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ABSTRACT

This study examined the capacity and predictors of socially responsible leadership among African American/Black college students at HBCUs and PWIs using data from the Multi-institutional Study of Leadership. An independent sample $t$-test was used to test the hypothesis that African American/Black students at HBCUs would have higher leadership capacity. Two hierarchical multiple regressions were calculated to address the second hypothesis that predictors would vary by institution type. No significant differences were found in leadership capacity between African American/Black students and regression models, which explained 53-55% of the variance, showed that most predictors were mutual.

This study adds to leadership literature that examines the intersection of race and leadership. It also identified college environment variables that predict gains in leadership capacity in HBCU and PWI contexts. This study highlights the importance of membership in on-campus and off-campus organizations, participation in sociocultural conversations, leadership efficacy, and campus climate in leadership development.
CHAPTER ONE

CONTEXT AND PROBLEM

A first-year Black male college student arrived on the campus of a flood-ravaged Historically Black University (HBU) to move in and begin his undergraduate studies. Shortly before his first academic year started, a flood destroyed 80% of the campus buildings; students were living in trailers instead of residence halls. Despite the destruction, the university opened and continued educating its students. Federal relief funds helped the campus stabilize and rehabilitate, but it was a long process that the student witnessed throughout his four years at the university (Beazley, 2008, unpublished paper).

The student became engaged in the classroom and enjoyed a rich educational experience. Beyond the classroom, the student was active in several campus organizations including a historically Black fraternity and student government. The student held leadership positions and served on a university president search committee, an experience that changed his life. The student recalled reading hundreds of CVs of highly qualified applicants and being inspired because all of them were Black (Beazley, 2008, unpublished paper).

During his last two years, the student remained active and built a strong mentoring relationship with the new president. He was involved in re-opening ceremonies of the buildings that were damaged in the flood four years before. “I gained
an amplified sense of self-worth and realized I could do ‘it,’ whatever ‘it’ was,” he explained (Beazley, 2008, unpublished paper).

This student’s experiences inside and outside the classroom offer a compelling personal narrative consistent with empirical literature on college student leadership. The student’s reported growth in leadership suggests that he is a prime example of the kind of leadership development desired by colleges and universities across the country. However, important questions remain: Was this student's life and leadership learning a result of his experiences at an HBU in particular or would an African American/Black student enrolled at a Predominantly White Institution (PWI) encounter the same experiences and benefit from them in the same ways? How much does context matter? These are questions largely left unanswered in the literature on leadership development.

Leadership development has been identified as one of the critical outcomes of higher education in the United States (Astin & Astin, 2000; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association [NASPA & ACPA], 2004; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). College student leadership programs are multiplying and number more than 1,500 (Owen, 2012). Despite the college student leadership programmatic growth, there remain many questions about how and the extent to which college experiences influence leadership development (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006) because empirical research about leadership development has not maintained pace with the rapid expansion of leadership programs (Dugan, 2006b; Posner, 2004).

Extant leadership research (e.g., Dugan, 2006a, 2006b; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000;
Posner, 2004, 2009) is helpful, but questions remain about what predicts students’ leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2007, 2010). Research is particularly lagging in specific institutional contexts such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and PWIs, and among specific populations, such as African American/ Black students (Arminio et al., 2000; Dugan, 2011). Existing research on institutional contexts has largely focused on traditional characteristics such as size, type, and control, and the effects are typically trivial (Dugan, 2011; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). However, the HBCU institutional context may be a significant predictor of leadership development in a way similar to the demonstrated positive influence of all-female institutions on female students’ leadership development (e.g., Boatwright & Egidio, 2003; Whitt, 1994). Research has already shown the HBCU environment to have a positive effect on other educational outcomes (e.g., Allen, 1992; DeSousa & Kuh, 1996). Although HBCUs are not necessarily single-race environments, the majority of the student body is frequently African American/ Black meaning that leadership development among African American/ Black students may be higher at HBCUs because of the greater presence of African American/ Black peers and reduced stigma and social oppression associated with race that are prevalent at PWIs (Hawkins & Larabee, 2009).

This chapter introduces the topic of leadership development among African American/ Black college student populations at HBCUs and at PWIs. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the literature regarding African American/ Black students at HBCUs, followed by a synthesis of the leadership literature. The statement of the problem and guiding research questions follow. A section devoted to defining key terms
comes next and is followed by the significance of the study and a summary of the methods. The chapter concludes with a general summary.

**African American/ Black Student Leadership in College and at HBCUs**

Evidence of African American/ Black students in U.S. higher education dates to the early 1800s (Bowles & DeCosta, 1971; Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009), but only in more recent decades has this student population come to be included in the scope of higher education research. Many of the earliest colleges and universities for African American/ Black students were founded by Northern missionary organizations and White philanthropists (Anderson, 1988; Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Redd, 1998). Though these schools faced financial constraints and resistance from White legislators from their beginnings, they were the training grounds for generations of leaders within the African American/ Black communities of freed slaves (Anderson, 1988). Throughout the 1800s and into the 1950s, these colleges for African American/ Black students experienced great challenges and great successes. Following the Civil War, newly freed slaves were finally able to act on their yearning for education, leading to a rapid development of Black educational institutions (Anderson, 1988; Brown, Donahoo, & Bertrand, 2001).

The mass education of newly freed slaves was a significant step away from the previously illegal act of educating Black people in the U.S. (Brazzell, 1992; Brown, 1999). In the 1950s, multiple Supreme Court rulings brought about desegregation in the US education system (Brown v. Board, 1954; Hawkins v. Board of Control 1956). Through the Higher Education Act of 1965, the federal government officially defined the
previously Black-serving institutions as Historically Black, and set a legal precedent to
ensure that funds would always be set aside for these institutions under Title III.

As a result of the desegregation of educational institutions, the White-serving
institutions were mandated to open their doors to African American/ Black students.
Because PWIs were accustomed to a fully White population, they were not adequately
equipped to provide support for the needs of the incoming African American/ Black
students (Patton, 2006), whereas HBCUs were able to aid their students’ development in
a more supportive environment. As a result, the HBCUs have more frequently been
recognized as having educated many of the most important Black leaders such as W.E.B.
DuBois, Martin Luther King, Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Rosa Parks, and Toni Morrison.
Meanwhile, PWIs, though also a source of Black leaders, have more often been depicted
as places where Black students struggle to succeed in their higher education efforts as a
result of institutional oppression (e.g., Allen, 1992; Allen & Haniff, 1991; Fleming,
1984). The resulting challenges from the forced desegregation led to inequitable
experiences between White and African American/ Black students (Fries-Britt & Turner,
2002).

Scholars noted these differences in experience and have examined various aspects
of Black college students’ educational outcomes such as success rates and retention (e.g.,
Furr & Elling, 2002; Tinto, 1973), psychosocial and identity development (e.g., McEwen,
Roper, Bryant, & Langa, 1990; Pope, 1998), and involvement (e.g., Harper, Carini,
Bridges, & Hayek, 2004; Kimbrough & Hutcheson, 1998). However, research about the
intersection of race and leadership in general, and research about leadership among
African American/ Black student populations in college specifically, remains scant (e.g., Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008a). Furthermore, research about leadership development at HBCUs is virtually nonexistent.

**Defining Leadership**

Scholars in the field of leadership have not established a singular definition of the term. Instead, as Bass (2008) and Rost (1991) have noted, there are as many definitions for leadership as there are those who have studied it. Although the definitions of leadership are numerous, Rost (1991) proposed two paradigms of thought about leadership: the industrial paradigm (i.e., leader-centric, hierarchical, leadership as good management) and the postindustrial paradigm (i.e., leadership as relational, non-hierarchical, process-oriented, and value-centered). Rost (1991) argued that the paradigm shift from industrial to postindustrial occurred with the emergence of transforming leadership (Burns, 1978), though other scholars have argued that the paradigm shift really only occurred for White men because communities of color and women had already consistently been practicing relational and postindustrial approaches to leadership (Komives & Dugan, 2010).

The industrial paradigm of leadership consists of models that view leadership as leader-centric and more as good management (Rost, 1991). Examples of this approach to leadership include trait theory, skills approach, and path-goal theory. In each of these three examples leadership is based on what the leader does, a trait or set of traits, or a skill or set of skills a leader has that makes a leader a leader. The followers receive neither attention nor credit for their role in leadership.
Conversely, the postindustrial paradigm describes leadership as a mutual interaction between leader and follower; leadership is relational, transformative, non-hierarchical, process-oriented, and values-centered (Rogers, 2003; Rost, 1991). Two major examples of postindustrial thought include leadership that is transformational (Burns, 1978) and authentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Transformational leadership is a model in which “leadership is viewed as a mutual process focused on care for the follower and the pursuit of socially desirable ends” (Kezar et al., 2006, p. 38). Authentic leadership theory stemmed from work on transformational theory and is based in positive psychology and humanist philosophy (Kezar et al., 2006). This theory represents an area of leadership research still in its nascent stages (Komives & Dugan, 2010; Northouse, 2010).

Virtually all of the industrial and postindustrial theories described above were developed within organizational contexts. Only in the past two decades have scholars created models and theories specifically applicable to college student populations (Dugan & Komives, 2007). These college student models and theories fall under the postindustrial paradigm and consist of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner, 2004, 2009; Posner & Brodsky, 1992), the relational leadership model (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998, 2007), the leadership identity development model (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006), and the social change model of leadership development (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996). The social change model was adopted for use in this study because of its broad use on university and college campuses in the US (Kezar et al., 2006; Owen, 2012).
The social change model of leadership development (HERI, 1996) was the result of a collaborative effort by a group of higher education scholars and practitioners to design a leadership model specifically with college students in mind. In this model, leadership is defined as a “purposeful, collaborative, values-based process that leads to positive social change” (Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009, p. xii). Through the model, students develop across seven critical values (i.e., consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship; HERI, 1996). These seven values interact across three levels: individual (consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment), group (collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility), and societal (citizenship). The interaction of these three levels and seven values leads to an eighth and final core value of change for the common good (HERI, 1996). Tyree (1998) developed the term socially responsible leadership as the type of leadership one enacts when using the social change model.

**Statement of the Problem**

Because African American/Black students have become part of the scope of higher education research only in more recent decades, there remain fundamental questions about how the institutional contexts of HBCUs and PWIs influence African American/Black students’ leadership development. One of the questions about college student leadership development pertains to what the predictors of leadership in African American/Black student populations are at HBCUs and PWIs. This is problematic because without an understanding of what interventions, environmental factors, or activities facilitate leadership development within African American/Black student
populations, it is difficult to have an intentional approach to achieving the core collegiate outcome of leadership development.

Emerging research is beginning to address unique leadership development considerations associated with race and racial identity (Dugan, 2011; Dugan, Kodama, & Gebhardt, 2012; Harper & Quaye, 2007), but evidence in this area is still limited and no known studies have simultaneously considered differences in the collegiate environment attributable to HBCU status. In other words, there is a lack of clarity about the differences between African American/Black student leadership development at HBCUs and PWIs. Obtaining this information can inform educators as they work with African American/Black students in both settings and serve as a foundation for research-based practices.

African American/Black leadership in society has been historically overlooked in the U.S. (Ospina & Foldy, 2009). This is an issue because not only has it been present, but also strong (Marable, 1998; Walters & Smith, 1999). Socially responsible leadership is an approach to leadership that not only aligns with the collective, group-oriented leadership approach that has been in place within the African American/Black community, but it is also applicable in other communities as well (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Preskill & Brookfield, 2009). Socially responsible leadership is a kind of leadership that “levels the playing field” because it is no longer only about the person(s) in positions of power, but about the collective whole and the collaborative effort of the masses toward the common good.
Because previous research has not captured data from the HCBU environment regarding socially responsible leadership development, gaps exist in the knowledge base that informs theory and practice in the higher education field. Research that examines the conditional effect of institutional contexts of HBCUs together with PWIs on African American/Black student leadership development is overdue (Pascarella, 2006). Research about socially responsible leadership and its roles in the collegiate experiences of African American/Black students is important to examine because the ideals behind and involved in socially responsible leadership may facilitate the development of African American/Black leaders that are active both in college and in society at-large. Socially responsible leadership is a fitting model of leadership for higher education settings and in society at-large because of its social justice focus, its inherent inclusivity, and recognition of both positional and non-positional aspects of leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000; HERI, 1996). More importantly, socially responsible leadership, with its inclusion of community values, aligns with values found within the African American/Black leadership tradition that lean toward community orientation and racial uplift (Arminio et al., 2000; Bordas, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2007).

The nurturing environment frequently described in the literature (e.g., Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Hirt, Amelink, McFeeters, & Strayhorn, 2008; Palmer & Gasman, 2008) suggests that HBCUs provide an ideal training ground for development of leadership capacities because of their empowering educational setting (e.g., Palmer, 2010). Despite what seems to be an ideal place to pursue undergraduate studies, the statistics show that a large majority of African American/Black students are now
enrolled at PWIs (Aud, Fox, & KewalRamani, 2010). Scholars (e.g., Allen, 1992; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001) have suggested that PWIs do not appear to be as effective in facilitating the development of African American/Black students or addressing their specific needs. This is a serious and troubling problem that could be attenuated in the area of leadership development if there were clearer evidence identifying unique predictors within each context.

Research aimed specifically at understanding the leadership development of African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs would inform the higher education field by providing empirical evidence of effective practices in working with African American/Black student populations. In addition, this type of inquiry would be of mutual benefit to HBCUs and PWIs, giving insight into what practices or environmental features most strongly effect leadership development. Though some features may not be replicable (e.g., campus racial composition), helpful practices can be particularly effective if they are evidence-based. With the aid of well-conceived research, the experiences of African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs can be better understood, leading to a more purposeful focus on development for future generations of Black leaders. This current investigation is designed with this research gap in mind and uses the following two questions as its guide:

1. Are there statistically significant differences in socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/Black students attending HBCUs and African American/Black students attending PWIs during college?
2. Are there differences in the types of college experiences that predict socially responsible leadership capacity for African American/Black college students in HBCUs and PWIs?

Definition of Terms

Defining Leadership Development, Capacity, and Efficacy

According to Komives et al. (2006), “Leadership development involves engaging with learning opportunities in one’s environment over time to build one’s capacity or efficacy to engage in leadership. This developmental approach entails moving from simple to more complex dimensions of growth” (p. 402). This definition of leadership development suggests that leadership can be learned and that the understanding of leadership changes over time from simplistic to more complex. Leadership capacity is defined as one’s enacted leadership beliefs, style, approach, and abilities (Dugan, 2011; Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, & Harms, 2008). Capacity for leadership is best understood and measurable when it is framed within a theoretical model such as the social change model.

Leadership efficacy refers to one’s internal belief to enact leadership capacity in groups or across positional boundaries (Dugan, 2011). Leadership efficacy, which is grounded in cognitive theory, stems from Bandura’s (1997) research about self-efficacy when performing general tasks. In quantitative research, efficacy has been the single greatest predictor of leadership capacity (e.g., Dugan, Rossetti Morosini, & Beazley, 2011a).
Defining HBCUs and PWIs

HBCUs are defined by the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, as:

Any historically Black college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of Black Americans, and that is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary [of Education] to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation. (as cited in Provasnik, Shafer, & Snyder, 2004, p. 104)

There are 105 HBCUs located in Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The HBCUs have categorizations of public and private, two-year and four-year, and single sex and coeducational HBCUs.

PWIs are defined as institutions with a student body demographic largely consisting of White students. This institution type represents the largest number of institutions of higher education in the U.S. Scholars have also referred to these institutions as Traditionally White Institutions and Historically White Colleges and Universities, based on the argument that these institutions of education were created to educate the upper echelons of White citizens, and intentionally precluded African American/Black people from being educated.

Defining the Sample Population

The population studied in this dissertation consists of individuals who self-identified as African American/Black in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) survey. Within this demographic group there is a range of ethnicities, but for the
sake of consistency and clarity, this study uses the term “African American/ Black(s)” to reference members of these various backgrounds. Although I do not believe the varied backgrounds of the participants to be insignificant, for this project I maintain this singular identifier because the purpose of this research is more focused on an institutional characteristic than an individual characteristic. From the foundation established through this study, it will be possible to explore more deeply the ethnic populations within the larger African American/ Black community.

**Significance of the Study**

This study is significant for at least four reasons. First, the study offers the possibility to examine a different institutional characteristic than previous studies. HBCUs, which potentially have the greatest impact on leadership development among African American/ Black students, have not been explored in the leadership literature. Research has already suggested that there are differential impacts on leadership development between women at coeducational schools in comparison to single sex institutions (Astin, 1993; Astin & Leland, 1991; Kinzie, Thomas, Palmer, Mach, & Kuh, 2007; Whitt, 1994). A parallel effect may exist between African American/ Black students at HBCUs, where previous research demonstrated positive effects on other educational outcomes (e.g., Allen, 1992).

Second, it further contributes to the understanding of the African American/ Black student experience in U.S. higher education. There are studies that examine African American/ Black students at HBCUs and PWIs on a broader scale (e.g., Allen, 1992; Fleming, 1984; Gurin & Epps, 1975). These foundational studies shed light on the
experiences of African American/ Black college students and are continuously cited and helpful, but they are limited in quantity and scope, and they are outdated as a result of college environments and social structures having changed since the research was conducted. These studies serve as a guide for understanding what may be predictive for leadership development among African American/ Black college students, but there is no research that specifically examines socially responsible leadership development among African American/ Black students at HBCUs and PWIs.

Third, the study sheds light on African American/ Black college student leadership development at HBCUs and PWIs and offers research-supported ways to ensure that, regardless of educational context, African American/ Black student leadership development will be designed and delivered using evidence-based practice grounded in empirical research. Research of this nature on college student experiences is important for guiding policy and programming initiatives, particularly for underrepresented populations at PWIs (Garland, 2010).

Finally, this study builds on a growing body of college student leadership development literature that uses a systematic, theoretically grounded approach to measure leadership development – socially responsible leadership – based on the social change model (HERI, 1996). Previous studies (e.g., Antonio, 2001; Astin, 1993; Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Smart, Ethington, Riggs, & Thompson, 2002; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999) used a more “scattershot,” atheoretical approach to measuring leadership using various constructs that do not measure leadership specifically. For example, some studies define leadership from
a positional perspective, thereby not aligning with postindustrial understandings of leadership and confounding research implications (Dugan, 2011).

**Methods Summary**

This quantitative study employed a cross-sectional, causal comparative design in a secondary analysis of data collected using the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). The MSL is an international research project designed to inform educators about college student leadership development. Through examination of data gathered through the MSL, it is possible to examine the impact of various curricular and co-curricular experiences on the development of students’ leadership capacity within the higher education context (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

The sample for this study consisted of data collected during the MSL iterations of 2009 and 2011 at 136 institutions in the U.S. Of the participating universities, three were HBCUs (two in 2009 and one in 2011). Participating universities self-selected for involvement and random samples of students within participating universities were solicited to complete the MSL instrument. Schools with over 4,000 students used random samples while those with less than that used full population samples. The total sample size for 2009 was 346,067, of which 118,733 responded, a 34% return rate; 94,367 respondents completed 90% of the survey or more (Dugan, Komives, & Associates, 2009). With the exception of the Historically Black College that participated in the 2011 iteration, all data analyzed for this study were drawn from the 2009 data. The sample size of the HBCUs was 828. A matched, random sample of 828 African American/ Black
students from the national sample at PWIs was selected for comparative analysis with those from the HBCUs, for a total sample size of 1,656 students.

The MSL survey consisted of new and pre-existing scales compiled specifically for use in the national study. Reliability and validity were established through pilot studies and significant psychometric testing (Dugan, Komives, & Associates, 2009). The first research question was addressed using independent samples t-tests to distinguish statistically significant differences and similarities between the student populations at HBCUs and PWIs. Effect size measures were used to interpret the magnitude of any differences. The second research question involved calculating two separate multiple hierarchical regressions – one each for the HBCU and PWI samples – in seven blocks following a modified inputs-environments-outputs (IEO) model (Astin, 1991).

Chapter Summary

This study builds on previous literature in the area of college student leadership development. Significant contributions to the higher education knowledge base include an in-depth examination of predictors that lead to socially responsible leadership development among African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs using a theoretically grounded measure of leadership development. The results provide an opportunity to improve practices through the identification of empirically supported educational interventions that can be used with the African American/Black student populations specifically enrolled at HBCUs and PWIs. The next chapter consists of a comprehensive review of literature related to this study. The third chapter offers a detailed outline of the methodology used in the study. In chapter four, the findings of the
study are presented in detail. The fifth and final chapter is made up of an interpretation of the findings in the context of previous literature, research and practice implications, limitations of the study, and a final conclusion.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter consists of an overview of the evolution of leadership theory, followed by a more specific review of college leadership models. The second section includes a review of college impact findings at HBCUs and PWIs. The third section presents an overview of student development theories – cognitive structural theories, psychosocial theories, and Black racial identity. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Evolution of Leadership Theory

Bass (2008) posited that leadership is the world’s oldest vocation. It has been described as a universal phenomenon that is built into our psyche from childhood through adulthood (Bass, 2008). In their analyses, both Bass (2008) and Dorfman (1996) traced the historical foundations of leadership to the time of the ancient Egyptians (dating to 2300 B.C.E.), citing the existence of hieroglyphics that symbolized leader, leadership, and follower. Bass (2008) and Dorfman (1996) continued their traces of leaders and leadership through Confucian China (sixth century B.C.E.); the Greece of Plato, Aristotle, and Alexander the Great; the Roman Empire of the Caesars; and the Renaissance Italy of Machiavelli. Brungardt (1996) noted that, despite the long history of leadership, it has only recently received the attention of scholars attempting to understand how leaders develop.
Part of the challenge of understanding leadership and how it is developed is rooted in the lack of clarity around how leadership is defined. Bass (1990) stated, “There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 11). Burns (1978) added, “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena in the world” (p. 2). Rost (1991), in his critical analysis of leadership theory and theorists, remarked that scholars in the academic discipline of leadership studies have muddled what leadership is and have been content to accept “definitional ambiguity and confusion” and that the discipline of leadership studies “has a culture of definitional permissiveness and relativity” (p. 6). Rost (1991) went so far as to suggest that scholars are not writing about leadership, but rather its peripheral elements. Therefore, it should be no surprise that there is a lack of clarity around the definition of the term.

