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ABSTRACT

HOW FIRST-YEAR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS INFLUENCE STUDENTS’ BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES IN ORDER TO PROMOTE CIVIC ENGAGEMENT THROUGH DEMOCRATIC DIALOGUE AND DEMOCRATIC DELIBERATION

Pamela Pruitt
Eric J. Kaplan

This study utilizes the lens of student experience to provide an understanding of how students’ behavior and attitudes are influenced by first-year college leadership programs in order to promote civic engagement. This qualitative study uses semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews, focus groups, and an online survey at three sites—the John Glenn College of Public Relations at The Ohio State University, the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences at The University of Maryland, and The Wharton School at The University of Pennsylvania. The study reviews the best practices and principles of leadership in communicating and interacting with others through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation. The focus of the study is on sophomores, juniors, and seniors who participated in first-year college leadership programs and how they express the value derived from their classroom and service-learning involvement in collective decision making and democratic settings for the common good of all. The findings contribute to understanding how colleges and universities may effectively implement their roles in the development of students as civic-minded citizens of an increasingly global community through first-year college leadership programs.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

*Universities should be about more than developing work skills. They must also be about producing civic-minded and critically engaged citizens—citizens who can engage in debate, dialogue and bear witness to a different and critical sense of remembering, agency, ethics and collective resistance.*—Henry Giroux

Introduction and Problem Statement

The current pressures on higher education institutions, from rankings to being economic development centers for promoting workforce readiness, have redirected their historic civic purpose. According to the report *Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects*, incentive systems in American colleges and universities place greater emphasis on rankings and fundraising, with professors being rewarded for academic honors and publications (especially in research institutions) and students falling from the priority position of the core civic purpose (2006, p. 1). The report continues: “There is evidence that higher education is failing to meet students’ pre-matriculation expectations or their readiness to be engaged” (p. 1). Further, according to Putnam (2000), there is an erosion of America’s civic engagement and social connectedness that has occurred over several decades. He claims that the American family structure has changed with the loosening of family bonds through the pressures of time and money; suburbanization and commuting have moved families farther from urban communities; electronic entertainment promotes less time spent in the communities with others; and there has been a generational change in different forms of civic engagement, in which younger people are not as engaged as actively as the older generation (pp. 283–84).
The larger context of concern within which universities operate is relevant. According to Charles Quigley (2011), the executive director of the Center for Civic Education, there is a continuing decline in civics education in America which indicates that we are facing a “civics recession.” Educational policy and practice appear to direct more focus to “developing the ‘worker’ at the expense of developing the ‘citizen’ ” (p. 1). Many high school seniors are at or approaching voting age and should be prepared to participate in the responsibilities of American citizenship. But as Quigley (2011) stresses, the results of the 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which reflects the academic achievement of K–12 students in the United States, are of special concern: There is a “persisting gap in racial/ethnic civic knowledge and the essential topics of study [skills of democratic citizenship and government] addressed and neglected are in grades 4, 8, and 12 . . . also disappointing is the finding that four percent of high school seniors ranked at the Advanced level—a level we would hope our future leaders would attain” (p. 1).

The Office of the Under Secretary and Office of Postsecondary Education (2012) assert that while continuing to promote traditional civic learning among students is important in increasing civic knowledge, participation in voting, and volunteerism, “the new generation of civic learning puts students at the center and includes both learning and practice—not just rote memorization of names, dates, and processes” (p. 8). More recently, as a continuing concern, Owen (2015) alleges that “an alarming proportion of Americans do not see themselves as having the responsibility or efficacy for civic engagement” (p. 86). Hartley, Saltmarsh, and Clayton (2010) affirm that “institutional
change is needed to realign the central premises and core work of the academy with fundamental democratic aims,” which involves community engagement and democratic citizenship, allowing students to experiment with and practice democracy through their community-based educational experiences (p. 391). According to the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) (2013), civic education “is essential if we are to continue as a free democratic society. Not to educate the next generation will ensure the destruction of our American way of life as we know it” (p. 4).

Any review of the mission language of institutions of higher education in the United States is likely to find reference to roles beyond academic excellence, including “engagement” and “leadership.” Although this assertion regarding institutional mission language reflects commitments to civic engagement and service in broad terms, Morphew and Hartley (2006) affirm through their empirical study that the mission of higher education institutions should be more than a statement for cultural or planning processes; rather, it should serve as a “means of telling important stakeholders outside the institution that ‘we understand what you want and we’re going to deliver it to you’ ” (p. 469). According to Holland (1999), “university mission is where engagement must become imbedded because it is through active engagement that university mission comes alive and takes on real meaning for campus and community” (p. 48). Further, according to Shehane, Sturtevant, Moore, and Dooley (2012), institutional missions of higher education indicate that developing leaders is one of the primary outcomes of the college experience; therefore, more ways need to be identified to develop leadership capacities
successfully in college students. Moreover, as asserted by Mayhew, Seifert, and Pascarella (2012), higher education is where moral development can begin or be refined. Hence, it must provide the “collegiate contexts and specific educational practices that influence the development of moral reasoning during the college years” (p. 21).

In a review of the existing body of scholarly literature, one of the main goals of leadership development programs is to cultivate civic leaders, with the emphasis on preparing students to become better citizens (American College Personnel Association, 1994; Astin, Astin, & Associates, 2001; Bell, 1994; Freeman, Knott, & Schwartz, 1996; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon 1998; Lloyd, 2004; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Leadership programs are one of the ways to introduce entering students to appropriate and responsible behavioral practices (Bjorklund et al., 2011; Dechter, 2007; Young, 2003). Further, research indicates that as students increase their leadership skills during college years, they also increase their character and personal development, self-efficacy, civic engagement, and academic performance (Benson & Saito, 2000; Fertman & Van Linden, 1999; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Scales & Leffert, 1999; Sipe, Ma, & Gambone, 1998; Van Linden & Fertman, 1998).

Moreover, when service-learning is added to leadership programs through the related curricula, students are better able to develop their moral and civic learning through this pedagogy and develop skills for their personal growth and for gaining an awareness of others in their connection to civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995). Service-learning enables students to practice service through real-life experiences with direct
hands-on engagement, encountering various behavioral modes and connecting theory to practice (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). Further, students entering college who seek leadership programs that include service-learning in the curriculum can use these programs as a process toward becoming empowered to be mindful and aware of others, and collaborative as active leaders. They are therefore able to “grow throughout their career at the university and become more involved in local, national and global communities” (Shehane et al., 2007, p. 144).

According to Kuh and O’Donnell (2013), giving students the ability to have direct experiences through field-based “experiential learning” with community partners allows them to apply what they are studying in the curricula and in the classroom to their ongoing practices of analyzing and solving problems in the community. Service-learning and community-based learning programs promote the notion that, as a college outcome, “giving back” to the community will further prepare students for good citizenship, career, and life experiences. Service-learning, however, is a high-impact activity that when incorporated into leadership programs could result in deep learning and general, personal, and practical gains, according to Kuh et al. (2013). Moreover, it is the high-impact practices, such as service-learning, that provide intentionality and purposeful collaborative experiences that are proven strategies involving reflection, feedback, and applied learning. With participation in six high-impact activities in terms of first-year college student self-reported gains in three clusters of learning and personal development outcomes, as well as engaging in approaches to learning, Table 1 summarizes the
associated strong positive effects for the importance of service-learning in this regard (Kuh, 2008).

Table 1.

| Relationship between Selected High-Impact Activities, Deep Learning, and Self-Reported Gains |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
|                                       | Deep Learning | Gains: General | Gains: Personal | Gains: Practical |
| Learning Communities                   | +++          | ++             | ++             | ++             |
| Service Learning                       | +++          | ++             | +++            | +++            |
| Study Abroad                           | ++           | +              | +              | ++             |
| Student-Faculty Research               | +++          | ++             | ++             | ++             |
| Internships                            | ++           | ++             | ++             | ++             |
| Service-Learning                       | +++          | ++             | +++            | +++            |
| Senior Culminating Experience          | +++          | ++             | ++             | ++             |


Rationale for the Study

Even with the “new wave of research in higher education on civic participation and the necessary identities, skills, dispositions, and knowledge of responsible and effective citizens,” as stated in the report Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects (2006, p. 1), more is left to query and explore about civic-minded leadership practices and principles. Understanding the role of leaders and leadership is essential to leadership development and promoting civic-mindedness—and ultimately producing democratic citizens for a diverse and connected world. Leadership programs can incorporate these principles and promote democratic dialogue in a democratic setting, which can be more conducive to listening and learning from each other through civil discourse and engagement (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007). Moreover, according to Ehrlich (2000), by aligning the curriculum with civic engagement in experiential practices through service-

---

1 Pruitt is not related to the author of this study.
learning, students can better embrace the responsibilities of active citizenship and civic participation. With the experience of democratic deliberation, which connects collective decision making and collective action or public work, students are able to face and weigh moral differences and norms that are associated with democracy, which are “freedom, equality, respect for others, and justice” (Kettering Foundation, 2008, p. 291).

**Statement of Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore through the lens of the student how first-year college leadership programs influence students’ behavior and attitudes regarding how they interact with and respond to others in a democratic setting through best practices and principles of leadership. The study focuses on college students who participated in first-year leadership programs as freshmen and addresses the following research questions:

RQ1—How do college leadership programs for first-year students influence civic engagement?

RQ2—What best practices or principles of first-year college leadership programs prepare students to communicate deliberatively and engage with others?

RQ3—What value do students derive from their service-learning experiences in first-year college leadership programs?

**Significance of Study**

According to the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) (1996), “leadership and service means that leadership goes beyond individual gain. It means that leadership has a
greater purpose, that of somehow making the world a better place” (p. 13). Higher education should also serve a higher purpose by returning to a civic purpose and extend its potential by “radically transforming its institutional cultures and structures into socially responsible civic universities and colleges by democratically realigning and integrating themselves to develop a comprehensive, realistic strategy” (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007, p. 84).

Bonous-Hammarth (2001) claims that “[l]eadership is a process or way of channeling skills and energies to some ultimate purpose: that of contributing to the society and social outcomes” (pp. 35–36). In building self-efficacy for leadership and leadership-related skills, which includes civil behavior and being respectful of others, leadership programs “enhance student learning, and facilitate positive social change” (Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009, p. 48). Therefore, the impact of leadership programs further contributes to the development of civil behavior through collaboration, because “students involved in these programs were more than likely to develop a sense of civic responsibility, meaning that they learned the importance of participating in their community and helping others” (Shehane et al., 2012, p. 142). Shehane et al. (2012) further assert that “everyone has the capacity to lead, leadership is multifaceted, leadership is collaborative, leadership is a process, leadership strives to create positive change, and leadership strives to reach shared goals” (p. 144). Purposefully developing leadership capacities in college students may help to prepare and increase civically engaged citizens and diminish an emerging leadership crisis in American society (Dugan et al., 2007; Ehrlich, 1999; Korten, 1998; Lappe & DuBois, 1994).
A Preview of the Study

Two main points or results emerged that are of interest. They are: 1) Value is derived through best practices in the classroom and service-learning experiences, with deep reflection and peer support, in first-year college leadership programs and therefore may influence students’ behavior and attitudes in order to promote civic engagement; and 2) Best practices or principles of first-year college leadership programs prepare students to communicate democratically and deliberatively when engaging and interacting with others.

The literature review will provide an essay on the importance of leadership programs during first-year college experiences and how best practices, such as service-learning, can be instituted to promote civic engagement in order for students to gain more civics knowledge and community connectivity in hopes of making this world a better place. Civic engagement is defined more as democratic engagement and implied as such throughout, as the aim is democracy. Also discussed are the need for civic learning and civic engagement in higher education, which has moved further from its core mission, and how democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation are instrumental in the process of communication and collective decision making for the common good of all. The evolution of leadership development and its pathways from pre-college to college lead to the discussion on the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development and its successful principles and outcomes, which is discussed further in Chapter 2.

The intricacies of the methodology are discussed in detail, followed by the findings, which include details of the three institutions and their respective first-year college
leadership programs, the 16 emergent themes and four realms, best practices through the lens of the student, students’ reflections on their service-learning experiences, students’ perspectives about civic engagement and the value derived from their service-learning experiences, and how democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation influenced students’ behavior and attitudes.

In the discussion and analysis, similarities and differences between the three institutions and their respective leadership programs are highlighted, followed by the student story, which begins in high school and continues through student leadership and civic engagement in college. I then take a look at how students’ self-awareness and self-efficacy align with the Leadership Identity Development (LID) model and the Social Constructionist Theory of leadership identity. From there, I discuss best practices through teaching and learning, which lead to how students related to others being a part of their success in their first-year college leadership programs and service-learning through peer support. Then I discuss the negative comments that some students made and a little more overall detail about the students and their civic engagement.

The conclusion summarizes the whole story and what was learned, again revisiting the main points of interest. I underline again the importance of first-year college leadership programs, followed by discussing the implications for higher education institutional best practices and policy and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Leadership programs are an important way for colleges and universities to provide formative experiences for many of their students. But what do we know about leadership programs and their influence on students’ behavior and attitudes in order to promote civic engagement? The focus here is on first-year college leadership programs with a service-learning component, which are believed to be pathways to the development of moral behavioral practices and good citizenship through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation in order to promote civic engagement. And then there is the question as to the context in which the term “civic engagement” is being used throughout this essay, given that it can mean different things to different people. Saltmarsh and Hartley (2012) take civic engagement to a deeper level by referring to it as “democratic engagement,” because it requires more than a mere connection to the universities and the communities they serve. They assert that “democratic engagement” requires “a larger sense of purpose and distinct processes to strengthen our communities and to build a participatory democracy” (p. 10). Though the experiences of students herein are described in the context of “civic engagement,” it is my goal in the discussions to strive toward “democratic engagement” by incorporating democracy as the aim for the students’ interactions with others in dialogue and deliberation when making decisions for the good of all.

Six sections of literature are used to contribute to defining and understanding whether and how first-year leadership programs on college campuses influence students’ behavior
and attitudes in promoting civic engagement through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation. The first section of literature discusses the need for civic learning and civic engagement in higher education. The second section delves into democratic deliberation in civic engagement and public life. This defines democratic deliberation and explains the context in which it is used in civic engagement through college institutions and communities. The third section describes democratic dialogue and how it connects to higher education in a dynamic process including dialogue, deliberation, and decision making. This discussion promotes a charge for higher education to take on fostering democratic dialogue and values as a civic mission. The fourth section delves into factors that shape students’ needs for leadership development, from their selected role models to their pre-college experiences, influences, and challenges. The fifth section reviews the leadership development process as a transition from high school to college, including formal leadership programs as well as opportunities through student affairs and Greek life. The sixth and final section looks at leadership styles and the approach of the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development, which is the theoretical framework for this study, along with its goals, key assumptions, and critical values.

The Need for Civic Learning and Civic Engagement in Higher Education

The United States needs its citizens to be knowledgeable, engaged, and “public-spirited,” according to the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012), which further asserts that “colleges and universities are among the nation’s most valuable laboratories for civic learning and democratic engagement, but regrettably, too few postsecondary institutions offer programs that prepare students to
engage the questions Americans face as a global democratic power . . . limiting higher education’s potential civic impact” (p. 2). According to Ferraiolo (2004), civic engagement has progressed by its connection to the intellectual and financial resources in higher education during the past decade. At the same time, the curricula in higher education lean more toward specialized careers and workforce readiness. Although it is usually the expectation to be gainfully employed upon graduation from college, being able to be responsible in matters of good citizenship should also be an expected outcome. Ferraiolo (2004) further asserts that the academic funnel is too narrow for the conception of the potential that higher education has to offer. The way Hollander and Hartley (2000) express it, “the landscape of higher education looks like a prairie with a lot of unconnected silos which could, if brought together, provide a rich feed for the civic renewal movement” (p. 345). According to the CIRCLE (2013), young citizens who have college degrees are more likely to vote in a presidential election than those who are less educated and knowledgeable. (See Table 2.). “The educational reform movements of the last 20 years have generally overlooked civics, thereby allowing disparities to persist and grow” (p. 15).
During the last two decades, colleges and universities have responded to the troubled state of civic health in the United States; however, the influence of the civic reform movement is still only partial and not pervasive on almost all college and university campuses in America, according to the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012). McCoy and Scully (2002) assert that “civic engagement is thus both a barometer of our public life and a focal point for action when we want to improve it.” There must be intentionality and purpose in civic engagement, and without it “there is a diminution of democratic potential. Students may learn, and important service may be rendered, but rarely does such an approach to engagement result in actively contesting a problematic status quo or engender concerted action to challenge and change it by every democratic means possible,” as emphasized by Saltmarsh et al. (2012, p. 17).

According to Ferraiolo (2004), “one of the most powerful ways in which higher education can demonstrate engagement is by committing to nurture in students the civic
skills and attitudes that will enable them to be responsible and effective citizens” (p. 7). Community partnerships can be formed and maintained by colleges and universities in order to promote civic engagement for the students’ benefit, so they may receive civic knowledge in the classroom, through co-curricular activities, and in everyday college life, and also through service-learning and community activities. As Sullivan (2000) goes on to describe, “one of the most often cited challenges involves the dominance of academic departments and disciplines in today’s colleges and universities, which tend to overemphasize the marketability of technical skills and deemphasize contribution to civic life” (p. 19).

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012) stresses that

[t]he times call for visionary leadership that locates education for democracy as a focal point of educational study, reflection, and practice. This moment in history also calls on us to embrace a comprehensive and contemporary vision for civic learning that includes knowledge, skills, values, and the capacity to work with others on civic and societal challenges. Investing in these forms of learning will increase the number of informed, thoughtful, and public-minded citizens and better prepare them to contribute to public life. (p. 6)

Further, according to the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012), it is important for higher education to make contributions, with corresponding obligations, to understanding the depth, complexity, and competing versions of what “civic” means and entails in civic knowledge and democratic engagement. “Specifically, higher education must in this next generation of civic learning investments build a broader theory of knowledge about democracy and democratic
principles for an age marked as it is by multiplicity and division” (p. 31). The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012) further asserts that higher education has the capacity to promote investments in civic learning and empower communities and college and university environments, through “which students can expand their critical abilities to make judgments about issues and actions, their powers to investigate and analyze, and their wisdom and passion to seek justice with keener insight into how to determine what is just, for whom, and under what circumstances” (p. 31).

