

THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND LEADERSHIP ROLE
ON SELF-REPORTED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

By

JOSEPH JAMES LEYLAND

Bachelor of Science in General Studies

The University of Central Oklahoma

Edmond, Oklahoma

2008

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2011

THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND LEADERSHIP ROLE
ON SELF-REPORTED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Thesis Approved:

Dr. John Foubert

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Lee Bird

Dr. Jesse Mendez

Dr. Mark Payton

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There is no way I could have I could have made it to this point in my new career without acknowledging my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. “For God did not give us a spirit of fear, but one of power, of love, and of self-discipline” (II Timothy 1:7).

Thank you to my thesis committee: Dr. John Foubert, for guiding me through this process and helping me become a wiser student affairs professional; Dr. Lee Bird, for handing a new Student Affairs Graduate Assistant her personal cell phone number the first time we met to ensure her commitment and support to my development if needed; and Dr. Jesse Mendez, for his support and thought provoking questions during this process.

I would like to thank all of my family, friends, colleagues, and mentors over the years that have contributed to my love for life and all of the wonders and people in it. Thank you, Dean Fisher, for taking a chance on a kid from a small school and believing in him. Thank you to Steve Kreidler, Lane Perry and the Leaders of Tomorrow, the source of my obsession to serve students and to have fun while doing it. Thank you to Dr. Lisa Kerr for your encouragement and advice during this trying time period in my life. It meant more than you will ever know and I plan on paying it forward.

My deepest appreciation will always be towards my parents, Joseph and Colleen Leyland, for their unselfish service to their country and their children through all times, good or bad. I am what you made me to be and my dedication to serving others was born from your example. I would like to thank my brothers, Andrew and Mathew, for always being there for me and teaching me the challenges and blessings of being your older brother.

I am appreciative of my sisters, Tammy and Shannon, for their love and well wishes from so many miles away. I love you both.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge an amazing woman that has taught me what it really means to live, laugh, and love. There is no way that I would be so optimistic about an uncertain future that has been written for me without your soulful spirit and overwhelming inspiration. I admire all that you are and I am in your debt for the time that you have allowed me to know you. I am a better professional and person because of you. Thank you, Abby.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Formal Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Significance of the Study	6
Assumptions.....	7
Limitations	7
Organization of the Study	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
Leadership & the Student Transformation.....	11
Residence Halls.....	17
Greek Life	21
Sex & Leadership.....	28
Leadership Effectiveness	33
Chapter Summary	39
III. METHODOLOGY	41
Research Questions.....	41
Background.....	42
Sample.....	43
Instrument	45
Procedure	49
Chapter Summary	52

Chapter	Page
IV. FINDINGS.....	53
Summary of Research Questions	54
Chapter Summary	57
V. CONCLUSION.....	58
Summary of Results	59
Consistency with Previous Research	60
Limitations	63
Suggestions for Future Research	65
Suggestions for Future Practice	67
Conclusions.....	70
Chapter Summary	72
REFERENCES	75
APPENDICES	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics.....	54
2. Multivariate Tests	55
3. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.....	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Student leaders have long held an influential standing on campuses around the country that have shaped not only the learning experiences of all students, faculty, and staff involved, but also a culture of involvement and collaboration that affects the academic and surrounding communities in and outside of the classroom. Involvement in campus organizations and activities during a student's college experience have been known to correlate with several factors including GPA, retention, student satisfaction and positively affects learning and personal development through commitment and responsibility (Davis & Murrell, 1993).

Students have found several ways to get involved over the years. This fact was certainly aided by the introduction of Greek social fraternities and sororities in the late 1700s as a means to escape the purely academic structure of university life and enjoy social activity in between studies. Several chapters colonized on campuses across the country over time to form a widely popular social and involvement experience in today's university culture. However, due to many reports over the years of sexual assault, hazing, alcohol abuse, and harassment (Foubert, Newberry & Tatum, 2007; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007;

Hayek et al., 2002; Neuberger & Hanson, 1997; Wilder et al., 1997), schools have raised questions over the perceived value of these social organizations in educational settings.

Many campus student leaders are members of Greek organizations. This is consistent with studies that sought evidence of increased engagement among other relevant academic and intellectual learning outcomes (Pike, 2003; Hayek et al, 2002). Leaders of these organizations have been the subject of several studies to gain a better understanding of the level of leadership that is amassed in the world of Greek social fraternities and sororities. The leaders perceived to be the best in these organizations are those that commit to the development and well being of the fraternity and sorority members (Harms et al., 2006). This quality has been identified in transformational leadership theory.

The explosion of residence hall construction after World War II sought to house more students at universities because of research that indicated a better learning and development experience when students lived on campus (Nuss, 2003). Over the past couple of decades, research has indicated that students living in residence halls experience more personal growth than those who do not (Wu & Stemler, 2008; Johnson et al., 2007; Jaeger & Caison, 2006; Arboleda, Wang, Shelley, & Whalen, 2003).

A contributing factor of these results is the role of the “RA” or Resident Advisor (Arboleda, Wang, Shelley, & Whalen, 2003). RAs are campus leaders that take on the responsibility of aiding the institution in achieving its educational and developmental mission in the residential facilities through training and implementation of programming and policy. They also have the task of helping students feel connected to their new living environment as well as encouraging their involvement with other students in the community and the campus to aid retention initiatives. These great responsibilities require great leaders who are capable

of understanding and utilizing their role as a mentor and role model to maximize student development opportunities for the students in their charge. The quantity of current research into the leadership styles and effectiveness of student affairs staff, especially RAs, has been difficult to find in recent times. However, studies by Wu & Stemler (2008), Johnson et al. (2006), Posner & Brodsky (1993), and Komives (1991a, 1991b), among others, have helped establish the importance of RAs and the outcomes that directly rely on them.

Another interesting dynamic is the possible effect that sex has on the leadership perceptions and effectiveness of these student leaders. Research has shown that men are more autocratic and power-driven while women are more democratic and community-driven (Hoyt, 2007; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). There has been a major paradigm shift in leadership practice from the male dominated industrial era to the post-industrial leadership period where emotion and community mentoring have become prominent.

However, research has been mixed on the question of whether there is an effect of sex on leadership and its effectiveness. A meta-analysis of sex differences in regards to transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles was completed (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). According to the analysis, transformational leadership has become a popular term in the post-industrial times and women consistently score higher than men in several transformational aspects.

While there has been much research completed on the dynamic of sex on leadership, little exists in the realm of higher education. Studies completed by Dugan (2006a) and Whitt et al. (2003) have studied such sex differences involving college student leaders where significant distinctions and experiences were discovered. However, Posner and Brodsky (1994) maintain that sex has made no difference on leadership practices by student leaders.

The instrument used in the study was the student version of the Leadership Practices Inventory; developed by Kouzes and Posner (2006). Adams and Keim (2000) used the same instrument to discover significant sex and effectiveness differences.

Formal Statement of the Problem

Residence halls and Greek organizations are vital pieces to a campus community in their own ways. Obviously, residence halls are important places for student and community development where students learn to rely on each other in the event that these outcomes will translate into a real world scenario outside of the university. Housing staffs are charged with developing programs and maintaining the welfare of their residents through educational initiatives (Wu & Stemler, 2008).

Greek organizations are one of the largest and most popular choices for student involvement. They also house many students across the country and can sometimes provide approved alternate student housing that satisfies on campus living requirements. Fraternities and sororities have support systems in place for their members and claim various requirements to aid in academic and personal development.

These two vital atmospheres have the possibility of making or breaking a student's entire collegiate experience and have put student leaders at the front lines of development and interaction with the students under their charge. RAs and Greek officers hold positions of influence and responsibility to the students they lead. With these leaders still learning and growing as students themselves, it is important for universities to assess and train these leaders to maximize their effectiveness in an effort to strengthen the educational experience for all involved. How do these leaders perceive their own leadership qualities and are they effective? Do males and females differ in their self-perceptions of leadership effectiveness?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to discover the effect of sex and leader role on the perceptions of best leadership practices and their effectiveness by Greek chapter officers and Resident Advisors (RAs). Sex of the respondents can be described as either biologically male or female. Leader type of the respondents can be described as a fraternity or sorority president, vice president, secretary, or treasurer in Greek social organizations; or a resident advisor in the Department of Residential Life. The following research questions provided the context for the research study.

Research Questions

1. Is there an effect of sex on the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of Greek chapter officers and Residential Life RA student leaders?
2. Does the position that is held by a Greek officer or Residential Life student leader affect the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of these student leaders?

These questions are grounded in Kouzes and Posner's (2008) model of the five practices engaged in by student leaders that are considered exemplary. This model is considered to be transformational in nature and shares similar qualities of the Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) model of transformational leadership. Though Kouzes and Posner have completed multiple studies using the instrument based on the five practices, the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI), and claim sex to not be a significant factor in leadership behavior, other studies have given evidence to the contrary. This study, in part, is an attempt to explore this question further to provide increased clarity to whether sex and leadership behavior are related.

Definition of Terms

1. Effectiveness: behavior that leads to consistent progress toward or the achievement of goals.
2. Leadership Role: a student leadership position identified in this study as a Resident Advisor in residential life or a Greek Chapter President, Vice President, Secretary, or Treasurer.
3. Resident Advisor: according to the university's job description: "The RA develops, coordinates and maintains a program within the community, which strives to provide a positive intellectual, emotional and social living environment for students" (Resident Advisor Job Description, 2009).
4. Sex: the natural and biological difference between male and female.
5. Student Engagement: "The amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities" (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2010).
6. Student Leader: a person that is enrolled at a university and participates in a leadership role on campus.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant in a number of ways as it sheds light and attention on an issue of great importance in student affairs. The research of the areas of interest in this study have shown mixed results that can become less clouded with the evidence and findings presented. It is argued whether sex has a significant effect on leadership behavior. There is little literature and research on student leadership effectiveness in higher education. The implications that this study can have on programming, training, and funding decisions can

benefit Greek Life and Residential Life departments. Potential effects and perceptions of student leadership may be realized.

Also, the students taking part in this study have an opportunity to reflect on their leadership skills and assess how they can best use their strengths as well as identify ways to improve other areas of effectiveness.

Assumptions

The following is an assumption made in the study:

1. It is assumed by the researcher that the RAs and Greek chapter officers across the campus have similar responsibilities to others in the same leadership role.

Limitations

The following are limitations identified in the study:

1. The data and the sample were obtained from one university and the results may not be generalized to other universities or colleges.
2. The various roles of President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer are not consistent in all Greek Organizations. There are also several organizations that have multiple Vice Presidents. To keep numbers similar with those that only have one Vice President, only one Vice President that is considered to be the “next in line of succession” will be surveyed from each organization.
2. The data is a cross-section or a snapshot in time of how a student leader self-perceives their effectiveness at when they are at their best. There is no longitudinal or observer process in this study to raise validity. This is intentional as the study seeks to note differences through self-reports.

3. The transformational leadership and five practices models provided the framework for this study. Though there are several other leadership theories available, this study exists to further the evidence of leadership effectiveness through this framework. An attempt will be made to identify factors that influence leadership effectiveness in college student leaders.
4. The copy of the instrument used can be slightly misleading as the directions on the front page of the SLPI indicate that students will choose ratings on the Likert scale as (1) RARELY or SELDOM; (2) ONCE IN A WHILE; (3) SOMETIMES; (4) OFTEN; and (5) VERY FREQUENTLY or ALMOST ALWAYS. However, the choice columns on the actual survey list the choices as (1) RARELY OR SELDOM; (2) ONCE IN A WHILE; (3) SOMETIMES; (4) VERY OFTEN; and (5) FREQUENTLY.
5. Typically, Greek Chapter Officers and RAs have primary leadership roles over constituents of the same sex. Therefore a cross-sex dynamic is not strongly established in this study.

Organization of the Study

This introductory chapter has discussed the background and basis of this study. Topics of discussion include the purpose of the study, definitions of terms, significance of the study, assumptions, and limitations. Chapter II is a review of the literature regarding leadership including transformational leadership and the five practices that provides a foundation for the study. The rest of the chapter reviews the literature on the several other relevant subjects of interest including: residence halls, Greek life, sex and leadership, and leadership effectiveness. Chapter III provides the details of the methodology that is used in

the study. Chapter IV contains the data obtained and an analysis of the results. Chapter V concludes with a summary of the study, discussion of the results, implications of the research data, and recommendations for future practice and research.

CHAPTER II

The Review of Literature

This chapter is a presentation of the relevant literature that pertains to this study. The first section will discuss leadership and the theoretical framework that guides this research. Section two will be a discussion of residence halls and its implications on the development of learning and engagement of students and student leaders. The third section will be an overview of Greek organizations and their influence of student life and leadership. Fourth, research covering how the sex of a leader may or may not affect leadership practices is discussed. Finally, the last section addresses the concept of leadership effectiveness as it relates to the study.

Leadership & the Student Transformation

“Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2007, p. 3). This definition is one of many that have been offered to explain the mysterious, but vital phenomena that the world has relied on since the beginning of man. Leadership is used in governments, tribes, workplaces, schools, and households to provide direction toward common goals and has been the subject of study by a wide variety of researchers (Northouse). Theories on the features, process, and possession of leadership have been long debated. Research has affirmed the complexity of leadership rather than its simplicity. It is a concept that is described in different ways but is said to be “intuitively” understood by many people (Northouse).

Given their mission to educate students, colleges have always been about influence. They have also long focused on preparing individuals to become civic minded through a collaborative learning experience. This educational process involves the academic faculty instructing students in the area of their expertise, the residential life staff (at colleges that have residential facilities) teaching students about responsible living and community building, and the student services staff that foster organizational opportunity and support to the students in the several ways that they associate with each other.