Definitions of leadership are numerous, but categorizations of the leadership theories and schools of thought are fewer and more readily agreed upon by scholars. Dorfman (1996) suggested that the leadership field has passed through three distinct eras: trait, behavior, and contingency. Rost (1991) suggested a more simplified understanding of leadership theories with his dichotomous categorization of theory as being of the industrial paradigm or postindustrial paradigm. From Rost’s (1991) perspective, each of Dorfman’s (1996) three eras of leadership theory falls under the industrial paradigm.

Although Rost (1991) noted a paradigm shift from industrial to postindustrial in his analysis, some scholars have argued that people of color and women have long been using post-industrial approaches and this has been co-opted by White men, who have
historically held positions of leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2011; Komives & Dugan, 2010). What follows is a broadly stated description of the evolution of leadership theory using Rost’s (1991) classification of industrial theories and postindustrial theories, and how the college student leadership models were developed. It is important to interpret this review, however, through the critical lens that scholars have presented. This involves recognizing the normative assumptions – particularly related to race and gender – that inform the evolution of theory.

**Industrial Paradigm**

Industrial paradigm leadership is leader-centric, hierarchical, rational, and focused on achieving goals in organizational settings (Rost, 1991). In this paradigm, leadership is seen as positional in nature and the follower is only included in theory insofar as the extent to and manner in which a leader can influence the follower (Komives & Dugan, 2010). Theories associated with the industrial paradigm include great man (mid-1800s-early 1900s), trait (1904-1947), behavioral (1950s to early 1980s), situational and contingency (1950s-1960s), and influence (1920s-1977; Komives et al., 2007).

**Great man and trait theories.** Great man theory was predicated on the assumption that leaders are born, not made (Komives et al., 2007). Trait theory research – which Bass (2008) referred to as the modern study of leadership – began around the turn of the 20th century (Dorfman, 1996). Researchers focused their attention on the traits of great leaders. They believed that examining the leadership practices of historical figures like Julius Caesar, Napoleon Bonaparte, or George Washington would guide them in their search for a definition of what makes a leader (Northouse, 2010). Though this line of
research is backed by a century of study, scholars have been unable to arrive at a singular list of traits that defines an ideal leader or an ideal approach to leadership (Northouse, 2010). The great man and trait theories are subject to the social construction of gender and race, thereby typically limiting research subjects to those who were White male, upper-class, heterosexual, and able-bodied (Dugan & Komives, 2011).

Stogdill’s (1948) review of 124 leadership studies drew trait theory into question, stating:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leaders must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of the interaction of variables [that] are in constant flux and change. (p. 64)

In other words, the success of leaders may vary from situation to situation – for example, a military commander may not make a strong college president. Though Stogdill’s (1948) review marked a shift in research away from traits and personalities to a focus on situations and contexts, Stogdill maintained a belief that traits were an important factor in leadership (Bass, 2008). Scholars (e.g., Bass, 2008; Dorfman, 1996) have suggested that the trait theory has been scientifically disproven. Rost (1991) contended that trait theory research has not been abandoned. Instead, leadership theorists (e.g., Zaccaro, 2007) continue to draw on trait theory in their research and attempt to reframe it with the context of contemporary leadership theory.

**Contingency and situational theories.** In response to the shortcomings of the trait theory research, leadership scholars shifted their attention to behavioral approaches to leadership, and contingency and situational approaches – Dorfman’s (1996) second
and third eras of research. Behavioral approaches to leadership remained leader-centric and focused solely on what the leader does and how the leader behaves (Dorfman, 1996; Northouse, 2010). Behavioral approaches were divided into two independent categories: task-oriented behaviors and relationship-oriented behaviors (Dorfman, 1996; House & Aditya, 1997). Task-oriented behaviors facilitate goal accomplishment while relationship-oriented behaviors help subordinates build connections with each other while becoming comfortable in their roles (Northouse, 2010). Despite a 30-year dedication to leader behavior research (House & Aditya, 1997), scholars were unsuccessful at finding a universal pattern of behaviors that led to subordinate satisfaction or leadership effectiveness.

Contingency and situational theories of leadership such as the path-goal theory of leader effectiveness (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974), life cycle theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982), and cognitive resource theory (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987) factored in situational circumstances that may influence the effectiveness of a leader’s behavior or style of leadership (Yukl, 2010). These theories were based on the assumption that one particular set of leadership traits, behaviors, or styles do not automatically make a leader effective in every case (Dorfman, 1996). Instead, each situation – or contingency – calls for a different leadership trait, behavior, or style. Determining which approach would be most effective for the situation is determined by the leaders’ evaluation of their followers’ competence for a task (Northouse, 2010).
Postindustrial Paradigm

Rost’s (1991) postindustrial paradigm defined leadership as more relational, transformative, non-hierarchical, process-oriented, and values-centered (Rogers, 2003; Rost, 1991). Burns’s (1978) transforming leadership is oft cited as the shift into the postindustrial paradigm (Rost, 1991), though House and Aditya (1997) asserted that House’s (1977) charismatic leadership theory was also influential in the paradigmatic shift. The two conceptualizations of leadership as transforming and charismatic are similar, if not synonymous with each other (Northouse, 2010), and have been included in much research since. The more open and inclusive nature of the postindustrial paradigm opened researchers’ eyes to the need to consider gender and race in leadership, although this research has often lacked the necessary sophistication to address the topic adequately (Ospina & Foldy, 2009).

Transformational leadership. Burns’s (1978) transforming leadership, though still rather leader-centric (Bryman as cited in Northouse, 2010), highlighted a moral and ethical obligation to attend to the needs of followers. Bass (1985) expanded on Burns’s model – calling his model transformational leadership – and differentiated between transforming and transactional leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2011), placing the two types of leadership on opposing ends of a continuum (Northouse, 2010). Transactional leadership involves a leader motivating followers to stay on task in exchange for a reward, which can promote a self-interested approach (Dorfman, 1996). By comparison, transformational leadership is about using charisma and individual attention to inspire followers to look beyond their self-interests in favor of the good of accomplishing a task.
Moreover, this transformational leadership theory emphasized the moral obligation and duty of leaders to uplift, empower, and motivate their followers toward common goals (e.g., Northouse, 2010).

**Chaos theory.** Chaos theory was designed in response to the perception by researchers that there was more to leadership than what contingency theory suggested, that is, a leader matched a style to a task or the followers’ preference (Kezar et al., 2006). It acknowledged the complexity involved with leadership at individual, organization, and societal levels, and the interaction among those levels (Dugan & Komives, 2011). Chaos theory "demonstrates that leadership is the practice of combining simple rules that are adaptive to multiple local conditions” (Kezar et al., 2006, p. 41) and that leadership is a complex, constantly changing process occurring at multiple levels within an organizational context.

**Authentic leadership.** Authentic leadership has been described as the multi-level, multi-dimensional root construct that underlies all positive forms of leadership and leadership development (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Being a root construct means that “one can practice authentic approaches to other forms of leadership (e.g., authentic transforming leadership)” (Komives & Dugan, 2010, p. 116). This theory is based in positive psychology and humanist philosophy (Kezar et al., 2006) and represents an area of leadership research that is still in its foundational stages (Komives & Dugan, 2010; Northhouse, 2010). Scholars have defined authentic leadership from intrapersonal, developmental, and interpersonal perspectives (Northhouse, 2010).
From the intrapersonal perspective, authentic leadership is centered on the leader and what goes on within the leader (Northouse, 2010). Developmental authentic leadership is something that stems from a lifetime of experience and nurturing and is not a trait (Northouse, 2010). Using a developmental approach, scholars have suggested that authentic leadership consists of four types of behavior: self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson as cited in Northouse, 2010). Finally, the interpersonal authentic leadership is something that stems from relations and interactions between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2010). Authentic leaders are true to themselves and are concerned for their followers; they are self-aware, motivated by ethics and personal convictions instead of status, and they perform beyond expectations and encourage their followers to do the same (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

**Cultural and global leadership.** Theorists began the examination of the influence of culture on leadership, and vice versa, in the 1980s (Kezar et al., 2006). These studies focused on how leadership functions in a complex social system and incorporated organizational values in ways not previously included in leadership research (Kezar et al., 2006). Cultural theorists examined organizations and the influence leaders had on shaping culture within the organization (Northouse, 2010). In addition, cultural leadership studies have examined ways in which a leader’s culture (e.g., ethnicity [Kezar, 2002] or gender [e.g., Astin & Leland, 1991]) may influence leadership, though to a much lesser extent.
Two major global leadership projects by Hofstede (1980, 2001) and House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) examined leadership in organizational settings on a global level. The abovementioned projects led to five and nine cultural dimensions, respectively, on which cultural variables affected how leadership was developed and perceived. It would follow, then, that if culture on a global level had a measurable impact on leadership development and perception, culture on a domestic level – specifically race – would also have a measurable impact on leadership development and perception. The inclusion of culture in leadership theory has demonstrated that factors such as race have an influence on leadership (Chin, 2010). As already stated, scholars have posited that a paradigm shift occurred when leadership scholars re-conceptualized leadership as more process-oriented and inclusive of followers’ needs. Some research (e.g., Dugan & Komives, 2011; Ospina & Foldy, 2009) suggested that the paradigm shift was only a change in approach for those in a privileged position (i.e., male, White, upper and upper-middle class) because communities of color have practiced process-oriented, community-focused leadership for generations (Bordas, 2007).

**College Student Models**

Scholars and national associations alike have called on educational institutions to be true to their mission of developing future generations of leaders (Astin & Astin, 2000; NASPA & ACPA, 2004). With the attention drawn toward higher education and scrutiny placed on institutions of higher education to deliver the intended outcomes – leadership development being one of them – a more intentional approach to leadership education has been used during the past 10-15 years (Dugan & Komives, 2007, 2011). This
intentionality led to the design of several theories and models that are consistent with the postindustrial paradigm (Komives et al., 2007) and the study thereof. Although not all of the post-industrial models were created for specific use with college students, some of them have become popular and more widely used among student affairs practitioners and leadership educators, as well as adapted for use with college students (Komives et al., 2007).

**Servant leadership.** Greenleaf proposed the concept of the leader as servant, or “servant leadership,” which became his 1977 book title (Rogers, 2003; Yukl, 2010). Evolving out of Herman Hesse’s *Journey to the East*, Greenleaf began to understand that a great leader must be seen as a servant first (Greenleaf, 2007). Servant leaders gain the support of their followers by serving and empowering them. Servant leaders, perhaps best exemplified in historical figures like Mahatma Gandhi and Mother Theresa, are service-oriented and are most focused on how best to serve the needs of their followers (Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2010).

The concepts behind leadership through service are in line with the postindustrial paradigm and remind leaders of the importance of ethics and relationships with others in their organizations. However, as Yukl (2010) pointed out, this model describes a potentially dangerous level of emphasis on the followers by the leader. Perhaps more importantly, servant leadership was adapted into higher education through models like service learning, not created specifically for use with college students. The servant leadership model maintains a leader-centric view of leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2011) and has not been empirically tested.
Leadership challenge. The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, 2008) describes five practices of exemplary leadership. Though initially created for the business world, Leadership Challenge was adapted for the college student leadership field in the form of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory, or S-LPI (Posner & Brodsky, 1992). The five practices of exemplary leadership are Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. Model the Way consists of clarifying personal values and setting an example to follow as a means to establish credibility and a set of shared values with colleagues. The practice of Inspire a Shared Vision involves envisioning the future for oneself as well as others and creating excitement and belief in the vision of the future. Student leaders are people who Challenge the Process, or confront a system (or systems) to promote innovative change for the betterment of practices, products, or services. To Enable Others to Act, student leaders foster collaboration and strengthen others through delegation. This practice targets the group process that is to the mutual benefit of all individuals involved. The last exemplary practice is Encourage the Heart. Student leaders who exhibit this behavior do so through recognition of individual and group contributions to a project or process, and through celebration of these contributions (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

Kouzes and Posner’s (2008) exemplary leadership practices model aligns with the postindustrial leadership paradigm insofar as it emphasizes that leadership is a process and it is a set of learnable skills that everyone can do. Although this model was adapted for college students, the S-LPI (Posner & Brodsky, 1992) is drawn from a business-based model. This model is largely behavioral and could be critiqued that these five behaviors
may not necessarily work in every situation. In addition, the model is still leader-centric and is prescriptive in nature (Northouse, 2010). In other words, this model suggests that if a leader develops the five practices, a leader would be effective, which may not necessarily be true.

**Relational leadership.** Komives et al. (1998, 2007) based the relational leadership model on the premise that leadership is “a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive things” (p. 74). Relational leadership deemphasizes that leadership comes from a person in a formal leadership role, thus aligning with the postindustrial paradigm. This model was developed specifically for college students and emphasizes reciprocal relationships (Dugan & Komives, 2011). Relational leadership consists of five primary components – process-orientation, purposefulness, ethics, inclusivity, and empowerment – within the framework of “knowing-being-doing” (Komives et al., 2007). As Dugan and Komives (2011) noted, this model may not resonate with students who hold leadership as a positional concept. Like the social change model (HERI, 1996), this model promotes the social responsibility component of leadership. Relational leadership also serves as the foundation for the leadership identity development model, presented in greater detail later in this chapter. However, unlike the social change model (HERI, 1996), relational leadership remains largely untested in empirical research.

**Social change model.** The social change model of leadership development (HERI, 1996) was created by an ensemble of higher education scholars and practitioners. It was the first leadership model developed specifically with college students in mind. In
the model, leadership is defined as a “purposeful, collaborative, values-based process that leads to positive social change” (Komives et al., 2009a, p. xii). The model consists of seven interrelated and interacting values – the so-called “Seven Cs.” These values operate on the individual (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment), group (collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility) and societal (citizenship) levels. The interaction of these seven core values leads to an eighth and final value of change for the common good (HERI, 1996).

Consciousness of self refers to the knowledge of oneself in the senses of personality and mindfulness. This value also includes an understanding of personal values. It is important for the remaining values of the model because without an understanding of oneself, it is difficult to work effectively with others. Congruence is defined as acting in accord with one’s values and beliefs. Commitment is the intentional investment of psychological and physical effort to the leadership development process (HERI, 1996).

Collaboration, the first of the three group level values, is defined as coming together to work toward a common goal through shared responsibility in the process. Collaboration is also about how people value and relate to each other across differences. Common Purpose is about working with others toward a shared goal. It refers to the process of developing and embracing a shared vision. Controversy with Civility is the leadership process of understanding varying perspectives and resolving any disagreements through honest, open dialogue. This controversy is beneficial in the leadership development process because it empowers group members, gives them a voice
in all conversations, and also allows group members the opportunity to challenge the status quo. The Citizenship value implies social and civic responsibility and serves as the link of an individual to the larger group, community, or society (HERI, 1996).

Figure 1. Theoretical Model: Social Change Model of Leadership Development

Since its development, the social change model has become one of the most widely used leadership models on US college campuses (Kezar et al., 2006; Owen, 2012). Socially responsible leadership is a term coined by Tyree (1998) that describes the enactment of leadership consistent with the social change model and is “an approach to leadership that maintains a sense of responsibility for the welfare of others as the group goes about its business” (Komives et al., 2009a). In addition, scholars have used the social change model as a foundation for a leadership scale to measure socially responsible leadership capacity among college students (Dugan, 2006c; Tyree, 1998). As a result of the increasing amount of research conducted with this model as the theoretical
framework, scholars and practitioners have a better understanding of college student leadership, but there remain questions related to how students develop the leadership capacities described in the “7 Cs.” Figure 1 shows a conceptual representation of the social change model.

**College Impact, College Student Leadership, and College Student Development**

Research on college student leadership development is a relatively new line of inquiry that has gained scholars’ attention in the past 20 years (Komives, 2011). As a result of the novelty of this line of research, it should come as no surprise that the same issues that present problems in the broader leadership research are also problematic in college student leadership research. For example, the definition of leadership in college student leadership literature is equally elusive or, when offered, is often inconsistent or inaccurate (Dugan, 2011). An example of an inconsistent definition would be the use of leadership in terms of positional authority, a concept counter to the postindustrial paradigm (Dugan, 2011). Inaccurate definitions deal more with two key concepts of capacity and efficacy. Leadership capacity “can be thought of as a student’s enacted leadership beliefs, style, and approach” (Dugan, 2011, p. 61), while leadership efficacy, which influences capacity, is an internal belief that one has the ability to enact leadership capacity successfully (Hannah et al., 2008). Although capacity and efficacy are different, they are not frequently distinguished in empirical studies. The ambiguity, inconsistency, and inaccuracy of definitions in college student leadership research confound research implications and make comparisons difficult (Dugan, 2011).
College student leadership research is part of a broader range of research on college impact, which seeks to determine the value of collegiate experiences and education (Dugan & Komives, 2011; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The body of literature on college impact is substantial and contains explorations of critical outcomes such as cognitive development, educational attainment, critical thinking, and persistence (Dugan & Komives, 2011), some of which consists of comparative examinations of the experiences of African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Below is a review and critique of leadership research related specifically to college student populations, followed by a synthesis of college impact research at HBCUs and PWIs.

**College Student Leadership**

Dugan and Komives (2010) classified college student leadership research by four themes: pre-college knowledge and experience, the collegiate environment and experience, self-efficacy, and demographic group membership. These themes provide a useful way to understand the effects college has on leadership development. The four themes do not provide a uniform definition of leadership used in the various studies, but they demonstrate the relationship between leadership development and each theme.

**Pre-college factors.** Despite inconsistencies in definitions, findings in the first theme suggest that pre-college leadership capacity and knowledge rank among significant predictors of college leadership capacity (Antonio, 2001; Dugan et al., 2011a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Smart et al., 2002) and efficacy (Dugan, Garland, Jacoby, Gasiorski, 2008b). Pre-college factors are not only important for students in the US, but for international students as well. Dugan et al. (2011a) found pre-college experiences have a
positive relationship with leadership experiences on the international level through a cross-cultural study. Considering that students are usually at least 18 years old when coming to college, it makes sense that pre-collegiate knowledge and experience account for significant amounts of variance in quantitative studies and emerge as relevant in qualitative studies (Dugan, 2011).

**College experience and environment.** The second theme of the empirical findings is the influence of college experience and college environments on student leadership development. Research has rather consistently shown students’ leadership capacities increase during college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), though the precise reasons for the increase are not always agreed upon among studies. Although the ways in which leadership was measured were not consistent among studies, research has indicated a number of experiential and environmental factors such as on- and off-campus involvement, positional leadership roles, and peer interaction that frequently share a positive predictive relationship with leadership development.

A number of studies revealed that involvement in campus activities and organizations leads to increases in leadership capacity (Antonio, 2001; Astin, 1993; Dugan, 2006b; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Komives et al., 2006; Smart et al., 2002). Formal leadership training also has a significant impact on the development of leadership skills (Cress et al., 2001; Dugan 2006b; Dugan et al., 2008a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Posner, 2009; Whitt, 1994; Zimmernan-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). In Dugan and Komives (2010), the length of the leadership programs also made a difference in predictive power for leadership development. Short and medium-length
programs were more predictive than long programs, a finding replicated by Dugan, Bohle, Gebhardt, Hofert, Wilk, and Cooney (2011b).

Positional roles have also been shown to be important experiences that lead to the development of leadership abilities (Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994; Dugan, 2006b; Dugan et al., 2008a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004; Smart et al., 2002). These roles reflect a variety of organizations and activities including student government, resident assistants, and Greek organizations. Non-positional participation in Greek organizations also appeared to increase leadership development (Antonio, 2001; Kimbrough, 1995; Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001), though some studies have shown the contrary (Cress et al., 2001). The contradictory findings may be a result of not using a consistent, theoretically grounded definition of leadership in these studies. Another explanation may stem in differences among Historically Black or Latino fraternities and sororities, and predominantly White fraternities and sororities.

Increased leadership development has also been found to be a result of off-campus activities such as community service and volunteer work (Astin, Keup, & Lindholm, 2002; Astin & Sax, 1998; Cress et al., 2001; Dugan, 2006b; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Thompson, 2006). In two other studies, internships also emerged as having a significant predictive effect on leadership development (Cress et al., 2001; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000).