Higher education institutions would need to commit to a democratic ideal, and civic engagement would need to be embraced across institutions in order for the institutions to honor the commitment they have declared to engage faculty and interdisciplinary efforts to promote civic learning and engagement (Brukardt, Holland, Percey, and Zimpher, 2004). According to Hartley et al. (2010), there needs to be a more purposeful linkage in driving community-based activities and outcomes for civic learning. They further assert that “democracy is a verb, not a noun” (p. 405). There needs to be a more action-filled shift of mind to democratize civic engagement through higher education, which will promote the emergence of democratic engagement as part of a universal institutional culture. Democratic-centered civic engagement to address vital social problems collaboratively promises to transform the identities of institutions and their educational practices, impacting not only colleges and universities but a larger public culture as well (Hartley et al., 2010).
Democratic Deliberation in Civic Engagement and Public Life

According to Olivos (2008), “Deliberative democracy is defined as a practice that “builds on the capacities of citizens to think, talk and work together in their common interests” (p. 61). “Democracy depends on citizens, and their distinctive take on democracy is reflected on their references to public deliberation and public work,” as claimed by Mathews (2008, p. 290). When citizens join together in civic networks and engage in a collective practice of solving community challenges and problems, they build resilience and increase a community’s capacity through these democratic practices. In a healthier America and democracy, “dialogue” and “deliberation” are more than “just talk” and collective decision-making. Saltmarsh et al. (2012) assert that

dialogue is a process of talking and listening with the express purpose of building relationships and fostering mutual understanding. Effective dialogue is a foundation for personal and collective commitment and action; improved intergroup relations; stronger communities; and reasoned and deliberative decision-making, action, and sustainable change. (p. 159)

Universities and colleges occupy an important place in the United States for being potential safe spaces for public deliberation and operational democracy (Carnegie Foundation and CIRCLE, 2006; Ehrlich 1999; Giroux 2006), and are essential to a community’s civic infrastructure for students and communities (Mathews, 2002). According to Olivos (2008):

To their credit, in an effort to promote civic engagement and instill a democratic culture in students, many universities and colleges across the country do require their students to work, volunteer, or do projects in ethically and socially diverse communities through varied forms of community-service learning assignments. (p. 65)
Mathews (2002) contends that the well-intentioned endeavors of community development and civic engagement are not adequately engaging students or the communities in which they work through deliberative processes that inform both student learning and the community voice. Olivos (2008) further posits that a possible solution is to create “an intrinsically motivating learning experience from which students study the broader sociopolitical and economic context of the problems they encounter while concurrently developing the civic skills, knowledge, and disposition to be active practitioners of democracy and effect social change” (p. 65).

Gutmann and Thompson (1996) describe “the ideal of deliberative democracy: citizens should treat each other with respect, even if they disagree. Policymakers and citizens alike must be able to justify their decisions and viewpoints on the basis of mutually acceptable reasons” (p. 55). In order to effect change in the behaviors and attitudes of young people, according to Saltmarsh et al. (2012), colleges and universities can provide leadership education in

leadership theory and models, group dynamics, critical thinking, and ethics. More advanced courses may include conflict resolution, social movements, and political leadership. Central to student learning is the arts of democracy: democratic dialogue, deliberation and reason, conflict management, and collaborative change. (p. 168)

According to Mathews (2002), “Deliberation helps locate the area between agreement and disagreement, which might be called “common ground for public acting” (p. 27). “Deliberating together in order to make a decision about how to act together changes not only the way people talk [dialogue] but also the way they relate to one another” (p. 29).
Democratic Dialogue in Higher Education

Pruitt et al. (2007), for the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), refer to democratic dialogue (a term used to describe civil “dialogue processes” of governmental institutions) as conversation, not debate, or as discussion that takes place where diverse members come together in a safe environment to listen and understand the viewpoints of others. Pruitt et al. (2007) assert that this involves a dynamic process that may take a brief or expansive amount of time. Participants in democratic dialogue share inquiry; engage in exploration of others’ views; discover differences and commonalities among them; provide deep listening to those who speak, fostering respect and understanding in order to work together to resolve specific problems; and apply shared meaning-making and co-construct knowledge to yield democratic reforms. Democratic dialogue involves deliberation with reasoned argument, weighing ideas, considering possible solutions, and making tradeoffs with informed judgment. In the decision-making process, authority rules with negotiation, consensus, and voting (p. 23).

One of the vehicles for promoting democratic dialogue is colleges and universities. A 2006 report, *Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects*, commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and CIRCLE, was written jointly by 22 distinguished scholars representing the fields of political science, developmental psychology, sociology, economics, philosophy, research on higher education, and women’s studies. This consensus report led the charge for its participants, who agreed that colleges and universities have a civic mission in serving their communities, which
includes providing forums for democratic dialogue; conducting research on democracy, civil society, and civic development; and promoting civic education at the college level, so students can be more effective and responsible citizens in a globally diverse world.

Pruitt et al. (2007) stress that creating a culture and environment of democratic dialogue through human interactions for sustainable solutions can exist in in all areas of practice, putting the emphasis on building capacity at the societal level, which would reflect a long-term perspective (p. 31). Hartley et al. (2010) assert that “higher education must promote democratic processes and purposes—and pursue institutional change strategies aimed at realigning the work of the academy to serving democracy” (p. 391). Further, in getting college students more civically engaged, according to Thomas and Levine (2012), “Democratic dialogue is not only an important skill to be learned. ‘It is a good way to learn’” (p. 169). McKeachie (1994) claims:

In experiments involving measures of retention of information after the end of a course, measures of transfer of knowledge to new situations, or measures of problem solving, thinking or attitude change, or motivation for further learning, the results tend to show differences favoring discussion methods over lecture. (p. 54)

Such ideas about the civic mission of colleges and universities reflect a return to (or a maturation of) some of the founding values of American universities. *Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects* (2006) discusses how civics and morality were taught in the 19th century with the expectation that students would incur moral obligations. As part of a broader cultural movement between 1880 and 1945 to replace communal responsibilities with individual choices, voting shifted to secret ballot, political parties were weakened, school districts were consolidated with more power for experts rather
than opportunities for citizens to serve on school boards, and the “modernist” university departed from moral education to embrace “choice, individualism, critical distance, and scientific rationality.” According to Talcott (2005), whose focus was primarily research institutions in the late 19th century when the modern universities emerged, new types of citizens in a “free society” were being shaped through new institutional arenas of public practices. This created a relationship between the universities and modern citizenship that was mutually complicated and confusing based on the aforementioned traditional roles. As opposed to the highly partisan citizenship, or strong party allegiances, of late 19th-century electoral politics, modernist citizenship emphasized a citizen’s decision to make individual rational choices (McGerr, 1986; Schudson, 1998). During the “modernist” university era, good citizenship was framed by individuals who voluntarily formed a “free society” through mutual obligation, and universities were one of the “vehicles and expressions” of this model of practice, primarily through universities’ scientific learnings (Buck et al., 1945/1950, p. 50).

From the mid-1940s until 1960, according to Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects (2006), good citizenship was rarely discussed academically, as the civic purpose of the modernist university waned and was eventually forgotten. Critics in the 1960s attacked the university as a “bureaucratic shell” that did not have a civic or other normative mission. Following this was much civic experimentation on college campuses. Student-led protests led to “curricular innovations” that enabled students to become designers of social- and civic-themed courses such as “Berkeley’s Democratic Education at California (DeCal) initiative” (p. 1). Brukardt et al. (2004) claim that, in 1999, the
efforts of Campus Compact, in their commitment to higher education’s civic purposes, brought attention to its revival of civic mission through service-learning and/or community service with institutional partners. Seed money for urban concerns through the Department of Housing and Urban Development was logged for a decade for university and community partnerships. Advancing the conversation on engaged learning through major initiatives were the Kellogg Foundation, Pew Partnership for Civic Change’s “Solutions for America,” and others. Benchmarking tools brought engagement into the mainstream through efforts of the American Council on Education, the American Association for Higher Education, the American Association of Colleges & Universities, to name a few. Informed assessment portfolios were made available on faculty engagement and advocate organizations to impact national and international policy for engaged institutions to become a reality (pp. 2 & 3). Service-learning through the intentional combination of academics and community service helped to revive the civic mission of U.S. academic institutions. Torney-Purta and Amadeo (2003) claim that with a new wave of research on civic participation, the principles of effective citizenship—including knowledge of effective and responsible citizens, identities, and dispositions—brought into consideration multiple dimensions of civic engagement and assisted in placing students from the U.S. into a global perspective.

Hayden (2010) asserts then, “if we as campus leaders are to educate students to participate as citizens in a democracy, we must explore not only fundamental differences on the basis of religion and ideology, but also our models of engagement” (p. 20). He further discusses how engagement brings about civic responsibility and commitment to
forging a common good—and not just being nice to one another or getting along. Based on what he calls “the deepest levels of difference,” Hayden (2010) insists that “whether it is the formal curriculum or the hidden curriculum, the competency of civility provides a framework for students to interrelate” (p. 20). Pruitt et al. (2007) assert that there seems to be a need to build a culture of democracy. In one way or another, virtually every institution promoting dialogue identifies a need to build the attitudes, skills, practices, and experience that add up to a societal capacity for democracy. According to Pruitt et al. (2007), guiding principles for the concept of the dialogic approach provide a “code of conduct” in facilitating the processes for democratic dialogue, which includes being transparent and creating the trust necessary for people to enter into a dialogue with those who are different; being respectful toward others; and being open to divergent viewpoints and showing empathy (p. 33). Further, McCoy et al. (2002) assert that the building of trust and working relationships has to be done with explicit effort. This will lead to meaningful action and change through deliberative dialogue (p. 122).

Factors Shaping Students’ Needs for Leadership Development

External role models can affect conceptualization of leadership for young people, going back to early adolescence. According to Shehane et al. (2012), which is the most recent literature found on this subject for this study, students relate that their parents, teachers, and others influence their perceptions of leadership. Anderson and Cavallaro (2002) found that 34% of children named their parents as role models and heroes, followed by entertainers (20%), friends (14%), professional athletes (11%), and acquaintances (8%). What is important in looking at children is that adolescence is where
the development of identity occurs. By the time students reach college, they may already identify with the role models they wish to emulate.

This can be of concern because of the outsized, media-fueled influence of entertainers and athletes, in particular, and frequent media coverage of their uncivil behavior. Age does not seem to be a factor with college students as they identify with such role models (Shehane et al., 2012). According to Mayhew et al. (2012), “understanding students in their first year in college remains a priority for scholars and educators interested in providing support to meet the eclectic needs of incoming students while maintaining an ethos of challenge that spurs them toward learning and development.” Students who have preconceived ideas about “leadership” based on the influence of negative role models could be more challenged in leadership development.

Some students come to college with established beliefs about how their views on work ethic, morals and values, ethics, and/or religion have influenced their perceptions about leadership. Other students, who come from environments where values systems have not been clearly articulated or taught, would face distinct challenges. Sergiovanni (2005) asserts that “leadership as moral action is a struggle to do the right thing according to a sense of values and what it means to be a human being” (p. 113). Shehane et al. (2012) found that those with strong religious values feel that religion helped them to make better decisions. Moreover, morals and values, ethics and religion were the factors that influenced the leadership for the students in their study. Belief systems not only made them see how they viewed themselves but how they viewed their roles in leadership development. Some students identified the focus of leadership as being positional, as
opposed to non-positional, being either servant-minded or management-oriented leadership, which are described further in this chapter.

As observed by Wielkiewicz et al. (2012), men and women differ substantially in dimensions related to leadership and approaches to leadership development.

Incoming first-year college freshmen women tend to be significantly more ‘neurotic’ and agreeable than males. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to enter a leadership situation with less concern for thoughts and feelings of others and a stronger hierarchical orientation toward leadership (top-down), which is the default approach reinforced in American society. (Wielkiewicz & Stelzner, 2005; Wielkiewicz et al., 2012, pp. 18–19)

This implies that men may be more in need of education and exposure to the value of respect in systemic leadership practices and support mechanisms.

Pre-college experiences related to diversity and leadership, or the lack thereof, can also present challenges in leadership programs and training around matters involving interactions with others. In some cases, students noted how important it is to learn about others who are different from themselves and how to communicate with them. For first-year students, college leadership programs that include service-learning but lack diversity training engage students but, according to Roper (2012), their interpersonal capacity and ability to support those with profound needs is limited. Roper (2012) goes on to assert:

By educating students to demonstrate intercultural proficiency, we not only can empower students to construct more meaningful relationships, but we also increase the likelihood of students being able to be positive contributors to culturally diverse learning and work groups. Educating students for intercultural proficiency has benefits for the individual and for society. (p. 1)
Moreover, in making long-term plans with community partners, the partners may be apt to be further committed to the university’s efforts in providing feedback on some of the educational materials regarding diversity issues on race and social class. The partners may be better positioned to provide insight on diverse issues more broadly (Vogelgesang, 2004). However, those students who have limited or no knowledge of leadership principles are able to adapt and engage if led in the direction of leadership programs, even though potential challenges are posed (Shehane et al., 2012).

**Leadership Development from Pre-College to College**

In keeping with this line of thought, leadership may interest students who self-identify as leaders, whether “positional or non-positional,” and who are content in group processes that involve inclusivity and collaboration. They usually seek opportunities that involve making a positive change to society (Komives, Longerbeam, Mainella, Osteen, Owen, and Wagner, 2009). It is important to understand the various inductive stages of how students’ leadership development begins early in life and evolves toward self-efficacy, which is the key variable influencing leader development, along with good behavioral practices (McCormick, 2001). The Leadership Identity Development Model (LID) (Figure 1) proposed by Komives et al. (2009, pp. 13–21) identifies a sequence of six stages, detailed below, through which an individual progresses as his or her identity as a leader develops. This model helps us to understand better at what stage in the growth process individuals build relationships with others and how they view leadership roles and styles. Although pre-college leadership awareness usually begins in Stage 2, as described below, it can be reached in Stage 3 by some. Shehane et al. (2012) assert that
“pre-college experiences influenced awareness of leadership and were evident in the statements shared by the students they studied” (p. 145). Having some knowledge of these experiences can provide insight into incoming first-year college students’ leadership activities before they become exposed to the college leadership development experience.

Figure 1.

In Stage 1, **Awareness**, a child becomes familiar with the leadership roles of principal, teachers, and politicians, who are thought of as “leaders.” Stage 2 is **Exploration/Engagement**, where students become engaged with groups, form friendships, and carry out responsibilities as a member of a group, whether through sports, class projects, clubs, or scouting. Some students do not reach this stage until college, according to Komives et al. (2009).
Stage 3, **Leader Identified**, encompasses multiple phases. The beginning is when the individual learns about group dynamics and sees how the leader plays a key role in getting tasks done. In the middle phase, the students identify key individuals who hold positional roles and see them as being “in charge” of groups. As they transition out of this stage, they recognize the complexities of leadership processes and understand that others are needed to assist. They may even question the hierarchical model, particularly if a crisis arises. High school students are accustomed to hierarchical leadership structures that include the principal at the top, the teachers in the classroom, and the school administration supporting their needs along the way. Upon entering college and leadership programs on campus, they are met with a paradigm shift in the nature of the hierarchical leadership structure compared to high school (Wielkiewicz, Fischer, Stelzner, Overland, & Sinner, 2012). Albeit there is the president of the college or university at the top, with faculty and other staff in a hierarchical leadership structure that is similar to the structure with which they are familiar from high school, the next stage (number 4) presents them with a different model.

This third stage is also where leadership styles are defined and students decide if they are leaders or followers. According to Dugan, Kodama, Correia, and Associates (2013):

> The exploration of self, group, and societal values become important to socially responsible leadership development. They may also trigger cognitive gains as students begin to view peers as valid sources of knowledge thus promoting more complex, non-authority bound approaches to leadership. (p. 9)

Stage 4, **Leadership Differentiated**, shifts from the identified leader to viewing leadership as a process not controlled exclusively by positional leaders. Leadership
becomes a shared group process and “some students demonstrate an ability to apply individual capacities in a group context directly, but others need to acquire competence with ‘social perspective-taking (SPT)’ in order to do so” (Dugan et al., 2013, p. 28). SPT is when students begin to recognize others’ points of view and, through reflection, to consider others’ thoughts and feelings, which could allow them to be empathetic while maintaining their individuality (Dugan, Bohle, Woelker, & Cooney, 2014; Galinsky, Ku, & Wang, 2005; Gehlbach, 2004; Johnson, 1975; Selman, 1980; Underwood & Moore, 1982). SPT also has been linked theoretically to moral development and how one judges others judiciously, according to Kohlberg (1976).

The next stage is when students become more engaged in the leadership process and therefore their individual leadership capacity increases. Stage 5, Generativity, is when an individual actively contributes to the development of others and working toward the sustainability of the organization. Finally, in Stage 6, Integration/Synthesis, individuals become aware of their developmental processes and are able to “re-cycle” through the LID model and help others to grow through it as well.

Another theory worth noting in leadership identity, this one from the “social constructionist” perspective, is the approach of its leading advocate and sociologist, Keith Grint. This method enables students to use images of leadership from their own perceptions in comparison to those of others, through both the person and the situation (Grint, 1997). According to Fairhurst and Grant (2010), it is the beholder who holds the image of leadership and it is that person who forms the imagery from his or her own understandings. Further, Billsberry (2009) claims that “people are not free from social
influence and this allows for the ‘truth’ of someone’s leadership to emerge over time; truth emerges from a competition between various accounts and interpretations . . . without equal weight” (p. 2). Using a classroom component of pre-selected images as a reference, through a technological device, students may choose or “construct” images they perceive as representing leadership. It is a way to engage students in a conversation about their conceptions of leadership. This way students are able to avoid unconsciously preconceived perceptions about leadership (Maxwell & Greenhalgh, 2011).

