1604	0.5483	130	83.90%	4.1486	0.3630	25	16.10%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3072	0.3837	73	67.59%	4.2408	0.3355	35	32.41%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2346	0.5575	130	83.90%	4.3000	0.3968	25	16.10%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3607	0.4401	73	67.59%	4.2952	0.3159	35	32.41%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0606	0.5569	130	83.90%	4.0847	0.3711	25	16.10%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2603	0.3995	73	67.59%	4.1929	0.3617	35	32.41%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0829	0.5236	130	83.90%	4.0800	0.3856	25	16.10%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2131	0.3839	73	67.59%	4.0857	0.2990	35	32.41%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8704	0.4694	130	83.90%	3.8764	0.3802	25	16.10%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0012	0.3552	73	67.59%	4.0234	0.3002	35	32.41%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9375	0.5397	130	83.90%	4.0050	0.3051	25	16.10%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1164	0.3658	73	67.59%	4.1036	0.2978	35	32.41%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8608	0.4871	130	83.90%	3.7516	0.4243	25	16.10%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8932	0.3513	73	67.59%	3.9286	0.3250	35	32.41%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 16

Leadership Minor--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Leadership Minor		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9750	0.4999	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0614	0.4094	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1516	0.5246	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2857	0.3701	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2517	0.5344	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3397	0.4049	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0663	0.5316	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2429	0.3918	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0794	0.5075	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1714	0.3659	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8693	0.4555	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0165	0.3356	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9541	0.5094	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1202	0.3445	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8428	0.4787	147	94.80%			8	5.20%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9114	0.3381	105	97.22%			3	2.78%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 17

Leadership Major--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Leadership Major		**No**				**Yes**				**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9910	0.4928	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	3.9741	0.5000	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0654	0.4084	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.0617	0.4083	108	100.00%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1648	0.5114	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	4.1585	0.5219	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2884	0.3692	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.2857	0.3685	108	100.00%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2600	0.5194	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	4.2452	0.5343	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3442	0.4026	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.3395	0.4037	108	100.00%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0749	0.5167	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	4.0645	0.5304	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2407	0.3884	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.2384	0.3873	108	100.00%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0933	0.4939	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	4.0824	0.5028	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1744	0.3628	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.1718	0.3622	108	100.00%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.8822	0.4500	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	3.8713	0.4551	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0093	0.3385	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.0084	0.3371	108	100.00%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.9583	0.5010	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	3.9484	0.5090	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1133	0.3453	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	4.1123	0.3439	108	100.00%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.8506	0.4733	150	96.80%			5	3.20%	3.8432	0.4780	155	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9047	0.3435	107	99.07%			1	0.93%	3.9046	0.3419	108	100.00%
	National												

Table G 18

Place of Residence--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Place of Residence		**Parent/guardian or other relative home**				**Other private home, apartment, or room**				**College/university residence hall**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.8708	0.5686	43	4.40%	3.9752	0.4678	591	60.40%	3.8797	0.5270	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	3.8889	0.3849	3	1.22%	4.0179	0.4562	118	47.97%	4.0837	0.3826	73	29.67%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.2392	0.4439	43	4.40%	4.1740	0.4331	591	60.40%	4.1422	0.5008	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	4.1905	0.2182	3	1.22%	4.2421	0.4261	118	47.97%	4.2975	0.3625	73	29.67%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2558	0.4663	43	4.40%	4.2352	0.4392	591	60.40%	4.2294	0.4791	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	4.3889	0.5358	3	1.22%	4.3065	0.4487	118	47.97%	4.2945	0.3864	73	29.67%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0203	0.4321	43	4.40%	3.9960	0.4149	591	60.40%	3.9291	0.4830	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	4.1667	0.5052	3	1.22%	4.1801	0.4353	118	47.97%	4.2551	0.3729	73	29.67%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0284	0.3613	43	4.40%	4.0256	0.3935	591	60.40%	3.9750	0.4282	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	4.1481	0.3902	3	1.22%	4.1685	0.4062	118	47.97%	4.1461	0.3109	73	29.67%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.7146	0.4764	43	4.40%	3.8685	0.3860	591	60.40%	3.8032	0.4496	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	3.8182	0.3278	3	1.22%	3.9492	0.3891	118	47.97%	4.0610	0.3736	73	29.67%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.7529	0.4673	43	4.40%	3.8306	0.4250	591	60.40%	3.7955	0.4755	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	4.0833	0.1909	3	1.22%	4.0064	0.4517	118	47.97%	4.1507	0.3566	73	29.67%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.6698	0.4902	43	4.40%	3.8064	0.4459	591	60.40%	3.6679	0.4801	231	23.60%
	OSU Compare	3.6667	0.1528	3	1.22%	3.8585	0.4094	118	47.97%	3.9027	0.3969	73	29.67%
	National												