Interpersonal relationships are important for leadership development. As mentioned above, the building of mentoring relationships with faculty members was predictive of greater leadership development in multiple studies (Astin, 1993; Dugan &
Komives, 2007; Komives et al., 2006; Thompson, 2006). Astin (1993) suggested that peers are among the most influential of all environmental factors, though Dugan et al. (2011a) did not find peer influence to have any significant predictive power. A study by Campbell, Smith, Dugan, and Komives (2012) suggested that mentoring relationships with student affairs professionals predict increases in leadership capacity. Sociocultural conversations – interactions with peers across or about difference (e.g., racial, political, religious) – have consistently ranked among the most powerful leadership development predictors (Antonio, 2001; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Dugan, et al. 2011a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000).

**Leadership efficacy.** Leadership efficacy, the third theme, is the internal belief that one can enact leadership capacity successfully (Dugan, 2011). It emerges from Bandura’s (1977, 1997) theoretical work on self-efficacy. Self-efficacy “refers to beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Bandura (1997) suggested that efficacy affects nearly every aspect of a person’s life, including how one thinks, motivates oneself, how one feels, and how one acts.

Efficacy beliefs are derived from four principal sources: enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states (Bandura, 1977, 1997). Enactive mastery experiences are the most powerful sources of efficacy because they give the best demonstration of whether an individual has the capability to perform a given task (Bandura, 1997). Individuals develop efficacy through vicarious experiences when they see others perform a task and believe they
would be able to replicate the task. Efficacy is built through verbal persuasion when individuals reevaluate themselves as a result of others telling them they have the necessary capabilities for a given goal. When individuals who are stressed or anxious about the ability to accomplish a task still accomplish the task, they build efficacy through physiological and affective states (Stage, 1996). These four sources are not mutually exclusive and efficacy may be derived from one or many of these sources. The efficacy resultant from these four sources varies in strength and is not unchangeable over time, but it is durable (Bandura, 1997).

As it relates to leadership, self-efficacy has received little research attention (Hannah et al., 2008). Though present, the amount of research on self-efficacy in college student leadership is limited (Dugan & Komives, 2010). This is surprising considering the recognized link between leadership and efficacy (McCormick, 2001).

In a master’s thesis, Fincher (2008) examined the leadership self-efficacy of college students with a learning disability and found that campus climate was a positive predictor of leadership efficacy. Fincher (2008) also found that being Asian Pacific Americans (APA) or having an off-campus job negatively affected leadership efficacy. Campus climate was positively predictive of leadership efficacy. Dugan et al. (2008a) similarly showed students in APA populations to have the lowest leadership efficacy scores among dependent (living with parent or guardian) and independent (living alone or with person other than parent or guardian) commuter student populations. In the same study, participation in off-campus organizations and short/moderate length leadership programs for dependent commuter students had positive influences on leadership efficacy.
Not participating in a formal leadership program negatively affected leadership efficacy among independent commuters. Mentoring relationships with employers, leadership positions in on-campus groups, and sociocultural conversations with peers for both dependent and independent commuter students (Dugan et al., 2008b). It is interesting to note the overlap that leadership roles in on-campus organizations in Fincher’s (2008) study were also significant (at the \( p < .01 \) level), but did not reach the researcher’s cutoff point for significance and was therefore not ultimately cited as predictive.

Bardou, Byrne, Pasternak, Perez, and Rainey (2003) and Endress (2000) both examined leadership efficacy using the S-LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 1988; Posner & Brodsky, 1992). Bardou et al. (2003) found that gender, campus environment, and previous leadership experiences influenced levels of efficacy. Women in the study tended to have equal or higher levels of efficacy than men, though the findings were not statistically significant except on the S-LPI construct of Modeling the Way, on which women scored higher. Endress (2000) also found that women rated themselves as more efficacious than men. Findings from these two studies must be interpreted with a great deal of caution because the S-LPI is not an instrument that specifically measures leadership efficacy, but rather self-reported behaviors.

Dugan et al. (2008a) showed that women demonstrated lower leadership efficacy than men. There are at least three possible reasons for this difference. First, Bardou et al. (2003) and Endress (2000) used single institution samples while Dugan et al. (2008a) drew from a multi-institutional sample. Second, Dugan et al. (2008b) focused their
attention on commuter students instead of “traditional” students who often live on campus. Finally, as noted above and perhaps most importantly, Bardou et al. (2003) and Endress (2000) used the S-LPI, an instrument that does not specifically measure efficacy, while Dugan et al. (2008b) employed a theoretically grounded scale of efficacy for measurement.

Dugan, Fath, Howes, Lavelle, and Polanin (2012c) recently conducted a study of leadership efficacy among women in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) fields of study. Their findings suggested women in STEM majors and non-STEM majors reported having the same leadership capacity, but women STEM majors reported lower leadership efficacy. The study also found that APA students reported the lowest leadership efficacy among all racial groups, a repeated finding from Dugan et al. (2008b) and Fincher’s (2008) previous work. In addition, pre-collegiate experiences, a sense of belonging at the student’s university, sociocultural conversations, off-campus employment, and community service emerged as positively predictive of gains in leadership efficacy.

In studies of student leadership at women’s colleges, efficacy is indirectly addressed by the suggestion that students at all-women’s colleges have opportunities to participate in leadership at a greater rate than those who attend co-educational institutions. First, with more leadership opportunities, women’s colleges give chances for women to learn by doing, thereby developing efficacy through enactive mastery. Second, vicarious experiences are made possible through seeing other female positional leaders that are present in greater number on women’s campuses. Finally, women’s colleges
build efficacy through verbal persuasion, which may occur at a greater rate than at a co-
educational college (Arminio et al., 2000; Renn & Lytle, 2010; Romano, 1996).

**Demographic group membership.** The final theme is the relationship between
demographic group membership (i.e., gender, sexual orientation, gender orientation, and race and ethnicity) and leadership capacity.

**Gender.** The intersection of gender and leadership has received a great deal of research focus (Dugan & Komives, 2010), but the inconsistency of the findings has left questions (Dugan, 2006a). Chemers (1997, as cited in Northouse, 2010) noted that, because women did not hold leadership positions, because the largely male population of researchers was disinterested, and because of an assumption of gender equality, the intersection of gender and leadership was left largely unexplored until the 1970s.

Since the 1970s, women have benefited from the change in understanding of leadership in the postindustrial paradigm (Dugan, 2006a). With the inclusion of more relational, collaborative, and democratic approaches in the conceptualizations of leadership (Rost, 1991), women’s access to leadership has increased and has transformed cultural stereotypes (Carli & Eagly, 2007). This lends support to the claim that women have been employing postindustrial leadership approaches before they were acknowledged by the male dominated mainstream.

The broader body of leadership literature holds a large volume of women and leadership research, but the research specifically related to women in college student leadership is of a more modest amount. For example, two meta-analyses (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003) showed female leaders
demonstrated more democratic approaches to leadership than their more autocratic male counterparts, and tend to be more transformational and charismatic than their male peers. Consistent with Avolio et al. (2005), many of these meta-analyses drew from college student samples, but were not analyzed using a college student leadership lens (Dugan, 2006a).

The few studies conducted on college women and leadership – and interpreted for understanding college populations – have led to a number of important findings that are consistent with previous research. Scholars emphasized the need for females to have female role models and the importance of developing relationships with those role models (Astin & Leland, 1991; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1985), a finding that is consistent among female college students (Boatwright & Egidio, 2003; Romano, 1996; Whitt, 1994). Role models can arguably be more readily found both in peer groups and among faculty and staff at all-women’s institutions. Both faculty and peer groups have proven to be influential and predictive of females’ leadership development specifically (e.g., Astin & Leland, 1991; Renn & Lytle, 2010; Whitt, 1994) and in broader leadership research as well (e.g., Astin, 1993; Dugan & Komives, 2007).

In two studies, men rated themselves as more effective leaders than women (Adams & Keim, 2000; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000), though other research showed women to have higher leadership capacity than men (Dugan, 2006a; Dugan et al., 2008a). The latter studies highlighted the more relational aspects of women’s leadership and demonstrated congruence with postindustrial approaches to leadership. Posner (2009) found no differences in the five measures of the S-LPI between men and women business
majors during their senior year, consistent with a previous study with the same instrument (Posner & Brodsky, 1994). The way men self-rated higher level of capacity is telling of how college students view leadership and reflects social norms around leadership and gender roles influenced by industrial models.

**Sexual orientation and gender orientation.** Sexual orientation and gender orientation, though distinct from each other, are frequently grouped together for simultaneous examination. An emerging line of research is addressing the need to study the leadership experiences of transgendered students independently of lesbian, gay, and bi-sexual (LGB) students (e.g., Dugan, Kusel, & Simounet, 2012b; Dugan & Yurman, 2011).

Research on sexual orientation and leadership is still in a nascent stage, but according to Renn (2007), there has been an explosion in the research generated in regard to lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, and transgendered (LGBT) students. In his dissertation study of efficacy among LGBT students, Porter (1998) found lesbian women to be more efficacious leaders than gay men in leadership roles in heterosexual-dominant student organizations. In the same study, gay men demonstrated greater efficacy in all non-heterosexual groups (Porter, 1998). This finding seems to reflect the influence of social norms around the “acceptability” of being gay or being lesbian.

Renn and Bilodeau (2005) continued research on the LGBT student populations using the leadership identity model (discussed in further detail later; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; Komives et al., 2006) as a theoretical framework. This study showed that students who led in LGBT organizations achieved
increased leadership identity development, during which the understanding of leadership evolves from a positional understanding to a more transformative understanding. In addition, findings suggested that, along with leadership identity development, sexual identity development was also promoted.

Renn (2007) examined LGBT student leadership development and identities and arrived at three major conclusions. First, greater leadership involvement often meant simultaneous increased LGBT identity. Second, as with female leaders (e.g., Boatwright & Egidio, 2003; Whitt, 1994), peer and faculty mentors played an important role in the development of LGBT leadership. Finally, Renn (2007) developed a four-way, non-hierarchical classification by combining a modified version of two of Dilley’s (2005) categories of non-heterosexual males (Gay and Queer) with two categories of her making (Leader and Activist), derived from the leadership identity model of Komives et al. (2005, 2006). Although the activist demonstrates a more advanced understanding of leadership in the leadership identity model, an Activist is not more important than a Leader (Renn, 2007).

**Race and ethnicity.** The intersection of race and leadership is one that is frequently ignored in broader leadership studies (Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Some scholars have examined racial and ethnic group membership and college student leadership (e.g., Arminio et al., 2000; Dugan et al., 2008b; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000), but this type of research remains under-explored in the college context (Arminio et al., 2000; Dugan et al., 2008a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Although Cress et al. (2001) did not find race to be a differentiating demographic variable, previous research
produced rather consistent results indicating that race and ethnicity affect students’ understanding of leadership, leadership predictors, and the manner in which and extent to which they engage as leaders (Arminio et al., 2000; Dugan et al., 2008a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Liang, Lee, & Ting, 2002). Scholars have suggested that the inconclusive findings may be a result of not examining the full complexity of race (Dugan et al., 2012a; Ospina & Foldy, 2009).

Arminio et al. (2000) highlighted the personal costs students of color associate with holding leadership positions, which can lead to avoiding leadership positions. Students of color were shown to be averse to being called or identifying oneself as “leader” because it can be viewed as “buying into” the hegemonic culture (Arminio et al., 2000; Harper & Quaye, 2007) or because it is incongruent with their cultural values (Dugan et al., 2008b; Liang et al., 2002; Liu & Sedlacek, 1999). Further testament to this is a single-campus study of 1,964 first-year students that showed APA group members were least likely to self-identify as a leader and less likely than African American/Black and White students to classify members from their group as a leader (Balón, 2005). Part of the issue may be found in the lack of diverse staff and faculty members who could potentially provide support and guidance for students of color (Arminio et al., 2000). Another part of the issue may be a result of systematic oppression that elevates Whiteness as normative when it comes to leadership, deeply affecting the ways in which individuals negotiate race in organizational contexts.

Although there may be some cultural incongruence, some students expressed that they felt an obligation to represent their fellow students of color by participating in
organizations (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Komives et al., 2005). Harper and Quaye (2007) explained that Black males who became leaders on PWI campuses did so in part as a means to uplift the Black race on campus. The campus climate may dictate the degree to which students of color assume leadership positions on campus wide organizations at PWI schools versus in cultural student groups or off-campus (Brown, 2006).

In an exploratory study of leadership across the eight core values of the social change model, African American/Black students reported higher mean scores than White students on four of the eight values – Consciousness of Self, Controversy with Civility, Citizenship, and Change (Dugan et al., 2008b). These findings further demonstrate a group-oriented nature among African American/Black students who are active in leadership that was also found in multiple studies (Arminio et al., 2000; Guiffrida, 2003; Harper & Quaye, 2007). Black men gave back to the community through volunteer service and were active for purposes of racial uplift (Harper & Quaye, 2007). However, in a study using the same measures of the social change model as above, but employing more complex statistical modeling, racial group membership did not emerge as statistically significant in predicting socially responsible leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2010).

In a recent study, Dugan et al. (2012a) examined collective racial esteem (CRE) among 8,510 students at four-year institutions to investigate the intersection of race and leadership from a more complex perspective, beyond a less complex categorical characteristic. In the study, unique predictors emerged for each of the racial groups involved (Black, Asian Pacific Americans, Latino, Multiracial, and White). For African
American/ Black students, membership in on- and off-campus student organizations, sociocultural conversations, and faculty mentoring were positive predictors of socially responsible leadership while leadership positions in campus organizations were negative predictors. Two of the four factors in the collective racial esteem measures emerged as significant predictors of socially responsible leadership. This research helps establish the need to study individual groups by race as well as by the unique predictors that emerge in the research about the importance of CRE, but the study did not consider attendance at a PWI/ HBCU or campus climate as variables.

**Critiques.** There are at least five recurring limitations in the college student leadership literature that are worthy of mention. First, a majority of the studies reviewed used single institution samples, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Future research would be even more informative if samples are taken from multiple institutions because it could lead to sample sizes that are random and large enough for adequate analysis of student populations by race. The present study drew from a multi-institutional data set in order to address this critique.

Second, the focus of college student leadership studies tends to be on students who hold positional roles and not students in general. By focusing only on positional roles, researchers not only continued using a dated, industrial understanding of leadership, but they limited the sample size and also potentially precluded populations of color that may feel indifferent or alienated by an industrial approach to leadership instead of a perspective that is group-oriented, non-hierarchical, and better aligns with more contemporary leadership models. In response to this critique, this study used the social
change model, a postindustrial model of leadership that does not define leadership as positional, but as a shared process in which leadership is something everyone does.

Third, some instruments used specifically for the measurement of leadership in college student populations are problematic insofar as there is not a consistent definition of leadership nor are the variables measured always consistent with a theory-based model (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). This research is helpful, but leaves numerous gaps in our understanding of college student leadership. The current study used data obtained from the MSL instrument, based on the social change model of leadership. This model is theoretically grounded and was designed specifically with college students in mind.

A fourth limitation is that samples are not always representative of the diversity of student bodies at US campuses. Moreover, the foundational college leadership studies that described the experiences of students of color (specifically African American/Black students) that are continuously cited are now outdated. It is important for scholars to broaden their view to include as large an amount of students of color in their samples as possible, especially because of the increasing diversification of US college campuses (Torres, Jones, & Renn, 2009). This study provides new insight into outcomes of African American/Black students attending HBCUs and PWIs.

Finally, institution types such as HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving institutions (HSI), and community colleges – institutions potentially having the greatest impact on leadership development among students of color – are not well-represented in the literature. Pascarella (2006) pointed out the need for observations of conditional effects such as institutional type. Scholars have repeatedly highlighted the differential impacts that
appear with women at coeducational versus single sex institutions on leadership
development (e.g., Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Whitt’s (1994) qualitative study of 200
subjects (98 female undergraduates, 48 administrators, 36 faculty members, and 18
alumnae) at three women’s colleges demonstrated the importance of college women
having leadership opportunities and showed the increased likelihood of those
opportunities happening at all-women’s schools, a finding later replicated by Kinzie et al.
(2007) and Renn and Lytle (2010). As a result, scholars argued that leadership
opportunities for females at coeducational schools need to be available in the same
manner as women-only institutions, and that this is possible if practitioners are
intentionally creating such opportunities (Renn & Lytle, 2010; Whitt, 1994).

It is important to understand whether a parallel effect exists for African American/
Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Institution type was not found in the literature
because it has not emerged as a significant predictor, but it may also be because
researchers have not been examining the correct institutional characteristics. That is,
control, size, and Carnegie classification may need to be traded in for HBCU or PWI
status. This study examined the significance of the frequently measured institutional
characteristics, as well as examined specifically HBCU and PWI status. Other types of
Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) such as Native American and Tribal College, HSIs
and Asian American Institutions (that are designated as MSIs when the student
population reaches a threshold percentage of the institutional student body population)
may also prove to be environments that positively affect and influence African American/
Black student leadership development, but these kinds of institutions are beyond the
scope of this study.

In summary, the literature provides a fuller understanding of leadership development and its predictors among White student populations, and that there is much to examine among students of color. Extant research has answered some questions, but many still remain. One major question is aimed at understanding the conditional effect of institution type (i.e., HBCUs and PWIs) on the leadership development of African American/Black students. A conditional effect “suggests that the magnitude of the effect is conditional upon, or varies according to, the specific characteristics of the individuals being considered (e.g., minority vs. nonminority, male vs. female, traditional-aged vs. older students)” (Terenzini & Pascarella, 1991, p. 88).

**College Impact Research At HBCUs and PWIs**

In the past 20-25 years, African American/Black students in higher education have become an increasingly studied population (Bourke, 2010; Harper et al., 2004). Scholars have examined the learning and development of African American/Black students at HBCUs (e.g., Harper et al., 2004; Palmer, Davis, & Hilton, 2009; Palmer & Gasman, 2008), African American/Black students at PWIs (e.g., Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001; Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010; Sdlacek, 1987), and compared the two settings (e.g., Bohr, Pascarella, Nora, & Terenzini, 1995; Cokley, 2002; Fleming, 1984; Gurin & Epps, 1975). What follows is a review of literature that demonstrates differences in domains and outcomes, other than leadership, based on attendance at an HBCU or PWI.

The comparative literature suggests that HBCU and PWI contexts influence student learning and development differently. Although HBCU students typically
reported lower academic preparation than their PWI peers, HBCU students more often reported positive overall academic experiences as well as more significant growth in academic-related measures (Allen, 1998; DeSousa & Kuh, 1996; Fleming, 1984). Bohr et al. (1995) did not find statistically significant differences between HBCU and PWI student learning, but HBCU students scored higher on average on the measure used.

**Pre-college characteristics.** Three pre-college characteristics appear to play an important role in students’ experiences at HBCUs and PWIs. First, PWI students reported higher high school GPA and standardized test scores than their HBCU peers (Allen & Haniff, 1991; Kim & Conrad, 2006), though women were academically stronger students in high school than males (Allen, 1992). Second, parental educational attainment was higher for PWI students than HBCU students (Jackson & Swan, 1991). Finally, reported socioeconomic status (SES) of HBCU students tended to be lower than PWI students (Kim, 2002; Wenglinsky, 1999).

Despite claims that HBCU students reported higher grades in college coursework than PWI students (e.g., Allen, 1987), two foundational comparative studies found that while the GPA of men at HBCUs went up, the GPA of women at HBCUs went down. These findings are troubling, especially because women reported being stronger students in high school (Allen & Haniff, 1991; Fleming, 1984; Gurin & Epps, 1975). Interestingly, these gender-academic roles reversed at PWIs. Men felt less capable, alienated, and had higher levels of anxiety about academic performance than women (Fleming, 1984; Gurin & Epps, 1975). In a more recent study, Harper et al. (2004) described more balance in academic achievement by gender at HBCUs.
**Environmental considerations.** The academic picture of PWI environments is depicted as more unfavorable for African American/Black students as students are often described as needing to fight for intellectual survival (Hughes, 1987) and navigate negative stereotypes about their intellectual abilities (Sedlacek, 1987). Students at PWIs reported higher levels of academic competition, greater reluctance to ask professors for help or develop relationships with professors, and less effort devoted to academic pursuits (Allen, 1992; DeSousa & Kuh, 1996; Sedlacek, 1987). PWIs seem to present a particularly challenging environment for students who needed remedial work to bridge high school preparation and college performance. Conversely, the relationships HBCU students have with their professors are described as nurturing (Allen & Haniff, 1991), that result in higher GPAs, more accurate academic self-appraisal, critical thinking, positive academic self-concept, increased academic effort, and greater academic integration (Allen, 1992; Cokley, 2002; DeSousa & Kuh, 1996; Fleming, 1984; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002; Nettles, Thoeny, & Gosman, 1986; Palmer & Gasman, 2008).

On a social level, previous research suggested that there is a stronger sense of community in HBCU environments. This closeness reminds its students of home and family (Palmer & Gasman, 2008; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002), which is important given that it is congruent with the community-based cultural patterns described as representative of African American/Black populations (Centra, 1970; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Sedlacek, 1987). This feeling of home is also crucial to persistence (Hirt et al., 2008). Frequently at PWIs students experience difficulty adjusting and feel socially alienated, isolated, and unsupported. These are effects associated with the campus climate
and institutional ethos and may lead to difficulty developing a healthy personal identity (Allen, 1987, 1992; Brown et al., 2001).