Upon entering college, students may enroll in leadership development programs in order to gain a “sense of purpose, ethical authenticity, commitment, collaboration, shared goals for organizations and communities, respect for others, and civic responsibility” (Astin & Astin, 2000; Bok, 2006; Komives, Lucas, McMahon, T. R., 2007; Morse, 1989; Roberts, 1981; Salisbury, Pascarella, Padgett, & Blaich, 2012, p. 303; Thelin, 2003; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). According to Dugan (2011), formal leadership programs provide multiple platforms of delivery that include intentionally designed learning opportunities focused on increasing students’ “leadership knowledge, skills, and values through an overarching set of experiences” (p. 75).

In addition to formal programs, there is a long history in academe of student affairs educators who foster leadership development among students, according to HERI (1996, p. 13). These educators offer encouragement and opportunities to shape students’ leadership potential through residential facilities, student clubs and organizations, fraternities, sororities, and community service programs. Being committed to inclusion at
all levels, student affairs educators empower diverse students to use their full talents and potential in reaching their goals in leadership development.

Hayden (2010) connects the dots between student leadership development and being respectful, asserting that “student affairs staff and faculty advisors should encourage connections and interactions between student organizations and promote a focus on programming aimed at improved student leadership ability, which is another way to develop the competency of civility” (p. 24). He goes on to discuss how being engaged in leadership demands the ability to “collaborate, compromise, and contribute to a common destiny.” At the institutional level, celebrating civility in action can speak volumes about an institution’s values. Hayden thinks that civil behavior should be rewarded on campuses, much as members of Greek organizations are often rewarded for the amount of community service they perform. National fraternities and sororities claim that their organizations provide leadership opportunities, build and improve leadership skills, and promote prominent leadership positions on campus. Their core values include scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship (Martin, Hevel, & Pascarella, 2012). Looking at civil behavior as a fitting complement to service would mark it as a commitment to on-campus citizenship. Moreover, recognition of civility on campus by administrators could serve to reinforce it as a value and educational objective.

“Positive” civic engagement, which encompasses working to make a difference in the civic lives of communities, is developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference, and promoting the quality of life in a community through political and non-political means (Ehrlich, 2000; Stephenson, 2010, p. 3). For
students in particular, *Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects* (2006) claims that “the quantity, quality, and equality of civic participation are all important, but they do not necessarily move in the same direction” (p. 2). In a democracy, the report (2006) goes on to state, “all young people should be prepared to select and exercise forms of civic engagement that are appropriate to their own circumstances” (p. 2).

**Leadership Development Pathways and Program Models**

Komives et al. (2011) claim that, for the past two decades, considerable attention has been devoted through critical research programs to the ways in which the college context contributes to learning leadership. Alexander Astin was among the first to consider leadership development as more than a by-product of a college degree, which is one of the justifications for the use of theory in leadership program design. Astin’s work with the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) explored the most influential empirical studies on student leadership. Through the work of CIRP, the door was opened for researchers to explore college student leadership and its influences (p. 64).

In collegiate leadership development programs, the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development is most widely used (Kezar, Carducci, Contreras-McGavin, 2006; Komives et al., 2011, p. 8; Owen, 2009). Astin and Astin (HERI, 1996) facilitated the development of the SCM through leadership scholars and educators. The SCM is intended to approach leadership as a “purposeful, collaborative, values-based process resulting in positive social change” (Komives et al., 2009, p. xii; Komives et al., 2011, p. 45). It was developed specifically for the college context and undergraduate learning experience, instead of having educators and college leadership attempt to customize
business leadership models that were based on a different context. The SCM provides the theoretical framework used for this study. Not only is the SCM approach in line with the research inquiry posited for this dissertation, it was developed by scholars and is widely used in higher education with good measures and outcomes.

Two goals are at the core of the SCM, according to HERI (1996, p. 19): 1) to enhance student learning and development, which involves self-knowledge, understanding of one’s talents, values, and interests in the relationship to a student’s capacity to provide effective leadership; and 2) to facilitate positive social change at the institution or in the community. The SCM process of leadership development is based on the following “key assumptions” (HERI, 1996):

- Leadership is concerned with effecting change on behalf of others and society.
- Leadership is collaborative (collective action, shared power, and a passionate commitment to social justice).
- Leadership is a process rather than a position (shared group experiences working toward common goals).
- Leadership should be value-based (understanding of self-values and trust necessary for collective action).
- All students (not just those who hold formal leadership positions) are potential leaders (engaging with others and creating change).
- Service is a powerful vehicle for developing students' leadership skills (promoting positive change for others and the community). (p. 10)
Most traditional leadership programs are “top-down,” emphasizing “leaders” as only those individuals who hold formal leadership titles. The approach of the SCM, according to HERI (1996, p. 11), emphasizes the nonhierarchical method of leadership, which is “flat.” This alternative approach posits that what is most important is developing the leadership of the entire group. The SCM regards leadership as a value-neutral process involving positional “leaders” and “followers.” Others continue to use this approach in their leadership programs and find merit in its underpinnings. For example, Owens (2013) discusses how “typically institutional administrators take on the role of leaders while students are recipients or followers; however, students play important roles that affect the success of these programs.” Owens (2013) affirms how the big picture of leadership encapsulates both the leaders and the followers, and considers students’ perspectives in the value they offer in contributions toward an organization’s mission.

In discussing leadership programs, it is also important to have some knowledge of leadership styles as articulated through leadership theory. (Some leadership styles may be less applicable within the college context.) The emergence of leadership theory reveals models of “individual achievement, management, and positional authority, process orientations, and shared responsibility” (Komives et al., 2011, p. 37; Northouse, 2010; Rost, 1991). Leadership selection theories became “leader” training, and “leader” development transitioned to “leadership” development (Komives et al., 2011).

Different leadership styles encompass traits of leaders that are categorized as leader-centered or follower-centered. Both of these leadership styles have a vision and a mission, but they use two entirely different approaches, according to Maslennikova
The traditional leader-centered leadership style tends to assume an authoritarian, transactional, or charismatic model, while the follower-centered, nonhierarchical leadership style favors participative, servant, and transformational models, as detailed below.

Leader-centered styles are found in “top-down” hierarchical structures, which are familiar to students while they are in high school. They are identifiable through self-realization and self-projection of the leader. Included in this type of leadership are: 1) Authoritarian Leadership, which regards leaders as experts in the organization who take responsibility for a strategic plan toward success and are task-oriented; 2) Transactional Leadership, which regards followers as those who follow orders exactly, and is usually found in short-term projects; and 3) Charismatic Leadership, which involves an enthusiastic leader who is able to communicate and lead through charm and is trusted by others, who have faith and believe in them. These models of leadership continue to be discussed in some leadership programs; however, “top-down hierarchical models of leadership have more recently been replaced with models of Participatory and Facilitative Leadership [my emphasis],” according to Saltmarsh et al. (2012, p. 168).

Follower-centered styles achieve organizational success through the realization, growth, and development of the followers. This type of leadership is found in nonhierarchical (“flat”) structures, where leaders and followers are treated equally. Leadership styles that fall in this category are: 1) Participative Leadership, which relies on the abilities and feedback of the entire team; 2) Servant Leadership that involves strong values and ideas that the leaders and followers bring into the mix; and 3)
Transformational Leadership, which builds on inspiring the followers to achieve a shared vision of the organizational future.

These styles capture the concept of leadership behavior and are significant when understanding the importance of relationships in organizations. There may be overlaps in styles, in which a leader might be more authoritarian on some issues and display another style on others (Northouse, 2015, p. 89). Thompson (1967) describes how the organizational flow of the leadership hierarchy is up and down for leader-centered styles; and Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) assert that anyone can lead if they have the knowledge and personality to gain agreement from other members, which would involve follower-centered styles. In addition to overlaps between styles, there may be tensions between different approaches to leadership development.

In another context, Wielkiewicz et al. (2012) discuss that an ecological or collaborative leadership model would be effective in helping students think about their approaches to leadership development, but it poses a tension with an industrial or hierarchical approach to the leadership processes (Allen, Stelzner, & Wielkiewicz, 1998; Wielkiewicz et al., 2005; Wielkiewicz et al., 2012). For example, while positional leaders remain important to the process of decision-making, a diversity of outlooks should be included in order for an organization to comprehend the varying degrees of opportunities and constraints that accompany challenging situations. Relying exclusively on a collaborative leadership approach, however, could lead to an organization’s collapse. The availability of information addressing a challenge can be nearly infinite, this information needs constant update, and it can involve the organization almost indefinitely. Ecological
or collaborative leadership models address organizational or group leadership, but they do not address the process of development through which an individual’s identity as a leader might emerge and evolve.

According to Komives et al. (2009), “As a person’s awareness of core values grows, the desire to act consistently with those values grows as well” (p. 339). Komives et al. further discuss how leadership development provides the means to develop personal goals to be congruent with personal values, as demonstrated by Mahatma Gandhi—a leader whose life was an extraordinary example of congruence. His speech and processes were congruent with his beliefs, so therefore his behavior reflected moral, civil, and respectful values (pp. 340–41). The idea of “congruence,” as embodied by Gandhi, is an example of one of the seven “critical values” of leadership development as identified by the developers of the SCM, also referred to as the “working ensemble” (HERI, 1996, p. 22). (See Figure 2.) These critical values are categorized by three perspectives or levels: individual, group, and community.

The first level within the SCM, A) **Individual values**, includes 1) **consciousness of self**, involving beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that enable a person to motivate him/herself to action; 2) **congruence**, encompassing consistency in thinking, feeling, behaving, being honest with others, and being genuine; and 3) **commitment**, having the energy to serve the group and its goals.
The second level, B) **Group values**, includes 4) **collaboration** in working with others in a common effort, capitalizing on various perspectives and talents, and using the power of diversity to generate creative solutions and actions; 5) **common purpose** in having shared aims and values, individually as well as in groups; and 6) **controversy with civility**, recognizing that different viewpoints are inevitable and such differences must be aired openly but with respect.

Finally, the third level within the SCM, C) **Community values**, comprises 7) **citizenship**, which is believing in a process whereby individuals and groups become responsibly connected to the community or society at large through some activity,
realizing that members of communities are not independent, but interdependent, and that individuals and groups have responsibility for the welfare of others.

The group values at the second level would apply most directly to leadership programs, in which students experience interpersonal relationships, choose leadership styles and organizational norms, create missions and visions, plan and project-build together—and ultimately serve the needs of the community (the third level). It is at the second level where democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation begin to take place and continue through the third level, with shared inquiry, listening, and solving problems and working together for the good of all.

Conclusion

Colleges and universities can have an impact on the moral development of students by “developing character, conscience, citizenship, tolerance, and individual and social responsibility,” according to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (1997, pp. 12–13). Although higher education cannot change the world, it can extend existing knowledge, research new and innovative methodologies, refine, and teach positive behavioral competencies in how we communicate, interact with others, and serve our communities. Fischer et al. (2010) and Wielkiewicz et al. (2012) hone in on students as they enter college, saying “a better understanding of the leadership attitudes and beliefs of incoming first-year students may allow institutions to more effectively meet their needs, and efficiently use institutional resources to develop effective leadership programs” (p. 2).
Bogue (2002) asserts that it is the closeness within higher education environs that exudes the basic organizing principles of the “sense of community.” Students are able to bond with others in a structured, but unmonitored, atmosphere of learning and camaraderie. With this line of thought, institutions of higher learning seem to be “the most likely places for the reinvigoration of the democratic spirit,” according to Steigerwald (2003, pp. 13–15). Hayden (2010) further states that “developing a coherent worldview should be an educational outcome as important as any skill or competency learned, because it forms the basis of integrity, where trust between individuals is made possible” (p. 23).

Indeed, educators have ongoing discussions about how to develop leadership capacities in college students and engage them in democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation. According to Roberts (2007), in order to create dynamic opportunities to meet the needs of a wide array of students, multiple purposes, strategies, and populations need to be considered. Dugan et al. (2011) further stress that scholars have identified factors through student leadership research that have a high impact on student learning. They include faculty mentoring, community service, civic engagement, sociocultural discussions, and formal leadership programs. Leadership programs that follow the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development are using consistent standards in preparing students for diverse settings in which they will practice democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation with others while enriching their individual uniqueness—all toward helping them flourish and become engaged citizens in a diverse global community.
This study targets what existing scholarship may not tell us, including how today’s students conceptualize how their leadership development influences their behavior and attitudes in order to promote civic engagement. And, it may not tell us how they express their understanding of the value of their roles as leaders, and of leadership, after participating in the best practices of leadership development programs with a service-learning component. Further, it may not tell us if they feel that democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation in these leadership programs positively affect the way that they interact and communicate with others in being able to “agree to disagree” and be able to make collective decisions for the good of all in making the world a better place. What scholarship also may not tell us is how today’s students benefit from leadership principles and moral values in becoming more civic-minded citizens in the long term, if higher education continues to move farther from its democratic mission and roots.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction and Research Questions

This study conveys how first-year college leadership programs influenced students’ behavior and attitudes in the way they responded to and engaged with others through classroom and service-learning experiences and how these students expressed their roles as leaders and citizens after this participation. (See Appendix B for Concept Map.) Dugan and Correia (2014) assert:

Leadership self-efficacy (LSE), one’s internal belief in the likelihood that they will be successful when engaging in leadership, is a key predictor of gains in leadership capacity as well as a factor in whether or not students actually enact leadership behaviors. (p. 34)

The study focuses on college sophomores, juniors, and seniors who participated in first-year leadership programs as freshmen.

In this section, I will discuss the research methodology in detail, including site selection, site access, participant selection, data collection, data analysis, role of researcher, reliability and validity, ethical considerations, and limitations.

Three research questions were used to guide this study. They are:

RQ1—How do college leadership programs for first-year students influence civic engagement?

RQ2—What best practices or principles of first-year college leadership programs prepare students to communicate deliberatively and engage with others?
RQ3—What value do students derive from their service-learning experiences in first-year college leadership programs?

I use qualitative research when a problem or issue needs to be explored and there is a need for a detailed understanding, according to Creswell (2007, pp. 36–40). Therefore, I used a qualitative research methodology to employ an inductive process to compile the various components of what the data means, why events occur, and what happens in discovering the important categories and interrelationships to answer the research questions appropriately (Tuckman, 1999, pp. 395–96). The qualitative research methodology provided interpretive, material practices that made sense of any emerging themes through the lens of the participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). Through a series of observations, I collected the data through semi-structured, face-to-face, individual communications with students and teaching assistants (TAs) or team leaders, and from online surveys.

Site Selection

In selecting the three sites for this study, I used a “criterion” sampling strategy (Creswell, 2007) in order to assure quality and consistency regarding, specifically, leadership practices and principles in the classroom and service-related activities that were taught by the administrators, learned by the participants, and delivered to and received by the community. According to Pinnegar and Daynes (2006), qualitative data should not be generalized unless it is related to a case study, but it should reveal the precise or exact data that the researcher is seeking. The three institutions had the identical
interview, focus group, and online protocols in order to maintain reliability of the participants’ responses regarding their experiences.

Each site had to meet the following criteria, as shown in Appendix C in more detail: 1) four-year college/university, public or private; 2) first-year leadership program (or course) for the first full semester or first year of college, at minimum; 3) required or elective option for students to participate in the program; 4) at least 50 college students participated in the program; 5) the learning objectives are robust and include outcomes that speak to civically engaged citizenry and involve students in service-learning programs with both classroom and community components; 6) the program objectives encompass the six key assumptions of the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development or have an overlay of its principles; and 7) the program includes individual, group, and community as the critical values of leadership development (HERI, 1996, pp. 19–21), as described in the literature review in Chapter 2.

Finding first-year college leadership programs through the Internet and personal communications proved to be a challenge. After contacting administrators who are connected to leadership training at the institution where I am employed and others whom I reached by telephone or in-person visits, I also got in touch with representatives of the Bonner Foundation, Campus Compact, and the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. Even though there are first-year college leadership programs across U.S. public and private institutions, those that I found seemed to be limited in scope for the purpose of this research and did not fully meet the criteria of the theories that are addressed in Chapter 2.
Another sampling strategy used in the site selection for this study was “snowball” or “chain” sampling, which, as defined by Creswell (2007), “identifies cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases/sites are information-rich” (p. 127). The people I contacted after reaching out to the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs helped me to identify other similar participants or leadership programs (Keyton, 2011). The three universities and their respective programs that were finally selected are the John Glenn College of Public Affairs of The Ohio State University (OSU)—John Glenn Civic Leadership Community; the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences at The University of Maryland (UMD)—CIVICUS Living and Learning Program; and The Wharton School of The University of Pennsylvania (UPENN)—Management 100: Leadership and Communication in Groups. OSU is located in Columbus, Ohio; UMD is in College Park, Maryland; and UPENN is in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Further descriptions of these institutions and their first-year college leadership programs can be found in Chapter 4.

Obtaining permission to study each of these programs at their sites was done through email communications to each of the three program administrators. Their contact information was relatively easy to locate on the respective websites of the institutions. Each program administrator responded quickly to my email request asking for a phone conversation to discuss the study that I wanted to conduct on their campus with their students, which provided only a brief overview. Once they agreed to speak with me, and in preparation for the phone calls, I emailed each of them details as to: 1) what the research study was about; 2) why the research was important; 3) how the research study
interviews and focus groups would be conducted; 4) the method for assigning subjects to groups; 5) administration of the online surveys; and 6) confidentiality information, along with templates for sample emails to the students for the semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews, the focus groups, and the online surveys. This enabled the program administrators to have a complete picture of the process, and it also defined the necessary information and expectations for their involvement in connecting me to their students.

I followed all of the protocols in obtaining permission from UPENN’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) in compliance with their rules and regulations to protect the rights of human participants. Once I received my approval from the IRB, and during the data collection process, I put the necessary documents in a safe location. Although my study was anonymous across my data collection methods, I secured the proper permissions as dictated by the standards of UPENN and its IRB.

When studying as a guest researcher at another institution, it is necessary to obtain permission from their IRB as well as one’s own university. For this study, I contacted the IRBs at OSU and UMD at College Park (location is an important detail for multiple-campus institutions) once I had submitted my IRB application to UPENN. Given that UPENN is my home institution and encompasses The Wharton School, I did not need to receive extra permission from UPENN to conduct the study at that site.