Table G 18 (continued)

Place of Residence--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)													
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1													
Place of Residence		**Other campus student housing**				**Fraternity or sorority house**				**Other**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.7569	0.4615	32	3.30%	3.9588	0.4663	62	6.30%	3.7944	0.6152	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0000	0.5126	26	10.57%	4.0711	0.4361	25	10.16%	4.7778	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Congruence	OSU Random	4.0179	0.4004	32	3.30%	4.1567	0.3701	62	6.30%	3.9714	0.6992	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2857	0.4257	26	10.57%	4.2629	0.2965	25	10.16%	4.8571	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Commitment	OSU Random	4.1563	0.4015	32	3.30%	4.1720	0.3480	62	6.30%	4.0917	0.7463	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3077	0.4915	26	10.57%	4.4000	0.3664	25	10.16%	4.8333	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Collaboration	OSU Random	4.0117	0.4334	32	3.30%	3.9395	0.4364	62	6.30%	3.8625	0.6749	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1154	0.4014	26	10.57%	4.2500	0.3041	25	10.16%	4.5000	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Common Purpose	OSU Random	3.9722	0.3961	32	3.30%	4.0215	0.3218	62	6.30%	3.8278	0.6037	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1111	0.4000	26	10.57%	4.2711	0.3471	25	10.16%	4.7778	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Civility	OSU Random	3.6875	0.2818	32	3.30%	3.7551	0.3575	62	6.30%	3.7591	0.4822	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8252	0.3848	26	10.57%	4.1091	0.3049	25	10.16%	4.4545	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8281	0.4587	32	3.30%	3.8508	0.3585	62	6.30%	3.7875	0.5751	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9856	0.4128	26	10.57%	4.1350	0.3403	25	10.16%	4.3750	.	1	0.41%
	National												
Change	OSU Random	3.7500	0.4296	32	3.30%	3.7629	0.4177	62	6.30%	3.6000	0.5582	20	2.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8217	0.4394	26	10.57%	3.9280	0.3221	25	10.16%	4.9000	.	1	0.41%
	National												

Table G 18 (continued)

Place of Residence--Means, Standard Deviation, N's and Percents by Social Change Model Values/Constructs (continued)					
5 point scale with 5 suggesting a higher level of the value/construct than a 1					
Place of Residence		**Total**			
		Mean	**SD**	**N**	**%**
Self-Understanding	OSU Random	3.9362	0.4922	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0425	0.4389	246	100.00%
	National				
Congruence	OSU Random	4.1591	0.4534	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2671	0.3936	246	100.00%
	National				
Commitment	OSU Random	4.2252	0.4516	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.3157	0.4269	246	100.00%
	National				
Collaboration	OSU Random	3.9755	0.4412	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.2038	0.4018	246	100.00%
	National				
Common Purpose	OSU Random	4.0078	0.4023	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.1685	0.3737	246	100.00%
	National				
Civility	OSU Random	3.8310	0.4062	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.9860	0.3825	246	100.00%
	National				
Citizenship	OSU Random	3.8192	0.4395	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	4.0625	0.4114	246	100.00%
	National				
Change	OSU Random	3.7589	0.4599	979	100.00%
	OSU Compare	3.8767	0.4027	246	100.00%
	National				