Feelings of social alienation and not feeling supported at PWIs are partly caused by the presence of individual and institutional racism (Outcalt & Skewes-Cox, 2002). Gibbs (1974) suggested four ways to adapt to the PWI environment: withdrawal, separation, assimilation, and affirmation. Allen (1992) noted that students at PWIs developed relationships with White students – Gibbs’s third or fourth category – overcoming the Black-White cultural conflict that might often be present (Sedlacek, 1987). However, Steward, Jackson, and Jackson (1990) suggested the reasoning behind developing social relationships with White students is to access information that is perhaps otherwise harder to obtain for African American/Black students.

At HBCUs, African American/Black students reported higher frequencies of developing stronger peer relationships, finding role models, and becoming personally acquainted with staff and administrators (Allen, 1992). In addition to building more influential relationships, students at HBCUs were shown to be more likely to find activities on campus that align with their cultural heritage than at PWIs (Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002). As a result, there are higher levels of general involvement, overall satisfaction, and adjustment to college at HBCUs (Allen, 1987). One study showed that African American/Black students at PWIs were more active than their White peers, which would suggest that African American/Black students were able to find PWI campus activities (DeSousa & King, 1992). However, closer examination showed that the organizations in which the African American/Black student participated were
predominantly Black, likely meaning that the higher participation was a means of networking with other African American/ Black students (De Sousa & King, 1992).

HBCUs are often discredited for promoting segregation (e.g., Brown et al., 2001). In a longitudinal study, Flowers and Pascarella (1999a, 1999b) found that the racially homogenous environment of HBCUs did not inhibit growth in African American/ Black students’ openness to racial, cultural, or value diversity. African American/ Black students at PWIs have probably had more contact with the White culture, leading to a more bicultural understanding (Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002). If higher socio-economic status (SES) is indicative of a more developed sense of Blackness, students at PWIs are more likely to have a more developed sense of Blackness. However, African American/ Black students at PWIs are more likely to face alienation and cultural clashes, which could potentially cause developmental stagnation or regression. In this sense, it would stand to reason that PWIs would be more likely to promote segregated development.

The psychological experiences of African American/ Black students at PWIs have been reported as disengaging, and there are feelings of academic anxiety. In their fight for “intellectual survival,” African American/ Black students at PWIs defer social, personal, emotional, and cultural development (Hughes, 1987, p. 540). Anxiety is higher among men at PWIs and higher among women at HBCUs (Fleming, 1984; Gurin & Epps, 1975). Allen and Haniff (1991) found that HBCU and PWI peers had comparable levels of self-esteem, but other studies indicated that students at HBCUs reported higher self-esteem and self-concept than their PWI counterparts (Berger & Milem, 2000; Pascarella et al., 1996; Sedlacek, 1987). Specifically, HBCU students self-rated significantly higher in
three domains of self-concept than their PWI peers: psychosocial wellness, academic achievement, and achievement orientation (Berger & Milem, 2000).

The 105 HBCUs represent only about 3% of all postsecondary institutions (Evans, Evans, & Evans, 2002) but they educated 13% of African American/Black undergraduate students in 2001 and conferred 22% of all bachelor’s degrees earned by African Americans during that same year (Provasnik et al., 2004). HBCU students are more likely to be first-generation students (Merisotis & McCarthy, 2005), meaning the student’s parents did not attend college. HBCU students also tended to report higher educational aspirations, aim to obtain master’s degrees and PhDs, and account for a third of African American/Black graduate students in 1994 (Wenglinksy, 1999). African American/Black students at PWIs more frequently aspire to a higher degree of JDs and MDs (Allen & Haniff, 1991).

One specific area not well covered in the above impact literature is leadership development. As a critical collegiate outcome (e.g., Astin & Astin, 2000, NASPA & ACPA, 2004; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999), leadership development should undoubtedly be a goal of HBCUs. In considering HBCU alumni, these institutions may arguably be the most important training grounds for Black leaders in the US, but due to a lack of definitive research, that argument is conjecture. However, based on the reviewed literature, it is worth noting that many of the same pre-college and college variables (e.g., race, gender, mentoring relationships) that predict more successful experiences for African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs are also predictive of leadership
gains. Examining relationships between these variables for students at HBCUs and PWIs would be a worthy endeavor.

In summary, a majority of the comparative studies have demonstrated that HBCUs provide an environment that better supports African American/Black students’ needs. Even in cases when differences were not statistically significant, findings often pointed to more favorable outcomes at HBCUs (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). However, because the findings do not provide conclusive determination of whether attending an HBCU instead of a PWI is more impactful for African American/Black students, further investigation of the HBCU and PWI environments would be useful.

**College Student Development Theory**

This section will look at cognitive structural, psychosocial, racial identity, and holistic theories to provide further context for the study. Racial identity is part of the larger social identity theoretical family that also examines the role of gender or sexual orientation. These four families of theory inform leadership development research.

**Cognitive structural development theory.** Rooted in the work of Piaget (as cited in Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010), cognitive structural theories examine the process of intellectual development during the college years with a focus on how people think, reason, and make meaning of their experiences (Evans et al., 2010). Perry (as cited in Evans et al., 2010) is oft cited as the first scholar to develop a model related to higher education with his scheme of intellectual and ethical development. Perry’s model consisted of nine positions including dualism (positions 1 and 2), in which a person views the world dichotomously; multiplicity (positions 3 and 4a), representing the
ability to appreciate diverse perspectives without knowing the right answer; relativism (positions 4b, 5, and 6), when opinions and knowledge are viewed more subjectively; and commitment in relativism (positions 7, 8, and 9), which includes both making choices in a contextual world and defining those choices (Evans et al., 2010; Love & Guthrie, 1999; Perry, 1981). The scheme was based on a longitudinal study of a sample of White men attending Harvard in the 1960s. Though Perry’s model is limited in applicability to females and populations of color because of the study’s initial White male sample, his work has provided groundwork for continued examination of meaning making among college students (Evans et al., 2010).

Gilligan (as cited in Evans et al., 2010) developed a theory of women’s moral development, the first major study of women’s psychological development. Belenky et al. (1986) continued the work of Perry (1981) and Gilligan (as cited in Evans et al. 2010) by interviewing 135 women to understand why women were experiencing learning gaps and doubting their intellectual competence. The results led to the development of five perspectives (instead of stages) to describe women’s ways of knowing: silenced, received knowing, subjective knowing, procedural knowing, and constructed knowing (Belenky et al., 1986; Goldberger, as cited in Evans et al., 2010).

Baxter Magolda (1992) developed the four-stage epistemological reflection model based on a longitudinal research project in which male and female college students were interviewed annually. This study was distinct and significant because it provided unique insight into the annual developmental progress experienced by college students, and because it examined male-female similarities and differences (whereas Perry [1968] and
Belenky et al. [1986] had single sex populations). However, this study was also limited by the lack of inclusion of more students of color (Evans et al., 2010).

Cognitive development is the process of intellectual growth and making meaning of experiences. Research has demonstrated that leadership identity is a function of cognitive development (Komives et al., 2005, 2006). As students have experiences with leadership positions, experiences in which they put leadership into effect, or experiences in which they witness leadership in action, their understanding and perception of leadership evolves and they stand to increase their leadership efficacy also.

Students’ encounters with differing (or perhaps more advanced) understandings of leadership can also lead to further evolution of an understanding of leadership. After all, cognitive growth can also stem from dissonance caused by encountering differences (Evans, 2011). For example, sociocultural conversations with peers about or across differences like religious belief, political ideology, or diversity issues can cause cognitive dissonance and lead to greater leadership capacity as a result. Context also influences cognitive development in part (Evans et al., 2010), which would suggest that the differences in institutional context at HBCUs and PWIs may influence students’ cognitive development, and thereby leadership development.

**Psychosocial development.** Psychosocial theories are directly or indirectly related to Erikson’s (1968) theory of human development (McEwen et al., 1990). These theories explain the content of development of individuals at various points in their lives (Evans et al., 2010). Chickering’s (1969) theory of identity is a landmark psychosocial theory in the higher education field (Evans et al., 2010). Later updates by Chickering and
Resisser (1993) described college students’ development by way of seven vectors: developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. Chickering’s theory is non-linear, though each of the vectors builds on the others (Evans et al., 2010), and was originally intended to aid faculty members in the creation of education programs to achieve student development outcomes more systematically (Thomas & Chickering, as cited in Evans et al., 2010).

A common critique of psychosocial theories in college student literature is that they are not inclusive of students of color. To address this critique, McEwen et al. (1990) developed nine dimensions that need to be considered for psychosocial theories to be inclusive of African American/Black students: developing ethnic and racial identity, interacting with the dominant culture, developing cultural aesthetics and awareness, developing identity, developing interdependence, fulfilling affiliation needs, surviving intellectually, developing spirituality, and developing social responsibility. McEwen et al. (1990) suggested the need for a workable psychosocial theory that applies to African American/Black students.

Pope (1998) shed further light on the role of race in psychosocial theory in her examination of the relationship between psychosocial development and racial identity in African American/Black college students. The study used the Student Development Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI; Winston & Miller, 1987) and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale-B (RIAS-B; Parham & Helms, 1981). The SDTLI measures three
developmental task areas based on Chickering’s (1969) developmental theory, and the RIAS-B was designed to measure the Cross (1971) Black identity model (discussed below). Pope (1998) found a significant relationship between psychosocial development and racial identity, but the predictive nature of the relationship was limited.

In a follow-up study, Pope (2000) broadened her scope to include Latinos, Asian Americans, and Black Americans. Pope (2000) found a relationship between psychosocial development and racial identity in each of the three populations. Each task of psychosocial development was related to racial identity, and psychosocial development varied by race.

Just as cognitive development underlies leadership development, so too does psychosocial development. Psychosocial theory suggests that self-awareness and developing relationships with others are important steps of development throughout one’s life (Evans et al., 2010). Contemporary models of leadership such as the social change model and relational leadership model also suggest that students must be conscious of themselves and be able to develop relationships with others.

**Racial identity models.** Racial identity theories are derived from psychosocial theory and “focus on the role of race and the extent to which it is incorporated into identity or self-concept” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 254). Racial identity theories involve exploration of self-concept in a social context. The identity development process requires marginalized groups to acknowledge, cope with, and address perceived internalized disregard to establish a healthy self-concept.

Cross (1971) authored a five-stage model: Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion-
Emersion, Internalization, and Commitment. This model described the process of developing a Black racial identity, but it was not created with college students in mind. However, this Nigrescence model, or process of becoming Black, is a foundational work that researchers have frequently used to examine the experiences of African American/Black students in higher education (e.g., Wilson & Constantine, 1999).

Parham and Helms (1981) operationalized the Cross (1971) racial identity model with the RIAS-B. This measure has been widely used for measuring the relationship of racial identity to variables such as moral development (Moreland & Leach, 2001), self-esteem (Watt, 2006), psychosocial development (Pope, 1998, 2000; Taub & McEwen, 1992), and student involvement (Taylor & Howard-Hamilton, 1995). Despite its broad usage, this scale is based on an outdated version of Cross’s Nigrescence theory.

Helms (1984, 1986, 1990, 1995) also made numerous contributions to the understanding of Black racial identity development. Though involved in creating a scale to measure aspects of racial identity development (Parham & Helms, 1981), Helms (1986) argued that it is difficult to classify individuals’ racial identity based on scores of a scale. Helms also believed that Cross’s (1971) use of the term “stage” in his model was synonymous with the concept of world view. As such, Helms (1986) said scholars should note that not all worldviews evolve at the same rate or last for the same duration of time. Instead, Helms (1995) urged the use of the term “status,” citing three reasons why “stage” is inadequate for describing the racial developmental processes. First, whereas “stage” implies a static place or condition a person reaches or achieves, “status” hints at the dynamism of racial identity development. Second, the stages of racial identity are not
mutually exclusive. Individuals can simultaneously exhibit behaviors of multiple stages. Third, both research and theory supported her argument that the stages are not static or mutually exclusive (Helms, 1995).

In 1991, Cross made two significant changes to his model. First, he decreased the number of stages to four: Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. Second, he included the key concepts of personal identity, reference group orientation, and race salience to clarify aspects of the developmental process. Personal identity refers to personality traits and characteristics that can be measured regardless of race, and reference group orientation refers to individual values and the philosophical and political lens through which an individual views the world (Evans et al., 2010). The reference group orientation concept deals with individuals’ memberships in social groups (e.g., race, gender, or sexual orientation), and they can belong to more than one social group at the same time (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002). Salience describes the importance of race in individuals’ identity (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). Vandiver et al. (2000) operationalized Cross’ (1991) updated model with the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS). The CRIS was designed to measure the newer Cross (1991) model more accurately because the RIAS-B was dated, still incorporating the first Cross (1971) version (Vandiver et al., 2002).

The most recent Cross model revision applied the concept of Nigrescence in three patterns and consists of a six-sector life cycle (Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001). In the original model, Black individuals assumedly reached adulthood without achieving a Black self-concept, whereas this revision demonstrated that the racial identity process
takes place from infancy and childhood through adulthood. Nigrescence Pattern A describes the normative experience in which racial identity develops through socialization experiences from childhood through late adolescence (Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001). In this pattern, Black people reach adulthood having already developed one of many Black identities (there is no singular Black identity).

Nigrescence Pattern B refers to a small portion of the Black population who achieve Blackness through an adult Nigrescence process, described in earlier Cross (1971, 1991) models. Nigrescence occurs during adulthood because race was minimally significant in their childhood identity formation. Nigrescence Pattern C is similar to Parham’s (1989) Nigrescence Recycling and occurs regardless of whether individuals experience Pattern A or B. Those with a developed Black identity face issues of racism or experience triggering events in their adult lives that cause them to revisit different Nigrescence phases, leading to a renewed Black identity.

The three Nigrescence patterns occur over a lifetime, divided into six sectors. The First Sector is Infancy and Childhood when children are shaped by family members, traditions, and socioeconomic status (Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001). Sector Two is Preadolescence in which Black children develop either high racial salience (race is important to their identity), or low racial salience (race is minimally important to their identity), or internalized racism (a self-hatred resulting from mis-education about and misrepresentation of Black people). Adolescence, the Third Sector, is characterized by a moratorium during which Black youth with high racial salience explore identity components in order to take ownership of them, reaching an achieved identity status
Low racial salience individuals also experience a moratorium, but their identity exploration focuses on a part of their identity more salient than race. If internalized racism is not corrected in this sector, individuals are likely to develop a self-hatred, a negative form of achieved identity, and a negative general impression of Black people.

For a majority of Black people, the Fourth Sector, called Early Adulthood—which includes the age range of traditional college students—leads to one of a variety of Black identities. Those who have achieved a Black racial identity by their early adulthood generally do not experience adult Nigrescence, the Fifth Sector (Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001). In Adult Nigrescence, individuals experience the four-stage process described by Cross’s (1971, 1991) earlier models. Sector Six, Nigrescence Recycling, is a concept developed by Parham (1989) that begins after individuals have achieved a Black identity, whether by early adulthood or during adulthood. Recycling occurs throughout the balance of their lives and leads to a fuller understanding of Blackness.

Cross and Fhagen-Smith (2001) explained that there are individuals who do not experience Nigrescence. Those with low racial salience may never focus on race as a major part of their identity, perhaps because where they live or their profession does not make it necessary. Individuals with internalized racism as part of their identity may never have a corrective experience that alleviates the self-hatred resulting from negative portrayals of the Black race.

Racial identity is important to understand in the context of this study because race is a consistently present factor in the students’ lives that influences the perception of self
within any context (e.g., educational context; Evans et al., 2010). Like psychosocial theory, racial identity theory is centered on an increasing recognition of race and the role it plays in self-awareness and self-understanding in relation to others. Students’ level of racial identity development may affect their leadership development (Komives et al., 2009b).

**Holistic development.** The above models are useful, despite their limitations. Each provides insight into ways in which individuals understand the world, and ways in which that understanding evolves throughout their lives. This insight gives those who work with students the ability to “identify and address student needs, design programs, develop policies, and create healthy college environments that encourage positive growth in students” as well as give grounding for professionals and professors to “enhance student learning and maximize positive student outcomes” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 7).

One of the major limitations of the above theories is that they cordon off various parts of a person and their development from the other. In other words, the theoretical models are designed to examine only one aspect of an individual’s identity, despite each individual having multiple aspects that make up an overall identity (e.g., male, Black, gay, Christian, paraplegic, student leader). Jones and McEwen (2000), Abes, Jones, and McEwen (2007), and Baxter Magolda (2009) specifically pointed out the need to have theories that simultaneously examine multiple aspects of an identity. Evans et al. (2010) refer to this as holism, or a holistic approach. Using a holistic approach, one is able to see various parts of a person’s identity and the ways various identities interact and intersect with one another.
Connecting Student Development Theory to Leadership

Wagner (2011) noted that issues in student development influence the ways students understand and practice leadership. Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009) suggested that “part of developing as a leader is identifying a more articulated and complex conception of self as leader, and that development is a lifelong process” (p. 67), echoing McEwen’s (2003) position that development is a general process in which individuals grow and become more complex vis-à-vis social identity (e.g., race), values, and cognition. Development influences leadership insofar as issues of identity and cognition play a role in the ways individuals understand leadership, develop as leaders, and attain levels of leadership efficacy and capacity. The leadership identity development model (Komives et al., 2006) uses a holistic approach in that it stems from an examination of the intersection of leadership with psychosocial and cognitive theories (Komives et al., 2006).

Leadership identity development. Though there were models that were used to understand student leadership development, it was not clear how students formed their understanding of leadership or the ways in which their view of themselves as leaders evolved over time. Komives et al. (2005) addressed this gap, using a grounded theory approach to develop a six-stage leadership identity development (LID) model that examines students’ perceptions of leadership vis-à-vis the relational leadership model. The six stages are awareness, exploration/engagement, leader identified (with an emerging and an immersion phase), leadership differentiated (also with an emerging and an immersion phase), generativity, and integration/synthesis. Although the understanding
of leadership differs from stage to stage, each stage’s understanding builds on the previous (Wagner, 2011), and is influenced by five developmental components—developmental influences, developing self, group influences, a changing view of self with others, and broadening view of leadership (Komives et al., 2005). According to Komives et al. (2006), each stage in the LID model ends with a transition that is represented by a change in thinking about leadership and reflection about the role of the five developmental components.

The first stage, awareness, is the recognition of leaders and an understanding of leadership as external of the self. Individuals in the first stage frequently cited their parents as individuals they thought of as examples of leaders. Stage two is exploration/engagement, which is characterized by intentional involvement, working in groups, and having responsibilities that are not related to positional leadership. In stage two, individuals expressed a reliance on leaders and still did not think of themselves as leaders. The first two stages typically occur before college (Wagner, 2011).

Leader Identified is the third stage and consists of emerging and immersion phases. In this stage, students viewed leadership from a leader-centric perspective. They perceived groups as made up of leaders and followers, and that leadership is something only leaders do. During this stage, students observed leadership, became confident in their personal abilities, and took different leadership responsibilities in groups. The fourth stage, Leadership Differentiated, also consists of an emerging and immersion phase. Students expanded their understanding of leadership from only positional to something that anyone in a group can do. The emerging phase included the recognition of leadership
from all parts of the group while the immersion phase was described as building of group community.

In the fifth stage, called Generativity, students looked beyond themselves toward the future of their groups. Students in this stage were able to express their beliefs and passions, and demonstrated a commitment to their organizations and the individuals in the organizations with them. Reaching this stage was symbolic of the students’ becoming mentors for future generations of positional and non-positional leaders alike.

Integration/Synthesis, the sixth stage, marked the understanding of leadership as a daily activity and as part of students’ identity. Students at this stage of the LID model demonstrated capacities for systemic thinking, working effectively in diverse settings, and recognizing growth in their leadership capabilities.

The LID model has limited use in empirical research. LID was used in one study with LGBT student populations and seemed to hold well, confirming its validity (Renn, 2007). More research using this model as a framework is needed to prove further or disprove the viability of the model. In addition, stage models are not always well received because they can be interpreted as suggesting an idealized state as a goal and anything else as not being a fulfillment of the goal. Although the sample was relatively diverse, further testing is necessary with the broad range of student diversity. Komives et al. (2006, 2009b) noted that race played an observable role in the manner in which students of color moved through the stages of LID, further underlining the importance of further research with LID for improved understanding of how best to work with students of color.
Chapter Summary

Literature covered in this chapter provided the theoretical and empirical foundations on which the current study of leadership development among African American/Black college students at HBCUs and PWIs is built. Leadership theory evolved from an industrial (managerial, leader-centric) to postindustrial (process based, non-hierarchical, values-centered) paradigm, though the paradigm shift is contested as a change for White males, who historically held positions of leadership. College leadership models such as the social change model (HERI, 1996) are consistent with the postindustrial leadership paradigm. Research on college student leadership is increasing, but unclear or ungrounded definitions of leadership have produced results that do not necessarily accurately depict what kind of leadership development is occurring in college. Additionally, scholarship that addressed African American/Black student leadership, and African American/Black student leadership in the HBCU setting specifically is lacking.

The review of literature also included a review of college impact theory that focused on the effects of HBCUs, PWIs, and comparisons of the two institutional contexts on African American/Black college students. HBCU contexts were generally shown to be more conducive to student gains. Finally, the review covered families of student development theories because of their underlying roles in leadership development. The LID model serves as a theoretical bridge between development theory and leadership development theory by virtue of its framing the leadership identity development vis-à-vis psychosocial and cognitive theories of development (Komives et al., 2009b). The combination of previous research conducted about racial identity, college
impact at HBCU and PWIs, and college student leadership provide a solid point of
departure for investigation into African American/ Black student leadership development
at HBCUs and PWIs. Because of the positioning of leadership development as one of the
key collegiate outcomes (Astin & Astin, 2000), it is critical to understand the predictors
in the two contexts in order to create more effective interventions.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter summarizes the methods for the study of socially responsible leadership capacity and its predictors among African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. The chapter begins with the purpose of the study, research questions, hypotheses, and research supporting the hypotheses. The conceptual framework for the study ensues, followed by information about the planned research design and sample, a description of the instrument and its reliability for the study, an analysis plan, and variable selection. The chapter concludes with a study summary.