The other two IRBs accepted UPENN’s IRB as the IRB of record in a reasonable amount of time, once I was connected to the appropriate person. This posed a small challenge, as neither of the program administrators were sure of whom to contact. The following caveat about proceeding in a research study without formal permission may be
worth noting. I received it in an email from OSU. According to its IRB representative (C. Pettey, personal communication, August 5, 2015):

Other than my research study involving the students, my contact with the staff and their participation would be limited to the following:

- Inform prospective subjects about the availability of the research;
- Provide prospective subjects with information about the research (which may include a copy of the relevant informed consent document and other IRB approved materials) but do not obtain subjects’ consent for the research or act as representatives of the investigators;
- Provide prospective subjects with information about contacting investigators for information or enrollment;
- Seek or obtain the prospective subjects’ permission for investigators to contact them;
- Assist in securing meeting space.

This reference helped me to clarify and stay within the boundaries of expectations for the program administrators, who were extremely helpful in promoting this study to the students and supporting my efforts in securing space on the campus.

**Participant Selection and Description of the Participants**

Again using the “criterion” sampling strategy (Creswell, 2007) for the participants, the three main criteria for participating students from the three institutions involved in this study were that 1) students had to have successfully completed at least one full semester in the designated first-year college leadership programs as freshmen; 2) students had to be sophomores, juniors, or seniors, or TAs/team leaders (current or past) who were current undergraduate students and had participated in the respective first-year college leadership programs; and 3) students had to be amenable to the process of participating in
the study. Since the program administrators were assisting in the outreach for the student participants, they knew who was and was not responding to the outreach for participation in the study, except for the online surveys, which were anonymous.

This methodology allowed students to be at a point beyond their first-year college leadership experiences where they were able to reflect back on their overall involvement. Semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews were conducted with five to 10 students per institution. One focus group of five to eight TAs/team leaders (current or past) who were current undergraduate students and also had been participants in the designated first-year college leadership program was conducted at each site. There was no overlap in participation between the semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and the focus groups. After my departure from each institution, I offered an online survey with a subset of the questions asked in person to other sophomores, juniors, and seniors who also had participated in the respective first-year college leadership programs. I asked each in-person participant not to submit an online survey but to encourage the participation of other sophomores, juniors, and seniors who had been in the respective first-year college leadership programs.

I divided demographic information about the students in this study between in-person and online participants across all three institutions (Tables 3 and 4). Further, I was curious to see at this juncture of their college lives how engaged they are in college activities and if they were still involved in some type of service-learning or community service. I did not separate the participants’ data by institution because the participants across the three institutions provided information that did not need to be analyzed by
university. A total of 71 geographically diverse students across the three institutions participated in this study, with 40 students participating in person, and 31 students out of 110 respondents completing the online survey. To clarify, I accepted only survey submissions that were at least 50% complete for this study. In some of the surveys submitted, much of the data was missing, including questions that were not fully answered. Setting the criterion of at least 50% completion invalidated 79 of the 110 online survey submissions for this study. Being more explicit in instructing the students of the completion requirement might have resulted in more accepted submissions.

I selected all students through an email invitation to participate. Albeit more equal numbers in the mix of racial/ethnic and gender diversity in the participants would have been desirable, of the in-person participants, 26 students identified as being white, nine students as Asian, three as Black or African American, and two as Hispanic or Latino; 15 were male and 25 female. Nevertheless, the student respondents in this study represent the demographics of the three universities, which are predominately Caucasian. There were 27 students who considered themselves “high” in engagement for college activities, with 12 at “medium” and one at “low.” Only four of the 40 students no longer participate in service-related activities. For the online survey, 18 students identified as being Caucasian, seven students as Asian, three as Black or African American, two as being of mixed heritage, and one as Hispanic or Latino; 13 males and 18 females participated. Overall, 25 sophomores, 22 juniors, and 24 seniors participated in this study, which was a balanced number of participants across the three grade levels. There were 16 students who considered themselves “high” as far as being engaged in college activities, with 11
at “medium,” three at “no,” and one not engaged at all. Nine of the 31 online participants no longer participate in service-related activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Class Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Home State or Country</th>
<th>Current Student Role</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Identification</th>
<th>Engagement in College Activities</th>
<th>Still Involved in Service?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Human Ecology, Majoring in Consumer &amp; Family Financial Services, CPP Track</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Public Affairs &amp; Political Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Other service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Public Affairs/Economics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service, Other Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Public Affairs and Criminology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service and Other Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Economics/Education &amp; Politics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Business Undeclared</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Broadcast Journalism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Environmental Science and Policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Government &amp; Politics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Psychology and Communication</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Hearing and Speech Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Government &amp; Politics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Broadcast Journalism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Communication/English Language and Literature</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Finance/International Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Other Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Finance, Social Impact</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>International Studies and Business</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Finance/Legal Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Economics (Finance &amp; Management)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Operations Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Business Economics &amp; Public Policy (Legal Studies and Business Ethics)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Finance/Marketing/Statistics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Statistics, Management, Operations, Management &amp; Decision (OPSM)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Finance Management, Materials Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Finance and Operations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Qualtrics: Online Survey Software & Insight Platform (2016)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Class Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Home State or Country</th>
<th>Current Student Role</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Identification</th>
<th>Engagement in College Activities</th>
<th>Still Involved in Service?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Animal Science: Pre-Professional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Criminology &amp; Criminal Justice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Neurobiology and Physiology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Psychology/Communication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Government &amp; Politics, History</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Other Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Community Health</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Government &amp; Politics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Public Health Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Service-learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Other Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Student Leader other than TA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Engineering and Business (Dual degree)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Molecular Biology, Health Care Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>OIDD/SIAR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>OPIM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black or African American and White</td>
<td>No engagement</td>
<td>Service-learning, Community Service, &amp; Other Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Qualtrics: Online Survey Software & Insight Platform (2016)*
Data Collection

Rossman and Rallis (1998) assert that qualitative data is better collected in settings that are more natural to the participants in order to observe greater detail and gain understanding of the experiences of the participants. In this study it was important to capture the sophomores, juniors, and seniors in an environment with which they were familiar, so the interviews were conducted onsite at the three respective institutions. This also provided me with the opportunity to familiarize myself with their surroundings and get a sense of where the participants lived and/or learned. Though I did not visit the service-learning sites, the students provided graphic details in their semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and in the focus group sessions.

There were four protocols used in this study (Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix F, and Appendix G), which are discussed further below. The protocols were intended to connect back to my research questions and elicit information about the following: the students’ experiences prior to college and in the first-year college leadership programs; what skills they learned in interacting with others and in communicating in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community; what changes they had observed in their behavior since coming to college; the most important life lessons learned in their first-year service-learning experiences; collective decision making in groups; service-learning and promoting good citizenship; growth as a leader; and anything that was relevant but not covered by my other questions. As Rossman et al. (1998) suggest, protocols should be interactive and humanistic by going to the site and delving into the encounters of the study participants in order to build a rapport and credibility with them. Further, Creswell
(2003) aptly stated, “We take these questions out to the field to collect either ‘words’ or ‘images’ ” (p. 43). I was able to collect both.

I used one set of 12 pre-determined, open-ended interview questions (Part I) for all semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews with five to 10 students in each of the three institutions (Appendix D). For the focus group sessions (one at each institution with five to eight TAs/team leaders), there was one set of 11 pre-determined, open-ended interview questions (Appendix E). For the online survey, there were nine pre-determined, open-ended interview questions (Appendix F). I created and distributed the online survey through Qualtrics software. Each protocol included a demographic section, “About You,” as Part II (Appendix G). This section of the protocol had 10 questions that were multiple choice and fill-in-the-blanks. The in-person participants completed this section as a form, after signing the consent form upon arrival, prior to the interviews or focus groups. When the interviews or focus groups were completed, each of the participants received a $10 gift card to either Dunkin’ Donuts or Starbucks, whichever was regionally more popular. There was no incentive for online participation.

The open-ended questions were consistent, except that more or fewer questions were included in the protocol depending on the type of method (12 questions for the face-to-face interviews, 11 questions for the focus groups, and nine questions for the online survey). The demographic questions were the same, except for Question 1 in “About You.” The students did not see the other two institutions identified, only their own institution. For my personal organizing purposes, on the protocol in “About You,” I
referred to OSU as Institution #1, UMD as Institution #2, and Wharton as Institution #3. In Qualtrics, there were three separate surveys representing each institution.

These four protocols were vetted in an earlier pilot study at The Wharton School, and as a result of that pilot study, I made some changes to the questions for this study. During the three site visits, the protocols did not need to be changed. What I also learned from the pilot study was that being more conversational with the in-person communications led to diversions from the intended questions; therefore, during this research study, I read each question precisely as it was scripted, and the students responded to the question. Later this proved to be useful when the transcripts were complete. Finding the questions and responses was easier in my analysis with coding. I did ask, however, that the participants be as candid in their responses as possible, and I went off script to respond to responses that needed more query.

I made one-hour appointments for the semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and focus groups. In order to have a successful interviewing experience, it seemed that having the support of the program administrators was critical to galvanizing the students to participate. The interviews averaged 30 to 45 minutes, and the focus groups lasted approximately 55 minutes. I spent one day traveling to each site and two full days conducting the interviews and focus groups, returning home the evening of the second day. My visit to OSU occurred September 20–22, 2015; UMD September 27–29, 2015; and Wharton October 19–21, 2015. Before leaving each site, I emailed another email template to the program administrators, which was the invitation for the online surveys. That email was published two days after my departure. I used my Apple iPhone
5s as the primary source and my Apple iPad Air 2 as the secondary source to record the interviews and focus groups. The recorded interviews were then sent to Transcribeme.com, an online transcribing service. This required having a signed non-disclosure form from Transcribeme.com on file with the University of Pennsylvania UPENN IRB.

According to Glaser & Strauss (1967), in remaining faithful to qualitative research principles, sample size should generally follow the concept of saturation, which means that when an issue is under investigation and the data is recurring and does not shed any new light, then saturation is achieved. By the end of the data collection in this study, I realized that the responses from 71 students were quite similar in content, as described in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. The few negative responses recorded were distinct, but all of the other replies across all three institutions became repetitive, except when the students described their high school leadership and service-learning experiences. This indicated that I had reached some saturation in collecting this data.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2007) stresses that organizing and preparing the data for analysis might involve several components and is an ongoing process of asking analytic questions, reflection, and memo writing or journaling throughout the study. At the onset of this study, I prepared three individual one-inch notebooks, one for each of the three institutions, in order to compile data pertaining exclusively to each university. When I traveled to the three sites, I brought the appropriate notebook. I also had a five-by-seven-inch journal with three tabs, one for each university. These highly portable items were
my main tools throughout the entire process of collecting data for this study that I used in my inductive analysis. Further, the way I asked the questions during the data collection helped to organize the data on the transcripts.

According to Saldana (2008), it is best to start coding data as soon as all the documents are gathered from the site, rather than waiting for all fieldwork to be done. During the data collection phase, I was not quite ready to approach NVivo, the qualitative data analysis software used for coding. When I received each set of transcripts from Transcribeme.com via email, I read them and extracted quotes that I found impactful, saving them in a Word document. I referred back to the journal in which I wrote notes during the interview process. As each person spoke, whether in an interview or focus group, I wrote in the margins of the pages key words that resonated with me, along with contextual notes to the right of the words, which I scanned frequently post–data collection to reflect on what the participants stated, what seemed to be the general ideas, and how they were communicated during the interviews and focus group sessions (Creswell, 2007). Given that this is a qualitative study, significant phrases, sentences, and words provided general trends, associations, and relationships in addressing the three research questions. Layder (1998) asserts that this methodology with words and short phrases is considered a type of pre-coding. Some of the words and terms that were repeated frequently during the face-to-face interviews and focus groups were charity, civility, commitment, communication, dialogue, empathy, family, feedforward, leader, listening (active), manners, patience, open-minded, privilege, respect, and support. Recording these words and phrases seemed like a practice that might be helpful later, but
at the time, it was a way to stay focused on what the students were saying and how they were responding overall. Boyatzis (1998) further emphasizes that rich quotes and passages by participants are worth bolding or highlighting, as they represent “codable moments.” With the students’ quotes, I used various colors of highlights to categorize them as I answered the research questions and captured the emerging themes.

When it was time to delve into NVivo, which came at the end of the data collection, I found the process very challenging. YouTube videos were the most helpful methods for learning the software, together with the instruction manual. The NVivo software was useful in the limited time I could utilize it.

The first step was to import external data into NVivo, which uses a hierarchical or parent/child type of organizational structure. I basically used “Sources” to store my data in “Internals” and “Nodes” to code the data, as there were several other options that did not seem to be of practical application to my immediate needs. In “Internals” I created sub-folders for Demographics, Institutional Data, Interviews, Focus Groups, Online Surveys, and Research and Journal Notes. All transcriptions, field notes, and Qualtrics reports for the online surveys were imported into NVivo and organized under the respective sub-folders into sub-sub-folders by institution. The sub-folder for Focus Groups did not require a sub-sub-folder because there was only one focus group at each institution.

Next, I made a folder in “Nodes” for Autocoded Interviews. My goal was to organize all questions by individual numbers within each institution. For example, with OSU, I autocoded the transcripts so that I could see all responses for Question 1, all responses for
Question 2, and so forth, allowing me to separate each question into its own “chunk” of data per institution. According to Rossman et al. (1998), this is the beginning of data segmentation into smaller “chunks” of data to be able to bring meaning to them. With the focus groups, I grouped all three institutions together and autocoded the questions separately. This made it easier to code, which was a tedious process and took a few weeks but could have taken even more time manually. I also aggregated the demographic data from the interviews and focus groups in NVivo, but ultimately used Excel instead, which I found to be a better tool to complete the coding at that point in the process.

The online surveys that I administered through Qualtrics needed to be coded as well. I had previously generated a report for each of the institutions and imported them into Word documents for safekeeping in the event of possible software disruptions. (Saving data and making backups was a normal routine during this research.) Each protocol has two parts; in person, there were the interviews and focus groups with a handout for Part II. In Qualtrics, both parts were in the same survey, so I uploaded the raw data and exported it into an Excel file, split the data in half, extracting the demographic data and making it a new file. The open-ended responses were in their own file, and I was able to see all of Question 1, Question 2, and so forth, separately for each institution, which is also possible in a Qualtrics report. Given the incomplete data in unfinished surveys, I used only 31 of the 110 online surveys, which met the 50%-complete requirement that I had imposed.

I followed the same process with the online surveys as with the interviews and focus groups, only I coded them manually. I reviewed the data and then found impactful quotes
to add to my existing file. It was after comparing the responses from the three institutions that it became evident the responses were similar across the institutions. Overall, I had approximately 230 broad codes at the beginning of the process, which gradually narrowed considerably in scope and size. In NVivo, with the semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews, there were 12 questions with about 10 codes per question, equaling approximately 120 codes. I used the same codes for each of the three institutions. For the focus groups, in which the three institutions were combined as one for each question, there were 11 questions, also with approximately 10 codes per question, equaling 110 codes. Following the aforementioned process, this ultimately led me to identify 16 meaningful themes. The latter were directly related to changes in students across the three institutions in their behavior and attitudes as a result of these experiences during their first-year college leadership programs and service-learning involvement, and the themes addressed the three research questions.

In order to have an idea of how the coding began and how the themes eventually emerged, some of the first codes that were used in NVivo, and ultimately in Excel (frequently used in both), led to the 16 themes (shown in italics) as follows: 1) Advantage over less fortunate, feelings of self-awareness—Honesty and Truth and Privilege/Privileged; 2) Bonding of team members and social engagement with peers, success getting through the programs’ experiences—Peer Support; 3) Challenges team faced and consensus in decision making—Democratic Deliberation and Democratic Dialogue; 4) Civic engagement—how promoted?—Commitment and Citizenship; 5) Collaboration—Collaboration; 6) Consideration of others—Altruism, Empathy, and
Tolerance and Sensitivity; 7) Identifying as a leader or the role of —Leader/Leadership; 8) Interacting with others—Communicating (Language and Listening; Democratic Dialogue); 9) Respect among team members—Respect; 10) Sense of satisfaction—Accomplishment and Impact; and 11) Trust among team members—Trust. These 16 themes were then divided into four realms based on the context of the students’ experiences and the resulting quotes: 1) student leadership and civic engagement; 2) self-awareness and self-efficacy; 3) best practices through classroom teaching and learning and service-learning; and, 4) relationships with others and succeeding through leadership and civic engagement. The descriptions of these themes and realms are shared in Chapter 4. (See Table 5.)

Role of the Researcher

Going into this research as the head of a leadership program at my institution, I realized that I needed to be extremely cautious about potential ethical issues or personal biases. According to Locke, Spirduso, and Silverman (2000), being explicit in identifying any personal interests and values that were foreseen with my research topic and the process of researching it needed to be fully addressed. For this reason, I chose not to study any leadership programs at my university.

On the other hand, my position and my working life in various leadership roles in corporate America and higher education have given me the ability to see different facets of leadership in varying contexts. Moreover, I am currently a student, a college administrator, and a part-time lecturer, giving me a range of relevant perspectives. When
the students revealed their opinions and feelings through the three data collection methods, my experience enabled me to understand better what they conveyed.

I was sensitive to the needs of the participants in my study and emphasized that if any of them wanted to discontinue their involvement, they would not be penalized. I was not concerned about possible implications that might jeopardize the results of my study if this had occurred. During the recording of the focus groups, I strived for anonymity among the participants, even when they were inclined to refer to one another by first names.

Reliability and Validity

According to Keyton (2011), “reliability is subjective especially in qualitative research” (p. 114). Although the measures used in this study are designed to be reliable, being clearly stated, with explicit instructions, and given under similar environmental conditions, it is important to ensure that they are valid. In order for the measurements to be valid, they must fit the meaning of their intended purpose. Also, “the measurement of variation must be replicable”: the same cultural norms must be repeated on subsequent occasions (Hoover & Donovan, 1995; Keyton, 2011, p. 114). For example, all in-person methods must remain consistent from group to group and from session to session, and all participants must meet the given criteria for the study. I followed this methodology as previously detailed, and achieved some saturation by the end of the data collection process.