Rogers (2003) wrote that those who are leading institutions of higher education need to “let go of the notion that they can control events and create changes by implementing mechanistic processes” and consider what it takes to “solve problems, transform outdated systems and structures, and create a better society” in an unpredictable and ever-changing environment (p. 447).

Universities offer a developmental arena for students in which to engage and learn. The case for student development and its purpose has been discussed since the beginning of American higher education (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Rodgers, 1990). In Rodger's literature review of student development, research, and practice, he explained that student development can be described as "the ways that a student grows, progresses, or increases his or her developmental capabilities as a result of enrollment in an institution of higher education" (p. 27).

With a growing student body that is increasingly diverse, educators and students alike have become more creative in the ways that they approach learning. The American Association for Higher Education & Accreditation (AAHEA), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) came together to compose a report on ten principles of learning that can be implemented in a number of ways (King, 2003; Engelkemeyer & Brown, 1998). Some of the suggestions include "giving students responsibility for solving problems and resolving conflicts, give students increasing responsibility for leadership, strive to develop a campus culture where students learn to help each other, and sponsoring programs for students, faculty, and staff that serve both social and educational purposes" (Engelkemeyer & Brown, 1998, p. 11).

One of King's major points in summarizing her research was the fact that student learning can be broken down into three main categories. The first area is cognitive. Students are constantly solving problems, juggling tasks, and developing reason. The second area is interpersonal. This area is about acknowledging differing perspectives rather than being

defined by them. The third area is identity. A student's journey to find out who they are and what they believe is affected by the decisions they make.

The theme that is running through the research is that students have the opportunity to be directly involved in and affected by what they learn through the college experience. While student affairs practitioners intend to have certain learning outcomes in the atmospheres that they foster, there are lessons that can be learned outside of such scopes (King, 2003); lessons that can solve problems and transform the systems that already exist so that their learning can be of more value or meaning to the students that experience such gains.

Students have a vested interest in these opportunities as it is their environment in higher education that is being influenced. Many of them take it upon themselves to contribute to this societal influence through their own involvement on campus. Several campus entities are open to students for this very purpose. Not only do students participate in their various class discussions and projects, but students also join organizations, engage in student government and volunteer projects, and work within various campus offices and services.

The effects of involvement on a students' college experience have had very positive results (Baird, 2003). Student involvement aids in retention (Tinto, 1993), fosters leadership development (Astin, 1993; Dugan, 2006b), enhances critical thinking (Gellin, 2003) and "correlates with student satisfaction, college GPA, and graduation...and is positively associated with intellectual and personal growth" (Davis & Murrell, 1993, p. 59). Baird reiterated that institutions have the ability and responsibility to promote student involvement (2003).

However, not all of the responsibility should be taken on by the institution. The effects of involvement also rely on the efforts of the students. It is their responsibility to take

interest and ownership of their own education and to contribute to the culture of involvement on campus (Davis & Murrell, 1993). Several methods of involvement, such as volunteering, membership in student organizations, serving in a position, or participating in various campus programming can influence leadership (Dugan, 2006b). Over time, the involvement of these students can transform their leadership potential.

From the time of the industrial revolution (Rogers, 2003), leadership had been known to be individually focused on a strict and mechanical idea called Transactional Leadership. It is exchange based and gives the impression of a leader that provides guidance for a specific result. These leaders impose their will on their followers and are very concerned with status and power.

Leadership began to shift in the way it was defined in the 1970s (Rogers). Theories began to surface about a new age example of leadership that focused on collaboration and the involvement of the followers. This type of leadership is called Transformational Leadership. Though the term was first referenced by Downton (1973), James Burns made Transformational Leadership popular through his manuscript in the late 1970s. Burns made the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership and said that engaging the needs of others was the key to helping the constituency reach their full potential (Northouse, 2007). Northouse also suggested that this type of leadership meshes well with today's organizational makeup due to its inspirational and empowerment focus. With the type of collaboration and involvement suggested by the previous research, it is intuitive to suggest that a student's learning and development can be enhanced through Transformational Leadership.

Bass added to the work of Burns to create a model of transformational and transactional leadership. In this model, Bass explains four factors that make up a transformational leader. The first factor is that they possess *idealized influence*. This characteristic involves being strong and steadfast in their beliefs and hold a high moral standing. Followers look up to these leaders and want to follow them. The second factor is *inspirational motivation*. This is about establishing goals and convincing the followers to achieve them. Factor three is *intellectual stimulation*. Leaders with this talent encourage their followers to brainstorm and develop new ideas to help the organization or group achieve their goals. Finally, the transformational leader embraces *individualized consideration*. This factor aids the individuals through careful attention and guidance. They listen to what people have to say and take great care to make others around them better. Research has shown that people that have shown transformational leadership were “perceived to be more effective leaders...than those who exhibited only transactional leadership” (Northouse, 2007, p. 184). It is also known that transformational leadership is vital to the sustainability of complex organizations (Canty, 2005).

Instruments have been developed to examine the effectiveness of leaders that use transformative techniques. One such instrument that has been linked to transformational leadership is the Leadership Practices Inventory developed by Dr. Barry Posner and Jim Kouzes. The instrument consisted of several statements that participants rated themselves based on how well their style of leadership matched the statements when at “their personal best” (Kouzes & Posner, 2006a, p. 1). While their development originated with managers in the business sectors outside of higher education, they wanted to see if student leaders were similar in their perceptions of good leadership practice. After thousands of responses

gathered through interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups, they had concluded that student leaders were strikingly similar to managers in practice and thought process. Coupled with the need for a student leadership development instrument in higher education, Kouzes and Posner developed the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI). It is through this instrument and the theory of Transformational Leadership that this study is guided.

In evaluating the many areas that these ideas of learning, developing, and transforming can be implemented on a collegiate campus, there are two areas that seem to be a popular forum for such actions and are discussed in this literature review: residence halls and Greek social fraternities and sororities. These communities offer a wide range of developmental opportunities for students. The student leaders involved in such an influential environment are under the scope of responsibility and effectiveness by the practitioners that oversee their development.

In review, these studies have shown that leadership and the developmental needs of students have evolved over time. A growingly diverse population in the United States and in universities has indirectly called for changes in how student affairs professionals lead in their various tasks and responsibilities. This shift has concurrently existed with the changing leadership paradigm that has allowed for more participation by students in their transformation process from inexperienced freshmen to educated seniors. One factor that has been routinely critical to student development is student involvement in various campus organizations and activities on and around the campus. This factor alone requires effective leadership to plan and implement developmental programs. Transformational leadership has been shown to be a very important style to implement by leaders of complex organizations. Additionally, two important areas where development and influence on students occur are in

residential life Greek organizations. These areas have student leaders that work on the front lines and interact with the other students.

Residence Halls

While academics and the pursuit of a degree is certainly the mainstay of the collegiate experience, what happens outside of the classroom is just as important. Dungy said that the “primary responsibility of residence life is to provide healthy, clean, safe, and educationally supportive living environments that complement the academic mission of the institution” (2003, p. 352). Residence facilities did not exist in the numbers that they do today. Housing construction on campuses boomed after “the passage of Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950” during a period that the federal government was getting involved in higher education (Nuss, 2003). It was widely believed that student housing affects how well students do in the classroom as the universities mission and educational philosophies can easily be injected into the students living community (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

Residential Life departments have made it their responsibility to provide a nurturing and supportive atmosphere for students to succeed academically and developmentally. In Gregory Blimling’s meta-analysis of residence hall influence on academic success, he examined the research done over a twenty year period from 1966-1987. His studies and calculations concluded that students who lived in residence halls had higher academic success rates than students who lived at home or in off campus apartments. The research also showed positive academic success in residence hall living over living in a Greek fraternity or sorority house (1989).

One of the major goals in residential life is to build community and help students feel connected to the collegiate environment that they rely on through supportive academic and

social means. Johnson et al. (2006) studied the importance of first-year undergraduate students and their sense of belonging. The research indicated that both students and the institution have a mutual responsibility to understand the integration of new students into the college environment. Also, one of the most important contributions to a student's sense of belonging is a residence hall (pg. 537).

Halls use academic and social programming events and organizations to encourage student involvement within the community. Researchers have studied predictors of residence hall involvement. In a study completed at Iowa State University, Arboleda, Wang, Shelley, & Whalen (2003) found that students who were happy with their hall government, had a connection with housing staff, and participated in academic study groups became more involved in their residence halls. Additionally, encouraging involvement in the residence halls can lead to a developmental process that can be used when the students go outside of the collegiate residential community (pg. 530).

One of the most important factors in a student's living experience in the residence halls is the presence of the Resident Advisors. RAs are student leaders that are hired by residence life or housing departments to aid in the development of the students on the same floor or in the same building. RAs have taken a leadership role in their campus living communities by building and maintaining relationships with residents, educating residents on university and residential regulations, facilitating programs and academic initiatives, and accounting for the general welfare of the residents. The literature has consistently shown that the responsibilities bestowed upon these students are among the most critical at residential universities as student learning outcomes are strengthened by an effective student staff (Wu & Stemler, 2008; Komives, 1991b; Blimling & Schuh, 1981). As mentors and front line

representatives of the university mission, it is important to have student leaders that can provide positive support and influence.

Several studies have put RAs under the scope. In a study done by Audrey Jaeger and Amy Caison, criteria for selecting Resident Assistants were examined along with the suggestion of including the theory of emotional intelligence into the mix. Emotional Intelligence was being tested to see if it had any influence on the effectiveness of RAs. Jaeger and Caison used the BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 1997) to measure emotional intelligence. The EQ-i measures the potential for behavior through changes in knowledge and attitudes (Jaeger & Caison, 2006). The researchers concluded that the EQ-I (which measures components of Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Adaptability, Stress Management, and General Mood) was a significant tool used to predict RA performance as their study showed that those with high emotional intelligence scores were shown to produce more outstanding RAs than those that scored lower.

Wu and Stemler (2008), building upon research done by Jaeger and Caison, expanded the study to include measures of general intelligence, personality, and belief factors that could be measured through other personality instruments. The International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) (Goldberg et al., 2006) measured for emotional/social/personal intelligence, the NEO-PI (McCrae & Costa, 1987) measured personality, and Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices (RAPM) test measured general intelligence. The researchers found that the self-reported answers of the RA's on the EQ-i:S, a shortened version of the EQ-i, showed significance in predicting RA performance (Bar-On, 2002). With regard to personality, the amount of effort, satisfaction, and confidence in ability as RA categories were significantly and positively correlated with overall performance ratings (Wu & Stemler, 2008).

Komives' (1991b) study of transformational and transactional leadership on RA outcomes found that RAs satisfaction and motivation are “substantially enhanced through the transformational leadership behaviors of their HD supervisors” (p. 514). Also, the researcher concludes that her findings are consistent with speculation of “Blanchard and Johnson’s thesis (1982) that subordinates who are inexperienced, immature, or untrained need the individualized consideration of the transformational leader to support, develop, and empower them further.” Komives points out that motivation is “essential” to RA success and that support for transformational leadership in residence life must be found (p. 514).

“Housing directors and student personnel administrators generally agree that the quality of residential life is directly related to the character and quality of the residential life staff (RAs)” (Posner & Brodsky, 1993, p. 300). The student version of the Leadership Practices Inventory was used in a study by Posner & Brodsky to measure the leadership effectiveness of RAs in residential life. The study spanned six campuses across the United States. It was reported that RAs and the constituents that rated their RAs as being less frequent in practicing the five characteristics (challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart) were also less effective than those who were more frequent in their practice.

As RAs perform their duties and attend classes, they are participants on both sides of the spectrum. On one side, they are trained ambassadors of the university’s mission to educate and develop students in a controlled but frenzied atmosphere. On the other side, RAs are still students who seek education and development; just as their residents do. They have the opportunity to see behind-the-scenes of student affairs practice and implement those lessons on their residents and themselves. As RAs seek support from their staff and respond

to the measures listed in the mentioned studies, it is reasonable to assume that students may respond positively to similar support from the RAs.

In review, this section offers evidence through several studies that show the structure and benefits of living in a residence hall at a university. Residential life programs are designed to offer a broad learning and development experience by building community with the residents and deliver unique programs with specific and, sometimes, unexpected outcomes. Resident advisors are students that were hired to be a role model for the residents in their area by enforcing policy and encouraging involvement by the residents. Characteristics of effective resident advisors include emotional intelligence and transformational leadership skills. Studies by Komives as well as Posner and Brodsky have shown the importance of resident advisors to the effectiveness of residential life departments. The fact that RAs are also students creates an interesting dynamic in the leader-follower relationship as RAs maintain dual roles throughout their academic experience as long as they are employed. However, they also get to participate in the cognitive and social development of their residents and learn the behind the scenes infrastructure of development practice and theory. RAs are one of the leadership roles being scrutinized to see how their perception of their own leadership effectiveness is affected by their sex and leadership role. This literature can offer an explanation for the difference, if any, in leadership perception.

Greek Life

Extracurricular activities began to surface when students took exception to the long and rigorous academic programs during the nineteenth century and demanded developmental activities outside of the classroom (Nuss, 2003; Geiger, 2000). The first Greek-letter organization, Phi Beta Kappa, began at the College of William and Mary in 1776 as a literary

and debate society (Nuss, 2003; Jackson, 2000). The first social fraternities and sororities were founded between 1825 and 1850 and gained popularity over the region of New England as they provided the kind of social and family atmosphere that students desired during the course of their studies (Nuss, 2003).