Purpose of Study and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to examine capacities for, and predictors of, socially responsible leadership among African American/Black students attending HBCUs and PWIs. The study was guided by two questions:

1. Are there statistically significant differences in socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/Black students attending HBCUs and African American/Black students attending PWIs during college?

2. Are there differences in the types of college experiences that predict socially responsible leadership capacity for African American/Black college students in HBCUs and PWIs?
Findings presented herein are unique because this study presents recent data dedicated specifically to the examination of the intersection of race and a theoretically grounded measure of leadership development in the context of HBCU campuses. Until recently, studies on college leadership development relied on ungrounded measures of leadership development (Antonio, 2001; Astin, 1993; Cress et al., 2001; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Smart et al., 2002; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). The examination of race and college student leadership development is an intersection that is largely unexplored in college student leadership development literature (Dugan, 2011). More specifically, the intersection of race and leadership development within the HBCU context is a topic absent from the college impact literature. Many of the oft-cited HBCU studies are based on older data (e.g., Fleming, 1984; Flowers, 2002; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999a, 1999b; Gurin & Epps, 1975) making an update essential to understand whether previous findings hold or have changed over time.

**Hypothesis 1**

African American/ Black students attending HBCUs will demonstrate significantly higher capacity for socially responsible leadership than those attending PWIs.

Although research on leadership development at HBCUs is sparse, there is a strong body of research examining various aspects of African American/ Black student experiences at HBCUs versus PWIs such as academic self-concept (Cokley, 2000, 2002), cognitive effects (Fleming, 1984; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996), and student involvement (Watson & Kuh, 1996). Results of the previous HBCU-
PWI research showed that established predictors of leadership development such as faculty mentoring relationships occur more frequently for African American/Black students at HBCUs than for those at PWIs (Allen, 1987; Allen & Haniff, 1991). The greater prevalence of mentoring suggests that African American/Black students at HBCUs may develop higher levels of leadership capacity at HBCUs as a result (Palmer & Gasman, 2008).

Research has also indicated that levels of student involvement are higher for African American/Black students at HBCUs than PWIs (Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001); higher levels of student involvement are predictive of higher levels of leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2007). In a study of participation in on-campus organizations and racial identity expression of African American/Black students, Harper and Quaye (2007) found that performing in leadership roles was likely an indication of a more developed Black racial identity.

If greater development of Black racial identity is an indicator of more participation in leadership, it may suggest that African American/Black students at HBCUs would be more likely not only to have a more developed racial ID, but also have greater leadership capacity. The environment of HBCUs, which have been established in research as nurturing environments for African American/Black students (e.g., Palmer, 2010), may be more conducive to leadership development because students feel more welcomed and may face less of a challenge developing a healthy racial identity. If the removal – or mitigation – of racial identity development struggles happens at HBCUs, it would make sense that students would be able to focus more attention on the exploration
of leadership, and not only attain a more advanced leadership identity, but also develop greater efficacy and capacity for leadership.

On PWI campuses, African American/Black students more frequently reported sentiments of social alienation than their HBCU peers (Allen, 1987, 1992). As a result of social alienation at PWIs, achieving a healthy racial identity may be more consuming and cause a student to remain uninvolved in campus organizations, thereby limiting their experiences with opportunities to engage in sociocultural conversations with peers and other experiences that build up leadership efficacy and capacity.

**Hypothesis 2**

Significant predictors of socially responsible leadership capacity will vary between African American/Black students based on attendance at an HBCU or a PWI.

Pascarella (2006) indicated that conditional analyses often yield varying predictors, but few studies have disaggregated African American/Black student data from larger samples. Therefore, it would not be surprising if many of the predictors that have arisen in prior research (e.g., sociocultural conversations with peers and faculty mentoring) also emerged in the study, along with predictors that have not previously been identified. The institutional context may differentiate predictors even further. Previous research has shown that institutional context accounts for significant differences on students’ development on at least two levels worth noting. First, comparing HBCUs and PWIs has demonstrated with some consistency a more favorable environment for African American/Black students’ development (e.g., Allen, 1992; Berger & Milem, 2000). It would stand to reason that leadership development would also be better fostered in the
HBCU context. Second, the all-female institutional context has been shown to be a differentiating factor for female students’ development in comparison to co-educational institution context (Kinzie et al., 2007). It would follow that parallel differences may be present in a comparison based on the HBCU and PWI contexts.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework that guided this study was an adapted version of Astin’s (1991) college impact model, and is shown in Figure 2. This model, also known as the IEO model, was designed to facilitate the examination of the effects of the college environment and college experiences (e.g., participation in campus organization, mentoring relationships with faculty) on desired educational outcomes (e.g., leadership development) after holding constant pre-collegiate characteristics and experiences (e.g., demographic information, pre-college leadership experiences). The IEO model was originally meant for longitudinal, pre/post-testing on at least two separate occasions (Astin, 1991), and assists researchers in separating the influence of pre-collegiate characteristics and experiences and the collegiate environment on desired educational outcomes (Astin, 1993).

The conceptual framework was adapted for this study through the inclusion of variables from outside the college context (e.g., off-campus employment) that may also have an impact on educational outcomes (Weidman, 1989), and through a cross-sectional approach that used retrospective pre-test questions to capture the data regarding pre-college knowledge (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Students were asked to reflect on their knowledge and experience to serve as a pre-test baseline for determining the value-added
effect of college experience on change in leadership capacity. Previous research has demonstrated that a retrospective pre-test approach is appropriate for this study because the then/now retroactive questions leads to more accurate responses when used for self-reporting data by mitigating the confounding effect of response shift bias (Howard, 1980; Howard & Dailey, 1979; Rohs, 1999, 2002; Rohs & Langone, 1997).

Response shift bias can be defined as the difference between self-reported pre-/post-test scores attributable to a change of the subject’s understanding of the construct(s) being measured (Howard & Dailey, 1979). For example, students are asked to self-rate their leadership capacity in their first year of college and again in their fourth year. Between years one and four, the students’ cognitive interpretation of leadership may have changed, along with their self-perception for leadership capacity. By using a pure pre-/post-test approach, students potentially interpret the concept of leadership using a different definition, thereby confounding the ability to compare the data meaningfully. If, instead, students are asked during year four to evaluate themselves at year one retrospectively and at year four presently, they evaluate themselves using the same cognitive interpretation of the leadership construct, thereby reducing the possibility of response-shift bias.

**Research Design**

This quantitative study used causal comparative design, a non-experimental research method aimed at the examination of the relationship between one or more categorical independent variables and one or more quantitative dependent variables. (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). The non-experimental nature of causal-comparative
Figure 2. Socially Responsible Leadership Conceptual Framework for African American/Black Students at HBCUs and PWIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Inputs</th>
<th>Collegiate Experiences</th>
<th>Student Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1:</strong> Demographics</td>
<td><strong>Block 3:</strong> Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong> Socially responsible leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender</td>
<td>- Size</td>
<td><strong>Intermediate Outcome</strong> Leadership Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td>- Carnegie type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 2:</strong> Pre-Test for Dependent Variable</td>
<td><strong>Block 4:</strong> Student Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Class standing</td>
<td>- Membership in on-campus org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership position on-campus org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Membership off-campus org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership in off-campus org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 5:</strong> Student Experience</td>
<td><strong>Block 5 (cont.):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community Service</td>
<td>- Internship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment off-campus</td>
<td>- Employment on-campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multicultural Greek</td>
<td>- Faculty Mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community Mentor</td>
<td>- Parent/Guardian Mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer Mentor</td>
<td>- Leadership Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership Training</td>
<td>- Sociocultural conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Block 6:</strong> Campus Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-discriminatory Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research indicates that the independent variables are not manipulated (Johnson, 2001). Despite the name of the method, determining causality is not the function of causal-comparative research (Johnson & Christensen, 2008), though one may use this method for establishing predictive relationships (Johnson, 2001).

Data for this study were drawn from an existing data set of two separate iterations – 2009 and 2011 – of the MSL. The MSL is an international research project developed at the University of Maryland that is geared toward developing an understanding of the impact of college on student leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2007). The data represent self-reported scores collected using a web-based instrument, described in greater detail in the following sections.

**Overall Sample**

The HBCU and PWI samples were a combination of data from MSL iterations from 2009 and 2011. The data collection procedures for both iterations were similar and are covered together when possible. The combination of 2009 and 2011 was done to increase sample size in the case of HBCUs, augment the generalizability of the findings, and to aid in institutional anonymity. Data collection took place between January-April 2009 at 101 US-based institutions, including two HBUs. The 2011 instrumentation occurred between January-April 2011 as well and data were collected from 31 US-based participating institutions, including one Historically Black College (HBC). Data were also collected from institutions in Jamaica, Mexico, and Canada, but they are neither counted among participating institutions above, nor are their data factored into this study.
Participating institutions were solicited in the months leading up to the data collection period to participate through electronic communication through professional organization listservs (e.g., NASPA knowledge communities, ACPA commissions). For the 2011 iteration, the researcher specifically solicited 13 HBCUs and one national association via email correspondence to bring about participation by HBCUs in the data collection. As noted above, the solicitation yielded one participating Historically Black College.

In 2009 and 2011, the MSL complied with Human Subjects regulations and had Institutional Review Board clearance from the University of Maryland, College Park and Loyola University Chicago (see Appendix A). The MSL was administered directly to the student samples using a web-based survey instrument. Each participant received an individualized identification code, leading each student to an online consent form. After the participant consented to the study, a new individualized code was given to ensure confidentiality. Participants received encouragement to participate via two emails sent seven days apart. Reminder emails were only sent to participants who had not started the survey. Participants were also incentivized through lotteries for electronics, food coupons, and parking passes.

The overall MSL sampling strategy for 2009 and 2011 was based on the size of the student body of the participating institution. For student bodies of 4,000 or less, the full population was sampled. At institutions with a student body of more than 4,000, a simple random sample of 4,000 was taken. The confidence level was set at 95%, with a confidence interval of ±3 (Dugan et al., 2009). To facilitate reaching a 30% response rate
typical in web-based research (Couper, 2000; Crawford, Couper, & Lamais, 2001),
oversampling was conducted at 70% (Dugan et al., 2009). The final 2009 sample size
was 346,067 from which 118,733 responded, a 34% return rate; 94,367 respondents
completed 90% of the survey or more (Dugan et al., 2009).

**Study Sample**

The overall sample size for this study was $N = 1,656$. A sample of 828 African
American/ Black students from three HBCUs, including two HBUs from 2009 and one
HBC from 2011, was used for this study. The first HBU is a non-religiously affiliated,
four-year, public university in a mid-sized city in the southeast United States. This first
HBU has a Carnegie classification as a Master’s Colleges and Universities. The second
HBU is a non-religiously affiliated, four-year, public university in a mid-sized city in the
southern United States. The Carnegie classification is a Research University with high
research activity. The HBC is a religiously affiliated, four-year, private college in a mid-
sized city in the southern United States, and is Carnegie classified as a Baccalaureate
College. The matched sample of 828 African American/ Black students at PWIs was
drawn from the 2009 MSL national sample.

The HBCU data from 2009 and 2011 were combined to create a larger sample
size, protect institutional anonymity, and boost the generalizability of results. This study
used only cases in which a minimum of 90% of the survey was completed. Data were
further cleaned to remove cases of students who self-identified as other than African
American/ Black, students outside of undergraduate status, international students, and
students from two-year institutions. International students were excluded because they
may not share the same experience of race as individuals who grew up in the US. The final HBCU student sample size was 828.

The HBCU sample was matched by a randomly selected matched sample of 828 students from the 2009 MSL sample. The matched sample consisted of students who self-identified as African American/Black. The matched sample was also cleaned to remove international students, students outside of undergraduate statues, and students from two-year institutions. The sample was matched at the student level because measures of institutional type such as size and control have not entered into analyses as significant predictors in previous leadership studies (e.g., Dugan & Komives, 2010).

**Instrument**

The MSL instrument is a survey composed of individual items and composite measures used to gather data for the purpose of examining the environmental aspects within the college context that facilitate leadership development. The MSL was first used for data collection in 2006. Since then it has been administered annually between 2009-2012, and will now be administered every three years for data collection. The MSL was pilot tested rigorously to establish validity and reliability of the measures in the instrument (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Dugan, et al., 2009).

The MSL instrument used the social change model as its theoretical framework and consisted of seven core scales and four sub-studies. The core scales included the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale, Leadership Efficacy Scale, Cognitive Skills Scale, Campus Climate Scale, Sociocultural Conversations Scale, Social Change Behaviors Scale, and Mentoring Scale. The four sub-studies include Collective Racial
Esteem, Mentoring, Spirituality, and Social Perspective-Taking. Through the MSL, one is able to gather information about demographics, pre-college experiences, and college experiences for the purpose of examining an outcome measure such as the Omnibus Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS). Coding, means, and standard deviations for all variables used in the study are provided in Figure 1.

### Dependent Variable

The outcome measure of this research was the Omnibus SRLS, the mean levels of agreement among students regarding their sense of leadership capacity, obtained using the SRLS-Rev3. This outcome was selected because of its theoretical grounding in the social change model and because it reflects students’ overall capacity to engage in socially responsible leadership. Students evaluate themselves on the values that demonstrate their capacity for enacting socially responsible leadership by indicating their level of agreement using Likert-like responses that range from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5).

The SRLS-Rev3 used in this study evolved from research initially conducted by Tyree (1998) in which she created the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS) that operationalized the social change model of leadership development (HERI, 1996). The SRLS consisted of 103 items divided among eight separate scales, each measuring one of the social change model values (i.e., consciousness of self, commitment, congruence, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change for the common good). The SRLS was adapted and revised by Dugan (2006c). The SRLS-Rev3 reduced the survey from 103 items to 71, but it still measures behaviors across the eight
social change model values. The SRLS-Rev3 is administered as part of the MSL and contributes to the development of a national normative data set (Dugan et al., 2008b).

The validity and reliability of these measures were established through extensive pilot testing (Dugan & Komives, 2007) and through other studies using the instrument (e.g., Dugan, 2006a; Dugan & Komives, 2010). Reliability estimates for the Omnibus SRLS measure were .97 for HBCUs and .96 for PWIs (cf. Appendix B). These reliability estimates are consistent with estimates of .93 in two recent studies (Dugan et al., 2012a; Dugan et al., 2011a). Moreover, a recent study established that the SRLS-Rev3 measured similar, but unique constructs when compared to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 2004), establishing convergent and discriminant validity. The MLQ measures leadership behaviors from transformational, transactional, and avoidant leadership. Convergent validity was found between measures of socially responsible leadership and transformational leadership, while discriminant validity was established between socially responsible leadership and transactional and avoidant leadership (Dugan et al., 2011a).

**Independent Variables**

Independent variables selection was based on the conceptual framework and drew from previous literature and factors that influenced socially responsible leadership directly and/or were perceived to be of influence for African American/Black students in an HBCU context. Input variables included gender, age, and first-generation status. For the environments, variables included on and off-campus involvement, participation in community service, having faculty mentoring relationships, and having sociocultural
conversations with peers. The variables were separated into a total of seven blocks, organized hierarchically according to the modified version of the IEO conceptual framework (Astin, 1991). Figure 2 shows all the variables within the IEO framework.

**Input variables.** The first block of variables consisted of three input variables of gender (dummy coded, 1=male, 2=female), age (open response), and first-generation status (students whose parents/guardians did not attend college; 1=first-generation, 2=non-first-generation). The second block was the pretest for the outcome measure of socially responsible leadership using the retrospective quasi pre-test. The quasi pre-test was measured using Likert-like responses and consisted of eight items. Students were asked to gauge their agreement with statements such as, “Hearing differences in opinions enriched my thinking.” The reliability estimate for the HBCU sample was .77 while the PWI estimate was .74. In previous research, the pre-test reliability estimates ranged between .71-.77 (Dugan et al., 2011a; Dugan et al., 2012c). A full list of the pre-test items and reliability estimates are listed in Appendix B.

**Collegiate experience variables.** The third block variables included institutional characteristics including size (small, medium, and large) and Carnegie type (four types – bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, doctoral/research, and very high research). These variables were dummy coded with “large” serving as the size reference group. “Very high research” served as the Carnegie reference group. The fourth block represented students’ class levels, with responses ranging between first-year (1) and senior (4).

The fifth block consisted of 15 variables related specifically to students’ experiences in college. The first four variables included membership in and holding
leadership positions in on-campus organizations, membership in and holding leadership positions in off-campus organizations. These four variables used Likert-like responses ranging from never (1) to much of the time (5). Also in the fifth block were the variables of community service, internship experience, employment off and on-campus, and membership in a multicultural fraternity or sorority. These five variables were coded using yes or no responses to indicate participation or not. Four variables were dedicated to measuring the frequency of mentoring relationships with faculty, a community member, parent/guardian, and peer (1=never, 4=often). One variable determined if a student was involved in a formal leadership programs (dummy coded with yes or no response).

The final variable in the fifth block was for sociocultural conversations with peers. It was measured by a six-item composite measure with Likert-like responses between never (1) to very often (4). Students responded to prompts about the frequency with which they engaged with peers in topics such as differences in lifestyles or customs, social issues, and political views. The reliability estimate for the sociocultural conversations composite measure was .92 for both HBCU and PWI samples. This measure is consistent with previous research with reliability estimates at .91 (Dugan & Komives, 2010). A full list of the sociocultural conversations items and reliability estimates can be found in Appendix B.

The sixth block was the measure of the inverse scale of non-discriminatory campus racial climate. Students’ perception of racial climate on-campus was measured using a five-item composite scale. Using Likert-like responses ranging from strongly
disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), students responded to prompts such as “I have observed discriminatory words, behaviors, or gestures directed at people like me” or “I feel there is a general atmosphere of prejudice among students.” Reliability estimates were at .87 and .88 for HBCUs and PWIs, respectively. Reliability estimates in previous research was .85 (Dugan et al., 2012b).

The intermediate outcome variable of leadership efficacy was measured using a four-item scale. Likert-like responses ranged from not at all confident (1) to very confident (4) to questions about students’ confidence in their ability to lead others, or take initiative to improve something. Reliability estimates for the leadership efficacy scale were .89 for the HBCU sample and .87 for the PWI sample. Previous research reliability estimates ranged between .86-.88 (Dugan et al., 2012c; Dugan et al., 2011a). A full list of the leadership efficacy items and reliability estimates are found in Appendix B.

**Data Analysis Plan**

This section provides detail about the approach to addressing the two research questions. The specific statistical methods are spelled out, along with a note about the potential for post hoc analysis.

**Question 1**

Are there statistically significant differences in socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/ Black students attending HBCUs and African American/ Black students attending PWIs during college?

The first question was addressed using an independent samples *t*-test using the SPSS statistical computer software. The *t*-test is a statistical test used to evaluate the
difference of means between two separate (independent) groups (Green & Salkind, 2008). The samples were grouped according to attending an HBCU or not attending an HBCU, and tested on mean scores for socially responsible leadership. In addition to setting the $p$-value at $p < .01$ for a more conservative estimate given the size of the sample, the effect size measure of Cohen’s $d$ evaluated the magnitude and meaningfulness of any potential statistically significant differences found in the $t$-test.

**Question 2**

Are there differences in the types of college experiences that predict socially responsible leadership capacity for college students in HBCUs and PWIs?

Two separate hierarchical multiple regressions conducted using the conceptual framework were calculated to address the second question. Multiple regression is a statistical method used to predict the score on a dependent variable based on scores from multiple independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Hierarchical multiple regressions are a type of multiple regression technique in which the researcher places the independent variables in a specific order to understand the predictive power of each independent variable. Prior to calculating the regressions, preliminary analyses examining zero-order correlations, variance inflation factors, and tolerance levels were calculated to ensure adherence to the statistical assumptions of regression and specifically that there were no violations of multicollinearity. Post-hoc tests were conducted to compare differences across models and examine more closely interaction effects.
Chapter Summary

The study was designed to examine capacities for, and predictors of, socially responsible leadership among African American/Black students attending HBCUs and PWIs. The quantitative study employed a causal comparative design, non-experimental research approach with a secondary data analysis. A response to the first research questions was facilitated by two independent samples t-tests. The second question is addressed by two separate hierarchical multiple regressions, guided by the conceptual framework, a modified version of Astin’s (1991) IEO model. The variables selected, coding for the variables, and reliability measures for composite measures were offered to provide support for the use of the MSL as the source of data for the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the capacities for, and predictors of, socially responsible leadership among African American/Black college students attending HBCUs and PWIs using data collected through the MSL. The hypothesis for the first research question was tested using an independent samples $t$-test. Two hierarchical multiple regressions were calculated to address the hypothesis for the second research question. Sample characteristics, tests of statistical assumptions, results from the two analyses described above, and post-hoc analyses are found in the following sections.