To test the reliability and validity of this study, triangulation was used by 1) conducting this research at three higher education institutions; 2) having three groups of participants in semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews, focus
groups, and online surveys; and 3) using four similar/like protocols. These three methods enabled me to overlay and examine different sources in building justification for the emerging themes (Creswell, 2007; Ravitch and Riggan, 2012). Probing through in-person interactions provided more nuanced, rich responses. I intentionally looked for negative responses, given that the sample reflected participants who might be more prone to provide positive comments because they were being asked about a program (or school) in which they had chosen to participate. With the online survey, the only unknown is whether the study participant actually completed the online survey or if they had someone else complete it for them, and there are no visual cues. Also, I anticipated that the online survey might yield more negative responses than the in-person interviews because of complete anonymity. The software used collected the data precisely and in an organized manner.

With any of the methods used, methodological rigor was instituted to verify, validate, and confirm the validity of the research project as a whole. I used open-ended questions to obtain data to comprehend meaning. Information from the literature, bracketing past experiences (i.e., keeping my experiences out of the mix), using an adequate sample size, using field and analytic notes, and adhering to the qualitative method until some saturation was achieved, which was one of the outcome goals, ensured methodological rigor (Creswell, 2007; Frankel, 1999; Meadows & Morse, 2001). Even though most of the responses from the students were positive, there were some negative comments that are included in this study.
and mentioned in Chapter 5. After the completion of the data collection, I emailed transcripts to each participant in the interviews and focus groups in order to determine if there needed to be any changes and otherwise to confirm that they were accurate (Creswell, 2007). One more step was that the information in this study that describes the leadership programs (Chapter 4) was sent to the program administrators of each institution to ensure accuracy, and further questions were clarified through email communications with them.

**Ethical Considerations**

I promised and pledged to conduct this study so that none of the participants would be harmed in any way. I was objective and fair in conducting the semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and focus group sessions, as well as being sensitive to the needs of the participants if someone felt overwhelmed for any reason during the process. I was transparent in the strategies I used to conduct this study, and I did my best to keep any implicit biases from entering my opinions or judgments about the dialogue that resulted from the semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews, focus group sessions, or online surveys.

**Limitations**

Some limitations of this study are worth considering when interpreting the findings. First, there was no prior research done to examine the influence, if any, of high school leadership training or involvement on the students in selecting or entering the first-year college leadership programs. Second, the study was limited to three research universities that offered first-year leadership programs to freshman students. The findings in this
study may not have addressed issues faced by other four-year institutions or community colleges. Third, this study is vulnerable to selection bias because the students from two of the three selected programs chose to be enrolled specifically in those programs in order to be engaged in leadership and student-learning experiences. Finally, this study lacked an equal amount of diversity in race/ethnicity and gender participants, but this did not affect the findings. All students from diverse and non-diverse groups responded similarly to the protocol questions, which did not pose relevance to race/ethnicity and/or gender.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to understand students’ perspectives on how their behavior and attitudes were influenced through best practices and principles of leadership, service-learning, and communicating and interacting with others in three first-year college leadership programs. Semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and focus groups with 40 participants revealed that the teaching and learning in the classroom and service-learning experiences at service sites made a difference in these students’ lives since their arrival in college. However, five of these participants expressed that they did not fully enjoy their experiences in the leadership programs. Further, with the 31 respondents to the online survey, more students spoke candidly about their negative experiences than those in face-to-face interviews, which was anticipated. Nevertheless, students across the three institutions contributed positive feedback and expressed consistently two main points about their first-year college leadership experiences: 1) Value is derived through best practices in the classroom and service-learning experiences, with deep reflection and peer support, in first-year college leadership programs and therefore may influence students’ behavior and attitudes in order to promote civic engagement; 2) Best practices or principles of first-year college leadership programs prepare students to communicate democratically and deliberatively when engaging and interacting with others.

This chapter begins with the findings from the three institutions, their first-year college leadership programs, and their respective curricula and service-learning processes. Courses in each of the three leadership programs were organized in a logical
sequence with specific goals, each building on the previous one, as opposed to being à la carte or modular without intentionality or direction. Following are findings regarding the best practices, service-learning experiences, student perspectives on how they derived value from their service-learning experiences through 16 emergent themes within four realms. (See Table 5.) Also in the findings, I observe how students expressed that communicating through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation influenced their behavior and attitudes in order to better promote civic engagement. By learning to use language that allows for all to have a “democratic voice,” they were able respectfully to “agree to disagree” when engaged in dialogue or debate. Also, the students learned how to make collective decisions for the common good of all those concerned.

The Ohio State University (OSU) and the John Glenn College of Public Affairs—John Glenn Civic Leadership Community (JGLC)

Profile of The Ohio State University

OSU, a public research institution in Columbus, Ohio, was established in 1870 as a land-grant college, which resulted from President Abraham Lincoln signing the Land-Grant Act on July 2, 1862, giving all high school graduates the opportunity to obtain a college degree. The first students, totaling 24, met at the old Neil farm, just two miles north of Columbus, in 1873. In 1878, OSU received university status, and during the same year it graduated six men. The following year, it graduated its first woman (https://news.osu.edu/history.html, 2016). Today, as I arrived on the grounds of OSU, it is reminiscent of a very busy, heavily concentrated city with vast structures, including a 104,944-seat football stadium, home of the Buckeyes. OSU belongs to the “Big Ten,”
and the size of the stadium alone is a testament to the committed fans who fill it to capacity on game days (http://www.ohiostatebuckeyes.com/facilities/ohio-stadium.html, n.d.).

The OSU main campus is in Columbus, the state capital, and there are regional campuses in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark, Ohio, with an Agricultural Technical Institute in Wooster, Ohio. To a prospective student or visitor on the OSU main campus, it could be a little overwhelming based on the number of buildings, transportation systems, and people moving about. As of fall 2015, there were 45,289 undergraduate students on the Columbus campus and 6,470 on the regional campuses, representing 69 countries. The students select from more than 200 undergraduate majors, 12,000 courses, and 15 colleges. (https://www.osu.edu/osutoday/stuinfo.php#admin, 2015). Student organizations total more than 1,000. (https://undergrad.osu.edu/admissions/quick-facts.html, 2016). There are approximately 13,425 graduate and professional students, who have access to 121 doctoral programs, 157 master’s programs, and baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate professional programs. The 6,836 faculty members include regular tenure track, regular clinical faculty, regular research faculty, and associated faculty, with an 18:1 student-faculty ratio (https://www.osu.edu/osutoday/stuinfo.php#admin, 2015). The mission of OSU is, “We exist to advance the well-being of the people of Ohio and the global community through the creation and dissemination of knowledge” (https://oaa.osu.edu/vision-mission-values-goals.html, 2016). OSU’s motto is “Education for Citizenship” (Krupin, 2014).
About the John Glenn College of Public Affairs

The John Glenn College of Public Affairs became OSU’s 15th college in January 2015 after having been the School of Public Policy and Management (graduate programs only), founded in 1969, and the John Glenn Institute (leadership development and civic engagement programs), established in 1998, and the John Glenn School of Public Affairs in 2006, which was a merger of the John Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management. John Glenn College is an academic unit of OSU in Columbus, offering coursework in public affairs at the undergraduate, master’s and doctoral levels. Just being on this college’s property gives a visitor a sense of awe. U.S. Senator John Glenn, who has been associated with OSU since 1969, is recognized for his service as an Ohio state senator from 1974 to 1999 and as an astronaut and the first American to orbit the earth on Friendship 7 in 1962. Earlier, he served in World War II and Korea while in the U.S. Marine Corps. He is an American hero who has received numerous honorary degrees and accolades for his accomplishments in the public sector (https://www.osu.edu/features/2015/honoring-an-american-hero.html, 2015).

On a map of the campus, The John Glenn College of Public Affairs, located in Page Hall on “The Oval,” appears to be on a diagonal from the stadium (across the street from the Blackwell Hotel) and not too far, but it takes about 10 to 20 minutes to cross the distance by shuttle, depending on the bustling traffic consisting of buses, cars, and bicycles. The century-old Page Hall was renovated (completed in 2004) specifically to personify Senator Glenn and his achievements. Perched on a hill, it is a remarkable structure with huge pillars, monumental stairs from the original building, and a massive
glass façade bearing a large American flag and two banners with the name of the college flanking it on both sides. Not only is Page Hall an academic center; it is also a museum that includes a moon rock and Senator Glenn’s archives. A prospective student may not even need to think twice about enrolling here once standing amid this incredible space. Senator Glenn’s office is in a three-story glass box suspended from the ceiling and can be seen from anywhere in the building (glenn.osu.edu/about/page-hall/, n.d.).

Even as Senator Glenn and his achievements are applauded, the credo of the institution, “Inspiring Citizenship, Developing Leadership,” informs potential undergraduate and graduate students that The John Glenn College of Public Affairs is a place in which “making positive change in the world” can be accomplished. Under the direction of faculty and lecturers, who create a spirit of civic responsibility, students learn through a wide range of professional experiences and research interests that are brought into the classroom (glenn.osu.edu/faculty/glenn-faculty, n.d.).

Background of the JGLC

Incoming freshman students who are interested in public affairs, leadership, public policy, community service, and the political process—regardless of their major—may apply to the JGLC. It was established in 2000, first as the John Glenn Living and Learning Program, then as the John Glenn Learning Community, and now as the John Glenn Civic Leadership Community, although it is still known as JGLC. This co-curricular living and learning community is housed in Baker Hall East, which is down the street from Page Hall rather than in or adjacent to it. This allows first-year students who are interested in public service, advocacy, community (social), and policy to live together
in the same residence hall (http://glenn.osu.edu/programs/leadership-community/, n.d.)
These students are then automatically enrolled as members of the John Glenn Civic Leadership Council (CLC), established in 2006, which is the John Glenn College’s undergraduate student organization yet open to OSU’s entire undergraduate community (glenn.osu.edu/programs/clc/, n.d.).

The mission of the CLC is to “promote, broaden, and cultivate civic engagement and leadership among college students.” There are four pillars of focus: academics, policy, service, and community (social). This group is intended to develop informed, inclusive leaders, providing an atmosphere conducive to promote active citizenship on campus and in the community. All students in the CLC are encouraged through this affiliation to engage in in-depth policy discussions and unique service projects while cultivating lifelong friendships and academic support in the process (glenn.osu.edu/programs/clc/, n.d.).

About the JGLC Curriculum

During arrangements to visit the JGLC, its leadership explained that learning and service are primary goals for students in this living and learning community. The program seeks to cultivate the essentials of our democracy: citizens, leaders, and ideas. The students typically have a passion for issues of service and policy. They study a wide variety of academic majors and participate in activities and events that center around the aforementioned four pillars. In the first semester of the JGLC, students take a public affairs course as a group in a standard classroom, located on the ground floor of Page Hall. Usually there are approximately 70 incoming undergraduate students in the fall
semester in the living and learning community who aspire to receive a BA in public affairs (established in 2010). In this class, the students explore the discipline of public affairs as a career and its opportunities. The concentration is on leadership and features discussions regarding civic engagement with faculty and professional practitioners (housing.osu.edu/learningcommunities/john-glenn-civic-leadership-community/, n.d.). The basic format of classroom instruction is lecture/discussion with a variety of guest speakers who are incorporated into the back half of the class.

Through the coursework, the JGLC aims to have a great connection to the learning community in the John Glenn College. It seeks to be able to craft a working definition of public policy through the learning and have the students better understand procedures, entities, and tactics that significantly impact Ohio government. The students are expected to gain appreciation for social justice, social change, ethics, and values in the public sector. Their training should help them to be comfortable having in-depth discussions about relevant policy topics through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation.

The typical curriculum includes topics on public policy, the law and public policy, “Community development districts: A tool for real estate development,” the 2009 financial crisis revisited, local government, civility in politics, the future of bipartisanship, the role of lobbyists in state government, careers in public service and politics, stories from the campaign trail, and discussions on current events. The program administrator is the instructor, but faculty and practicing professionals contribute by providing perspectives of both traditional and nontraditional career paths in public affairs when they are invited to be guest speakers.
Students must participate in a number of learning community activities throughout the term, which are based primarily on policy, service, academic, professional development, and social- and community-building, and may include a volunteer opportunity at a food kitchen. Other activities for the students may include a policy discussion or a faculty dinner dialogue or programming done around elections during election years. According to the leadership at the JGLC, these events and activities have different point values, and the students must earn a specified number of points to fulfill that particular requirement for the course, which will yield one credit hour. It takes 50 event points to pass the entire course. Students may choose from a menu of different service activities and other programs according to their interests. JGLC students engage in several local service projects each year. Some have included Columbus Early Learning Center, the Near East Side Cooperative Market, MLK Day of Service, and the Childhood League. The leadership community (JGLC) is just one of many academic and civic engagement programs offered to students at John Glenn College. For the purpose of this study, the JGLC is the only program being explored.

The University of Maryland (UMD) and the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSOS)—CIVICUS Living and Learning Program (CIVICUS)

Profile of UMD

UMD, a public research institution in College Park, Maryland, was one of America’s original land-grant institutions, which was founded in 1856 by a group of planters, making it the state’s first agricultural college. Its all-male cadet student body spent an hour a day on the farm, trained for the military, and then studied modern and ancient
languages, natural sciences, and English and math. In 1912, after a major fire destroyed its campus, the college was acquired by the state and rebuilt. With the abolition of the military, women were welcomed to the campus. When the Maryland legislature combined institutions of higher education to form the University System of Maryland in 1988, it made the College Park campus its flagship (https://www.admissions.umd.edu/about/History.php, n.d.).

Today, a prospective student or visitor to the campus lands in a sprawling community. The retail areas are filled with young people and vibrancy, like a typical college town, with active construction sites to fill vacant spaces that remain. There are trees and lawns with beautiful flower arrangements and many buildings for learning and living spread out as far as one can see, with people moving briskly among them. According to the University of Maryland System in 2015, University of Maryland–College Park (UMCP) had a total of 38,140 undergraduate and graduate students combined out of the entire population of students in the system (11 institutions), which totaled 163,454 (http://www.usmd.edu/usm/statistics/, 2015). There is a student-faculty ratio of 17:1 and a full-time equivalent faculty, which means that the equivalent number and not actual number of 2,036 (as reported in 2013–2014) is derived by a formula and includes tenured and tenure track faculty, department chairs, and full-time non-tenured and non-tenure track instructional and research faculty from all departments for the entire institution (http://www.usmd.edu/usm/statistics/, 2014, p. 11). A “Big Ten” School since the 2014–2015 season, the Maryland Terrapins (“the Terps”) boast that their intercollegiate athletics belong to one of the premier programs in the country
The institution’s expressed purpose is straightforward: “The mission of the University of Maryland, College Park is to provide excellent teaching, research, and service” (http://www.provost.umd.edu/mission_statement.cfm, 2015).

About the BSOS

The history of the BSOS at UMD dates back to 1919, seven years after the disastrous campus fire, when it was known as the School of Liberal Arts and located in Morrill Hall (http://bsos.umd.edu/about-us/college-timeline, n.d.). BSOS is now housed in Tydings Hall, an impressive reddish-brown brick structure with tall white columns flanking its façade, which is located on the beautiful, sprawling, green UMD campus in College Park, Maryland. The mission of the BSOS is to understand and pursue innovative solutions to the challenges facing the global community, drawing on connections in Washington, D.C., and worldwide to enrich its teaching, research, and service. “The BSOS community works to enhance international relations, advance global sustainability, understand societies and cultures and improve the human condition” (http://bsos.umd.edu/about-us/mission-statement, n.d.).

Today, the BSOS boasts of its reputation as “one of the largest and most academically challenging colleges at UMD,” according to its new dean. It includes the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, the Center for American Politics and Citizenship, and other “groundbreaking” research centers. The college’s portfolio ranges from “African American Studies to Hearing and Speech
Sciences to Sociology,” which is a reflection of its commitment to “Be the Solution to the world’s great challenges” (http://bsos.umd.edu/about-us/message-dean, n.d.).

The BSOS has more than 6,000 undergraduate students and 800 master’s and doctoral students. Two highly praised living and learning programs in the BSOS are housed on the UMD campus. CIVICUS, a two-year leadership program, is one of the three programs used in this study. It seeks to engage students in an environment of leadership courses, internships, and service-learning projects. The other is also a two-year program, Global Communities, in which students from different cultures live and learn together, making global interconnections to shape the lives of the students (http://bsos.umd.edu/node/246/view, n.d.). Faculty at the BSOS is committed to providing an engaging and inclusive experience for students, with challenges in the classroom, in laboratories, in the field, and around the world. Popular majors at the BSOS include Government and Politics, Economics, Psychology, and Criminology and Criminal Justice. The BSOS staff is available to assist students with a path from academics to career search, with internships and study abroad experiences in between (http://bsos.umd.edu/about-us/message-dean, n.d.).

Background of CIVICUS Living and Learning Program

CIVICUS first opened its doors in Somerset Hall to student residents in fall 1999. The leadership at the time viewed this residential program as an opportunity for 135 diverse students from varying majors to come together in a living and learning community, engaging in academic experiences and community building for a two-year period. CIVICUS provides a small-college atmosphere as well as being a part of the BSOS and
surrounded by the resources and advantages of UMD, a large research institution. In CIVICUS, students are able to connect, learn, serve, and lead (https://civicus.umd.edu/prospective-students/room-selection, 2014–2015).

Students are invited into this academic citation program, which is centered on five themes of civil society: “citizenship, leadership, community service-learning, community building in a diverse society, and scholarship” (https://civicus.umd.edu/about-us/civicus-program, n.d.). Besides residing in Somerset Hall, the students take core classes together and participate in service-learning projects with more than 50 area organizations (civicus.umd.edu/prospective-students/service-civicus, n.d.). Students are dedicated, enthusiastic, and motivated to get involved and make a positive difference to the community they serve outside the classroom. Although the citation component occurs during the first two years in CIVICUS, many juniors, seniors, and graduates continue to remain involved as alumni/alumnae (https://civicus.umd.edu/about-us/civicus-program, n.d.).