Greek-letter fraternities and sororities exist at many higher education institutions. While current research is inexact and unreliable on the number of students who are currently affiliated in Greek-letter organizations across the United States (Center for the Study of the College Fraternity, 2009), there is little doubt that fraternities and sororities remain popular among campus social organizations in terms of membership. Fraternities and sororities have gained so much attention over the past century that they have secured their own department in many campus life and student affairs divisions. While the offices exist to regulate national rules on recruitment and membership, they also enforce institutional policies, promote social community building, and champion campus and community initiatives (Dungy, 2003).

As Greek social organizations began getting into several controversial incidents in the 1980's due to alcohol, hazing, and harassment (Neuberger & Hanson, 1997; Wilder et al., 1997), college faculty, administrators, and researchers began doing more studies on the effectiveness and appropriateness of Greek organizations at universities (Hirschorn, 1988). This subject has been widely debated as many studies, including those in the following paragraphs, have produced varying results.

Pike's (2003) study surveyed 6,782 undergraduate students across fifteen research universities in the United States. He sought to answer three questions with the intention to provide information to university officials that could be used in decision making regarding recruitment and find student learning outcomes that may be related to membership in a

fraternity or sorority. Because of conflicting studies regarding the benefit or detriment of Greek membership and its effect on student involvement, engagement, and learning (Pascarella et al., 1996; Kuh et al., 1996; Pike & Askew, 1990), Pike sought to test the personal development and engagement levels between Greeks and non-Greeks. The results found that Greeks were just as involved in organizations, activities, and volunteering as non-Greeks. Seniors who were Greek achieved significantly higher academic development levels than seniors who were not affiliated. All Greek respondents reported “significantly greater gains in their personal development than did students who were not members of fraternities or sororities” (p. 377).

A longitudinal study completed by Kilgannon and Erwin (1992) looked into the student development growth through participation in Greek organizations, particularly through identity and moral development. Kilgannon and Erwin found that non-Greek women attained higher levels of moral reasoning than Greek women, Greek men, and non-Greek men. It was also found that Greek men scored very low in self-confidence, decision making, and standing up for their own beliefs possibly due to the structure and dependence of the culture within Greek fraternities.

Colleges may host chapters of national organizations or the organization may be local and independent. Many of these chapters provide housing to students on or off campus through facilities that are owned by the college, the national office, or an “alumni organization” (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). Hayek (2002) also studied engagement and the perceptions of Greek and non-Greek students on their experiences based on their view of their institution and if they actually lived in the fraternity or sorority house. Using the College Student Report instrument developed by the National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE), Hayek found that Greek students “generally do not fare worse and in many cases fare better than other students in terms of their levels of engagement in educationally effective practices” (p. 657). This included effort inside and outside the classroom as well as gaining personal and educational development.

However, living inside of the house can create some challenges for students and can lower academic and developmental outcomes (Blimling, 1989). While students of all year classifications may live in Greek housing, sophomores and juniors are more likely to (Hayek et al., 2002) because they are delving into the many facets of Greek and University life (Adams & Keim, 2000). Hayek explains that most of the negative things about Greek housing center on the negative effects that extensive social involvement have on the academic experience for new freshmen and sophomores. The study also compared first-year and senior Greek students that lived in either the chapter house or a residence hall. First-years living in Greek housing were found to have more cocurricular time, more class preparation, and less time for socializing and relaxing. Senior Greek students in chapter houses actually tested lower in academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and exposure to diversity than those in residence halls. As research has shown that diversity experiences influence positive learning outcomes, bringing together diverse populations can benefit the entire population (Hu & Kuh, 2003). Also, diverse campuses create higher levels of interaction between diverse peers and gains in understanding diversity in first-year and senior students (Pike, Kuh, & Gonyea, 2007). As learning and working experiences become more global, diversity opportunities in college are very important to take advantage of. This is an opportunity that is being seized more in residence halls than in Greek housing.

Unfortunately, the literature trends remain mixed on the educational and student developmental value of membership in a Greek-letter organization. Some of the explanations for this can be attributed to the many contexts that the studies were completed. Greek life, as well as quality of institutional services and programming and institutional size, comes in many different cultures and subcultures depending on the institutional policies that are in place to govern it and its members (Hayek et al., 2002). Regardless of the developmental results, all students that have associated themselves through a Greek organization have been influenced by the same institutional experience that every student at the university has had.

Not all of the chapters are the same as the membership depends on the students who attend the university. It is possible that a chapter of a fraternity or sorority at one institution could be well known and respected for all of the engagement and development opportunities that the members participate in while another chapter of the same organization could be notorious for the many stereotypical behaviors that are reported regarding alcohol, poor academic performance, and hazing (Neuberger & Hanson, 1997; Wilder et al., 1997). The leadership in these organizations is vital to the members that follow them as they have the opportunity to mold the precedent for the way the organization is portrayed on campus and in the community through the standards and example that they set.

Given that many fraternities, sororities, and the councils that lead them claim leadership development as a priority and benefit of membership (Harms et al., 2006; North American Interfraternity Conference, 2009; National Pan-Hellenic Council, 2009; National Panhellenic Conference, 2009), it is reasonable to assume that there are many ways that leadership is perceived and achieved in fraternal organizations. A study was completed on the perceptions of leadership in undergraduate fraternal organizations (Harms et al., 2006).

Tests were done to measure several areas and traits of leadership including personality, dominance, power motive, leadership identity, social influence, transformational leadership, and whether a person held an executive office. The results indicated that while “positions of prestige” are available for those that seek it, “when it comes to who is recognized as a positive example of a leader in the organization, it is not the ambitious members who are nominated, but rather the individuals with the strongest commitment to the organization and their fellow members” (p. 88). The results give a strong case that the characteristics of transformational leadership are highly valued in fraternal organizations.

The student leaders who run these organizations generally form an executive council that is led by a President. The rest of the executive council is made up with some combination of vice-presidents, chairs, and representatives. All of these positions, in contrast to university appointed positions like RAs, are elected by the organization members. Posner and Brodsky (1992) studied 100 chapters of the same national fraternity to develop a leadership instrument for students. The goal was to measure the effectiveness of the chapter presidents through self-reports and the observer reports from five members of each president’s chapter executive council. This study was conducted with the student version of the Leadership Practices Inventory instrument with supplemental questions inquiring about the leadership practices of Greek leaders. Posner and Brodsky discovered that self-reported effectiveness scores from the chapter presidents did not significantly differ from those reported by their observers, the executive council members. This showed that the observers agreed with the self-assessment scores of their presidents. The scores not only provided a way for the presidents to assess their leadership skills to find areas of improvement and different ways to utilize their strengths, it also gives the organization and student affairs

practitioners an opportunity to develop better programming and relevant training to address the areas that are not as strong in the leadership.

Because Greek organizations are scrutinized for their effects on student development, engagement, and academic progress, it is only natural that the student leaders who run these organizations are also under scrutiny as their decisions can influence the students who are part of their membership. With many students being allowed to live in Greek houses as early as their freshman year, their entire environment is structured around the traditions of the membership carried on by the student leaders in charge of the chapter. Are the leaders who operate these social systems that claim to promote leadership, involvement, and development as effective as those student leaders set in a structured system developed by the university such as residence life?

In review of this section on Greek life, it is apparent from their early history through modern times that these organizations have gained in popularity and have become a very influential entity in the lives of students. Students have joined Greek fraternities and sororities for various reasons. However, a strong draw is the camaraderie that forms through the various events and activities that the organization develops or participates in. Studies in this section have shown various benefits and detriments to membership in these organizations. Many Greek systems and chapters claim to have better opportunities for leadership development and involvement (Harms et al., 2006). Some of the studies in this section have concurred with these claims. The seemingly heavy cocurricular demand of membership has had many varying results as well. First year Greek students have a tougher time keeping up with their school demands than Greek seniors do. Several reports of alcohol and substance abuse, harassment, and sexual assault have plagued the reputation of Greek

organizations over the years as the leadership in these organizations has been questioned. Students are also responsible for these organizations on campus through some form of hierarchy. This study will view the leadership roles of President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer in the fraternities and sororities. Transformational leadership has been shown to be highly valued in these organizations. The SLPI will test to see the differences between these roles as well as the unique variable of sex division between fraternities and sororities on self perceived leadership reports. Since many students are involved with Greek organizations and few that also live in the chapter house, it is important to see what leadership effectiveness level the student leaders in the chapter possess to shed light on whether there may be an advantage or disadvantage to the students that are in these organizations.

Sex & Leadership

As more women are entering and securing leadership positions and opportunities, researchers have begun to compare the leadership styles and qualities that men and women possess to see if the ways they lead, and their effectiveness as leaders differs (Hoyt, 2007; Dugan, 2006a). Popular media, authors, and researchers have battled over the differences that exist between men and women, whether these differences even exist (Hoyt, 2007; Engen, Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001; Book 2000; Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser, 1965) and whether they should still be researched (Eagly, 1990). However, as time has moved on from the male dominated times of the industrial era of leadership, the emergence of the post-industrial paradigm and the integration of skills that are stereotypically feminine (Dugan, 2006a; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Helgesen, 1990; Komives 1994) into the current leadership marketplace has

created more opportunity for women to engage in leadership positions and has increased interest for studies of male and female leadership styles and effectiveness.

Research has shown that women lead in a “more democratic, or participative, manner than men” (Hoyt, 2007; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). It seems as though the nature of transformational leadership is easily projected better by women through studies that identify the caring, cooperative, and group member developing traits that they exhibit. There is little evidence to suggest whether the post-industrial paradigm characteristics that have become so popular the past few decades are because of the increased presence of women in leadership positions, or if women have been able to be effective because of the shifting paradigm trends that create a more conducive environment available for such traits. Several studies have indicated that women who utilize a more autocratic and directive type of leadership, characteristics of a male-dominated style, are not seen as positively (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen, 2001).

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) completed a meta-analysis that examined transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles between men and women. They began by exploring studies that analyzed the perceptions of gender roles and how they affected the leadership styles of men and women. The comparison of “agentic” qualities that are believed to be possessed by good leaders with the seemingly opposite “communal” qualities normally seen in women seems to show an impact on the behaviors of men and women leaders and their evaluations (pg. 572). Because of this “contradiction,” Eagly and Karau (2002) said that women’s actual and potential leadership are not perceived as high as men because of the perception that “agentic behavior” is stereotypic and preferred in male leaders. The researchers also note that women leaders that do utilize these behaviors

can lessen the negativity toward them by using their natural characteristics of nurturing and mentorship to increase their perceived and actual effectiveness. Women who engage in transformational leadership are better able to overcome the assumed higher standard of leadership roles.

The results of the 2003 study (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen) did show significant sex differences in transformational leadership styles. Women scored higher in every aspect of transformational leadership, except idealized influence, and women leaders perform well in “contemporary organizations” (pg. 583). However, male leaders were rated higher than women in some of the less effective styles such as transactional and laissez-faire leadership.

During most of the history of higher education, white males led student attendance and were the subject of early student development theory (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Thelin, 2003; Laker, 2003). According to Laker, this caused theory to favor males, given that they were the overwhelming majority attending college and “there was no gender lens in the research...” (2003, p. 1). It can be assumed that there were really no lenses at all for several decades as the profession of student affairs began to take shape in the early twentieth century. We have come a long way in the diversification of students and faculties as well as the research and theory that has been emerging from this shift.

Researchers have also been delving into the topic of sex differences and developmental outcomes in college (Whitt et al., 2003). Several studies have found that men and women have had significant differences “in college experiences and outcomes” (pg. 587). Dugan’s (2006a) study compared sex differences in college student leaders. He used an instrument that was designed out of the Social Change Model (HERI, 1996) of leadership

called the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS) by Tyree (1998). It has 103 items that measure leadership development and spans the eight categories of the Social Change Model (Tyree) which include: Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility, Citizenship, and Change. Dugan surveyed 443 women and 410 men over several undergraduate classes at a large doctoral-granting institution in the west (pg. 220).

Dugan's results showed that the mean scores were higher for women in all eight of the social change categories than they were for men. Additionally, the highest category for both men and women was the construct of Commitment. These results are further evidence indicating that women are benefiting from the rise of the post-industrial paradigm (Dugan, 2006a; Eagly et al., 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Dugan, Komives, and Segar did a similar study in 2008 with responses coming from 50,378 students from fifty-two colleges. They found that women scored higher in every category except Change.

As mentioned previously, there are many scenarios and opportunities for students to develop through engagement, involvement, and leadership among others. Residence halls and social Greek fraternities are strong facilitators of leadership opportunities for students of both sexes. Residence halls can be separated by sex and provide leadership positions where men lead men and women lead women. They can also be co-ed and have a mix of men and women who take the reins of responsibility. Greek organizations can operate in the same way. Traditional fraternities and sororities are separated by sex and use various hierarchical structures of leadership. Collaboration occurs within the Greek community, through various events and projects, and outside of the community with other various student activities and organizations. These examples are few of many that exhibit the opportunities that residence

hall and Greek leaders have to interact and develop. Again, researchers are still split on the impact that sex has on leadership behaviors. However, studies do exist that examine sex and its effect on leadership in residence halls, fraternities, and sororities.

Komives (1991a) study, mentioned previously, found significant sex differences in leadership and effectiveness within her study of residence hall staff. Hall directors (HD) were asked to take the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, a survey that measures transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles. RAs were asked to rate the hall directors on a revised version of the same survey. Male RAs and HDs were rated higher in the transactional factor by management and laissez-faire leadership. Posner and Brodsky's study in 1993 used the SLPI to determine leadership effectiveness of RAs. No significant sex differences were found. However, Wu & Stemler (2008) found that female RAs outperform male RAs. Female RAs usually address personal development and challenge in their programming. Male RAs, on the other hand, like to use competition in their programming (Arboleda, Wang, Shelley, & Whalen, 2003; Bierman & Carpenter, 1994).