Sample Characteristics

The overall sample size for the study was 1,656 students who self-identified as African American/Black in the MSL. The sample consisted of 828 students from HBCUs and a matched sample of 828 from PWIs. Table 1 offers means, standard deviations, and coding for the each of the variables by HBCU and PWI sample.

The 828 HBCU students consisted of 74.8% females and 25.2% males. Students between the ages of 18-24 made up 69.3% of the population and were distributed among class standing at the rates of 17% first-year, 21.5% sophomore, 27.1% junior, and 34.4% senior. Thirty percent of the HBCU population reported being a first-generation student. The matched PWI sample of 828 students consisted of 69.1% females, with the remaining 30.9% identifying as male. Students between the ages of 18-24 made up
Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Coding for Variables By Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th>PWI</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>23.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest for dependent variable</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (small)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (medium)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegiate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Standing</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in on-campus organization</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held leadership role in on-campus organization</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in off-campus organization</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held leadership role in on-campus organization</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship experience</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment – off-campus</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcome variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy for leadership</strong></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome variable**

| Socially responsible leadership capacity | 4.08 | .44 | 4.04 | .40 |

80.9% of the population and were distributed among class standing at the rates of 21.5% first-year, 19.6% sophomore, 27.9% junior, and 30.9% senior. In the PWI population, 23.3% of students reported being a first-generation student.
Hypothesis 1: Independent Samples t-test

The first research question was addressed using an independent samples t-test to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/Black students attending HBCUs and African American/Black students attending PWIs. The hypothesis that African American/Black students attending HBCUs would demonstrate statistically significantly higher capacity for socially responsible leadership than those attending PWIs was rejected. Results indicated that students at HBCUs ($M = 4.08, SD = .44$) self-rated at approximately the same level on the omnibus outcome measure of socially responsible leadership capacity as their peers at PWIs, $M = 4.04, SD = .40$, $t(1635.63) = 2.12, p < .05$ (two-tailed). Table 2 lists the means by HBCU and PWI.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations on the Omnibus SRLS Outcome Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus SRLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical significance of the differences shown in this analysis did not meet the established $p < .01$ cutoff level. Moreover, the Cohen’s $d$ effect size statistic (a measure of the magnitude of difference between the two groups) resulted in $d = .10$, a trivial effect. In other words, even if the differences in mean scores were significant at the $p < .05$ level, the effect size suggests that the difference is more likely attributable to the large size of the sample instead of actual distinguishable differences. Table 3 includes the results for the independent samples t-test. Although the first hypothesis was rejected,
Table 3. Results From Independent Samples t-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus SRLS</td>
<td>12.283</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s $d$ effect size = .10 (trivial)
further examination of whether unique predictors of leadership capacity exist between African American/ Black students at HBCUs and PWIs through hierarchical multiple regressions was deemed necessary and appropriate to understand more fully the results.

**Hypothesis 2: Hierarchical Multiple Regressions**

The second hypothesis, which stated that significant predictors of socially responsible leadership capacity would vary between African American/ Black students based on attendance at an HBCU or a PWI, was confirmed. Two separate hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to determine if – and what – different predictors of socially responsible leadership existed among African American/ Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Although there was some overlap between the two models, more predictors emerged as significant in the HBCU model.

Before the regression analysis, three collinearity diagnostics – Pearson correlations, variance inflation factors (VIF), and tolerance levels – were calculated to ensure multicollinearity was not present among the independent variables. Multicollinearity occurs when independent variables entered into the regression model overlap in their predictive power and is made evident when values of the above diagnostics are outside of commonly accepted cut-off points. The presence of multicollinearity among independent variables would constitute a violation of the assumptions of multiple regression (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Ideally, the measurement of the Pearson correlation should not exceed .7 to ensure that independent variables do not overlap. The Pearson correlation values between membership in an off-campus organization and holding a leadership position in an off-
campus organization reached a maximum of 0.73 in the HBCU model and 0.75 in the PWI model. These two values may be indicative of possible doubling of measures, but VIF and tolerance levels (noted below) were well within normal ranges, suggesting that leaving the two variables in the regression model was not detrimental to the results.

The VIF, which should not exceed a value of 10 (Pallant, 2007), ranged from 1.06–2.54 in the PWI model and from 1.04–2.45 in the HBCU model. Tolerance levels, which should not go below .10 (Pallant, 2007), ranged between 0.39–0.95 in the PWI model and between 0.41–0.96 in the HBCU model. Because the tolerance and VIF values were within acceptable norms, all variables were kept in the regression model. Each of these measures in the HBCU and PWIs models were within appropriate limits as defined by regression technique assumptions.

Results

The overall results confirmed the second hypothesis that predictors of socially responsible leadership would vary by HBCU and PWI. The HBCU regression model (Appendix C) explained 55% of the variance ($R^2 = .55$, Adjusted $R^2 = .54$, $F[1, 773], p < .001$) on the outcome measure of socially responsible leadership capacity. In the PWI regression model (Appendix C), the variables accounted for 54% of the variance ($R^2 = .54$, Adjusted $R^2 = .52$, $F[1, 783], p < .001$) on the same outcome measure. The results from the final block of the regression models are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Results From the Final Block of Each Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PWI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.02 **</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest for dependent variable</td>
<td>.28 **</td>
<td>.33 ***</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.30 ***</td>
<td>.30 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (small)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (medium)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegiate experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class standing</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.01 **</td>
<td>.03 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in on-campus org</td>
<td>.03 **</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role in on-campus org</td>
<td>-.01 **</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in off-campus org</td>
<td>.03 **</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role in off-campus org</td>
<td>-.03 **</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship experience</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment – off-campus</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment – on-campus</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural fraternity or sorority</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship – Faculty</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship – Community member</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship – Parent/ guardian</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship – Peer</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal leadership training</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural conversations with peers</td>
<td>.10 **</td>
<td>.18 ***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.08 ***</td>
<td>.09 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory climate</td>
<td>.08 **</td>
<td>.18 ***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.04 ***</td>
<td>.01 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy for leadership</td>
<td>.28 **</td>
<td>.37 ***</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.10 ***</td>
<td>.10 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.55 ***</td>
<td>.54 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R2</td>
<td>.54 ***</td>
<td>.52 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>168.29</td>
<td>173.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Input Variables

The first set of input variables in Block 1 consisted of gender, age, and first-generation status. Although the individual variables did not emerge as predictive in either model, in the HBCU model, the demographic block accounted for a statistically significant 2% of the variance ($R^2 = .02, F[3, 793] = 5.55, p < .01$), while in the PWI model this block explained a non-significant 1% of the variance. Block 2 was the pretest measure for the outcome Omnibus SRLS-3 scale. In both models, the pretest variable emerged as a highly significant, positive predictor ($p < .001$). In the HBCU model, the variable explained 30% of the variance [$R^2$ change = .30, $F(1, 792), p < .001$]. In the PWI model, the pretest variable also explained 30% of the variance [$R^2$ change = .30, $F(1, 806), p < .001$].

Collegiate Experience Variables

The third block of variables consisted of institutional size and Carnegie classification. The third block did not contain statistically significant variable or contribute a significant amount of variance explained in either model. The fourth block measured the significance of class standing. In the HBCU model, although the variable of class standing was not significant, the relationship between class standing and leadership capacity was negative, and the one percent of variance it explained beyond the previous five variables was significant ($R^2$ change = .01, $F[1, 790], p < .001$). In the PWI model, class standing added an additional three percent of variance ($R^2$ change = .01, $F[1, 800], p < .001$), and although the variable was not a statistically significant predictor, the relationship between class standing and the outcome measure was positive.
In the fifth block, environmental variables of the collegiate experience explained an additional 8% of the variance in the HBCU model ($R^2$ change = .08, $F[15, 775], p < .001$), with membership in an on-campus organization ($p < .01$), membership in an off-campus organization ($p < .01$), and sociocultural conversations with peers ($p < .001$) emerging as positive, significant predictors. Holding a leadership position in an off-campus organization was a significant, negative predictor ($p < .01$). In the PWI model’s fifth block, only membership in an on-campus organization ($p < .01$) and sociocultural conversations with peers ($p < .001$) emerged as positive, significant predictors.

The variable of non-discriminatory climate in the sixth block of variables was a positive, significant predictor in both HBCU and PWI models ($p < .001$). In the HBCU context non-discriminatory climate explained an additional 4% of the variance ($R^2$ change = .04, $F[1, 774], p < .001$). The non-discriminatory climate variable contributed 1% of the variance explained in the PWI model ($R^2$ change = .01, $F[1, 784], p < .001$).

**Intermediate Outcome Variable**

The intermediate outcome variable of leadership efficacy was a significant, positive predictor in both the HBCU ($R^2$ change = .10, $F[1, 773], p < .001$) and PWI ($R^2$ change = .10, $F[1, 783], p < .001$) models. The efficacy variable accounted for 10% of the variance in both models.

**Post Hoc Testing**

In order to understand the statistically significant predictors of leadership in this study, five separate independent samples $t$-tests were conducted as a post hoc follow-up to the hypothesis testing. Independent samples $t$-tests were chosen for their ability to
determine whether there is a significant difference between two individual items being measured. The $t$-tests were conducted on the five predictors that emerged as significant predictors in the regression models (omnibus pre-test measure, on-campus group membership, sociocultural conversations, campus climate, and leadership efficacy), with a dummy variable to categorize scores from HBCUs and PWIs. Tables with means and $t$-test findings are listed in Appendices D-G.

The first of the five post hoc tests, used to examine the scores on the omnibus pre-test measure, did not reveal statistically significant difference ($t[1654] = 1.415, p = .157$). The second post hoc test measured the difference in scores on the variable of participation in an on-campus organization. A statistically significant difference was found – ($t[1654] = -2.416, p = .02$) with a trivial effect size of $d = .12$. African American/Black students at PWIs reported higher levels of participation ($M = 3.07, SD = 1.53$) than their peers at HBCUs ($M = 2.89, SD = 1.54$).

African American/Black students at PWIs indicated that they participated in sociocultural conversations more frequently ($M = 3.07, SD = .83$) than African American/Black students attending HBCUs ($M = 2.96, SD = .81$). The difference in scores was statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level, $t(1652) = -2.792$. The effect size, $d = .14$, also represented a trivial effect.

A statistically significant difference was found between scores on the measure of non-discriminatory climate, $t(1650.610) = 6.093, p < .001$. The Cohen’s $d$ effect size was $0.30$, a small effect. Students at HBCUs were in greater agreement with the statements
regarding a more non-discriminatory climate at HBCUs ($M = 4.01, SD = .95$) than their peers at PWIs ($M = 3.73, SD = .96$).

The final post hoc $t$-test examined the difference in scores for leadership efficacy. African American/Black students at the HBCUs rated themselves as having significantly higher levels of leadership efficacy ($M = 3.27, SD = .59$) than African American/Black students at PWIs ($M = 3.13, SD = .64$). The difference in scores was statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level, $t(1654) = 4.615$. The effect size of $d = .23$ was small.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter provided an in-depth review of the findings of this study. The chapter reviewed the two guiding research questions and subsequent hypotheses, offered an explanation of the study sample characteristics, and information about the results from the independent samples $t$-test and hierarchical multiple regressions that were used in the study. Findings revealed no significant differences in the levels of socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Results from the regression models indicated that the pre-test measure largely explained the leadership capacity of African American/Black students at HBCU and PWIs, but college experience variables also emerged as predictive: membership in an on-campus organization, participation in sociocultural conversations with peers, the campus climate, and leadership efficacy. Two unique variables emerged as significant predictors in the HBCU model. The variable of membership in an off-campus organization emerged as a significant, positive predictor and the variable for holding a leadership position in off-campus organizations was significant, negative predictor. Post hoc analyses provided
further data for comparative analyses, showing greater leadership efficacy and greater feelings of non-discriminatory campus climate among African American/Black students at HBCUs. The next chapter will consist of a discussion of the findings, limitations of the study, and implications for practice and future research.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

This final chapter frames the findings of this study within the context of existing literature, presents an interpretation of the findings, limitations, and offers direction for practice and future research. The first part of the chapter is summative and consists of a review of the statement of the problem, the research questions, and methodology. The second part of the chapter is a review of the findings, and is followed by a discussion and interpretation of the findings vis-à-vis existing literature. The final part of the chapter covers limitations of the study, implications of the findings for practice and research, and a final conclusion.

Statement of the Problem

There remain fundamental questions about the ways in which the HBCU and PWI institutional contexts influence African American/Black students’ leadership development for at least four reasons. First, research about African American/Black students in general has only become part of the scope of higher education research in more recent decades (Harper et al., 2004). Second, research about leadership development in college is a newer line of academic inquiry dating to approximately 20 years ago (Komives, 2011). Third, in many of the college leadership studies, race was largely ignored (Dugan, 2011) until more recent studies (e.g., Arminio et al., 2000) began examining student populations of color. Finally, what research there is that examines race
and leadership in college populations has not determined if there are differentiating impacts of HBCU and PWI settings on leadership development. This is a problem because scholars (e.g., Dugan et al., 2012a) have demonstrated that race has an influence on leadership development (Dugan, 2011). Moreover, researchers indicate that there are observable differences in the experiences of students at HBCUs and PWIs that likely influence leadership development (e.g., Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002; Harper et al., 2004).

Emerging research has begun to address unique leadership development considerations associated with race and racial identity (Dugan, 2011; Dugan et al., 2012a), but evidence is still limited and no known studies have considered the simultaneous influences of race and institutional type as it related to PWI and HBCU status. In other words, there is a lack of clarity about the differences between African American/Black student leadership development at HBCUs and PWIs. Obtaining this information can inform educators as they work with African American/Black students in either setting. Because previous research has not captured data from the HBCU environment regarding leadership development, gaps exist in the knowledge base that informs theory and practice in the higher education field. Research that examines the conditional effect of institutional contexts of HBCUs and PWIs on African American/Black student leadership development is overdue (Pascarella, 2006).

HBCU scholars (e.g., Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Palmer & Gasman, 2008) frequently describe a nurturing environment, suggesting that these institutions provide an ideal training ground for the development of leadership capacities of African American/Black students because of their empowering educational setting (e.g., Palmer, 2010).
Despite what seems to be an ideal place to pursue undergraduate studies for African American/Black students, the statistics show that a large majority of African American/Black students are now enrolled at PWIs (Aud et al., 2010). Scholars (e.g., Allen, 1992; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001) have suggested that PWIs do not appear to be as effective in facilitating the academic or social development of African American/Black students or addressing their specific needs. Through the identification of the predictors of leadership development at HBCUs and PWIs, leadership educators could have a clearer understanding of what interventions would be most appropriate for each context.

Research aimed specifically at understanding the leadership development of African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs would inform the higher education field by providing empirical evidence of effective practices in working with African American/Black student populations. In addition, this type of inquiry would be of mutual benefit to HBCUs and PWIs, giving insight into what practices or environmental features most strongly effect leadership development. Though some features may not be replicable, helpful practices can be particularly effective if they are evidence-based. With the aid of well-conceived research, the experiences of African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs can be better understood, leading to a more purposeful focus on development for future generations of African American/Black leaders. This current investigation was designed with this research gap in mind and explored the following two questions as its guide:
1. Are there statistically significant differences in socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/Black students attending HBCUs and African American/Black students attending PWIs during college?

2. Are there differences in the types of college experiences that predict socially responsible leadership capacity for African American/Black college students in HBCUs and PWIs?

**Review of Methods**

This quantitative study employed a cross-sectional, causal comparative design in a secondary analysis of data collected during the 2009 and 2011 iterations of the MSL. The MSL is an international research project aimed at informing educators and practitioners about college student leadership development. Through examination of MSL data, it is possible to ascertain the impact of various curricular and co-curricular experiences and campus environmental factors on the development of students’ leadership capacity within the higher education context (Dugan & Komives, 2007). The MSL survey instrument consisted of new and pre-existing scales compiled specifically for use in the national study. Reliability and validity were established through pilot studies and significant psychometric testing (Dugan et al., 2009).

The overall sample for this study consisted of data collected at 136 institutions of higher education in the United States. Of the participating institutions, three were HBCUs (two in 2009 and one in 2011). Participating institutions self-selected for involvement in data collection. Samples of students within participating institutions were solicited via email to complete the MSL survey. The sampling strategy for institutions with over 4,000
students consisted of a random sample while those with less than 4,000 students used full population samples. The total sample size for 2009 was 346,067, of which 118,733 responded. The sample size for the study was made up of 828 African American/ Black students from the three participating HBCUs. A matched, random sample of 828 African American/ Black students from the national sample at PWIs was selected for comparative analysis. The total sample size for this study was 1,656 students.

The two guiding research questions determined if there were statistically significant differences in capacity for socially responsible leadership capacity, and what experiences predicted those differences. The first research question was addressed using independent samples t-tests to distinguish statistically significant differences and similarities between the student populations at HBCUs and PWIs. A measure of the effect size was used to interpret the magnitude of differences. The second research question required two separate hierarchical multiple regressions – one each for the HBCU and PWI samples – in seven blocks following a modified IEO model (Astin, 1991).

Summary of Results

The first of the two research questions examined if there were statistically significant differences in self-reported measures of socially responsible leadership capacity among African American/ Black college students attending HBCUs and PWIs. An independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant differences on mean scores for the outcome measure among African American/ Black students at HBCUs and PWIs, rejecting the first hypothesis. Although African American/ Black students attending HBCUs showed higher mean scores than their peers at PWIs, the significance
level \((p = .04)\) failed to attain the significance threshold set at \(p < .01\). Moreover, a measure of the effect size showed a trivial effect of .10 using Cohen’s \(d\) statistic. Although the result of this test was not statistically significant, further examination was deemed necessary and appropriate to determine whether unique predictors existed among African American/Black students at the two institution types.

The second research question determined the predictors of socially responsible leadership capacity among African American/Black students at HBCUs versus PWIs. The question was addressed through two individual hierarchical multiple regressions. The second hypothesis, which was confirmed, stated that significant predictors of socially responsible leadership capacity would vary among African American/Black students based on attendance at an HBCU or a PWI.

In the HBCU regression model, seven variables reached statistical significance. The omnibus pre-test measure \((p < .001)\), membership in an on-campus organization \((p < .01)\), membership in an off-campus organization \((p < .01)\), sociocultural conversations \((p < .001)\), campus climate \((p < .001)\), and leadership efficacy \((p < .001)\) emerged as positive, significant predictors of socially responsible leadership capacity. Holding a leadership role in an off-campus organization \((p < .01)\) was a negative, significant predictor in the HBCU model. The model accounted for 55% of the variance in students’ scores.

Five statistically significant predictors were found in the PWI regression model. Positive, significant predictors consisted of the Omnibus pre-test \((p < .001)\), membership in an on-campus organization \((p < .01)\), sociocultural conversations \((p < .001)\), campus
climate ($p < .01$), and leadership efficacy ($p < .001$). The model accounted for 54% of the variance across students’ scores.

The second hypothesis for variation of predictors by institution type was confirmed, though not in an overwhelming or distinctive manner, meaning that the variables that emerged as predictive were virtually the same in both regression models. The five significant predictors in the PWI regression model overlapped with their counterparts in the HBCU model. The HBCU model consisted of two additional, unique predictors. The overlap of statistically significant predictors begged the question, if a majority of the predictors are the same for HBCUs and PWIs in this study, then how do the experiences at HBCU and PWI influence students’ leadership development differently, if at all?

As a result of the overlap, post hoc independent samples $t$-tests were performed on the five overlapping predictors to inform the interpretation of the findings and determine what differences, if any, were present. In each calculation the predictor served as the dependent measure and attendance at either an HBCU or PWI served as the independent measure. The $t$-test examining the difference between the two omnibus pre-test scores was the only non-significant result. The remaining four post hoc tests revealed statistically significant differences among African American/Black students at PWIs versus HBCUs. The post hoc tests for differences in levels of on-campus participation in student organizations and differences in frequency of sociocultural conversations both resulted in statistically significant differences, but trivial effect sizes ($d = .12$ for on-
campus membership, \( d = .14 \) for sociocultural conversations) suggested that the effect was not meaningful.

African American/ Black students at HBCUs were in greater agreement with statements indicating a non-discriminatory climate at HBCUs than their peers at PWIs in the third post hoc test. The finding was meaningfully supported with a small effect size \( (d = .30) \). The final post hoc \( t \)-test examined the difference in leadership efficacy and showed that African American/ Black students at HBCUs rated themselves as having higher levels of leadership efficacy than African American/ Black students at PWIs with a small effect size \( (d = .23) \). In the next section, these findings are interpreted using existing literature. Suggestions for practice and research are presented before limitations of the study, future research suggestions, and the conclusion.

Discussion

This section highlights the findings from the study. The first subsection deals with whether there are differences in socially responsible leadership capacity in African American/ Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Each of the following subsections will include a statement of the pertinent regression and post hoc results, a contextualization of the results within literature, and an interpretation of the finding. The subsections cover membership in on-campus organizations, sociocultural conversations, non-discriminatory campus climate, leadership efficacy, membership and leadership in off-campus organizations, and mentorship.

The first research question explored whether there were significant differences in socially responsible leadership capacity between African American/ Black students at
HBCUs and PWIs. Results showed no significant differences in leadership capacity between the two populations, contrary to the hypothesis that African American/Black students at HBCUs would demonstrate significantly higher levels of socially responsible leadership capacity based on findings seen on other outcome measures. Although there were no differences, interestingly the post-hoc test examining the pretest showed no perceived differences at point of entry either. This runs contrary to the extant literature on other educational outcomes that found HBCU students entered with lower scores (Allen, 1998; Allen & Haniff, 1991; Fleming, 1984; Kim & Conrad, 2006). It appears that students at HBCUs and PWIs enter college on equal footing in terms of leadership development.