About the CIVICUS Curriculum

The goals of CIVICUS are to help students to 1) understand the social and historical foundation of a civil society; 2) identify the roles of individuals, groups, social institutions, and community services; 3) grasp domestic and societal issues from political, economic, and policy perspectives; 4) serve in a local, direct-service non-profit organization; 5) understand contemporary social problems through sociological perspectives; and 6) delve into a detailed study of selected social problems, including social conflict and social inequality (https://civicus.umd.edu/prospective-students/fun,
n.d.). As the program continues in the second year of college, more objectives are incorporated into the CIVICUS curriculum.

According to program leadership, CIVICUS students take six classes for 14 credits over four semesters, focused on concepts and insights needed for successful leadership in a global society in the 21st century. Three major elements are incorporated: 1) the practice of leadership; 2) the dimensions of a multicultural identity; and 3) awareness, realization, and understanding of the dynamics that leaders face in a multicultural environment. Students examine skills that are important to successful leadership in a 21st-century American multicultural society. They probe nine dimensions of identity—including race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, age, disabilities, class, citizenship, and language—and examine how these dynamics give rise to constructive leadership practices within a multicultural society. Constructive dialogue in positive intergroup relations enables the students to engage in multicultural issues democratically. Further, students are able to learn about multiple dimensions and relationships with regard to individual and group identity.

In the robust CIVICUS curriculum, students begin the semester with the program administrator as the instructor by defining “What is CIVICUS?” and watching a video from Iowa Public Television, which hosts Conversations on Civility: Interview with Dr. P. M. Forni of The Johns Hopkins University. By the second meeting, they are reading and discussing excerpts from Civility by Stephen L. Carter and also Choosing Civility by P. M. Forni. After an in-class exercise on civility during their third session, students are planning community service-learning activities and drafting an action plan. Other topics
in the CIVICUS curriculum focus on citizenship and civil society; a guest speaker from the UMD Office of Student Conduct is invited in to discuss student conduct and academic integrity, followed by reading and discussing excerpts from Brian O’Connell’s *Civil Society*. Other speakers from the Common Ground Multicultural Dialogue Program of UMD’s Residence Life also participate in facilitating conversations around multiculturalism and inclusive dialogue. Several discussion sessions focus on *The Laramie Project*, a documentary film that analyzes the 1998 murder of an openly gay college student who, because of his sexual identity, was brutally murdered. After the middle of the semester, students in CIVICUS return to class to discuss the power of social networks on citizenship and public policy. They are also asked to read Chapter 1 of *Bowling Alone* by Robert Putnam as well as Putnam’s *Civic Disengagement in Contemporary America*. Besides group project meetings, CIVICUS students discuss civil society and social capital; they read *The Taxi Driver* by Thomas Friedman and *Does the Internet Strengthen Community?* by William A. Galston; and they listen to an NPR Digital Life piece, *We Need to Talk: Missed Connections with Hyperconnectivity*. The final discussions of the fall semester of CIVICUS include social capital, community, Internet, digital connections, civility in the digital age, the digital divide, and civil society.

The CIVICUS leadership explained that as soon as the students move in, they complete a simple service-learning project so they can begin to understand community engagement and social problems. They make peanut butter sandwiches for the local homeless shelter. A representative from the shelter comes in to tell them where the food
is going, whom the sandwiches feed, how much the sandwiches contribute to those who need them, and why it matters. The students are able to feel less threatened about the people who benefit from the sandwiches and are then able to have a discussion among themselves about their feelings about homeless people and homelessness. Moreover, they are able to begin to see how they can effect positive change through this relatively simple gesture.

The next day, all 135 students go to a local park to remove invasive weeds—the only service project that can accommodate all the students simultaneously. Although it is not one of their favorite projects, it is another way to get them civically engaged upon arrival at UMD. Every semester, CIVICUS students must do a minimum interval of four service projects, which are not tallied by hours, only by project. Many of the students surpass this goal, as they find it rewarding to tutor others or participate in other meaningful community projects that may need consistent attention, such as reading to young children who become accustomed to a particular student and look forward to seeing that person regularly. CIVICUS seeks a variety of online sources and media for local service opportunities each semester. Students are also able to search for their own sites.

The University of Pennsylvania (UPENN) and The Wharton School—Management 100: Leadership and Communication in Groups

Profile of UPENN

The beginning of UPENN, a private Ivy League research institution in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, dates back to 1740, when the building it would claim as its home more than a decade later was the vision of prominent evangelist, George Whitefield, as a
charity school and house of worship. Given the high cost of the project and the lack of resources, the building went unoccupied until Benjamin Franklin—founding father of the United States, printer, and inventor—organized a group of 24 trustees to form an institution of higher education based on proposals that he had circulated among Philadelphia’s leading citizens. In 1751, Whitefield’s unfinished building finally opened to the children of the upper and working classes alike as the Academy and Charitable School in the Province of Pennsylvania. Benjamin Franklin was the school’s president for four years and served until the time of his death, 1790, as a board trustee. This school became the University of Pennsylvania in 1749 and is regarded as America’s first university (http://www.upenn.edu/about/history, n.d.).

UPENN’s campus today in West Philadelphia has approximately 215 buildings and notable landmarks, such as the first double-decker college football stadium and the first student union (http://www.upenn.edu/about/history, n.d.). There are more UPENN buildings in the New Bolton Center, with 110, and the Morris Arboretum, with 32. Moving around campus, one clearly can see the diversity of the community and the people. Walking among the people on the UPENN campus and seeing the beautiful historic buildings may appeal to many prospective students and visitors, if its standing and reputation were not enough. The total number of students enrolled at UPENN in fall 2015 was 24,876; of that number, 21,563 are full-time and 3,313 are part-time. Included are 4,675 international students. There are 10,406 undergraduate students and 11,157 graduate and professional students at UPENN, with access to four undergraduate schools and approximately 89 majors and 12 graduate and professional schools. UPENN has
2,566 standing faculty and 2,079 associated faculty, totaling 4,645, and the student-faculty ratio is 6:1. Being a charter member of the Ivy League, UPENN has 17 sports for men and 16 for women in intercollegiate competition. There are 1,338 students actively engaged in 36 active club sports (www.upenn.edu/about/facts, n.d.). UPENN’s overarching theme for the entire university family is “Penn Compact 2020: Building on a Decade of Progress.” Instituted by its president, Amy Gutmann, this vision includes three pillars: “Inclusion” in promoting access; “Innovation” to advance knowledge; and “Impact” in how UPENN engages locally, nationally, and globally (http://www.upenn.edu/president/penn-compact/penn-compact-landing, 2014).

About The Wharton School

The Wharton School was founded in 1881 by Joseph Wharton, an American entrepreneur and industrialist, and is world-renowned for its academic reputation in management education. Since August 2002, The Wharton School has been housed in a distinctive, reddish-brick, contemporary structure with a dome-shaped upper level and roof, designed by Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates in New York City and named after Wharton alumnus, philanthropist, and corporate leader Jon M. Huntsman (https://www.wharton.upenn.edu/huntsmanhall/tour/facts_main.html, 2015). I found it to stand out boldly among the surrounding historic buildings.

The Wharton School was originally intended by Joseph Wharton to produce “pillars of the state, whether in private or in public life” through its graduating students. The tradition of The Wharton School is to educate visionary leaders, not only in academe and business but also in government and nonprofit organizations. Today, Wharton is known
as one of the most prestigious and comprehensive sources of business knowledge in the
global community, and when walking through Wharton one can sense that it is a refined
and special place (https://www.wharton.upenn.edu/wharton-history/, 2015).

There are approximately 2,500 undergraduate students among the 14,000 students
from other disciplines within The Wharton School (5,000 in degree programs, plus 9,000
in executive education—shorter, non-degree programs), including MBA, MBA for
executives, doctoral, and executive education participants
(https://www.wharton.upenn.edu/facts-figures/, 2015). The 225+ faculty, both standing
and non-standing\(^2\), represent 10 departments in The Wharton School and are known to
engage in pedagogy that generates knowledge and innovation to transform practices of

Background of Management 100: Leadership and Communication in Groups

During the pilot study for this dissertation at The Wharton School, I learned that
Management 100 was created and developed in 1991 and integrated into the system in
1992 as a required foundation course for all incoming undergraduate students. A
curriculum review by The Wharton School dean and faculty at that time determined that
undergraduate students should have a communication requirement and thus be able to
speak and present themselves well in public. Approximately 540 undergraduate students
enter Management 100 in the fall semester of each academic year (which is the semester

\(^2\) Faculty who have the status of tenure or tenure-probationary are considered Standing Faculty. This
faculty is ranked as professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. Non-standing faculty may be full
or part-time instructors (https://provost.upenn.edu/policies/faculty-handbook/faculty-policies/i-b, 2015).
being evaluated in this study) and are assigned to one of 54 teams of 10 students. The
course requirement of Management 100 is in addition to the regular course load of all
incoming Wharton freshman students.

Management 100 requires that students work successfully in teams and engage in
persuasive rather than positional leadership, which is structured for more collaboration
and promotion of democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation. Moreover, according
to the Management 100 syllabus, students must adhere to a strict high standard of
conduct by being prompt to class, being prepared, keeping electronic devices off and out
of sight, and keeping aligned with class requirements and announcements regularly.
(https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/programs/undergraduate/course-information/course-
descriptions/, 2015). This type of experiential program was thought by the founders of
the program to foster civil behavior by enabling the students to be coached on
teambuilding, as well as enhancing their leadership and ability to make a difference in the
world.

Given that Management 100 is experiential (as are the programs at the other two
institutions), it created some concern at its inception and especially when it became a
credit-bearing course (1995) of one credit (equivalent to three credits elsewhere) after
successful completion. Basically, Management 100 adheres to “practice over theory.” It
could be argued that higher education institutions generally privilege “theory over
practice” in traditional settings, which could pose a barrier to earning credits for this type
of learning. Management 100 was designed to provide “real life” experiences without
being labeled a co-curricular or extracurricular activity that normally would be deemed
inappropriate for earning credits. Following experiential learning theory developed by David Kolb at Case Western, Management 100’s leadership proceeded to launch the program and ultimately provide credits for its completion (https://weatherhead.case.edu/executive-education/instructors/david-kolb, n.d.)

*About the Management 100 Curriculum*

Led by the program administrator and one faculty, along with support from a team of TAs, this course is aimed at developing the leadership skills, teamwork, and communication proficiencies of incoming Wharton freshmen through experimentation, application, action, and reflection. Activities include simulations or role-plays, impromptu speeches, and fieldwork in a service project. Management 100 provides opportunities for students to exercise their leadership through service, work collaboratively with a diverse group of students, and write and speak persuasively. The course seeks to change behavior as students acquire a heightened sense of individual strengths and growth through “feedback, feedforward [see Glossary of Terms in Appendix A], forward-looking, or constructive coaching” (https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/programs/undergraduate/course-information/course-descriptions/, 2015). TAs facilitate the student teams, advise on the scope and relationship students have with the nonprofit clients who benefit from the service projects, as well as offer guidance on class assignments (https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/programs/undergraduate/course-information/course-descriptions/, 2015).
The topics of the Management 100 curriculum begin with discussing images of leadership from a social constructionist perspective, which is leadership based on people’s perceptions. The curriculum then continues through the following topics and others: making team decisions in 10 minutes; making dumb groups smarter; climbing mountains; the real world; what business can learn from non-profits; the leader’s new work; “What is our mission?”; making your values mean something; building resilience; how to play to your strengths; ethical breakdowns; Management 100 quandaries (or predicaments); what we know about leadership; becoming an authentic speaker; managing interpersonal feedback; trying feedforward instead of feedback; find the coaching in criticism; bargaining and negotiating styles; conflict mode instrument; examining the differential longitudinal performance of directive versus empowering leadership in teams; the discipline of teams; the team that wasn’t; making teams work; high-performance teams; and re-envisioning employees as active crafters of their work.

The program administrator cultivates 72 community partners (clients) for nine lectures of 60 students, which results in 54 teams with 10 students on each team. There are eight community partners (clients) who are assigned to eight lectures. This is where the clients “pitch” their projects to the teams during each lecture. The teams rank the clients in order of the teams’ preferences from one to eight, with one being the most preferred. The teams are then distributed, first by the top three choices of each team. The intent is that the teams will gravitate toward different projects. It is possible that there will be multiple teams at one site.
During the course of two semesters (one academic year), Management 100 includes 11 sections (nine in the fall and two in the spring) of approximately 60 students each. Management 100 teams complete approximately 70 field-service projects during the academic year. Management 100 clients (from the field-service projects) usually come through the United Way. As mentioned previously, there are approximately 72 clients who are cultivated by the Management 100 administrator. Providing a classroom component coupled with a service project for each team, Management 100 is a highly interactive and participative course in experiential learning, which is “upside down, backwards, and high touch,” according to the syllabus. Each of the 11 sections includes six recitations, which determine in which project team a student will participate. The project team experience is the primary text of the class, supported by readings, classroom activities, and discussion, so it is considered “upside down.” Going out into the community to work with the service projects and respective clients and then returning to the classroom to reflect on those experiences is “backwards,” analogous to taking a test first and then studying. The field projects—whether community service or consulting—provide an excellent opportunity to develop leadership skills, build a team, and contribute to the greater community. Finally, the interactive process of building strong relationships with the community partners or clients of the service projects and completing the assigned tasks is considered “high touch” (https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/programs/undergraduate/course-information/course-descriptions/, 2015).
According to the Management 100 syllabus, students should follow these rules:

Whether completing a service project or an external communication audit, keep in mind that successful team engagements are:

- **Inspiring.** Make a real contribution to the mission of your client’s organization.
- **Challenging.** Under-promise and over-deliver on project objectives.
- **Achievable.** Put in the time to make your project a success. As a rule of thumb, expect to spend about twice as much time outside of class as in.
- **Creative.** Structure the way you execute your project but leave room for creativity.
- **Flexible.** Show resilience. Your project can change for reasons outside of anyone’s control.
- **Accessible.** Make the effort to meet your client on site. Most project sites are accessible by foot, taxi, or public transportation.
- **Responsive.** Contact your client at least once a week by email and copy your TA.


Feedback is essential to Management 100; therefore, students are involved in a research project led in the fall semester by a doctoral candidate. It explores how feedback is perceived in face-to-face conversations. Through this project, as noted in the syllabus, students learn about misunderstandings that may occur during feedback in face-to-face dialogue. After consulting in one-on-one sessions with their TAs, Management 100 students complete a brief survey for the doctoral candidate, which is a requirement of the course (https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/programs/undergraduate/course-information/course-descriptions/, 2015).
The Emergent Four Realms and 16 Themes

From the interviews, focus groups and online surveys, 16 themes emerged that fall within four realms. These themes flow throughout the findings and discussions with the students. (See Table 5.)

Table 5.

| Four Realms with the 16 Emergent Themes (defined based on usage by students) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Student Leadership and Engagement** | **Self-awareness and Self-Efficacy** | **Best Practices through Classroom Teaching and Learning and Service-Learning** | **Relationships with Others and Succeeding through Leadership and Civic Engagement** |
| Accomplishment — making positive change in the communities served | Honesty and Truth — seeing the world for what it truly is and striving to make it a better place through service; seeing oneself as one truly is | Collaboration — working together and making collective decisions for the good of others | Peer Support — always having friends there to be supportive |
| Altruism — being unselfish with regard to the welfare of others, giving from the heart and soul to others | Privilege/Privileged — being advantaged over those being served; being privileged to be able to serve those less advantaged | Democratic Dialogue and Democratic Deliberation — being able to agree to disagree; able to make collective decisions for the good of all | |
| Citizenship — active engagement in the community, voting for issues that matter | Language and Listening — communicating with others through language that is inclusive; deep listening while hearing what others have to say | Respect — accepting differences in others and the way they express themselves and being civil | |
| Commitment — being a servant to the community and not giving up | | | |
| Empathy — doing for others, understanding their plight | | Tolerance and Sensitivity — being patient and kind to others, sensitive to others’ needs | |
| Impact — making a difference in others’ lives | | Trust — confident of and reliant on others | |
| Leader/Leadership — taking the lead, following the principles of leadership training and applying them | | | |
Best Practices through the Students’ Lens

Students in the in-person interviews expressed that they learned mostly in the classroom environment and also through their service sites. They took the practices and principles from the classroom and applied them onsite. There were some students, however, who felt the class work was tedious, and they preferred to be onsite. Also, some students felt that it was too much information for a freshman to handle. In the classroom, students learned about technical and life skills. They learned how to create presentations and what components would be necessary to make the presentations effective. They learned individual values, which they thought helped them to gain more self-awareness through their lessons and being able to dialogue with others about their feelings. The students conveyed that lessons on communications and civility helped them to be able to listen to others’ voices and hear others’ needs and views. Being able to listen was a constant theme among students of the three institutions. The students found it remarkable that listening was the key to better understanding of others, whether it was their classmates or those whom they served. One student stated about listening properly: “The ability to listen and then digest in response to others and the ability to clearly orally communicate my view through facts is important.” All the students described how they were better able to listen after participating in their first-year leadership programs. At all three institutions, students reminisced about learning how to listen to others and really hear what others had to say about who they were and what they needed. This student commented on listening:
We should treat others with respect and actively listen to each other. Understanding another's viewpoint can help shape your knowledge on a subject instead of remaining close-minded.

Also, the students discussed the importance of language and learning how to speak to others in ways that would not be aggressive or offensive. In learning civility, the students thought that these lessons drove home points about being empathic, more tolerant, sensitive, and respectful. When the students discussed their high school leadership roles and how they compared those to their new experiences in college, they expressed that they were amazed at the difference. Also, in the classroom, the students learned group dynamics and values, along with collaboration, when they were put into teams. The students expressed that leadership roles were different in those group contexts than when they were in high school, which they felt was an eye-opener. The TAs and team leaders in the focus groups felt that participating in the leadership programs in different ways instilled more values for them, in that they were able to engage from different perspectives. They further identified a shift in the leadership roles and styles due to their being involved in different ways. One TA reflected that when she began participating in the leadership program, she thought she hated it. But halfway through the program, somehow she began to like it, so much that she strived to become a TA.