Adams and Keim (2000) studied 233 Greek members from three institutions to discover gender differences in perceived leadership effectiveness. Twenty-one fraternity and sorority presidents took the SLPI-Self version to rate how they view themselves "at their personal best" as effective leaders. 105 executive council members and 107 general members took the SLPI-Observer version to rate their presidents on leadership effectiveness. On the survey, women presidents consistently rated themselves lower than their constituents did. Men presidents consistently rated themselves higher than their constituents rated them and found that a significant difference existed between men and women. Adams and Keim noted that this is a different result than Posner and Brodsky's own study in 1992 where the

constituents did not have a significant difference in perceptions with the leader. Also, men and women had different perceptions in the Adams and Keim study rather than the synonymous ones found in 1994 by Posner and Brodsky.

Sex differences have been found in Greek organizations. First-year and senior women have been found to have significantly higher personal development than first-year and senior males, but first-year women showed lower levels of active and collaborative learning than first-year men (Pike, 2003). Greek men have been shown to be less confident than Greek women and non-Greek men and women (Kilgannon & Erwin, 1992).

The review of this section contains several studies that analyze sex and the potential it has to make a difference in leadership practices. The leadership paradigm has shifted from an autocratic and man driven industrial period to a democratic and communal post industrial period where more and more women are finding opportunities and success. This topic has long been debated through opinion and scientific inquiry. Due to the special nature of sex division in Greek organizations and the seemingly opposite nature of coed residential facilities, it is interesting and significant to determine what kind of effect sex has on leadership perceptions. While Kouzes and Posner have stated that sex has had no significant effect on leadership while using the SLPI, there have been other studies that have found differing results such as Adams and Keim's study in 2000, where significant differences were discovered.

Leadership Effectiveness

Like leadership, leadership effectiveness is defined in as many ways as there are people who define it. While definitions are certainly not in shortage, empirical studies determining which leadership styles are considered most effective in higher education are

sparse (Bryman, 2007; Tucker, 1990). Bryman notes that while many reflections and studies investigate what higher education leaders actually do, it is difficult to find much research on what makes these leaders effective. However, some reported best practices are being put to the test in the literature, including the development of instruments, to test such effectiveness.

Wysong (2000) studied leadership and organizational effectiveness in higher education through the use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership characteristics of the organizations leaders. Additionally, the researcher used her own instrument, the Organizational Effectiveness Measurement Instrument (OEMI) (Wysong, 1996). The OEMI contains demographic questions and selected items based on criteria from the Malcolm Balridge National Quality Award. A Likert scale was used to rate the institution's effectiveness in leadership, information and analysis, strategic and operational planning, human resource development and management, educational and business process management, school performance results, and student focus and student and stakeholder satisfaction. Also, "gender was included in the descriptive data because literature suggests that there may be a difference between the way men and women lead in an organization or are perceived to lead" (p. 135).

Wysong's results found that leaders and followers of this organization rated effectiveness to be the highest rated leadership behavior because the leaders and constituents believed that their leadership was very effective in achieving its mission. They also believed this was a result of the transformational leadership qualities the organization encompassed. The researcher concluded that organizations that want to be effective should find ways to identify and develop transformational leaders. Confirming what many studies and theorists

have concluded thus far in this literature review, Wysong also found that women rated significantly higher in transformational behaviors than men.

Tucker discussed the differences between successful leadership and effective leadership in her dissertation (1990). It is one thing to be able to move people towards a common goal, but it is entirely different to get the people to *want* to do it because they find it fulfilling (Tucker, 1990; Owens, 1970). The goal of her study was to link transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership as a predictor of (a) “followers’ satisfaction with leaders,” (b) “leader effectiveness as perceived by followers,” and (c) “extra effort of followers” (p. 92). Tucker did find these three things when transformational leadership was present.

Green’s study in 1994 affirmed the same findings with a similar study involving students. While the researcher echoes Tucker’s results, he cautions that it is difficult to find out exactly how effective the leaders actually are because education is an “intangible” area and the results of a leaders work must be seen and measured over time. However, the notion that satisfaction and perceived effectiveness can be predicted through highly transformational learning and leading environments can be helpful in identifying and training leaders to maximize their leadership effectiveness in a way that helps their followers, or colleagues, feel fulfilled by the direction and development that they are experiencing.

The application of the leadership lessons that students receive through training or experience is almost certainly with a pointed purpose. RAs would not be trained a specific way if there were not previous situations or practices forged out of previous study and analysis. Greek student leaders would not likely be appointed to their positions if the members that elected them did not feel as though the leader did not serve their interest

enough to be their voice. Student leaders can learn to be effective by analyzing their own skills and seeing how they can approve their practice. Many student leaders are faced with this challenge. “The most significant contribution student leaders make is not simply to today’s issues and goals but rather to the long-term development of people, communities, and institutions so they can adapt, change, prosper, and grow” (Kouzes & Posner, 2008, p. xvi).

This is particularly important to student leaders in Residence Life and Greek Life. With the tasks, commitments, and responsibilities given to student leaders in these areas, knowing the values and practices that these leaders internalize and perceive as effective can be beneficial to the departments as a whole and, ultimately, give the institution a better idea of the results or effectiveness of training and programming being received and delivered by these student leaders. “Students must learn not about simply leadership, or even about leaders, but must learn what it means to be effective leaders themselves as they practice learning about the behaviors in which leaders most frequently engage” (Posner, 2009, p. 561)

In this light, it is prudent to acknowledge the studies that have shown that transformational leadership is an effective leadership style (Northouse 2007; Yukl, 1999). Many of the studies involving transformational leadership and the effectiveness that it measures have been gauged by the MLQ (Bass, 1985) as it measures transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire qualities based through the theoretical model by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). Northouse (2007) outlines two other “transformational perspectives” that have contributed to the essence and understanding of the phenomenon (p. 186).

The first is the four-pronged strategy for organization transformation developed by Bennis and Nanus (1985). After interviewing several people with some basic personal

leadership questions, the four strategies emerged beginning with (a) having and sharing a clear vision with the followers. Creating a vision that encompasses the needs of the followers gives the organization a direction that can be followed and committed to by its members. Secondly, (b) being social architects of the environment is the second prong. It is easier to construct a transformation through the communication and transparency of the cause and getting the members involved in its implementation. Third is (c) creating and maintaining trust. Leaders do this by being decisive and sticking to the vision of the organization. Building trust makes the members feel more confident and comfortable about contributing to the growth of the group. Finally, (d) “creative deployment of self through positive self-regard” (Northouse, 2007, p. 187) is the last prong. Leaders are aware of their strengths and utilize them to progress through challenges and building an organizational identity. These leaders also inspire their members to have confidence and high expectations for their organizations and their commitment to learning.

The second is Kouzes and Posner’s five practices. These practices of “exemplary leadership” were forged through a content analysis of over 1,300 manager (since grown to over 2,500) testimonies of “personal best experiences” (Northouse, 2007, p. 188). These five practices are (a) model the way, (b) inspire a shared vision, (c) challenge the process, (d) enable others to act, and (e) encourage the heart (p. 188). The instrument born out of this analysis was called the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). The assessment not only measures a leader’s use of best practices, but is meant to be a tool of reflection and progress towards becoming a more effective leader.

Many similarities exist between these three viewpoints including the leadership categories and the major instruments that have come out of the thousands of interviews and

surveys studying best leadership practice. A major parallel is that they were all developed in a predominantly business world, including mid to high level leaders, to gauge best practice and effective characteristics of leadership (Northouse, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bass, 1985). While they have all been used and applied to various leadership realms in business and education, Kouzes and Posner's LPI and the research behind it has been enhanced through the study and development of a leadership effectiveness measurement tool specifically for student leaders due to the lack of such an instrument (Posner & Brodsky, 1992, 1993, 1994). A strikingly similar interview process with college student leaders was completed to see if students' leadership skills and processes were similar to managers (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). They were. Thus, the SLPI has been used nationwide in classrooms, residence halls, organizations, and many other institutional entities to measure and progress leadership skills and their effectiveness in student leaders. "It has been widely used in leadership training and development" (Northouse, 2007).

A review of the literature on leadership effectiveness in student affairs has turned up very little in terms of current and credible data. However, the literature that has been discovered has all determined that student development is a long-term process and must be sustained by effective leadership. The SLPI has been one of the only known measures of *student* leadership measurement and has a strong research base in its development.

Given the review of literature presented, a couple of hypotheses have been formulated. First, sex will have a significant effect on the sub scores measuring self reported leadership effectiveness. Leadership role will also have a significant effect on the sub scores measuring self reported leadership effectiveness.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the major topics relevant to this study and the major findings supporting the exploration of this area. The topics of leadership along with its place in residence halls, Greek organizations, sex, and its effectiveness were all discussed. Burns (1978) and Bass's (1985) Transformational Leadership was discussed in relation to these areas along with a transformational model developed by Kouzes and Posner (2008) known as the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership. Studies in this review have shown that there are many benefits of transformational leadership characteristics in higher education.

Residence halls and Greek organizations are two vital areas that have a strong influence on the development and engagement of students. The student leaders attached to the responsibilities of welfare, programming, and the implementation of the university's mission in residence halls vary in their effectiveness levels of leadership. Greek organizations have been shown to have an influence on the members in the organization through the commitment to leadership and academic development. However, several incidents of hazing, abuse, and harassment have some administrators questioning whether or not continuing to facilitate resources towards Greek life are worth the risks or even legal liability it potentially brings to campuses. Information is provided about the perceived impact of these student leaders.

Research has been split on the influence of sex on leadership practices. The review offers several studies and examples of how it can and does affect various leadership practices in college and its various student developmental entities. Many have shown that women tend to score significantly higher in transformational leadership practices; practices that are

needed in higher education to further the pace and quality of development in the modern collegiate setting.

Finally, the effectiveness of leadership is discussed in the context of higher education. Few instruments are available to measure student leadership effectiveness. Kouzes and Posner developed the SLPI, with the help of research done by Posner and Brodsky (1992, 1993, 1994), specifically to measure and aid in development of best practices.

These factors were discussed in preparation of a descriptive study to determine if sex and leader type within residence halls and Greek organizations affect student leader perceptions of best practices.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to scrutinize self-reported leadership practices by certain groups of student leaders. Specifically, the study will observe RAs in Residential Life housing and four chapter officers from every Greek social fraternity and sorority as a variable of interest. The reports from these participants will also be analyzed according to the subjects' sex to study its significance to the self-perceived effectiveness of these student leaders. The following questions directed the study.

Research Questions:

1. Does sex affect the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of Greek chapter officers and Residential Life RA student leaders?
2. Does the position that is held by a Greek officer or Residential Life student leader affect the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of these student leaders.

This chapter will be divided into four sections. Section one is the background information related to the study. Section two discusses the population and sample to be studied. Section three will describe the instrument used to measure self-perceived effectiveness. The fourth and final section will describe the procedure used in this study and the statistical method used to interpret the data.

Background

This study was conducted at a large land-grant university in the Midwest where the enrollment is just over 22,000 students and the male to female ratio is 1.08 to 1. The populations being studied at this institution are RAs in the department of Residential Life, and Presidents, Vice Presidents (or similar position, based on the organizations executive council setup), Secretaries, and Treasurers of the Greek organizations currently in place at the university.

Approval from the Institutional Review Board was secured in order to collect data for this research project (See Appendix A). Approval was sought from the National Panhellenic Council (NPC) in order to collect data from the sorority women in the chapters affiliated with NPC. A proxy script (See Appendix B) and A statement of implied consent and voluntary participation (See Appendix C) were used to recruit the participants in this study through the Hall Directors in Residence Life and the e-mail from the Director of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs. The Director of Residential Life provided the researcher with the names and building of employment of RAs currently employed in the various housing facilities on campus. The Hall Directors (HD) who supervise the various RAs were contacted to participate in the dispersal of the demographic collection page (See Appendix D) and survey instrument, the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (See Appendix E), during their annual training when the RAs were together prior to the beginning of the academic year. The Director of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs sent an e-mail to all of the Presidents, Vice Presidents, Secretaries, and Treasurers of the fraternities and sororities to request their participation in the study. Representatives from the Office of Leadership Development received the officer contacts

from the Director of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs to set up meeting times during the opening few weeks of school when the students returned from the summer break.

The surveys were distributed by the Hall Directors at the RA training and by the Office of Leadership Development designee to the Greek Chapter Officers during the scheduled survey meetings. The finished surveys were directly returned to the researcher.

Sample

There are over 3,000 students (13.6% of the overall student population) in the forty one registered fraternities and sororities that make up Greek Life at this university. Eleven representatives are from the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC). Five represent the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC). The Multicultural Greek Council (MGC) is represented by four organizations. IFC, or the Interfraternity Council, is made up of twenty one organizations. While each house has a unique hierarchy in the way they set up or define executive positions, each of them have four in common who were surveyed for this study. These positions are the: President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and Secretary.

Currently, there are around 5,000 students that inhabit the twenty-seven residence halls on campus at this university. There are five of the traditional “community-style” buildings where each room houses one or two students. Thirteen “suite” style buildings offer students several living choices. Suites can vary in floor plan; the number of students they can house varies between one and four. Finally, there is an apartment style housing option as well. According to the job description at the university where the study is being conducted, a RA lives on each floor of the residence halls to “provide support, encouragement and leadership to his or her community” (Resident advisor job description, 2009, p. 1). These

students are responsible for the development and well-being of the students staying in their area.

There is a difference in the way that Greek executive members and resident assistants acquire their positions. The fraternities and sororities hold elections every year to select their leadership. Chapter executives are non-paid volunteers and many of these positions are elected by a popular vote between student members already in the organization. Resident Assistants are students that are hired and paid after an application and screening process.