**Membership in On-Campus Organizations**

Membership in on-campus organizations achieved statistical significance in both HBCU and PWI regression models. The significance of this variable suggests that being active in on-campus organizations is important for leadership development among African American/Black students at HBCU and PWI campuses. The post hoc test to determine differences in levels of participation in on-campus organizations indicated higher mean levels of participation among African American/Black students at PWIs, but the effect size was trivial, indicating that membership in on-campus organizations is occurring at similar rates for African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. The trivial effect size is also suggestive that membership in on-campus organizations matters for leadership development, regardless of PWI or HBCU context.

The significance of the on-campus membership variable found in this study
echoes previous research results that suggested membership in on-campus organizations is predictive of leadership development (e.g., Dugan & Komives, 2007; Dugan et al., 2012a; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001). This makes sense because membership presents opportunities for helping students find a place on the campus, which is key for African American/Black students (Strayhorn, 2008). The parity in levels of participation found in the post hoc test is similar in nature to previous research that indicated campus racial composition does not make any difference in levels of involvement in campus organizations (DeSousa & Kuh, 1996). The overlap in significance of the on-campus membership variable that prompted the post hoc analysis also raised the question of how experiences at HBCUs versus PWIs affected gains in leadership development among African American/Black students.

Intuitively, one would think that there are greater opportunities for African American/Black student membership in organizations at HBCUs where organizations consist of mostly African American/Black students. This means that African American/Black students are also filling leadership positions, that the culture of organizations is more suited to these students (Allen, 1992), and that the participants more freely engage in leadership without the need to assimilate to dominant cultural norms. At HBCUs, students are in an environment with more visible peers, administrators, and faculty members of the same racial identity. As a result, students may find organizations to be more suited to their needs. Furthermore, the campus as a whole may be a more conducive environment for participation, and therefore contribute to leadership development.

At PWIs, African American/Black students find an environment for membership
in on-campus organizations that can be characterized by greater competition for fewer spots. In the PWI context, African American/Black students will likely have positional leadership roles at a lower rate than HBCUs because of multiple reasons. First, it may be that African American/Black students are not interested in positions of leadership because the leadership role does not align with cultural values (Arminio et al., 2000). Second, holding a leadership position could be interpreted as buying into the mainstream White norm (e.g., Arminio et al., 2000). Third, because of institutionalized oppression the African American/Black students may not even be considered for the positions or alternatively they may be essentialized based on race when they are obtained. In PWI environments, African American/Black students report an “overwhelming whiteness” (Hawkins & Larabee, 2009, p. 181) that can contribute to feelings of being the token person of color (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002). The decreased presence of faculty and administrators of color in lower numbers likely exacerbates this issue (Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001; Fries-Britt, Rowan-Kenyon, Perna, Milem, & Howard, 2011). Research also indicated that student organizations are more adequately suited to White students at PWIs and as a result leaves African American/Black students feeling marginalized (Griffin, Nichols, Pérez, & Tuttle, 2008; Harper, Byars, & Jelke, 2005).

The feeling of marginalization is particularly important in PWI environments where racism remains a reality and because PWI environments do not always foster involvement among African American/Black populations (e.g., Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002). Without being involved in on-campus organizations, students are less likely to feel like they have a place on campus, which is important for leadership development (Harper
This need for involvement is part of why identity-based groups are important to students of color at PWIs (Hawkins & Larabee, 2009). Identity-based groups provide cultural support and networking opportunities to African American/Black students in unwelcoming PWI environments. Participation in on-campus organizations at PWIs also provides chances for African American/Black students to open opportunities to other African American/Black peers to join organizations, increase representation, and raise the ability to influence happenings in campus organizations or policy on the campus level (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Sutton & Terrell, 2001). Harper and Quaye (2007) found that many African American/Black students at PWIs were participating in identity-based organizations because it was a safer environment.

Perhaps the import of this finding lies in the fact that despite all of these environmental constraints on African American/Black students desire for and access to participation in student organizations at PWIs, they still report equivalent levels of involvement as their peers at HBCUs. This likely says more about the resilience of African American/Black students at PWIs than it does about institutional efforts to create more supportive and equitable environments. Garland (2010) reported a similar finding in a study of Native American students’ levels of participation in student organizations at PWIs. Results indicated that the more hostile and under-represented within the environment, the more involved Native American students became in student organizations. These organizations became vehicles for creating communities of safety as well as advocacy within the larger institution. Although this study was not able to determine the type of organization in which the sampled students were participating on
HBCU or PWI campuses, it is definitive that African American/ Black students’ participation in organizations on-campus facilitated development of their leadership capacity.

**Sociocultural Conversations**

Sociocultural conversations are discussions among peers across and/ or about difference such as racial, political, religious, or cultural. The independent variable for sociocultural conversations was a positive, significant predictor of socially responsible leadership capacity in the HBCU and PWI regression models. In the post hoc analysis examining the differences between frequencies of reported sociocultural conversations, African American/ Black students at PWIs indicated greater frequency of participating than their peers at HBCUs, though the effect was trivial. Similar to the results around on-campus organization membership, the regression and post hoc findings together suggest that sociocultural conversations are important to gains in leadership development in HBCU and PWI settings and they are happening at a similar rate in the two institution types.

The finding of significance of sociocultural conversations supports previous research that conversations across and/ or about differences among peers predict gains in leadership capacity (Antonio, 2001; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001). Indeed, the variable for sociocultural conversations has been among the most consistent and powerful predictor variables in research stemming from the MSL (e.g., Dugan & Komives, 2007, 2010; Dugan et al., 2012a). Because the student populations at HBCUs are predominantly African American/ Black and more
racial homogenous (Aud et al., 2010), one might presume that sociocultural conversations would be more important for African American/ Black students at HBCUs or that the frequency of their occurrence was lower than at PWIs. Although students at HBCUs likely see mostly individuals of the same racial background, there remain several topics of difference that constitute a sociocultural conversation. After all, these discussions are about more than race. In fact, the scales structure extends the importance of difference beyond just race purposefully as a means to address the multiple and intersecting forms of identity that contribute to difference in society (Dugan et al., 2009).

In addition to race, sociocultural conversations can be about different lifestyles and customs, personal values, social issues (e.g., peace, human rights, and justice), religious beliefs, views about multiculturalism and diversity, and political opinions. This takes the onus off of students of color to always carry the burden of representing the “other” and educating White students in conversations across difference.

The findings from this study regarding sociocultural conversations further indicate that they are a “universally positive influence on socially responsible leadership capacity” (Dugan et al., 2012a, p. 184). The continued presence of these conversations as a powerful predictor of leadership development is also indicative of the manner in which conversations about difference overlap with the tenets of the social change model. Sociocultural conversations are sources of profound learning for students because they create cognitive dissonance and expand on students’ abilities for social perspective-taking (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002) and lead to more complex forms of thinking and making meaning about differences. Cognitive dissonance
occurs when what students experience or encounter is different from their expectations (Evans, 2011). When these encounters of difference occur with other peers through sociocultural conversations, the cognitive growth that results is particularly influential (Evans, 2011), and important for leadership development because the leadership identity development model situates cognitive development as one of the major underlying dimensions of increasingly complex leadership abilities (Komives et al., 2005, 2006; Wagner, 2011).

The finding of equal rates of participation in sociocultural conversations at HBCUs and PWIs is also suggestive that they need to be about more than just race despite the powerful role that race plays in society and degree to which individuals associate diversity and difference with issues of race (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; Johnson, 2006). The dominant or most frequent topics of these conversations may vary according to institution type – if only because of racial composition – and may also feed into the level of discriminatory feelings experienced among students at the two institution types. That is to say, although the conversations may be happening at the same rate, the nature of the conversations may be more honest and varied in topic at HBCUs helping foster a more inclusive environment and less discriminatory climate. At PWIs this finding – in connection with the finding in relation to less discriminatory climates at HBCUs than PWIs – may be representative of less meaningful conversations around difference. The meaningfulness of the conversation may be determined by who is having the conversation with whom. For example, there may be a difference in openness of conversation when two African American/ Black students at an HBCU are talking about
privilege and when a White student and an African American/Black student at a PWI are talking about privilege. This is not to suggest that genuine conversations cannot be had between two students of different races, but it may be that the cognitive dissonance and the emotional distance from controversial or difficult subjects may be different depending on the intersection of their personal identities. Additionally, there are most certainly socio-emotional costs associated with “being the source of learning” for those in the majority around difference for those in the majority.

**Leadership Efficacy**

Leadership efficacy was a significant, positive predictor of socially responsible leadership capacity in both models. The post hoc test also produced a significant finding, with a small but meaningful effect size. The African American/Black students at HBCUs showed higher levels of leadership efficacy than their PWI peers. This suggests some aspect of the experience at PWIs results in lower efficacy for African American/Black students.

Leadership efficacy is an important factor to consider in the understanding of college student leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2010). As previously noted, leadership efficacy is the internal belief that one is able to successfully enact leadership capacity (Dugan, 2011), and it greatly influences capacity (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Machida & Schaubroek, 2011). A student may have a high level of capacity or knowledge about leadership, but without efficacy the capacity may go unutilized (Dugan, 2011).

In previous college student leadership research, race influenced students’ levels of
efficacy (Dugan et al., 2008b). Bandura (1997) also noted race’s influence on efficacy stating:

People develop preconceptions of performance capabilities linked to age, sex, educational and socioeconomic level, race, and ethnic designation even though the individuals within these groups differ widely in their capabilities. Such preconceptions usually arise from a combination of cultural stereotyping and overgeneralization from salient experiences. (p. 98)

Bandura added that role models of a similar race and gender are more credible and instill greater efficacy beliefs than models of different race and gender. That is, African American/Black students are more likely to develop greater efficacy by seeing African American/Black faculty members or administrators than White ones.

The presence of higher levels of efficacy at HBCUs may be attributable to the greater presence of peer leaders, faculty, and staff of color from the same racial group. At HBCUs, students are in an environment in which they see individuals with similar racial group membership in leadership roles in administration or as faculty members – individuals whom they can aspire to be like. This is an example of Bandura’s (1997) core component of efficacy building through vicarious experiences (i.e., the building of belief based on seeing someone similar to oneself perform a task). Even if mentoring relationships did not emerge as a significant predictor of leadership capacity at HBCUs, it appears from this finding on efficacy that African American/Black role models are having an indirect impact on students. It may be that the overall ethos at an HBCU takes racial subordination and stigma out of the equation to a greater degree for African American/Black students fostering an affirmative and asset-based environment that potentially contributes to efficacy.
In PWI environments African American/Black students reported feelings of being the token person of color (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002) and see fewer faculty and staff of color (Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001; Fries-Britt et al., 2011). Because previous research has indicated that student organizations on PWI campuses are more culturally oriented to White students and create a general sense of overwhelming Whiteness, it is not surprising that PWI campuses may cause African American/Black students to feel marginalized (Griffin et al., 2008 Harper et al., 2005; Hawkins & Larabee, 2009). As such, it stands to reason that efficacy is likely to increase at lower rates at PWIs than at HBCUs. At PWIs, there are fewer visible models that, through vicarious experience, can serve in the cultivation of efficacy in African American/Black students. A similar effect was found in a study of college women in science and engineering majors compared with their non-science, female peers (Dugan et al., 2012c). The hegemonic masculinity that permeated the culture of science majors did not stop gains in efficacy, but caused the rate of growth to be remarkably lower than that reported by women in other fields. A similar effect may be playing out for African American/Black students at HBCUs versus PWIs.

Finally, this finding around efficacy may also be an indicator of the quality of involvement and interactions that are present on HBCU campuses. Although African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs were participating at similar rates in on-campus organizations, the involvement on HBCU campuses may have been more effective in developing efficacy. In an organization in which many or all members are from a similar racial background, there is less social pressure to assimilate to White
cultural norms (Hawkins & Larabee, 2009). In addition, the nurturing environment of an HBCU may contribute to organizations more suited to meet student needs (Allen, 1992) creating an environment in which African American/Black students have more resources (e.g., human and social capital) to engage in leadership development.

**Non-discriminatory Campus Climate**

In both regression models, the non-discriminatory campus climate variable emerged as a significant, positive predictor. In the HBCU model, this variable was both more highly significant and explained a greater amount of the variance than in the PWI model. The post hoc analysis revealed a significantly less discriminatory campus climate among HBCUs than among PWIs, with a small effect size. This finding, put into practical terms, means that the environments at PWIs are more likely to cause African American/Black students to feel discriminated against or that the PWI students have had greater experiences of prejudicial behaviors against them than students at HBCUs. Thus, HBCUs provide a safer context for African American/Black students to build leadership capacity.

This finding of a less discriminatory campus climate for African American/Black students at HBCUs aligns with previous research (Allen, 1992; Bohr et al., 1995; Chavous, Harris, Rivas, Helaire, & Green, 2004; Palmer & Gasman, 2008). The racial homogeneity frequently found on HBCU campuses (Aud et al., 2010) and the ways in which systemic oppression play out for students of color at PWIs may be contributing reasons as to why there is a greater feeling of non-discrimination at HBCUs. Whereas campus environments at PWIs contribute to marginalization of African American/Black students (e.g., Strayhorn, 2008) and may foster an internalized sense of discrimination,
HBCUs are more able to create environments in which African American/Black students are validated and supported (e.g., Allen, 1992). One way in which this is done is through a greater presence of students, faculty, and staff of color, and an environment that is not characterized by “overwhelming Whiteness” (Hawkins & Larabee, 2009, p. 181).

The findings around non-discriminatory climate in this study suggest that the extent to which African American/Black students experience discriminatory or prejudicial acts or a discriminatory environment plays a critical role in leadership development. It appears that the variable for non-discriminatory environment is the point at which greater development of efficacy – and thereby leadership capacity – hinges. At HBCUs the positive climate contributes to variance explained in the model in a meaningful way. Conversely, at PWIs the environment is more hostile and has a negative impact, but its overall effect in explaining differences between students’ levels of leadership capacity is smaller. In other words, a good environment is great and a bad environment does not help, but its relative impact on African American/Black students is small. This seems to reflect Ospina and Foldy’s (2009) powerful claim that most leadership research fails to acknowledge people of color’s agency in dealing with stigma and racism rendering them as passive recipients rather than able to cope and address it effectively.

While the above interpretation offers greater agency for students of color in the navigation of hostile environments, negative institutional effects still have the potential to constrain leadership development. The rate of discrimination may contribute to withdrawal from the very experiences that help build leadership efficacy and capacity. In
environments characterized by discrimination, African American/ Black students – although participating in organizations at equal levels – may feel a psychological constraint that plays out in the development and enactment of efficacy and capacity. Hawkins and Larabee (2009) suggested this might either reduce involvement levels on campus or refocus levels of involvement on identity-based organizations that provide a sense of safety and community within the hostile climate. Either of these two effects could potentially limit engagement in experiences that offer sociocultural conversations and efficacy-building experiences based on enactive mastery opportunities. If feelings of non-discriminatory climate contribute to greater development of leadership efficacy, the non-discriminatory variable gains importance because of leadership efficacy’s strong predictive relationship to leadership capacity (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Hannah et al, 2008).

**Off-Campus Membership and Leadership**

The two independent variables that were unique to the HBCU regression model both pertained to participation in off-campus organizations. The variable for being involved as a member of an off-campus organization emerged as a positive, significant predictor. Holding a leadership position in an off-campus organization was a negative, significant predictor. The importance of participating in off-campus organizations to leadership development is congruent with findings from Palmer, Davis, and Hilton (2009) who indicated community off-campus plays an important part in the lives of African American/ Black students at HBCUs. Palmer et al. (2009) posited that part of the need to stay connected to the off-campus community lies in the fact that students’
families are located within those communities and families play an important role in students’ lives. In a study of African American/Black students at a PWI, Sutton and Terrell (1997) posited that community organizations provided more adequate opportunity for leadership development for African American/Black students than institutions of higher education.

The two findings related to off-campus membership and leadership development simultaneously counter and support Tinto’s (as cited in Palmer et al., 2009) suggestion that students focus their attention on becoming involved in the on-campus community instead of maintaining off-campus ties. The positive effect of off-campus membership among African American/Black students at HBCUs may be attributable to the students continuing to work with an organization that helped them develop leadership capacity in a non-campus setting similar to what Sutton and Terrell (1997) found in their study. The data for this study are unable to determine the type of off-campus organization that contributes to the gains in leadership development. Perhaps having a leadership role in an off-campus organization, a more serious commitment of time and resources, detracts from the development of leadership capacity due to the required investment of energy. The negative impact of off-campus leadership positions may also be due to the structure of these roles, which could reinforce hierarchical or management approaches that are inconsistent with socially responsible leadership. Another possible explanation is that the students in leadership positions are involved in predominantly White organizations that cause pressure to assimilate to a White culture norm for leadership (similar to the assimilation pressures experienced on PWI campuses). The culture of the organizations
may cause the involved African American/Black students to feel stereotyped or constrained, negatively influencing their leadership efficacy and/or capacity.

**Mentoring**

In previous leadership studies, mentoring was a consistent predictor of gains in leadership capacity (e.g., Dugan et al., 2012a; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Campbell et al., 2012). Previous studies have cited the power of mentoring relationships – particularly with faculty members and student affairs practitioner – in student experiences at HBCUs (Berger & Milem, 2000; Fries-Britt & Turner, 2002; Hirt et al., 2008). It was therefore surprising not to find any of the mentoring variables reach statistical significance in the HBCU model. Though slightly less so, it remained surprising to note the non-predictive power of the mentoring variables in the PWI model because fewer instances of mentoring relationships with faculty members seem to occur at PWIs based on prior research (Allen, 1992).

**Limitations**

Like all research, this study has limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. The limitations are presented here as a tool for understanding the interpretation of findings along with potential implications for practice. The research has at least five limitations that merit discussion.

First, the sample was drawn from two different years of data. The combination of two years was done to increase the sample size for students at HBCUs, to increase generalizability, and to facilitate institutional anonymity. However, because the data
gathered through the MSL are cross-sectional, and therefore a single data collection point, the likelihood of parts of the data affecting the results are limited.

Second, the data collected represented only a small portion of HBCUs and their students. Just as each student is unique, so too are the HBCUs where the students are matriculating. Although the number of cases can justify the number of variables entered into the regression, a greater representation of HBCUs, along with a wider range of students, would likely generate more powerful findings. In conjunction with this limitation, it is important to note that the data representing the HBCU population consisted largely of respondents from one of the HBCUs, potentially skewing the results. In spite of these two limitations and with respect to the research question, the MSL is among the only data sets with the variables of interest, and this study provides an important foundation for future exploration of leadership development at HBCUs.

Third, this study used a cross-sectional approach with a quasi pre-test in place of a true longitudinal pre/post-test. Astin and Lee (2003) suggested caution when using cross-sectional research in college impact studies because the single data collection may not provide a proper baseline for comparison when measuring growth over a period of time. This study used a quasi pre-test, asking the student to reflect on their pre-collegiate experiences to serve as the baseline. The cross-sectional approach used here has been described as more appropriate when measuring dependent variables with a cognitive component like leadership (Howard, 1980; Rohs, 1999, 2002; Rohs & Langone, 1997). By using a cross-sectional data collection method, the MSL more accurately measures the impact of college experiences on leadership development because the participants are less
likely to have shifting cognitive lenses through which they interpret the questions, thereby mitigating the possibility of response shift bias (Howard & Dailey, 1979).

Fourth, the study relied on self-reported data. Some research has indicated that self-reported data leads to halo errors (Pike, 1999) meaning that, “raters tend to rely on general perceptions, even when they were asked to evaluate specific characteristics of individuals” (Pike, 1999, p. 65). For example, a student may inaccurately self-rate highly on capacity for handling conflict with civility based on true capacities for collaboration and common purpose. Other critiques of self-report data suggested that students respond in a socially desirable manner instead of in alignment with the truth, that students do not have the cognitive capacity to respond with full accuracy to questions about gains, and will therefore respond to the same questions differently, apart from their actual gains (Bowman, 2011). Much research has been conducted to validate the accuracy of self-report data, especially with regard to the measurement of educational outcomes. Scholars have suggested that self-report data may be a more favorable and accurate measure of educational gains (Anaya, 1999; Gonyea & Miller, 2011; Pike, 2011). Kuh (as cited in Gonyea & Miller, 2011) posited five conditions under which self-report measures are likely to be valid:

The information requested is known to the respondents, the questions are phrased clearly and unambiguously, the questions refer to recent activities, the respondents think the questions merit a serious and thoughtful response, and if answering the question does not threaten, embarrass, or violate the privacy of the respondent or encourage the respondent to respond in socially desirable ways. (p. 101)

Within the MSL, these five conditions as stipulated by Kuh (as cited by Gonyea & Miller, 2011) are satisfactorily met. First, the information requested pertains to the
participants’ experiences. Second, the MSL underwent rigorous pilot testing that included phrasing of items (Dugan, 2008). Third, for most participating students the experiences that factor into the measurements within the MSL have happened within recent years and for others pilot testing confirmed accuracy of recall. Fourth, students have the ability to skip responses to questions if they are interpreted as threatening, embarrassing, or invasive of privacy. In addition, for questions in relation to potentially sensitive questions like sexual orientation, race, or religious preference, the instrument has “Rather Not Say” as a response. Finally, pilot testing involved scales used to identify and eliminate concerns associated with socially desirous responding.