These findings may suggest that it is during the service-learning component that the shift in behavior and attitudes occurs. At least 85 percent of the students talked about being able to reflect on their behavior, from what it had been to what they believed to have changed. Students expressed that they felt differently about people less fortunate than themselves, which they attributed to a change in attitude. Also another important
theme emerged that was communicated by students across all three institutions, particularly when describing their family backgrounds and life experiences pre-college—namely, their feelings of being privileged. After going through the first-year college leadership and service-learning experience, one student reflected:

My dad was a long-time member of a ministry, and my family felt that if you weren’t participating in some way to make your immediate environment better then you are wasting your time. Even though now, looking back—and I have problems with its privilege in handing out to people they [his family] felt were lower than them; that really bothers me looking back. I still value that both my parents passed on the idea that you need to participate in issues and the problems, even though I now disagree in how my father was trying to help out and the mentality behind it. I think he has what would be called paternalistic racism, where he would just try and help out the lower classes.

Another student spoke about a change in attitude and behavior in a different context by describing the transition from high school to college and how, through the first-year college leadership program, there was a noticeable change in being able to “stir the pot,” listen, and solve problems:

Before I maybe wouldn’t speak up in class, I liked to let the others speak. I don’t really like to “stir the pot,” but I think now I’m able to do that and also, I’m better able to problem-solve and listen to other people actively; and listen to what they have to say and then come up with a solution that will make everybody happy . . . I think I am now prepared for the real world and things that I will have to deal with in the future.

Students discussed peer support as a value that helped them make collective decisions together, transition into college and through their first year, and beyond their first-year college leadership programs. Further, the students asserted that building trust among their peers helped them to feel safe, whether in the classroom, on campus, or in the community. One student said:
When it came down to it, it was the friends that you made in the program and the people that kept you on top of everything. Definitely those relationships that you form learning what you do in the service-learning—“right off the bat!” Even when you are complaining, that is something you bond over.

The students conveyed how onsite experiential learning was an effective way for them to learn about being connected to a community and its residents through meaningful projects. Those students who had lessons on public policy were able to express that they could understand what it would take to make change happen for the betterment of a community and how their experiences promoted good citizenship. One of the questions on the protocols for this study asked about how service-learning promotes good citizenship. Not one student wavered when addressing this important question. They discussed how getting familiar and interacting with the community brings awareness of the social issues that communities face. One student stated, “As a citizen, it is one's job to contribute to the common good, and service-learning enables individuals to go into the community and assist those who are in need.” Students talked about how participating in service-learning makes it possible to benefit from the discovery of what working in the community does to make things better for its residents and from being able to see the difference they have made through their work. Another student shared:

By interacting and serving the community you are part of, you are learning about the unique issues experienced by those who live in it. In this learning through service, an individual becomes more engaged in the welfare of their community and is more inclined to remain involved as a participating member and good citizen and leader.

Students talked about their fear of homeless people and sites that were not located in the best neighborhoods and how they became less afraid after being engaged with the
people at those sites. The students talked about seeing the world differently and walking in other people’s shoes through their service-learning experiences. By learning about deep reflection, students were able to return from sites and go deep within themselves to reflect on what they had experienced. Feedback (or feedforward) provided the students with others’ perceptions or observations, which the students felt enabled them to be more attuned to how they appear to others. Students learned different kinds of tolerance and sensitivity—along with acceptance—when the site directors gave them instructions for tasks that made them uncomfortable or had them do things for which they did not understand the purpose. In the classroom, students expressed that when put into teams and working with others, they had to learn that everyone had a voice in the process. “I learned to consider a million points of view without denigrating anyone,” one student said. Another student elaborated:

From the program I have learned a lot about being mindful about the differences between others and myself. I realize that everyone has come from different backgrounds and a wide variety of experiences and cultures and people will think about certain things and issues differently. I try to be tolerant and keep this in mind so that I can be more sensitive in my dealings with other people, especially when there is a conflict at hand.

Students articulated how proud they were to be able to make a difference in their communities. The majority of students across the three institutions who participated in this study were enthusiastic about their experiences in these programs.

Students’ Reflections on Service-Learning Experiences

The students interviewed in person reflected on and discussed how they participated in helping communities and individuals in need, whether in homeless shelters, soup
kitchens, or neighborhood beautification projects. They talked about tutoring and mentoring young children in their own communities and in some cases described what it was like to take public transportation into some very poor areas. The students talked about how intimidated they felt at first but that they got over those feelings the more they traveled to the sites. Some students interviewed in person were raising money for organizations that needed financial assistance. One service project used hula hoops for an afterschool program for young children whose parents were unable to pay for tutoring or extended daycare. This student felt that raising money for this kind of effort was more worthwhile in helping the children exercise and providing a better experience rather than “just regular video games.” Some of the students’ fundraising efforts resulted in amounts anywhere from a few hundred dollars to $5,000 and up to $33,000. Another service project focused on burials for unidentified people who died in the community. One student continues to be a pallbearer for “John and Jane Does,” saying that “these people need to be buried with dignity as does everyone else.” Many of the students expressed how serving had become a way of life for them since their high school experiences in community service. They said they could see that adding classroom teaching and learning to the mix made for service-learning opportunities in which they felt more involved and committed. One group promoted healthy eating for one of their service sites. The project involved erecting fruit stands for children who did not have convenience stores in their neighborhoods that offered fruit or alternatives to candy and other less healthy food choices. The service-learning projects that involved neighborhood beautification in parks seemed to provoke the disdain of the students interviewed in person; however, when they talked about the outcomes, about the value of having a beautiful park in a community to
benefit its residents, their whole demeanor changed. At first, they did not see that picking up trash and leaves would make a difference, and then there it was—a beautiful park! A project that involved picking up cigarette butts and trash from fraternity row, however, was described by a student as “a useless undertaking.”

Students’ Perspectives on Civic Engagement and Value Derived from Service-Learning Experiences

Students talked about civic engagement being more than community service. Several students talked about local policy and how lives were affected because of it. The students reflected on good citizenship and voting for issues in which they believe strongly, which could affect the lives of the less fortunate. It was expressed by one student this way:

Service-learning promotes citizenship because when you help and give back to the people around you, you build a stronger sense of community. Service-learning creates a connection between the people in an area and brings us closer together, and being closer to your community, in my opinion, makes me feel closer to the public and like I am being an active citizen of my country.

One student felt that service-learning had to be deliberate for him. He contrasted his experience in a soup kitchen when only distributing food versus when he became engaged with the people he was feeding. He went on to talk about discussions he had onsite with the leadership team and how they could change policy to address more needs of the residents he was serving. Though some students, especially in the online survey, expressed that there was nothing valuable about their experiences, the majority of students interviewed in person were enthusiastic, proud of their experiences, and felt that
their peers were among the most valuable assets helping them to succeed during their first-year college leadership program.

**Changes in Students’ Behavior and Attitudes through Democratic Dialogue and Democratic Deliberation**

Students interviewed in person remarked about the importance of learning how to communicate and have dialogue without having arguments. They felt that, in a democracy, everyone has a “voice” and that it is okay to “agree to not agree.” One of the values that the students derived from their first-year college leadership experiences was the ability to compromise and come to a point where two parties are in agreement. They felt that all opinions matter and that everyone has unique strengths. One student said:

> Respect and understanding are the most important aspects to communication. Knowing that not everyone shares your experiences and identity, and thus being able to understand their point of view will help make communication effective.

Sometimes, though, students felt that their group dynamics did not work. For example, it was difficult to have teams with all “Type A” personalities trying to lead. Tense moments made the group experience uncomfortable and unpleasant.

Students talked about language and being able to use the proper words at the right times, rather than just saying the first things that came to their minds. Listening deeply was also discussed as being very important to the students, so that they could hear beyond the words. When asked about the times when they had to make collective decisions for the good of all, most students reflected for a moment before answering. Many of the students found something significant that they had made decisions about, and others felt that they were given instructions that they should just follow and go home.
In one instance, a student commented on how the team members came from different ideologies, and when it came to discussing a policy in class, they had to exercise restraint when trying to reach a consensus on how the policy should be interpreted. Sometimes when working with food distribution, students conveyed how they had to make a decision that would enable more people to receive food by cutting back on the portion size. When working outdoors, some students talked about how they had to decide which tasks should be handled by group members, as some of them had issues with touching certain plants but could build benches. They looked at the total project and the talent within the group and then decided how to delegate the tasks so that everyone was engaged and doing something that suited him or her. In some cases, the project time went over; students expressed how they made decisions to stay late in order to leave the job completed.

Throughout these conversations, the students conveyed how these experiences influenced how they felt differently about themselves and others. They talked about being better at seeing the good in others and what others had to say, whether it was their peers or people they served. The students expressed that prior to their reflections on what they were experiencing; they had not given these things a thought. But once they applied the principles they had learned, they noticed that they were more engaged and willing to let others speak while they listened. They expressed that making decisions together became easier the more the groups worked together for the good of the community.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Similarities and Differences between the Institutions and Their Leadership Programs

Institutional

All three of the institutions conduct research and are well respected worldwide, with rich historical backgrounds. UPENN is a private Ivy League school; OSU and UMD are public and in the Big Ten. The campuses of the institutions are vast and like unique cities unto themselves, with extensive transportation systems and thousands of students and faculty. The student-to-faculty ratio at UPENN is 6:1, at OSU 18:1, and at UMD 17:1. The missions of the institutions are respectable but vague. Delving deeper into the vision statements provides more depth, and the institutions are inclusive and strive for excellence. Student life at these institutions seems to be robust.

Colleges of the First-year Leadership Programs

The colleges of these massive institutions become the central point where the first-year college leadership programs come to life. They are smaller in scale and more intimate by nature. JGLC and CIVICUS are living-and-learning communities, but CIVICUS is in a standalone building in which students live in one side of the building and receive instruction in the other. JGLC classes are held in the John Glenn College of Public Affairs, while the students reside in a separate building. Management 100 is taught in the classrooms within Wharton. Students at all three institutions venture out to attend other classes throughout their respective campuses.
The Three First-year College Leadership Programs

The commonality, as pointed out in Chapter 3, is that these programs fit within the criteria set forth, mainly that the program was required or an elective option for students to participate; at least 50 college students participated in the program; the learning objectives are vigorous and include outcomes that speak to civically engaged citizenry and involve students in service-learning programs with both classroom and community components; the program objectives encompass the six key assumptions of the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development or have an overlay of its principles; and the program includes individual, group, and community as the critical values of leadership development (HERI, 1996, pp. 19–21). Otherwise, the three programs were different in their curricula, service project sites, and scheduling. Nevertheless, the best practices that emerged were consistent among the three programs. The students at JGLC and CIVICUS refer to their service sites as “community partners.” In Wharton’s Management 100 program, the students interview the “clients” whom they will serve during their service-learning experiences. Other differences between the first-year college leadership programs in this study—public versus private institutions, living-learning communities versus more traditional classes—do not seem to be factors in the responses from the students. Even as there is research on the benefit of living-learning communities and the bonds that are formed between students, it did not affect the students’ responses nor did any differences in public versus private institutions.

Classroom instruction for all three programs includes similar objectives but different content in the way of scheduling lectures, discussions, and guest speakers. The classroom
instruction is scheduled throughout each week for the three programs, and all include team presentations. Leadership, teamwork, presentation skills, civility, communication, reflection, and service are common themes of pedagogy among the three; citizenry and policy are more aligned with the curricula of CIVICUS and JGLC. CIVICUS also includes multiculturalism specifically in its learning objectives. This is especially important when looking at the intersection of service and diversity. In 2004, Vogelgesang asserted that “we lack studies that address how institutions are integrating diversity and commitments to partner with local communities” (p. 34). Roper (2012) argues that in order to strengthen the capacity of students to engage with each other, educators should use opportunities to seize upon the intersection of community service and diversity. Eight years later, one institution of the three that participated in this study explicitly included multiculturalism in its learning objectives, which indicates that its students are receiving “tools” or “awareness” to assist them in restorative circumstances. Although diversity may be discussed in the other two first-year leadership programs, it was not inferred.

Service-learning is considered an essential component of each program, yet time spent in the field at the community projects is accounted for differently. Some students in this study went beyond their scheduled field time because they wanted to offer more service. The three programs incorporate written (and verbal) “deep” reflections in their practices, which is done after students go onsite. According to Tuleja and Greenhalgh (2008), these “reflective writing assignments,” which are called “leadership portfolios,” are “read and critiqued by their TAs” (p. 35). These reflections are not done precisely the same way by all three institutions; instead, they are done at the discretion of each program.
administrator. The students expressed that it is through these “deep reflections” that they feel they were influenced to change their perspectives about how they engage and interact with others in the classroom, on campus, and in the community. Students also indicated that beyond the classroom, once they started the reflection processes, they were able to “deep reflect” in their dorms or at other random times, which goes back to SPT (social perspective-taking), which was discussed in Chapter 2. All programs conduct assessments to measure their effectiveness. (See Appendix H for assessment information.). Moreover, the program administrators for the three different programs were similar in that their commitment to the students provided them with what the program administrators felt are excellent leadership practices and skills for becoming good citizens through the pedagogy and service-learning experiences.

**Leadership and Community Service in High School**

Even though the students realized that they could learn from others, they expressed that they came to college feeling pretty confident about what they knew from their high school leadership experiences in community service—either through their clubs and organizations or through working with their families in the community. Only four students across all three institutions expressed that they had absolutely no previous leadership or community service experiences in high school, and they were happy to have the opportunity to participate in a first-year college leadership program. One student said, “Wow. I didn’t have any leadership experience in high school. That’s why I joined the [college leadership program] that I did.” Another student very quietly stated, “I didn’t have any leadership experience in high school.” When I asked if it was because the
student was not seeking any leadership opportunities or there were none available, the student responded, “I was really, really shy and quiet. I didn’t want to do leadership, but now I have taken advantage of some of them [leadership roles] while in college.” Other students listed at least two leadership and/or community service experiences when asked, whether in-person or online, “Please tell me about your most significant leadership experiences in high school, and what made these experiences significant for you.” One student responded:

Probably the most significant one was I was really active at student council throughout high school. And we would go to the state conventions with our student councils, and national conventions, and workshops. And I was actually a certified workshop presenter. Ever since I was in my sophomore, junior, and senior year in high school, me and one of my friends would actually present workshops to large groups of people at these conventions.

What was significant was, we were helping to do leadership activities and other, not really ice breaker things, but just other big group activities with people from all over the state and, in one instance, all over the country when we did that national convention. It was interesting to be able to be in control of a room of people who were like-minded, trying to become better leaders, but at the same time I’m at the same place they were. That definitely helped a lot with who I am now, talking to people I don’t know and a couple other things* that really helped out a lot.

*The couple of other things: Just the way you have to present yourself when you’re in front of people and just different ways to think about situations. It kind of helped later on for things that I did in college.

Another student elaborated about being more of a support person and not realizing the amount of leadership roles he undertook while in high school:

My high school was amazing! Everybody was leaders. It was really competitive and tough to become “that” leader. So I didn’t really have too many leadership roles but I was involved in many clubs. I was head of the art club and I was a treasurer of the environmental club. So I did small roles within the community in high school, but nothing like—I wasn’t president or anything like that. But I enjoyed supporting those clubs. I did a community service trip in Costa Rica
where I was the team leader for that, so that was cool. And we did that the summer after my junior year for two weeks.

I take pride in listening to people, listening to ideas, and not really shooting people down. I felt joy that everybody can come together and not one person was feeling left out. So even now with my friends, I like to do that. I think in high school I fostered that relationship of inclusivity . . . I like to focus on people’s strengths and balance out everybody else’s weaknesses.

The students in the in-person interviews spoke with enthusiasm about having leadership roles prior to college. So many of the participants did have leadership and community service experiences prior to college, but even the few who did not have such experiences still found their way to these first-year college leadership programs in order to have those involvements.

**Student Leadership and Civic Engagement in College**

In the literature review of this study, Bonous-Hammarth (2001) discusses how channeling skills and energies to some ultimate purpose—civic engagement—is a way of contributing to society and social outcomes through leadership. This helps to build leadership-related skills and self-efficacy for leadership, which includes being respectful to others and demonstrating civil behavior, in particular when participating in service-learning activities. Komives et al. (2009) assert that positive social change is facilitated by the impact of leadership programs. Through the first-year college leadership programs at the three institutions, all students were taught leadership principles and practices in the classroom and in the field through experiential learning about social issues that affect communities and how some of these challenges might be addressed. This training included being good servant leaders and sometimes stepping into other leadership roles as needed; being respectful of others and their feelings; learning to appreciate those different
from themselves; understanding local community and government issues; being able to listen to and communicate with others democratically; and sharing in collective decision making for the common good of all. Two students expressed it this way:

I learned that different individuals have different leadership styles and have different ways of communicating. I also learned the value of patience and the ability to be flexible, especially when working with the leadership of my service project and the people we serve there.

Leadership isn't about dominating or being better but it's about motivating each other towards a common goal while also being inclusive and civil.

Students conveyed that they felt a sense of accomplishment from helping others.

Service projects across the three sites were important to the students, in that they felt that they were giving to others and at the same time they were receiving new lessons about life that were deep learning experiences that would make a difference in their growth and development as leaders and citizens. A student stated:

By interacting and serving the community you are part of, you are learning about the unique issues experienced by those who live in it. In this learning through service, an individual becomes more engaged in the welfare of their community and is more inclined to remain involved as a participating member and good citizen.

All of the students realized how they impacted others’ lives once they got past any initial fear and apprehension of interacting with strangers who may be less fortunate than they are or who may live in circumstances that seem meager in comparison to the students’ lifestyles back home or on campus.

Students from the in-person interviews across the three institutions felt that they would be missed or the children whom they tutored or to whom they read would not have someone available to serve their needs if the students did not show up on their designated
days. They expressed how much they needed to be attentive to the people they served.

Even though the students were keenly aware that academics were their priority, they felt that the people whom they served needed to have consistency in those who were there to serve them. One student’s comments exemplified altruism and commitment when she described giving up an evening of fun at a party with her peers so that she would be able to get up early the next morning to read to the children of her service project:

I missed the party with my friends the night before because the youths I read to in D.C. would be disappointed if I didn’t show up and I didn’t want that to happen. They were more important to me than the party even though I would see them again; the party would be gone forever. That was okay.