Every RA on campus as well as every Greek President, Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer was contacted to participate in this research study. This is the best way to generalize the results from this type of campus as participation from the total number of RAs (119) and Executive Council members (156) are reasonably accessible.

Of the 275 students targeted for survey completion, 131 students returned the survey for a 47.6% completion rate. Out of those 131 students, 75 were female and 56 were male. Out of 119 RAs, 116 of them turned in their responses for a 97.4% return rate; 67 of them were female and 49 were male. Of the Greek population, 15 students of the 156 targeted submitted their responses for a 9.6% completion rate. In the Greek population, eight were female and seven were male. While the return rate for the RAs nearly yielded a representation of the entire RA population, the very low rate of return from the Greek Officers renders the results for that population exploratory at best. Significant differences were found based on sex across the RA population.

Select demographic information was collected. The average length that RAs have been in their role is 0.81 years. The average time in which they have lived on campus is 1.99

years. The average school classification was 3.05 or just started their Junior year. The average age of the RAs was 20.19 years of age. Finally, the average RA GPA was 3.33.

A male's average time in their leadership role was 0.98 years, 1.98 years in living quarters, 3.0, or Junior, in school classification, average age is 20.34, and average GPA is 3.21. Females average time in their leadership role was 0.69 years, 2.0 years in living quarters, 3.09 (is a Junior) in school classification, average age is 20.07, and has an average GPA of 3.42.

Instrument

Preceding the main instrument is a document requesting relevant demographic information about the participant: (a) the leadership position that they hold (RA, President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer), (b) how long they have held the position, (c) what housing they live in (Greek house, residence hall, or off campus), (d) how long they have lived in that type of housing, (e) year in school (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, or graduate student), (f) age, (g) sex, and (h) cumulative GPA.

As Kouzes and Posner recognized the need for a solid student leadership development measurement tool, they completed a similar process with college students to see if they had similar experiences and characteristics relative to the five central themes. Their analysis concluded that they were strikingly similar. Thus, the SLPI was established for students in a thirty question Likert Scale response format so they can assess their personal leadership skills and see how effective they view themselves as leaders. Students can use this information to focus on their practices and enhance their abilities within these themes.

The data from over 2,500 participants was consistent with five central themes: *Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and*

Encourage the Heart. The testimonies and responses were examined and then broken down into several statements that encompassed the leadership behaviors used when a leader is at their “personal best” (Kouzes & Posner, 2006a, p. 1) thus creating the survey known as the LPI. Respondents given these statements are instructed to choose a number on a five-point Likert scale to measure how often they implement these characteristics as part of their own style. One (1) means that a person “RARELY or SELDOM” does what is described. Two (2) means the action is done “ONCE IN A WHILE.” Three (3) indicates an action is done “SOMETIMES.” Four (4) indicates a student engages in the described action “OFTEN.” The fifth (5) and greatest measure is that the action is used “VERY FREQUENTLY or ALMOST ALWAYS.” The values are added up in relation to which theme the statement belongs to. This gives a person their score for that theme.

Model the Way is about “setting the example” and defining the beliefs one possesses. It is giving the effort to make sure that details are taken care of and that the leader’s constituency feels heard and involved. An example of a *Model the Way* statement on the SLPI is “I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.” Statements 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 of the inventory are descriptive of this theme.

Inspire a Shared Vision is about thinking ahead and recruiting others to share the vision that is seen for the future. These leaders not only see where they are headed, they help others see the road to get there and why it matters to them. An example of this theme on the SLPI looks like this: “I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization can be in the future.” Statements 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, and 27 of the inventory are descriptive of this theme.

Challenge the Process. “I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects that we undertake” is an SLPI survey item from this theme. Leaders that are strong in this area look at the way things are done and find ways to make them better or more efficient. “They treat mistakes as learning experiences. Leaders also stay prepared to meet whatever challenges may confront them. They plan projects and break them down into achievable steps, creating opportunities for small wins.” Statements 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, and 28 of the inventory are descriptive of this theme.

Enable Others to Act is about getting other people involved. This leader uses their strengths and the strengths of others together as a way to empower and give confidence to the members of the group to act. They want to build teams and have others join them to help reach a common goal. “I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work” is found in the SLPI as an example for this theme. Statements 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, and 29 of the inventory are descriptive of this theme.

Finally, *Encourage the Heart* is in place to keep a positive attitude and outlook on the journey the group takes and the accomplishments or lessons that are learned along the way. This leader makes accomplishments and achievements by the team and individuals known to others as a notion of acknowledgement and appreciation. This theme is characterized by one of the *Encourage the Heart* statements on the SLPI: “I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.” Statements 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 of the inventory are descriptive of this theme.

There are two forms of the SLPI: the Self and the Observer. The Self version is a self-assessment for the student leaders to report their best practices and perceptions of effectiveness. The Observer version is for those that witness the effectiveness of a student

leader. They are usually compared to give a well rounded picture of a leader's effectiveness. For the purposes of this study, the Self form will be the only instrument utilized and scored. This creates a self-report and cross-sectional data collection procedure. In research, it has been noted that self-reports remain valid if five specific conditions are met: a) The information requested is known to respondents b) The questions are unambiguous c) The questions refer to recent activities d) The respondents believe that the questions merit a serious and thoughtful response e) Answering the questions does not threaten, embarrass, or violate the privacy of the respondent or encourage the respondent to respond in socially desirable ways (Hayek et al., 2002; Kuh et al., 2001).

RAs and Greek students are two populations that have been studied before with the SLPI. Sex has also been a variable of interest when comparing responses of best leadership practices and tendencies. While some research suggests that sex can affect leadership practices, Kouzes and Posner's studies have shown that it does not significantly affect leadership behaviors" (Kouzes & Posner, 2006b).

Due to the specific student leadership nature in the creation and implementation of this instrument, researching sex and leader type with regards to leadership practices is very appropriate and valid for this evaluative tool. We will be able to measure if the leadership practices described in the thirty statements are significantly influenced by sex or leader type. Posner (2004) found that "early studies reported internal reliability scores (Cronbach alpha) of $\alpha = .70$ for *Model*, $\alpha = .79$ for *Inspire*, $\alpha = .66$ for *Challenge*, $\alpha = .70$ for *Enable*, and $\alpha = .80$ for *Encourage*, and these are relatively consistent with more recent findings."

The study is going to be descriptive research by design as it is meant to describe the current perceptions of the student leaders, or a cross-section in time. The instrument will be

administered in a paper copy form. This design was chosen to answer the current research question through an analysis of variance. The data collection through this design is sufficient for this calculation.

Procedure

The researcher obtained the SLPI and permission to photocopy the SLPI for research distribution in this particular study. The researcher photocopied the survey instrument, the demographic information page, and the informed consent and voluntary participation page for each of the research participants.

Several measures were taken to ensure the confidentiality of the participants. Prior to contacting the participants, a packet was put together for each Greek Survey Meeting and for the RA training meeting. The packet is a 9x12 manila envelope that contains: (a) survey instructions (b) envelopes that are addressed to the researcher, (c) surveys for the participants in the Greek organization or residence hall, and (d) notices of informed consent stating that their participation is voluntary and they can drop out at any time.

The researcher contacted all of the Greek Fraternity and Sorority Executives by an e-mail from the Director of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs to tell them about the study and invite them to participate in the research project. They were informed that several times have been arranged for them to complete the survey and that they could choose one to attend. The distributor will take the manila envelope that contains the survey materials and distribute them to the participants. The students will fill out the demographic information and their responses on the SLPI. After completion, they will seal them in the envelope addressed to the researcher and hand them in to the distributor for prompt researcher collection.

Also, the researcher contacted all of the RAs in Residential Life by an e-mail from their Residence Directors to tell them about the study and invite them to participate during the training meeting. When the students completed their surveys, they sealed it in an envelope that was provided by the researcher and was dropped off at the researcher's office.

The first distribution was made in Fall 2010. Two weeks later, a second e-mail was sent to all targeted participants to seek participation by those who had not returned their survey. Responses were documented as they were received. The demographic information was compiled to provide a more detailed snapshot of the sample. The theme scores were calculated for each student using the SLPI Scoring Software in preparation for data analysis.

All information obtained from participants including the identities of participants was kept confidential. Students who completed the SLPI returned the demographic page and the SLPI directly to the distributor in a sealed self-addressed envelope to the office of the researcher. Envelopes were opened in private where all response pages were labeled with a single random number (i.e., the number 412 will be put on each page of a submission). A spread sheet was made on a computer containing the Random number assigned to the submission, the sex of the respondent, the position that the student holds in their organization, cumulative GPA, year in school, and SLPI self-reported ratings. The spreadsheet was password protected and accessed only by the researcher. Before analysis, the pages that contain identifiable information (name or demographics) was separated from the document and stored in a lockbox, where the researcher possesses the only key, when the information is not being analyzed. Any unauthorized access to the spreadsheet information will not be personally identifiable without the matching name and number stored in the lockbox. The data collected in this study will be used in presentations, articles, and theses.

However, names were not collected and information disclosed will not be identifiable to the participant. The data will be kept until August 2015 and will be destroyed, deleted, or shredded on September 1, 2015.

A multivariate analysis of variance, was conducted once the data was collected to determine whether the independent variables, sex (male, female) and leader type (RA/Greek Member), had an effect on a student's self-reported effectiveness as a leader (measured as the SLPI subscale scores, related dependent variables). The MANOVA yielded overall scores for the five sub tests of the groups and significance was tested at a .05 level.

Chapter summary

To describe the methodology involved with the study, the chapter was broken into four sections: the background, sample, instrument, and procedure. A large, public land-grant institution in the Midwest was the setting where over 22,000 students are enrolled. Greek fraternity and sorority executive officers and residential life resident advisors was the sample studied. The instrument used in this study was the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) developed by Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner. Demographic information was provided by the participants and the institutions current enrollment statistics for the Fall 2009 semester. The procedure of the participation and data collection process was discussed. A multivariate analysis of variance, or MANOVA, was the primary method used for data analysis.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Due to a low return rate of 9.6% from the targeted Greek Chapter Officers, there can be no useful analysis or comparison of the data in reference to the research questions posed in this study. However, there were interesting findings found with the Residential Life population based on sex.

The 131 responses of the 30 question survey were tallied into the SLPI scoring software. The software returned the five sub scores that were entered, along with the demographic information, into a spread sheet. The information was then broken up by the independent variables, Leadership Role (Residence Life or Greek Life) and Sex (Male or Female), and the dependent variables, the five SLPI sub scores, in preparation of a Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The MANOVA was carried out as a Multivariate General Linear Model in the SPSS 19.0 software program. Data was also analyzed through visual examination of graphs through changes in the mean scores and trends of the variables. Sub scores were also compared to Kouzes and Posner's scoring scale (2006f) to measure where students at this institution ranked across all students that have ever taken the SLPI.

Summary of Other Findings

The descriptive statistics in Table 1 indicated the scores reported by RAs. Male RAs reported the following scores: *Model the Way* (\underline{M} =23.12, \underline{SD} = 3.08), *Inspire a Shared Vision*

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Resident Advisors

Leadership Practice	Sex	M	SD	N
MODEL	f	23.81	3.076	67
	m	23.12	3.080	49
	Total	23.52	3.083	116
INSPIRE	f	22.51	3.207	67
	m	22.69	4.159	49
	Total	22.59	3.624	116
CHALLENGE	f	22.03	3.289	67
	m	21.96	3.974	49
	Total	22.00	3.578	116
ENABLE	f	24.96	2.464	67
	m	24.90	2.953	49
	Total	24.93	2.669	116
ENCOURAGE	f	25.18	3.366	67
	m	23.53	3.465	49
	Total	24.48	3.490	116

(\underline{M} =22.69, \underline{SD} = 4.16), and *Challenge the Process* (\underline{M} =21.96, \underline{SD} = 3.97), *Enable Others to Act* (\underline{M} =24.90, \underline{SD} = 2.95), and *Encourage the Heart* (\underline{M} =23.53, \underline{SD} = 3.46). Female RAs reported the following scores: *Model the Way* (\underline{M} =23.81, \underline{SD} = 3.08), *Inspire a Shared Vision* (\underline{M} =22.51, \underline{SD} = 3.21), *Challenge the Process* (\underline{M} =22.03, \underline{SD} = 3.29), *Enable Others to Act* (\underline{M} =24.96, \underline{SD} = 2.46), *Encourage the Heart* (\underline{M} =25.18, \underline{SD} = 3.37).

Though males and females had some similarity in their practice rankings, there was a significant difference found in one of the sub scores. While testing with a significance level of $p < .05$, multivariate tests (Table 2) indicated that the Independent

Table 2

Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	<i>F</i>	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Sex	Wilks'	.875	3.131 ^{a*}	5.000	110.000	.011	.125
	Lambda						

Note. a= Exact statistic. * $p < .05$.

variable Sex had a significance level of $F(5, 110) = 3.131, p < .05$. Upon further examination, the significant sex difference detected was found under *Encouraging the Heart* [$F(1,114)=6.622, p < .05$]. However, the figure does not seem to be practically significant as the partial eta squared figure was very low (.125). Also, Wilks' Lambda was defined as $\lambda = .875$ for the Sex variable which indicates a small effect on the model as seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III <i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Sex	MODEL	13.223	1	13.223	1.396	.240	.012
	INSPIRE	.983	1	.983	.074	.786	.001
	CHALLENGE	.141	1	.141	.011	.917	.000
	ENABLE	.093	1	.093	.013	.910	.000
	ENCOURAGE	76.911	1	76.911	6.622*	.011	.055
Error	MODEL	1079.743	114	9.471			
	INSPIRE	1509.154	114	13.238			
	CHALLENGE	1471.859	114	12.911			
	ENABLE	819.355	114	7.187			
	ENCOURAGE	1324.055	114	11.615			
Total	MODEL	65248.000	116				
	INSPIRE	60686.000	116				
	CHALLENGE	57616.000	116				
	ENABLE	72920.000	116				
	ENCOURAGE	1092.966	115				
Corrected Total	MODEL	1510.138	115				
	INSPIRE	1472.000	115				
	CHALLENGE	819.448	115				
	ENABLE	1400.966	115				
	ENCOURAGE	1092.966	115				

Note. * $p < .05$.