A fifth limitation of the study is that the data do not address the differences between racial group membership and collective racial esteem, which provides a more in-depth understanding into the impact of race on leadership development. Although the MSL has embedded scales to collect data on collective racial esteem, it is a sub-study and is completed by fewer students. Inclusion of the collective racial esteem measures in this study would have greatly limited the sample size and thereby the inclusion of potentially significant independent variables.

Implications

This research revealed relative parity in levels of development of leadership capacity among African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Perhaps more importantly, the research provides empirical evidence regarding similarities and differences among predictors of students’ leadership development on HBCU and PWI
The implications for practice and future research in the field of leadership education are discussed in the following sections.

**Implications for Practice**

Findings from this study offer insight into effective ways to facilitate development of socially responsible leadership capacity among African American/Black college students at HBCUs and PWIs. Implications are presented within the framework of significant findings from the current study.

The current study’s results indicated that membership in on-campus organizations facilitates development of leadership capacity for African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Student affairs practitioners and leadership educators should work to ensure that African American/Black students in both environments identify accessible pathways into student organizations and that these groups offer meaningful contributions to students’ development. At PWIs it is important for African American/Black students to have opportunities to engage freely in organizations and leadership without pressure for assimilation to the White cultural mainstream. This may best be done through identity-based organizations. However, to ensure that the pressure for assimilation is mitigated and that African American/Black students have the opportunity to hold membership in whichever on-campus organization they choose, training in multicultural competence should be a priority for organizational advisors as well as student members across all types of organizations.

Participation in on-campus student organizations both leads to gains in leadership development and presents opportunities to engage in sociocultural conversations with
peers about and across differences. These conversations proved to be predictive of gains in leadership capacity at HBCUs and PWIs in this study and were predictive of leadership efficacy in other research (Dugan et al., 2008b; Kodama & Dugan, 2012). With this in mind, practitioners and educators need to ensure that sociocultural conversations are intentionally structured into curricular and co-curricular activities. Moreover, the conversations need to cover more than strictly racial issues. The conversations may look slightly different based on whether they occur at an HBCU or PWI, but some things can apply in both settings. For example, a topic of sociocultural conversations for African American/Black students that may be useful in both HBCU and PWI contexts is that of gender roles as it pertains to men and masculinity. At an HBCU, it may be instructive to focus the attention of sociocultural conversations on the intersection of sexual orientation and religious beliefs. Previous scholarship has shown that acceptance of LGB-identified students can be a source of struggle within the African American/Black community (e.g., Harper & Gasman, 2008; Patton, 2011).

For sociocultural conversations to be intentionally included into a curriculum or co-curricular program, it requires that leadership educators have the adequate skill set to facilitate them and integrate this pedagogically into students’ experiences. Owen (2012) found that most leadership educators have little training or education preparing them for the role. If educators do not know how to engage effectively in sociocultural conversations, it is difficult to expect students to engage effectively. Even more troubling may be the harm that could be caused to students if educators fail to recognize the complexity of these conversations and facilitate them poorly. Because facilitation of
sociocultural conversations requires a sophisticated set of skills, leadership educators should look to professional development opportunities or programs such as intergroup dialogues through which they can develop the necessary skills and learn how to embed them within students’ experiences. This would likely also require a high degree of critical self reflection and willingness to examine educators’ own social identities and ways in which they relate to privilege and/ or oppression.

Non-discriminatory campus climate is an important factor to consider when developing curricular and co-curricular leadership development interventions. The findings of this study indicate that PWI campuses should continue working on the creation of more accepting campus climates and creating environments that do not discriminate against members of its campus community, particularly African American/ Black students. Suggestions for creating a more welcoming campus climate include the creation of initiatives that bring together identity-based and campus-wide organizations in meaningful ways when developmentally appropriate, the creation of public spaces and display of artifacts and symbols that reflect the diversity of the student populations on campus (Kinzie & Mulholland, 2008), and the involvement of African American/ Black students in decision-making processes within the institution (Patton & Hannon, 2008).

Campuses can foster a less discriminatory climate through the use of inclusive design in leadership programs and curricula (Munin & Dugan, 2011). “The inclusive design of leadership programs seeks to recognize, incorporate, and engage marginalized student populations on college campuses” (Munin & Dugan, 2011, p. 157). Leadership programs and curricula that are developed through inclusive design contain the means to
reach a diverse audience through an array of communication methods, incorporate a
variety of learning styles, and create opportunities for interaction about social justice and
sociocultural topics (Munin & Dugan, 2011). If a more diverse range of students were to
be reached, it would be reasonable to suggest that there could greater variation in the
nature of sociocultural discussions within the programming. Practitioners and educators
should also make use of inclusive design on a campus wide scale, beyond leadership
programs, potentially having a greater impact on the campus climate.

Although this study did not examine it specifically, an indirect implication for
practice would be the examination of institutional hiring for diversity. Greater
representation of faculty and staff of color for roles across the spectrum of responsibility
could contribute to a less discriminatory climate. It may also foster leadership efficacy of
students who aspire to reach similar levels of responsibility in their leadership roles and
goals by ensuring the presence of models to emulate.

Leadership efficacy was the strongest predictor of the development of leadership
capacity in this study as well as in other studies through the MSL (e.g., Dugan &
Komives, 2010; Dugan et al., 2011a). Efficacy is a necessary target component in the
leadership development initiatives of both institutional settings, but with findings in this
study indicating that students at HBCUs have greater efficacy, it appears to be more
important that educators and practitioners at PWIs specifically target efficacy building as
one of the outcomes of programming. Bandura (1997) suggested that efficacy is built
through four ways: enactive mastery (authentic experiences that build up belief in
ability), vicarious experience (building belief in self through observation of models
displaying efficacy, through simulations, or social comparisons), verbal persuasion (positive reinforcement and feedback about performance of a skill), and physiological and affective states (building efficacy by overcoming physical or emotional stress).

If the racial composition of the campus – students, faculty, and staff – is part of why students at HBCUs have greater levels of leadership efficacy, it is essential that PWIs develop other interventions that target the development of efficacy. As noted above, the involvement of African American/Black students in decision-making processes of the university could be a source of enactive mastery efficacy development. By increasing the presence of faculty and staff of color, leadership efficacy of students who aspire to reach similar levels of responsibility in their leadership roles and goals may be elevated by having models to emulate. Although the variable for holding a leadership position in an on-campus organization did not emerge as predictive of capacity in either model in this study, Kodama and Dugan (2012) found that holding a leadership position on-campus was predictive of the development of efficacy. Kodama and Dugan (2012) suggested that these kinds of leadership roles not only provide the opportunity for enactive mastery experiences, but they also carry lesser implications because of the organizational setting in which the leadership occurs (Kodama & Dugan, 2012). It may be that leadership roles in on-campus organizations could facilitate an increase in the efficacy of African American/Black, ultimately benefitting their leadership capacity.

That the variable of holding a leadership position in an off-campus organization was a negative predictor of leadership capacity at HBCUs suggests that African American/Black students may benefit from instances of filling a leadership role in a
setting with lesser implications than what they may be experiencing off-campus, perhaps in a work setting in which the need to maintain a job creates stress. It may also be useful to simulate a situation in a controlled environment in which African American/Black students are able to develop efficacy through vicarious experiences. In general, educators and practitioners should consider the experiences away from campus settings as sources of learning, not limiting their instruction or focus within the context of the campus only.

In looking at the findings above as a sum total, what emerges is that though the mean scores of socially responsible leadership are not different and the predictors are not highly distinctive, they are interrelated and reflect what is happening with leadership development is likely based on the environmental culture at the two institution types. That is to say, it makes sense that at an HBCU a student experiences a less discriminatory climate. African American/Black students see more people who look like themselves, and they participate differently in organizations on and off-campus, all of which may elevate efficacious feelings and in turn leadership capacity. At an HBCU, it may not be that the institutions are doing something that is functionally better, but the non-discriminatory climate removes hostile and negative elements that African American/Black students find on PWI campuses that constrain their efficacy and thereby capacity.

**Implications for Future Research**

The findings of this study show that it may be more meaningful to examine the effects of minority serving institutions on leadership development instead of traditional institutional characteristics (e.g., size, control, Carnegie classifications). One study has already argued that Carnegie classifications do not accurately capture the ways in which
HBCUs educate their students (Coaxum, 2001). Moreover, previous leadership studies demonstrated repeatedly that Carnegie classifications and other traditional measures of institutional type do not enter regression models as predictive of leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Dugan et al., 2012a). Although this study did not find a significant difference in mean levels of socially responsible leadership between African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs, it did find meaningful differences in the ways in which the HBCU and PWI environments influence the ways in which leadership develops in the two contexts. Future research aimed at understanding the effects of other types of minority serving institutions (i.e., HSIs, Tribal Colleges, and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institutions) should examine parallel effects in how the institutional climates affect the development of leadership efficacy and capacity for the students who attend them.

This study added to the body of literature about the collegiate experience at HBCUs vis-à-vis leadership development. In addition to further examination and recreation of results relating to leadership development at HBCUs, future research should attempt to replicate findings using a more substantial sample size to make the findings more compelling and extend the generalizability beyond the current scope. This would more fully recognize the diversity of institutional cultures present within the HBCU system. This is important because HBCUs, though a small percentage of the overall number of higher education institutions in the US, range in the form of single-sex (e.g., Morehouse College for men or Bennett College for women), religious affiliation (e.g., Paul Quinn College’s African Methodist Episcopal affiliation or Oakwood University’s
Seventh Day Adventist affiliation), level of degree granted (e.g., bachelor’s degrees at Philander Smith College or doctoral degrees at Clark Atlanta University), and other characteristics. The ability to determine what kinds of inter-group similarities and differences exist among HBCUs and how they influence leadership outcomes would be of great use to leadership educators and practitioners.

Future research should attempt to identify the types of on-campus and off-campus organizations that lead to increased development of leadership capacity. This would be particularly useful for on-campus membership in light of the finding that students at HBCUs and PWIs participated in on-campus student organizations at similar levels. Specifically, it would be useful to understand if African American/Black students are participating in identity-based or campus-wide organizations at PWIs as suggested by Harper and Quaye (2007) as well as the unique effects that may be related to participation in these types of organizations. More specific information about which types of off-campus organizations were influential in leadership development would also provide guidance to leadership educators in their suggestions for involvement opportunities. This could be useful in steering students towards environments that are more supportive and prepared to acknowledge and address the complex dynamics associated with race and leadership.

This study demonstrated the continued need for the consideration of conditional effects in research. A conditional effect “suggests that the magnitude of the effect is conditional upon, or varies according to, the specific characteristics of the individuals being considered (e.g., minority vs. nonminority, male vs. female, traditional-aged vs.
older students)” (Terenzini & Pascarella, 1991, p. 88). This study demonstrated differential effects on leadership development among African American/Black students based on attendance at an HBCU or PWI. Also, researchers should not make the assumption that the same predictors will arise just because a student is African American/Black. Findings among predictors may be similar, but there is an interaction between being African American/Black and the context of education that produces unique predictors and cannot be overlooked. Further research should focus on similarities and differences within groups (i.e., examine leadership development strictly among HBCUs or PWIs, not both) to determine if findings from this study would hold.

Findings from this study indicated that African American/Black students start and finish college at about the same level of agreement with respect to their socially responsible leadership capacity. However, the two regression models explained just over half of the variance, meaning research is still missing about half of the understanding behind what contributes to differences in leadership capacity. Future research should rely more on variables that emerged as predictive in this study and incorporate other predictor variables that may further explain what experiences are contributing to leadership development among African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. Qualitative follow-up interviews with students examining the results of this study and the degree to which it is either consistent or divergent from their personal experiences might shed light in additional variables for consideration in future research.

Finally, this study responded to calls for the examination of the intersection of leadership and race (Chin, 2010; Dugan, 2011). Given the demographic shifts occurring
in the US and at colleges and universities (Carnevale & Fry, 2003), leadership research needs to be inclusive of diversity (Chin, 2010). Only through meaningful integration of race into research is it possible to develop a deeper understanding of its complex and dynamic influence on leadership development. Future research should build on this study for deeper investigation of the intersection of race and leadership by using racial identity and its role in leadership development instead of using categorizations of race. This kind of research would deepen the understanding of race as it relates to leadership development among college students insofar as it would better incorporate the social dimensions of race and leadership. It would also provide guidance for the creation of effective interventions for leadership programs and how best to deliver them and serve as a logical next step in research to consider the varying levels of racial identity salience and their effects on predictors of leadership capacity in the HBCU versus PWI contexts.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in capacities and predictors of socially responsible leadership among African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs. By examining the leadership development of African American/Black students, this study filled a research gap regarding the specific environmental predictors of socially responsible leadership at HBCUs and PWIs for African American/Black students. It also adds to the body of leadership literature that investigates the intersection of race and leadership (e.g., Dugan et al., 2008a; Dugan et al., 2012a; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). This study confirms similar levels of socially responsible leadership capacity among African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs and identifies college
environment variables that predict gains in leadership capacity in both contexts. This study highlights the importance of membership in on-campus organizations and participation in sociocultural conversations for leadership development at HBCUs and PWIs. In addition, the study demonstrates that African American/Black students at HBCUs draw from off-campus involvement to increase their leadership development. Finally, the results of this study show that HBCUs foster leadership efficacy more effectively – in part through a less discriminatory campus climate – and that PWIs must strive toward creating more interventions geared toward the development of leadership efficacy and continue working toward campus climates that are supportive and affirming.

This study demonstrated that African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs enter and leave college at about the same levels of leadership capacity. The collegiate experiences of a less discriminatory climate and leadership efficacy influence students at HBCUs in a more meaningful way than students at PWIs. It would appear that, despite the differences in what predicts development of socially responsible leadership capacity, the outcome is largely the same regardless of institutional setting. From the perspective that leadership development is a desired collegiate outcome and African American/Black students at HBCUs and PWIs are reaching similar levels of leadership development, this finding is promising. To the extent that campus climate is a constraint on some African American/Black students, there is more work to be done to mitigate and ultimately remove the constraints, particularly at PWIs.

The undergraduate student from the story in the opening chapter was active in multiple campus organizations and took on leadership roles at the HBU that he attended.
He also found examples of other African American/Black leaders whose example helped foster a sense of leadership efficacy. The night before his graduation, the last residential trailer from his first year was towed away from campus, a memory that brought tears to his eyes. During his undergraduate time on campus, the trailers were a symbol of the campus community and a sign of the university’s commitment to education and its students. “I left with a real sense of pride… As the campus evolved, so did I.”

Following his undergraduate career at the HBU, the student pursued a master’s degree and doctorate at a PWI. The HBU student, now a professor at a PWI, devotes his career to research and practice with African American/Black college students. As a professor, he is active in and strives to ensure that the leadership experiences he had at the HBU are shared in some degree with other African American/Black students – at HBCUs and PWIs alike. Through this active support, the professor not only facilitates growth in leadership capacities, but also fosters efficacy development, guiding the next generation of students toward becoming the African American/Black leaders who effect positive social change.

The story framing this research offers a powerful illustration of the ways personal identity, institutional context, and individual experiences interact to influence student development. The students’ personal narrative brings to life many of the findings of this research offering further evidence of the importance of creating supportive contexts for student learning. Findings from this research further these efforts through the identification of specific ways in which educators can more intentionally contribute to the
development of African American/ Black student leadership development at both HBCUs and PWIs.
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RELIABILITIES AND FACTOR LOADINGS
### Reliabilities and factor loadings for composite measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach α</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest measure for socially responsible leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing differences in opinions enriched my thinking (PRE5A)</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had low self esteem (PRE5B)</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked well in changing environments (PRE5C)</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed working with others toward common goals (PRE5D)</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I held myself accountable to responsibilities I agreed to (PRE5E)</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group (PRE5F)</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My behaviors reflected my beliefs (PRE5G)</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I valued opportunities to contribute to my community (PRE5H)</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural conversations with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About different lifestyles/ customs (ENV9A)</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With those with values different than own (ENV9B)</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About major social issues (ENV9C)</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With those with different religious beliefs (ENV9D)</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About views regarding multiculturalism (ENV9E)</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With those with different political views (ENV9F)</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed discriminatory words, behaviors, or gestures directed at people like me (ENV11A_4)</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encountered discrimination while attending this institution (ENV11A_11)</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel there is a general atmosphere of prejudice among students (ENV11A_12)</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty have discriminated against people like me (ENV11A_15)</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff members have discriminated against people like me (ENV11A_16) | .887 | .860
--- | --- | ---
Leadership efficacy | .89 | .87
Leading others (OUT2A) | .863 | .869
Organize group tasks to accomplish goal (OUT2B) | .901 | .902
Taking initiative to improve something (OUT2C) | .878 | .867
Working with team on group project (OUT2D) | .819 | .764
Socially responsible leadership | .97 | .96
I am open to others’ ideas (SRLS1) | .700 | .650
Creativity can come from conflict (SRLS2) - -
I value differences in others (SRLS3) | .722 | .631
I am able to articulate my priorities (SRLS4) | .679 | .626
Hearing differences in opinions enriches my thinking (SRLS5) | .663 | .555
I have low self esteem (SRLS6) - -
I struggle when group members have ideas that are different from mine (SRLS7) - -
Transition makes me uncomfortable (SRLS8) - .337
I am usually self-confident (SRLS9) | .552 | .509
I am seen as someone who works well with others (SRLS10) | .661 | .612
Greater harmony can come out of disagreement (SRLS11) | .372 | .398
I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking at things (SRLS12) | .727 | .668
My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs (SRLS13) | .579 | .550
I am committed to a collective purpose in those groups to which I belong (SRLS14) | .737 | .656
It is important to develop a common direction in a group in order to get anything done (SRLS15) | .651 | .432
I respect opinions other than my own (SRLS16) | .577 | .561
Change brings new life to an .671 | .560
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SRLS17</th>
<th>SRLS18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The things about which I feel passionate have priority in my life</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contribute to the goals of the group</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is energy in doing something a new way</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am uncomfortable when someone disagrees with me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know myself pretty well</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to devote the time and energy to things that are important to me</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stick with others through difficult times</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there is a conflict between two people, one will win and the other will lose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change makes me uncomfortable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me to act on my beliefs</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am focused on my responsibilities</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make a difference when I work with others on a task</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively listen to what others have to say</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important to know other people’s priorities</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My actions are consistent with my values</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I have responsibilities to my community</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could describe my personality</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have helped to shape the mission of the group</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ways of doing things frustrate me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common values drive an organization</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give time to making a difference</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for someone else (SRLS38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value1</th>
<th>Value2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work well in changing environments (SRLS39)</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work with others to make my communities better places (SRLS40)</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can describe how I am similar to other people (SRLS41)</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working with others toward common goals (SRLS42)</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am open to new ideas (SRLS43)</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the power to make a difference in my community (SRLS44)</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look for new ways to do something (SRLS45)</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to act for the rights of others (SRLS46)</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in activities that contribute to the common good (SRLS47)</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others would describe me as a cooperative group member (SRLS48)</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable with conflict (SRLS49)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify the differences between positive and negative change (SRLS50)</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be counted on to do my part (SRLS51)</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me (SRLS52)</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I follow through on my promises (SRLS53)</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to (SRLS54)</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public (SRLS55)</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection is difficult for me (SRLS56)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration produces better results (SRLS57)</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the purpose of the groups to which I belong (SRLS58)</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable expressing myself (SRLS59)</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My contributions are recognized by others in the groups I belong to</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work well when I know the collective values of a group</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share my ideas with others</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My behaviors reflect my beliefs</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am genuine</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to trust the people with whom I work</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support what the group is trying to accomplish</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to be truthful</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me that I play an active role in my communities</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer my time to the community</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my work has a greater purpose for the larger community</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRLS71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

FINAL REGRESSION SUMMARIES

FOR HBCUS AND PWIS
### HBCU Final Regression Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>5.545</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>351.834</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>7.337</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>7.316</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>61.046</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>165.285</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01, *** p < .001

### PWI Final Regression Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>351.768</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>32.570</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>8.249</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>7.169</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>173.728</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01, *** p < .001
APPENDIX D

POST HOC TEST

OMNIBUS PRE-TEST
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus Pre-Test</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus Pre-Test</td>
<td>Equal Variances Assumed</td>
<td>1.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

POST HOC TEST

ON-CAMPUS GROUP MEMBERSHIP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-campus group membership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus group membership Assumed</td>
<td>Equal Variances Assumed</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s $d$ effect size = .12 (trivial)
APPENDIX F

POST HOC TEST

SOCIOCULTURAL CONVERSATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociocultural Conversations</th>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th>826</th>
<th>2.96</th>
<th>.81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Conversations</td>
<td>Equal Variances Assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s $d$ effect size = .14 (trivial)
APPENDIX G

POST HOC TEST

NON-DISCRIMINATORY CLIMATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Climate</td>
<td>Equal Variances Not Assumed</td>
<td>10.091</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s $d$ effect size = .30 (small)
APPENDIX H

POST HOC TEST

LEADERSHIP EFFICACY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Efficacy</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Efficacy</td>
<td>Equal Variances Assumed</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s $d$ effect size = .23 (small)
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