Chapter Summary

This chapter displayed the findings of the researcher after the data collection period. There were 131 students that submitted responses out of the 275 targeted for a return rate of 47.6%. Since the Greek student leaders returned 15 out of the targeted 156 surveys, for a return rate of 9.6%, any comparison or analysis of the data would not yield any type of productive or meaningful result and has been removed from consideration in this study. Resident Advisors that returned 116 out of 119 for a rate of 97.4%. Significant differences were found on the basis of sex within the Resident Advisor population.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This study was performed to determine the effects of sex and leadership role on self-perceived leadership effectiveness by residential life and Greek life student leaders at a large land-grant research university in the Midwest. Greek student responses were disregarded because of the anemic return rate of 9.6% of the population. The results provide evidence that sex is a significant factor in some areas of leadership practice among RAs. Specifically, the affected practices are from the major themes clarified by thousands of business and student leaders who provided responses and testimony in development of the *Five Exemplary Practices* and the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2006a).

The goal was to have the students participate in the survey to provide a glimpse of the frequency of best leadership practices for analysis, have the students reflect on their leadership behavior, and for practitioners to identify the effectiveness level and practice patterns of male and female student leaders in their respective departments. This research also sought to assess the effectiveness of leadership development and training relevant to the university and future employment experiences, and to provide literature and direction for future studies.

Summary of Results

The results indicate two findings. First, the data show the frequency of five categories of best practices that the student leaders perform at their personal best as RAs. Kouzes and Posner (2006f) developed a scoring scale after their research into the Student Leadership Practices Inventory. The scale is based on the percentile of all student leader responses. Scores in the five practices were divided into 3 levels: Low (1st – 30th percentile), Moderate (30th - 70th percentile), and High (70th – 100th percentile). The average mean of all RAs on the five practices scored between the 60th and 65th percentile of all student leaders in the country to maintain a moderate level of practice consistency.

This finding shows that these student leaders see themselves as having room to grow in each of the five areas. They are on the cusp of considering themselves as practicing at a high frequency of leadership effectiveness and could benefit from focus and training in each of these disciplines that are within the context of their responsibilities. Since the average age of the RAs is approximately 20.1 years and just began their junior year, there is plenty of time to reflect on and strengthen their skills, while modeling for and influencing the younger student leaders in their organizations.

Second, the data showed that sex was an overall significant factor on one of the self reported sub scores of the SLPI at this institution: *Encourage the Heart*. Male and female student leaders within residence life traditionally have varying groups of people with whom they predominantly interact. RAs may lead single-sex or coed living areas. This is what led to the interest in possible differences in style, approach, and frequency of their leadership behaviors. The male student leaders scored in the moderate category with their ratings while staying in the range of 50-65% of respondents across the board. Females perceived

themselves as having higher leadership behavior frequencies in all sub scores. They scored between 60-70%. Women have always been known to be a nurturing figure, particularly in education (Eagly & Carli, 2003).

RAs are paid student employees of the university. Typically, student leaders are found participating in a volunteer role within student organizations and may not have access to the finances, resources, or training available to those employed. However, RAs are still students and may still share many interests and leadership abilities with other student leaders.

Consistency with Previous Research

The literature review in chapter II offered much of the previous research done on the topics that this study is based. There are some consistencies as well as differences with the research compiled in this study. The limitations for each study vary and the ones that have limited this study must be kept in mind when comparing the results of past research and future directions.

Continuing to show a commitment to growth is a strong indication that a student cares enough about their organization to seek ways to better themselves and the chapter. This display is shown to them by the leadership, incorporated into their own leadership practice, and then the chances go up that they could be in a leadership position among their peers.

Students tend to work better when they have a mentor or role model who has a high frequency of transformative leadership behavior. They emulate or incorporate the behavior into their style and learn good habits of effective leadership practice. Wu & Stemler (2008), Komives (1991b) and Blimling & Schuh (1981) all concluded that learning outcomes are strengthened at residential universities due to an effective student staff. The same Komives study indicated that RAs are more satisfied and motivated when their supervisors display

transformational leadership behaviors. Due to moderate to high scores of the RA staff at the researched university, the learning outcomes will continue to be strengthened as the RA staff continues to improve their leadership practice. However, if leaders do not practice as frequently, they will become less effective. Posner & Brodsky's (1993) research indicated that RAs and their students that rated the RA low were actually assessed as being less effective than the RAs and observers who had higher ratings on the SLPI.

The literature continues to show a mix of sex differences. However, there are solid research reports in higher education of student leaders showing significant differences based on sex. Komives (1991a) found significant sex differences in leadership and effectiveness through the MLQ questionnaire. This questionnaire measures students' abilities in transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles. Males were shown to be higher in non-transformational leadership styles. Their lead in the Transactional leadership style is an ode to the autocratic days of sustaining power in a quid pro quo relationship (Northouse, 2007). This may also be why men in this study scored highest in *Enable Others to Act* as this deals with power and influence as well.

Women have naturally scored higher in transformational leadership characteristics, as shown in the data collected for this study. Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) agreed as they found that women consistently score higher than men in several transformational aspects. Other research studies corroborate these findings. Dugan (2006a) and Whitt et al. (2003) found significant sex differences in college student leaders. Dugan's study was based on the social change model of leadership and instrument developed by Tyree (1998) that surveyed 443 women and 410 men. Women scored higher in every one of the categories. The highest score of the eight social change categories was *Commitment*. There

was a similar study in 2008 by Dugan, Komives, and Segar that tested over 50,000 students. Women scored higher in every category but *Change*. This seems to mirror the notion that *Challenging the Process* is still a trait that students do not use as frequently.

Adams and Keim (2000) also found sex and effectiveness differences using the SLPI among 233 students. There were 21 presidents that took the Self survey. 105 council members and 107 general members rated them through the Observer survey. The results showed that female presidents rated themselves lower than their observers did and men rated themselves higher than their observers had. Posner and Brodsky (1992; 1994) did similar studies using the instrument and still maintain that there is really no significance in leadership practices based on the factor of sex, which is in conflict with this study.

Astin (1993) and Dugan (2006b) wrote that involvement by students can foster leadership development. This involves several leadership opportunities like having membership in student organizations or serving in a position (Dugan 2006a). The case for transformational leadership practices within the residence life resonates clearly as transformational philosophy continues to show positive results in leadership research. Canty's (2005) dissertation reminds us that transformational leadership practices are critical to the sustainability of the complex organizations that exist today, including higher education.

In summary, this study has given a small piece of evidence that supports the literature and theories that there are significant differences based on sex.

Limitations

The results of this research is specific to the groups studied at this university and may not be generalized to other institutions. A multi-campus study would allow for generalization to a broader population.

The data of this cross-section or descriptive research is used to show the self-perceptions of the student leaders within the groups of leadership role and sex. The purpose was to assess the effects of these variables on effective leadership practice. This design served its purpose and provided the researcher with the snapshot needed to analyze the data and report the sex effects that exist at this moment in time.

There was an unforeseen limitation that plagued the results of this research. The lack of data return from the targeted Greek population at the institution of interest resulted in less than 10% of useful responses. The Director of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs indicated that interest in completing the survey was low due to a lack of time during the eight weeks the data was collected. He explained that students were more concerned with the beginning of school, organizing the largest pledge class in university history, and planning for homecoming. This shortage in data does not allow for a useful comparison between Greek and residence life leaders as it pertains to the leadership role variable. Therefore, the two research questions posed

The Student Leadership Practices Inventory has been considered an instrument that is connected to transformational leadership behaviors (Northouse, 2007). It is difficult to tell, by this instrument alone, if student leaders are more effective using transformational leadership practices and strong democratic tendencies without analyzing them using other instruments and theories. However, there may be another instrument that exists that may

indicate that a student shares some democratic qualities but may possess and display more autocratic principles.

Unless the students were specifically asked to comment on the confusion of the Likert scale choices that were not consistent between the directions and the actual survey, it would be difficult to measure any sort of effect this error may have had on the responses from the student leaders. It is possible that it was not even noticed by most, if not all, of the respondents participating in the survey.

The design of the study did not create an opportunity to examine a cross-sex dynamic or influence on observers as the snapshot on self-perceptions prevented the analysis of possible effects of sex and leadership role on observer perceptions. Sex and leadership role may have stronger or weaker effects on effectiveness that is measured from a 360 degree analysis.

Another thought in comparing organizational membership is that residential life may have a different set of characteristics and standards that they look for in selecting those that they hire. Residential life follows a strict hiring process to select the student that is most qualified and in line with the mission and views of the department. Other organizations that provide student leadership opportunities have various membership criteria, or none at all, for students that are interested in becoming involved in the organization. This may influence the sub scores in future studies because of the specific qualities that these organizations seek in the leaders they choose.

Also, a student leader is trained or taught the same way as everyone else in the organization, which may lead to a uniform understanding of what it takes to lead, and what qualities are most important to be an effective student leader. Residential life leaders follow a

specific training protocol so that everyone has the opportunity to learn how to handle emergencies, student development and engagement, and other responsibilities.

Suggestions for Future Research

There are a few directions available for future research in this area that can shed more light on the level of self reported student leadership effectiveness and the progress that these leaders are making toward becoming more knowledgeable in the ways of these practices. Self perceptions represent an area of educational research that can be of benefit to cognitive and psychological development in students. The possible depth and breadth of this potential research can help identify more avenues of student leadership effectiveness and the way that it can be measured in the future to further the aim of best practice for student affairs professionals.

The first suggestion is to do a complete analysis of the student leader's effectiveness by distributing the Observer version of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory to the supervisors or advisors that lead the student leader and to the students that follow the RA. This would give more data to examine a student leader's effectiveness from other angles to see if there are any other significant perceptions affected by sex, leadership role, or many other variables.

There are many other variables that could be analyzed to test for influence on leadership effectiveness. Age, GPA, race, major, family size, etc. are a few examples of major demographics researched when looking at all areas of the student experience. These variables have rarely been researched in regards to self reported student leadership effectiveness. This scarcity must be explored to see what factors may be significant in the implementation of leadership practice and development.

Including more types of student leaders to the leadership role variable could reveal different results due to the nature of the many different leadership opportunities available on campus. Student government associations, volunteer services, programming boards, and student organizations contain students of differing leadership types, maturities, and interests in which the sub scores may be less consistent with their peers. The parameters for the variables researched within this report may also be widened to include other gender or sexual characteristics. LGBT students could also benefit from research of this type.

Another suggestion for future research is an analysis done with several other instruments that measure leadership practices so a more detailed profile on a student can be compared to the variables in the study. This may also include other leadership practices that may not fit into the scope of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory that may be seen as a valuable asset to the development of the students these leaders are responsible for. It also provides more information for students to reflect on and to determine a comprehensive action plan to help increase their skills and functionality in their leadership positions.

Lastly, qualitative analyses may be able to add depth of understanding to the phenomena explored in the present study, particularly regarding why the student leaders practice leadership the way they do and the things that have influenced their own development. Interviews and focus groups can uncover several major themes that constricted instruments cannot. There are student leaders who may score identically on the leadership instruments that arrived at those levels in dramatically different ways. This way, the circumstances and details of a student's leadership development can be used for comparisons to current and future practice.

Suggestions for Future Practice

The research collected can be useful information for practitioners on the topic of student leadership. The particular scenarios in residence life at the university require unique ways of assessing and responding with the right course of action. Attending classes, inspiring others toward a common purpose in a student organization, and completing tasks in advance of a job performance evaluation at a place of employment are all situations that provide opportunities for development. However, college was designed to prepare students for post university life by gaining valuable skills and experience that will aid them in their career and lifestyle. It is up to the practitioners to help enhance this environment and promote student success. One way to maximize their effectiveness level is to increase the opportunities that they have and raise the level of standards and complexity of the experiences they encounter. The easiest way to do this is by creating a culture of implementing the five practices in the department or organization. Make sure student leaders are involved in the process and informed of its significance to the mission of the university and the students that it serves while they implement the programs and interventions. Conceptualizing the theory behind these practices may be of interest to some students, but creative engagement may be the only way to get some student leaders to actively participate in these initiatives.

The data can be utilized by practitioners and student leaders to develop trainings, workshops, or activities that can enhance the frequency and quality of effective leadership practice by these leaders and others across the campus. Starting with an analysis of current skills creates an opportunity for practitioners and students to assess and reflect where the students' skills stand in the context of their responsibilities and leadership roles. Conversing with the student about their self perceptions will allow for a better understanding of how the

student arrived at the frequency levels they have which can narrow the programmatic customization and theory application to the development activities that reinforce the five exemplary practices. Reflection also occurs when a student realizes what the people around them think of their leadership abilities. In the end, the student leader gets to compare what they perceive their practice frequency to be with the opinions of the people that lead, follow, or practice with them. As a student affairs professional or advisor, going through this process with them will open up a level of trust and understanding with the student leaders by letting them know that you also see this as a worthwhile venture to improve your own leadership and advisory skills.

All of the five exemplary practices are conducive to molding organizations and systems through the development and transformation of their members. Student leaders can grasp these transformational practices by seeing it in action through their involvement and using it in their daily interactions with their peers, supervisors, and professors.

Transformational leadership should continue to be an intentional focus of leadership development by practitioners considering the continued paradigm shift in leadership today. Should the paradigm continue to shift toward a new and unknown style of leadership over time, what better way to transform than by way of transformational leadership?

The consistently moderate to high frequency rates of these characteristics in these RAs' self perceptions show a sense of belief that they are using them very often. They have the potential to raise the bar to a high frequency rate across the board among practices that are considered sound by many leaders of all industries if they continue to be exposed to them. It is important for practitioners to model and outwardly value these characteristics if they expect student leaders to improve and perceive growth upon them as well.

Universities intentionally provide opportunities for students to take responsibility for their own development through residence halls and student organizations. A person improves their skills by looking for different ways and opportunities to use them and learn from the results of their actions. Continuing to encourage students to be proactive in the development of the system that governs them will create an investment in the process, encourage independent critical thinking, develop personal and organizational identities, and naturally move to challenge ways things are done in order to construct better and more efficient processes. Involvement transforms leadership potential (Dugan, 2006b).

Student leaders in the residential life program have some similar leadership contexts with other student leaders on campus among their daily responsibilities. Both entities do require effective leadership from its student leaders to promote a vision, provide access to campus resources, and build a cohesive community. The RAs should implement activities that utilize the five practices on a regular basis to help the students in these groups increase their own leadership capabilities.

The topic of sex in leadership has been raised for many years and researchers have been split on whether or not it has a significant effect on leadership practices or effectiveness (Hoyt, 2007; Engen, Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001; Book 2000; Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser, 1965). Practitioners should take this research and apply it to their practice to identify other factors that may affect their commitment to or perception of being effective student leaders. A suggestion for the university is to have an open forum after a lecture on sex differences in leadership to explore the topic and create interest. Some discussion can be directed to point out the issues and previous research that has been completed to influence the current leadership atmosphere among males and females in today's society.

Conclusions

While there were some significant sex differences found in the data, it seems as though the practicality of the significance in this study is not strong based on the very low effect size. Given that the overall scores fall within the 60-65% range, it seems as though the RAs are consistent in their practice and complement each other well. It would be interesting to see the scores of the leaders from the observers' point of view to test the visibility of these leaders performance and if it also has any significance differences based on the variables. RAs are likely seen in a different light by a resident than a volunteer student leader is by their followers in a student organization. It is through self perception and reflection that the student leaders begin to assess their skills to see what areas they are strongest at, and which areas need some attention in order to continue the development of their skills, as well as those of their followers.

A high self perception can be seen as a couple of things: arrogance, or confidence. However, self-report bias can be claimed against anyone that ever fills out a survey or gives their opinion on any topic (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006). Observer reports work the same way as they can also be classified as self-report bias because observers give their personal opinion of what they have seen. Theoretically, they balance out to give a more accurate picture of what is actually happening. Either way, both opinions are necessary and it is clear why the instrument does have a self and observer component to the instrument when measuring the entire picture of what is happening. This is why the research is done.

It is imperative to promote the importance of leadership research to student leaders and encourage them to participate in future studies that are designed to help them. There seemed to be little interest from the Greeks, for various reasons, after being contacted several

times to complete the survey. Also, a research approval and support letter from the National Panhellenic Conference was sent directly to every sorority chapter at the institution, but this did little to encourage participation. The RAs in residence life did have a stronger participation level as they all attended the same meeting during their training period before the school year started to in order complete the SLPI. This type of response makes one wonder as to the perceived importance of the research to the Greek community at the university.

In conclusion, there is much more research needed in this area for student affairs professionals and student leaders to understand the meaning of leadership effectiveness in a world that is in heavy need of transformation. Providing the tools and resources necessary for these students to take responsibility of their development is why utilizing what is considered “best practice” of anything is a step toward that goal. The cognitive and psychological aspects of self-perceptions also need to be studied in this educational context for practitioners to emerge with a better understanding and frame of reference for training and mentoring student leaders to become the next generation of individuals entrusted to, in the words of, Lane G. Perry, III, “become a part of something bigger than them, but better because of them” (L.G. Perry, III, personal communication, August, 2006).

Chapter Summary

This study explored the possible effects of sex and leadership role on self-perceived leadership effectiveness. Previous literature has been split on the significance of sex on leadership practice as several researchers have supplied evidence of both in their studies (Hoyt, 2007; Engen, Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001; Book 2000; Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser, 1965). There is an extreme scarcity of literature comparing leadership effectiveness levels based on leadership role and this study aimed to add literature to both areas.

The Five Practices of Exemplary Student Leadership by Kouzes and Posner (2006a) and the theory of Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1985a; Burns, 1978; Downton, 1973) was the framework for this study. The five practices are themes that emerged among thousands of interviews with industry and student leaders: *Model the Way*, *Inspire a Shared Vision*, *Challenge the Process*, *Enable Others to Act*, and *Encourage the Heart*. These themes are very similar to the four that were described in Transformational Leadership Theory: *Idealized Influence*, *Inspirational Motivation*, *Intellectual Stimulation*, and *Individualized Consideration*. These categories are examples of leadership characteristics that are becoming more common with the paradigm change toward democratic leadership styles and are widely considered to be best practice.

The design was to conduct a survey at a large land-grant university in the Midwest among all of the resident advisors in the Department of Residence Life and the Presidents, Vice Presidents (or similar position), Secretaries, and Treasurers of the Greek social organizations in the Department of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs. Approval was received from the Institutional Review Board at the Institution and from the National Panhellenic Council headquarters in compliance with national research rules for sorority women that are

members of NPC chapters. Initially, support for this study was given from both departments and the Office of Leadership Development at the university prior to this investigation.

All participants were contacted through the participating departments and were invited to take the survey at coordinated times. There were 116 RAs that completed the survey during their scheduled training period before the academic year began. The researcher and the Director of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs designated the Office of Leadership Development to disperse and collect the surveys through designated meeting times after contacting the chapter officers. Only 15 students over four chapters completed the survey within the 8 weeks of data collection after several attempts to contact had been made. Therefore, data from the Greek respondents was excluded from the analysis.

The students completed the 30 question Student Leadership Practices Inventory as well as provide demographic information including, position, length in role, living arrangement, length of time in residence, age, and cumulative GPA. The responses were sealed in security envelopes and returned to the researcher. Responses were scored through the Student Leadership Practices Inventory Scoring Software to determine the sub scores of the five practices. These scores and demographic information were put into a spreadsheet for a multivariate analysis of variance in the SPSS 19 program to test for significance based on sex in residence life. The results of the MANOVA returned a significant difference in one of the five sub scores based on sex.

The average sub scores for male and female RAs were fairly consistent and stayed among the 60-65 percentile of all student leaders that have taken the SLPI. According to the scoring rubric from Kouzes and Posner, this indicates a moderate frequency of effective leadership practice. This information is useful to the university in discovering effective ways

to train and improve the leadership skills and effectiveness of their student leaders. The student leaders benefit by being faced with a measuring stick of how well they see themselves performing and reflection period to think about what it takes to make themselves better and the frequency of how they exhibit their skills. The students being led by these leaders also benefit by having the university research and improve the services and people entrusted to lead them and provide a well rounded learning experience to aid in their academic, social, cognitive, and leadership development.

More research on the topic is needed and suggestions for future research and practice have been made. Student leadership is an area of critical importance that should always be studied in order for practitioners and student leaders to continue growing in leadership excellence and effectiveness no matter what department they are a part of, or what sex they are.

REFERENCES

- Adams, T. C., & Keim, M. C. (2000). Leadership practices and effectiveness among Greek student leaders. *College Student Journal, 34*, 259-270.
- Arboleda, A., Wang, Y., Shelley, II, M. C., & Whalen, D. F. (2003). Predictors of residence hall involvement. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(4), 517-531.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2002). *BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory: Short (EQ-i:S): Technical manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Baird, L. L. (2003). New lessons from research on student outcomes. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 595-617). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B. M. (1985a). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985b). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Binghamton, NY: School of Management, State University of New York.

- Bennis, W. G. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bierman, S. E., & Carpenter, D. S. (1994). An analysis of resident assistant work motivation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 467-474.
- Blanchard, K., & Johnson, S. (1982). *The one minute manager*. New York: Morrow.
- Blimling, G. S. (1999). A meta-analysis of the influence of college residence halls on academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 551-561.
(Original work published 1989)
- Blimling, G. S., & Schuh, J. H. (Eds.). (1981). *Increasing the educational role of residence halls* (New Directions for Student Services Series. No. 13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Book, E. W. (2000). *Why the best man for the job is a woman*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Bowman, G., Worthy, N., & Greyser, S. (1965). Are women executives people? *Harvard Business Review*, 43(4), 14-28, 164-178.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693-710.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Canty, L. T. (2005). Conceptual assessment: Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles and job performances of managers as perceived by their direct reports. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. 454(1351), 125. (UMI No. 3187790)

- Center for the Study of the College Fraternity, Bloomington, IN. (2009). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved November 10, 2009, from <http://www.indiana.edu/~cscf/faq.htm>
- Cooper, M. & Schwartz, R. (2007). Moral judgment and student discipline: What are institutions teaching? What are students learning? *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 595-607.
- Davis, T. M. & Murrell, P. H., (1993). *Turning teaching into learning. The role of student responsibility in the collegiate experience* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8). Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and Charisma in a revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006a). Explorations using the social change model: Leadership development among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2), 217-225.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006b). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(3), 335-343.
- Dugan, J. P., Komives, S. R., & Segar, T. C. (2008). Socially responsible leadership: Understanding norms and influences of race, gender, and sexual orientation. *NASPA Journal, 45*(4), 475-500.
- Dungy, G. J. (2003). Organization and functions of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 339-357). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eagly, A. H. (1990). On the advantages of reporting sex comparisons. *American Psychologist, 45*, 560-562.

- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 807-834.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannessen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 569-591.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 233–256.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573-598.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). “Putting my man face on”: A grounded theory of college men’s gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(2), 210-228.
- Engelkemeyer, S. W. & Brown, S. C. (1998). Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility For learning. *AAHE Bulletin, 51*(2), 10-12.
- Engen, M. L. van. (2001). *Gender and leadership: A contextual perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.
- Engen, M. L. van, Leeden, R. van der, & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*, 581-598.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Foubert, J. D., Newberry, J. T., & Tatum, J. L. (2007). Behavior differences seven months later: Effects of a rape prevention program on first-year men who join fraternities. *NASPA Journal, 44*, 728-749.
- Gay, L R, Mills, G. E., & Airisian, P. W. (2006). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications (8th ed.). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Geiger, R. L. (2000). College as it was in the mid-nineteenth century. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(6), 746-762.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 84–96.
- Green, W. J. (1994). Transformational leadership as a predictor of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction in higher education. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. 454*(1191), 145. (UMI No. 9432121)
- Harms, P.D., Woods, D., Roberts, B., Bureau, D., & Green, A. M. (2006). Perceptions of leadership in undergraduate fraternal organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(2), 81-94.
- Hayek, J. C., Carini, R. M., O'Day, P. T., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Triumph or tragedy: Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter organizations and other students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(5), 643-663.

- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Hirschorn, M. W. (1988, May 11). Two colleges drop recognition of fraternities, sororities amid continuing concern over groups' behavior. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A27-28.
- Hoyt, C. L. (2007). Women and Leadership. In Northouse, P. G., *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.) (pp. 265-299). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hu, S. & Kuh, G. S. (2003). Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 320-334.
- Jackson, L. (2000). The rites of man and the rites of youth: Fraternity and riot at 18th century Harvard. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *The American college in the nineteenth century* (pp. 46-79). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Caison, A. L. (2006). Rethinking criteria for training and selection: An inquiry into the emotional intelligence. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1), 144-165.
- Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J. B., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan-Kenyon, H., et al. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 525-542.
- Kaplin, W.A. and Lee, B.A. (2007). *The law of higher education* (4th Ed., Student Version). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kilgannon, S. M., & Erwin, T. D. (1992). A longitudinal study about the identity and moral development of Greek students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 253-259.
- King, P. M. (2003). Student learning in higher education. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 234-268). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R. (1991a). Gender differences in the relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership and achieving style. *Journal of College Student Development*. 32, 155-165.
- Komives, S. R. (1991b). The relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership to select resident assistant outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32 (6), 509–515.
- Komives, S. K. (1994). Women student leaders: Self-perceptions of empowering leadership and achieving style. *NASPA Journal*, 31, 102–111.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006a). *Five practices of exemplary student leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006b). *Student leadership practices inventory: Facilitator's guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006c). *Student leadership practices inventory: Self*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006d). *Student leadership practices inventory: Student workbook* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006e). *Student leadership practices inventory: Observer*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006f). *Student leadership practices inventory: Scoring software* (2nd). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2008). *The student leadership challenge: Five practices for exemplary leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., Pascarella, E. T., & Wechsler, H. (1996, April 19). The questionable value of fraternities. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A68.
- Kuh, G. D., Hayek, J. C., Carini, R. M., Ouimet, J. A., Gonyea, R. M., & Kennedy, J. (2001). *NSSE technical and norms report*. Bloomington: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning.
- Laker, J. (2003, March). Bad dogs: Rethinking our engagement of male students. *ACPA's Standing Committee for Men Newsletter*.
- Maisel, J. M. (1990). Social fraternities and sororities are not conducive to the educational process. *NASPA Journal*, 28, 8-12.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.
- National Panhellenic Conference. (2009). *About NPC*. Retrieved November 10, 2009, from <http://www.npcwomen.org/about.aspx>

- National Pan-Hellenic Council. (2009). *About the NPHC*. Retrieved November 10, 2009, from <http://www.nphchq.org/about.htm>
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2010) *About NSSE*. Retrieved November 10, 2010, from <http://nsse.iub.edu/html/about.cfm>.
- Neuberger, C. G., & Hanson, G. S. (1997). The Greek life self study: A powerful process for change on campus. *NASPA Journal*, 34(2), 91-100.
- North American Interfraternity Conference. (2009). *Standards*. Retrieved November 10, 2009, from <http://www.nicindy.org/about/standards>
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 65-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Owens, R. G. (1970). *Organizational behavior in education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pascarella, E. T., Whitt, E. J., Nora, A., Edison, M., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). What have we learned from the first year of the National Study of Student Learning? *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 182-192.
- Perry, L. G., III. Personal communication, August 2006.
- Pike, G. R. (2003). Membership in a fraternity or sorority, student engagement, and educational outcomes at AAU public research universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 369-382.

- Pike, G. R., & Askew, J. W. (1990). The impact of fraternity or sorority membership on academic involvement or learning outcomes. *NASPA Journal*, 28, 13-19.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2007). Evaluating the rationale for affirmative action in college admissions: Direct and indirect relationships between campus diversity and gains in understanding diverse groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(2), 166-182.
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(4): 231-237.
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1993). The leadership practices of effective RAs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34(4): 300-304.
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1994). Leadership practices of effective student leaders: Gender makes no difference. *NASPA Journal*, 31(3): 113-120.
- Posner, B. Z. (2009a). A longitudinal study examining changes in students' leadership behavior. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(5), 551-563.
- Raven, J. (2000). The Raven's Progressive Matrices: Change and stability over culture and time. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 1-48.
- Resident advisor job description. (n.d.). Retrieved October 11, 2009, from <http://www.reslife.okstate.edu/studentstaff/resdec.pdf>
- Rodgers, R. F. (1990). Recent theories and research underlying student development. In D. Creamer & Associates, *College student development: Theory and practice for the 1990s* (pp. 27-79). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

- Rogers, J. L. (2003). Leadership. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 447-465). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thelin, J. R. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tucker, M. L. (1991). Higher education leadership: Transformational leadership as a predictor of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. 514(108), 230. (UMI No. 9121558)
- Tyree, T. M. (1998). Designing an instrument to measure socially responsible leadership using the social change model of leadership development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(06), 1945. (UMI No. 9836493).
- Whitt, E. J., Pascarella, E. T., Elkins Nesheim, B. S., Marth, B. P., & Pierson, C. T. (2003). Differences between women and men in objectively measured outcomes, and the factors that influence those outcomes, in the first three years of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(5), 587-610.
- Wilder, D. H., McKeegan, H. F., Midkiff, Jr., R. M., Skelton, R. C., & Dunkerly, R. E. (1997). The impact of Greek affiliation on students' educational objectives: Longitudinal change in Clark-Trow educational philosophies. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(2), 151-171.

- Wu, M. B. & Stemler, S. E. (2008). Resident advisor general intelligence, emotional intelligence, personality dimensions, and internal belief characteristics as predictors of rated performance. *NASPA Journal*, 45(4), 528-559.
- Wysong, L. M. (2000). Leadership behaviors and effectiveness in quality improvements at selected institutions of higher education. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. 514(138), 276. (UMI No. 9977036)
- Yukl, G. A. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

IRB Certification

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2010
IRB Application No: ED1059
Proposal Title: The Effects of Sex and Leader Role on Leadership Effectiveness

Reviewed and Exempt
Processed as:

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 5/24/2011

Principal Investigator(s):
Joseph J. Leyland John Foubert
1200 N. Perkins Rd. Apt. M7 314 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74075 Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Shelia Kennison, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Appendix B

Script

Hello, my name is _____ and I am here on behalf of the principal researcher of this project, Joseph Leyland, to distribute a survey as part of a research project studying the leadership practices of student leaders. You have been invited to participate in this research project by completing a short demographic page and the 30-question Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI). This should take less than 20 minutes of your time.

Your participation is completely voluntary and there is no penalty for choosing not to complete the survey. You also have the right to drop out of the research project at any time. The research is designed to strengthen leadership programs and opportunities by gathering information through self-perceptions of your own effectiveness as a student leader. This survey will also give you an opportunity to assess your leadership skills and reflect on ways that you can utilize your strengths as well as improve other areas to become a more effective student leader.

Your submissions will not be seen by anyone but the researcher. His contact information is located on the last page of the SLPI should you have any questions regarding the study. Steps have been taken to provide security and anonymity to your submission including the separation of your demographic data from the survey upon receipt by the researcher, securing survey information in a password protected computer, and the lock up of paper surveys and demographic data in a lockbox.

Please fill out the demographic page and Student Leadership Practices Inventory. Before filling out the SLPI, please read the instructions on the front page in their entirety. When finished, please seal your submissions in the provided envelope and return it to me. I will be handing these surveys over to Joseph very shortly.

Thank you for participating in this research project!

Appendix C

Consent Information

- Project Title:** The effects of sex and leadership role on self-reported leadership effectiveness.
- Investigators:** Joseph J. Leyland, B.S.
John Foubert, PhD - Advisor
- Purpose:** This research study involves research into the self-reported perceptions of student leadership effectiveness in Greek and Residential Life. This study is focusing on the President, Vice President (or similar position based on Greek Organization), Secretary, and Treasurer of each Greek Organization and every Resident Advisor in Residential Life at Oklahoma State University. Your participation is requested because you currently hold one of these positions. The information being sought from participants is their demographic information and answers to a thirty item survey that measures self-reported ratings on several leadership practices.
- Procedures:** Participants are requested to fill out a demographics page and the thirty item Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI). The entire survey will be twenty minutes in length. Once completed, the participant is encouraged to return the survey in the provided self-addressed envelope to the researcher.
- Risks of Participation:** There are no known risks associated with this project which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.
- Benefits:** There are a couple benefits of participation. First, the SLPI is meant to be a reflective survey for student leaders to see where they have areas of strength and areas of improvement. Second, the results of this study can give the men and women in Greek Organizations, Residence Hall staff, and student affairs professions insight into areas where programming or training can benefit students.
- Confidentiality:** All information obtained from participants including the identities of participants will be kept confidential. Students that complete the SLPI will return the demographic page and the SLPI directly to the researcher in a sealed self-addressed envelope to the office of the researcher. Envelopes will be opened in private where all response pages will be labeled with a single random number (ex. The number 412 will be put on each page of a submission). A spread sheet will be made on a computer containing the Random number assigned to the

submission, the sex of the respondent, the position that the student holds in their organization, cumulative GPA, year in school, and SLPI self-reported ratings. The spreadsheet will be password protected and accessed only by the researcher. Before analysis, the pages that contain identifiable information (name or demographics) will be separated from the document and stored in a lockbox, where the researcher possesses the only key, when the information is not being analyzed. Any unauthorized access to the spreadsheet information will not be personally identifiable without the matching name and number stored in the lockbox.

The data collected in this study will be used in presentations, articles, and theses. However, **names will not be used and information disclosed will not be identifiable to the participant**. The data will be kept until August 2015. The data will be destroyed, deleted, or shredded on September 1, 2015.

It is possible that the consent process and data collection will be observed by research oversight staff responsible for safeguarding the rights and wellbeing of people who participate in research.

Compensation: There is no compensation for participating in this research project. Students that wish to obtain a copy of their individual results on the survey or a copy of the research paper after completion may do so freely.

Contacts: Joseph J. Leyland, B.S. - Researcher
Phone: 405-744-5471
E-Mail: joseph.leyland@okstate.edu

John D. Foubert, PhD – Advisor
Phone: 405-744-1480
E-Mail: john.foubert@okstate.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact Dr. Shelia Kennison, IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu.

Participant Rights: Participation in this research project is completely voluntary and participants may discontinue their participation in the study at any time. There is no penalty, risk, or sanction for withdrawal.

Appendix D

Demographic Information Page

Leadership Role Held: _____

Length of Time in Leadership Role: _____

Do you live in a residence hall, Greek house, or off campus?

Length of Time in residence hall, Greek house, or off campus:

Please circle your current classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate

Age: _____

Sex: _____

Cumulative GPA: _____



STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF

Your Name: _____

Instructions

On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate *yourself* in terms of *how frequently* you engage in the behavior described. *This is not a test* (there are no right or wrong answers). The usefulness of the feedback from this inventory will depend on how honest you are with yourself and how frequently you *actually* engage in each of these behaviors.

Consider each statement in the context of one student organization with which you are now (or have been most) involved with. This organization could be a club, team, chapter, group, unit, hall, program, project, and the like. As you respond to each statement, maintain a consistent perspective to your particular organization. The rating scale provides five choices. Circle the number that best applies to each statement:

- (1) If you RARELY or SELDOM do what is described
- (2) If you do what is described ONCE IN A WHILE
- (3) If you SOMETIMES do what is described
- (4) If you OFTEN do what is described
- (5) If you VERY FREQUENTLY or ALMOST ALWAYS do what is described

In selecting the response, be realistic about the extent to which you *actually* engage in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you *typically* behave.

For example, the first statement is “I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.” If you believe you do this *once in a while*, circle the number 2. If you believe you do this *often*, circle the number 4. Select and circle only one option (response number) for each statement.

Please respond to every statement. If you can’t respond to a statement (or feel that it doesn’t apply), circle a 1. When you have responded to all thirty statements, please turn to the response sheet on the back page and transfer your responses as instructed.

STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF

How frequently do you *typically* engage in the following behaviors and actions?
Circle the number to the right of each statement, using the scale below, that best applies.

	1	2	3	4	5
	RARELY OR SELDOM	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMETIMES	VERY OFTEN	FREQUENTLY
1. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I praise people for a job well done.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I spend time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed upon.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I treat others with dignity and respect.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright © 2006 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

	1	2	3	4	5			
	RARELY OR SELDOM	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMETIMES	VERY OFTEN	FREQUENTLY			
16. I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect other people's performance.				1	2	3	4	5
17. I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.				1	2	3	4	5
18. When things do not go as we expected, I ask, "What can we learn from this experience?"				1	2	3	4	5
19. I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.				1	2	3	4	5
20. I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.				1	2	3	4	5
21. I build consensus on an agreed-upon set of values for our organization.				1	2	3	4	5
22. I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.				1	2	3	4	5
23. I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.				1	2	3	4	5
24. I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.				1	2	3	4	5
25. I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.				1	2	3	4	5
26. I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.				1	2	3	4	5
27. I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.				1	2	3	4	5
28. I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.				1	2	3	4	5
29. I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.				1	2	3	4	5
30. I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.				1	2	3	4	5

Copyright © 2006 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

Transferring the Responses

After you have responded to the thirty statements on the previous two pages, please transfer your responses to the blanks below. This will make it easier to record and score your responses.

Notice that the numbers of the statements are listed *horizontally* across the page. Make sure that the number you assigned to each statement is transferred to the appropriate blank. Remember to fill in a response option (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) for every statement.

- | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ | 3. _____ | 4. _____ | 5. _____ |
| 6. _____ | 7. _____ | 8. _____ | 9. _____ | 10. _____ |
| 11. _____ | 12. _____ | 13. _____ | 14. _____ | 15. _____ |
| 16. _____ | 17. _____ | 18. _____ | 19. _____ | 20. _____ |
| 21. _____ | 22. _____ | 23. _____ | 24. _____ | 25. _____ |
| 26. _____ | 27. _____ | 28. _____ | 29. _____ | 30. _____ |

Further Instructions

Please write your name here: _____

You should have received instructions to:

- Bring this page with you to the class (seminar or workshop) or
 Return this form to:

Joseph Levland

027 Student Union

Stillwater, OK 74078

If you are interested in feedback from other people, ask them to complete the *Student LPI-Observer*. This form provides perspectives on your leadership behaviors as perceived by other people.

Copyright © 2006 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved.

Published by Jossey-Bass

A Wiley Imprint

989 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103-1741 www.josseybass.com

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400, fax 978-646-8600, or on the Web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, 201-748-6011, fax 201-748-6008, or online at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions>.

Jossey-Bass books and products are available through most bookstores. To contact Jossey-Bass directly call our Customer Care Department within the U.S. at 800-956-7739, outside the U.S. at 317-572-3986, or fax 317-572-4002.

ISBN:0-7879-8020-X

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7

Copyright © 2006 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved.
Used with permission.



VITA

Joseph James Leyland

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND LEADERSHIP ROLE ON SELF-REPORTED
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Major Field: Educational Leadership

Biographical:

Personal Data:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science/Arts in Educational Leadership Studies at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2011.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Science in General Studies at the University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, Oklahoma in 2008.

Completed the requirements for the Associate of Arts in Liberal Studies at Rose State College, Midwest City, Oklahoma in 2006.

Experience:

Coordinator, Student Activities, Barry University, Miami Shores, Florida

Professional Memberships:

American College Personnel Association

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

National Association for Campus Activities

Name: Joseph James Leyland

Date of Degree: May, 2011

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND LEADERSHIP ROLE ON SELF-
REPORTED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Pages in Study: 96

Candidate for the Degree of Master of Science

Major Field: Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development

Scope and Method of Study:

This study was completed at a large land-grant institution in the Midwest amongst the resident advisors (RAs) and the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer of each of the University's Greek social organizations. The variables being examined were sex and leadership role to determine if they had any effect on the self reported sub scores from the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI). A 2 Way MANOVA was used to test for significance.

Findings and Conclusions:

Lack of data return from the Greek Chapter Officers resulted in the exclusion of Greek data from analysis. The research questions could not be answered. However, analysis showed a significant difference was found based on sex on one of the five sub scores amongst the RAs.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Dr. John Foubert