Overall, the students in this study learned about pacing and commitment by being able to juggle academics and other activities to which they were committed, such as service-learning and delving deep into the activities involving their service projects. They felt that it is important to be organized in order to get everything done without rushing or not showing up on site as promised.

According to Brukardt et al. (2004), students in service-learning courses learn how to “collaborate, to synthesize, research and experience that not only prepares them for citizenship and the workplace, but also allows them to learn they made a difference in their communities” (p. 3). One student asserted, “Being a good citizen means being a good neighbor.” All of the students indicated that they would not have traded going into their first-year college leadership programs for any other experience. These programs are where they felt that they received the opportunity to serve the community and to learn skills that enabled them to do so effectively. Two more students commented on citizenship:
The more you know about your own communities, the more inclined you are to get involved with them and vote for programs to help your communities, and get involved with politics and vote for people that have the same ideals as you when it comes to those in need.

Service learning shows you those less fortunate than you. When you see how your decisions can hurt others, you are more likely to be a better citizen everywhere instead of only when you feel like it’s necessary.

Although the service projects varied among the three college leadership programs, that did not diminish the value of the lessons learned by the students. And common to all three first-year leadership programs is the fact that they are required. At Wharton, the freshman class for the entire school is required to take Management 100, while at CIVICUS and JGLC, this requirement is only for students who are accepted into their living-and-learning communities.

Self-awareness and Self-efficacy

In the leadership development process, purposeful LSE (Leadership self-efficacy) is important at this point of the story, as it is a key predictor of gains in leadership capacity (Dugan et al., 2014). Given that many of the students started the path of leadership in high school, it is interesting to connect their paths to stages 3 and 4 of the Leadership Identity Model, as described in detail in the literature. Stage 3 is Leader Identified and involves becoming aware of group dynamics; Stage 4, Leader Differentiated, is where students recognize that leadership is not controlled only by positional leaders (Komives et al., 2009). In fact, in Stage 4, students become self-aware and recognize others’ points of view after deep reflection through SPT. SPT enables students to think of others and have
empathy while maintaining their individualism (Dugan et al., 2014; Galinsky et al., 2005; Gehlbach, 2004; Johnson, 1975; Selman, 1980; Underwood et al., 1982).

From my notes during the in-person interviews, some students described themselves giving to others unselfishly and from the heart; hence, the theme “altruistic” emerged. The more I heard from the students, I wrote the word several times. One quote came from a student who used the word more than once when discussing the college leadership experience versus the high school experience:

When I was in high school being a drum major is a very service-based kind of leadership so you’re basically like a nanny or mother for 158 students but here it was a lot different. So I learned about different types of leadership. Not as altruistic as what I had been experienced to previously but it was still very interesting. I’m definitely glad I did it.

The students discussed how they honestly felt about having the insight now to see misfortune through the eyes of the beholder. Being able to be vocally honest and truthful about their feelings from within, which they described as being deep and personal, was described as an “awesome” feeling by one student. The students recognize that their behavior and attitudes have changed for the better since leaving high school. As this researcher observed, these students described the changes they felt influenced their behavior and attitudes since arriving on campus and participating in their first-year college leadership experiences.

Students explicitly expressed self-awareness as they talked about their advantages, which heightened their empathy for those whom they served. In their verbal and physical expressions, while revealing their sense of privilege, it was evident that they were reflecting deep within and being honest about their true feelings. Their realization that they were from backgrounds providing advantages to them that many do not have was
profound. They recognized how much better off they are in comparison to those less fortunate than themselves. When the students saw that they made a difference in their communities, again, their privilege gave them a sense of accomplishment because they were able to have the advantage of giving back to the community. They expressed how involvement with the programs in this study opened their eyes to situations that had been foreign to them and that they may have thought only happened to people they saw on television. On the other hand, to engage in the communities also gave them a different kind of privilege—namely, the opportunity to serve others. Based on the theme of privilege, one student remarked:

I once got a fortune cookie that said “Service is the rent we pay for the privilege of living on this planet.” I keep that fortune taped-up in my dorm room because I think it says it all: We can't be a part of society unless we serve to make our society better.

**Best Practices through Teaching and Learning**

The students expressed that their first-year college experience was more meaningful, as they had come to understand what good citizenship meant in serving others in the community and how social justice issues prevail more for those less fortunate than those who are more privileged. They stressed that the classroom instruction was what made the difference in their understanding of what they faced and how to handle themselves at service sites. The experiential learning was also a valuable experience for the students. They expressed that learning onsite through real-life experiences and then being able to reflect on them took their learning to a whole new level. What they did was learn in the classroom and apply what they had learned onsite. Several students stated that they were extremely happy to have been accepted into their leadership programs because they
learned the importance of teamwork and peer support, especially when they were serving in the larger community. Being taught top-down leadership styles as well as participative leadership, and understanding the differences, provided them with greater insight as to how important leaders are in moving systems forward and resolving problems, especially those that they encountered in the community.

Programs provided a “safe” place in which students could communicate and exercise democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation—in the classroom, on campus, or in the community. One of the goals for democratic deliberation is to share inquiry and work together in a safe environment to foster respect, trust, and understanding while speaking to each other respectfully and democratically in order to explore others’ views to make democratic reforms and vote (Pruitt et al., 2007). The students talked about building trust among one another. One student said, “I learned that not everyone agrees with me and that people I disagree with can still be my best friends.” While JGLC and CIVICUS included living-and-learning communities, which were described by the students as being safe spaces to dialogue and make deliberative decisions, especially during late-night discussions, the Management 100 students described a similar type of camaraderie in their teamwork during their service projects. As a result of having been taught to be democratic in their dialogue with each other, they felt that they had learned how to agree to disagree in a positive way. Two students expressed their feelings by saying:

I learned about the importance of being able to speak comfortably with everyone you encounter. I furthered my understanding of utilizing empathy in leadership positions, and how to balance equality and egalitarianism. Dialogue is an important component in our leadership program that plays a major role in interacting with people.
I learned how to speak more openly and to share my opinions more. I learned how to have a dialogue instead of an argument and how to interact with those with differing opinions.

All students across the three institutions felt that they had learned how to make collective decisions deliberately in a democratic society through their respective leadership programs. These students shared:

During class, we had to give a final presentation on a policy. And so during that time, I was in a group of people with different ideologies other than my own and so with that, we had to interpret the policy and then try to come up with the solution and the root causes behind that, that we all agreed to it.

We determined that our organization into committees was not working, and so we restructured our organization to make the work streams better.

There was a wide variety of people who were in the learning community with many different beliefs; it helped me to become more open to others beliefs and to learn how to deal with conflicting ideas.

The students across all three institutions were taught how to be less aggressive while still having their own opinions. In the classroom, they had to be respectful when their classmates spoke and when they had discussions on controversial topics. Onsite they had to listen deeply and yield to those whom they were there to serve. The students expressed that this helped them to be more tolerant of and sensitive to others, especially when they were assisting at their service sites with people they may have found challenging because they were impaired cognitively or physically, younger, clingy, or demanding.

Students beamed when speaking about their service-learning projects, feeling that they made a difference to those they served. Having a sense of pride and accomplishment as well as being self-reliant meant a lot to the students in this study. They felt that they had
learned how to make valuable contributions to society through their commitment to
service and were made aware of their impact on others in making the world a better
place. Students felt that learning about inclusive language and building a vocabulary that
would be a part of their everyday life was positive reinforcement and helped them to be
more confident when speaking to others. They gained an understanding of social justice
issues and were able to see the world through different lenses.

Students were taught “collaborative innovation” and how to make collective or
collaborative decisions in that process that may require creativity to find appropriate
solutions. For example, when students at one community site felt that a cook was verbally
and physically (pushing/pulling) abusive to the children, they were reluctant at first to
report the many incidents of offensive treatment that they and others had witnessed. As a
group, they decided on what they saw as an “innovative” approach to the situation, which
was to present the problem to their program’s leadership rather than reporting it directly
to the service site’s leadership. In their classes, they were taught to seek “innovative”
approaches to find solutions to problems they encountered in their service and team
experiences.

Given that no precedent had been established for the students in the classroom on
reporting behavior or misconduct by employees at service sites, the students in this
situation had no rulebook to follow. The students felt that they should explore various
“innovative” options themselves to resolve the situation in a non-threatening way. Going
to someone they could trust in their first-year college leadership program was the
approach they decided upon out of several options they discussed. The cook was
prevented from further abusing the children by being removed from her position without
any repercussions to the children who were being abused or the students from the program who were responsible for serving the needs of the abused children. The example of having the abusive cook removed was described by at least four students and appeared to be an important step for everyone because they felt that they had made an appropriate and effective decision as a team. The students described how the victims appeared to be happier and more comfortable without the cook’s presence. They too felt that they could be freer to work with the children without a negative and hostile environment. This also gave the leadership program’s management notice that the site needed to be monitored more closely if the partnership were to continue.

In the classroom students learned use of language when interacting with others. Students were taught how to speak to others with kindness and consideration rather than using abrupt vocal qualities that may be offensive to others. They learned to say, “Please,” “Thank You,” “You’re Welcome,” and “My Pleasure” and other polite phrases, using good manners. According to Billsberry (2009), through discussion and debate, the medium of language becomes essential, which brings about students’ interpretations of their own definitions and contexts of leadership experiences. One student commented that in using proper language, one should do so “with compassion and kindness; to listen to others over your own personal thoughts.” Another student claimed:

People really do listen to what you say, after being in my leadership program, one of the first things I notice about people, and my friends, is how they speak to others, about others, and in general. The language people use says so much about a person.
Relationships with Others

Longo (2013) asserts that in promoting the civic mission, collaborative approaches to teaching and learning can encourage young people to “make a difference” through “concrete social action” (p. 2). One student observed that “relationships are key in working with teams.” Another student described having fun in the first-year college leadership programs: “Working with others who are motivated can be extremely fun.” Interaction between students and faculty, students and peers, students moving around campus, or students in the community seemed to be a positive experience for the participants in this study. One student stated, “Leadership isn't about dominating or being better, but it's about motivating each other towards a common goal while also being inclusive and civil.” Even though students expressed that getting to know one another and building trust took time and patience, they eventually learned that everyone is different and that is okay. According to Greenwood (2008), “together, the parties develop plans of action to improve the situation together, and they evaluate the adequacy of what was done” (p. 327). A student shared:

I learned mostly how I interact with others on my team. Compromise is important, and everyone should feel comfortable in every situation. That said, not everyone needs to be happy with every decision.

Succeeding through Teamwork

The students in this study were asked what they needed to be successful in their first-year college leadership programs. During the in-person interviews, at least 10 of the students across the three institutions mentioned their peers, TAs/team leaders, or professors/instructors. The students felt that building relationships with others was
important to their success in getting through the leadership program and service-learning experiences. When the students first came into these three first-year college programs and were put into teams, they were taught to have group values and how to work in collaboration with one another for a common purpose, both in the classroom and at service sites. They were instructed how to use their diverse talents to create dialogue democratically and common solutions deliberately with shared aims, as described in the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996, p. 22). One student claimed, “My relationship with my fellow associates was important for me to succeed.” Another student discussed equality and noted how, “The world doesn't revolve around anyone. We are all in this place together and we have to help each other. No one person deserves more than another.” Collegiality was important for another student, who thought that to be successful, “getting along well with my teammates, TA, and professor” was important. Two students expressed the importance of succeeding through the classroom instruction:

To succeed in our program, it was important to really care about the topics presented in class. We learned about being a conscientious member of society and an effective leader, among other things, and to do this one must be passionate about learning, helping others, and the issues in our society. What we learned directly related to our lives and the world around us; and, if you are passionate about these real-world issues, you could only do well in the courses.

The classes we took during our first year allowed me to learn about how to be an effective leader in society. I took these lessons and attempted to get involved in groups where I could work my way up to leadership positions. Also, taking part in certain service projects helped me learn about being proactive and hardworking, which is important qualities for a leader to have.

This question took considerable thought from the students and several times they asked me to repeat it. One student wanted to discuss this subject more from the vantage point of
various opportunities for involvement on campus since being in the first-year college leadership program and said:

I was able to involve myself in many different groups and become a leader by choosing the right direction that was offered by my program. My first year was more about learning about the leader that I was and how I was able to apply that skill.

Students felt that their behavior and attitudes were influenced more positively in promoting civic engagement through service-learning since entering college as the result of being in their first-year college leadership programs. In civic engagement through service-learning, they learned how to communicate better with others in respectful and democratic ways, deliberatively making decisions in their teams for the good of all, and they came to understand the importance of being empathic and understanding those less fortunate or less privileged than themselves. They expressed that becoming knowledgeable about the world outside of their lives could prepare them for a more productive future as a respectful citizen in a global society. According to McCoy et al. (2002), changes in individual behavior and attitudes happen when “better understanding of the issues and of one another inspires people to ‘make a difference’ ” (p. 131).

**Those Who had Negative Things To Say**

Not all of the 71 students who participated in this study were completely satisfied with their first-year college leadership program experiences. Even as the positive responses provide some evidence of behavioral change through service-learning and good leadership practices, that may not be true for all the participants. Among the 40 students who were interviewed in semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and focus
groups, there were about five negative comments overall. A couple of those comments stemmed from competitive factors within groups or teams, or were about the group or team size when there were more than five students joined together. Two students out of 71 wanted to have more learning on servant-leadership. These students came from families who raised them to serve in the communities in which they lived. They felt that their level of community involvement at home was more intensive; therefore, they perceived that the depth of commitment involved with their first-year college leadership program was less than what they had experienced in serving others with their parents. A couple of negative comments from students include:

- It was a very terrible experience. Although there were some leadership aspects such as communication and teamwork, it essentially caused tension, and rivalry within the program’s experience.
- I did not appreciate the experience. The teams are way too big to be efficient. Courses should be divided into two semesters so that half the students take it in the fall, and half in the spring, that way you effectively cut down the teams in half into teams of 5 (which is optimal).

Another student did not like the leadership program, feeling that he was far more advanced than the leadership training received due to a previous leadership experience in high school abroad. The student talked about the dynamics of the program using the terms “winners” and “losers.” “The focus was misdirected,” the student said. “We should have been directed to do the best for our clients without having a competition among us.” In fact, this student rushed into the interview with me and expressed that “most of the students that you have seen probably liked their experiences. Well, I hated mine! And, I am here to tell you all about it!” Even though this student went into detail on many of the
minuses of the program, the student felt that the impact of the service-learning and community engagement was valuable.

Another student felt that civic engagement “comes in different levels.” The student went on to say, after expressing disappointment in the program, that

I think the thing that I wanted to see more of is talking with the people. We talked a lot about issues and problems in the community; and talking about them without talking to people was ‘down the hill’ because we talked about it in this realm of ideas, and we talked about how things could be harmful for people in their lives—like poverty and food security and stuff like that. But none of us were experiencing that there.

Students who completed the online survey and had negative comments about their leadership program experiences were more candid. One student stated when asked to describe the first-year college leadership experience:

Awful! The program is an awful environment in generating a “leadership experience.” The environment is an unhealthy pressure cooker that fosters the general environment of the institution. Additionally, the class itself is a weird competition of students to be heard, but with surface-level analysis and regurgitation rather than actual college-level analysis.

Another student answered the same question by saying, “Follow [the program administrator] or fail.” When asked what they learned about interacting with others, a student responded by saying, “Nothing I didn’t already know.” Another student expressed it this way, “People in this program think they’re still in high school and form cliques.” When asking about the most important “life lesson,” a student online reflected, “Don’t half-ass a job when it needs doing.”
More about the Students and Their Civic Engagement

The students across all three institutions felt that it was more important to engage fully with the people at their service sites and get deeply involved in what it takes to make a difference in the community rather than go and serve food at a soup kitchen without any personal engagement. The classroom learning allowed them to reflect on the pedagogy and their service to the community. This enabled them to learn concepts and issues that were not a part of their everyday lives. Many of them expressed concerns about their privilege and its advantages and indicated that they had not realized that there were people out there who really needed support from people like them. They found that the practices they learned in the classroom helped them to use those skills, which in turn helped to change their behavior and attitudes when doing their fieldwork. They learned how to be tolerant, have empathy, listen deeply, communicate better, commit to democratic dialogue and make collective decisions through democratic deliberation, and accept collaboration and teamwork as a means to a positive end.

Participants in this study felt that the lessons they learned were going to help them throughout their lives and that they had gained better insights about people. They realized, after deep reflection, how much they had changed for the better after entering college and being involved in service-learning experiences in their first-year leadership programs. The students expressed that they had stepped outside of their comfort zones and were willing to take more chances in participating in activities to serve others, with more trust and willingness to “step up.” They had learned what it meant to be truly committed to someone, to something, and not give up on it if the situation were not
working out smoothly. They felt a sense of “stick-to-itive-ness” when working with children especially. It was the impact that they felt they had on others that gave them a sense of worth and satisfaction. They better understood the meaning of social justice and what challenges are faced by communities in resolving issues that may affect them. Moreover, they understood that all opinions matter, even if they were not in agreement. All students felt that this was a major change in their behavior and attitudes. They expressed that they were not as quick to get angry because someone did not agree with their point of view. Rather, they enjoyed the democratic dialogue and making deliberative collective decisions for the good of all.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study reveals how students today feel that they benefit from leadership principles and moral values in becoming more civic-minded citizens by promoting civic engagement. The findings and literature in this study support the importance of leadership programs during the first year of college and how students’ behavior and attitudes are influenced in order to promote civic engagement through democratic dialogue and deliberation. Classroom instruction across all three institutions provided the information needed to prepare the students to go out into the community and engage. The pedagogy laid the groundwork for service-learning. In this study, the students in the three leadership programs worked in teams and sometimes individually, depending on the type of service project. Besides the principles of leadership, students learned technical and life skills; communication skills (how to listen, digesting and understanding, and language, specifically inclusive); working collaboratively; and professional development (including manners). Though they learned how to interact with one another through lessons in the classroom on collaboration, leadership and communication, it was beyond the classroom, in the field, that students were able to build a trust that enabled them to voice their respective opinions and make collective decisions for the good of the team and those whom they served.

It is suggested in this study that the 71 sophomores, juniors, and seniors who participated felt that through their first-year college leadership programs, both classroom and service-learning experiences, they learned the importance of engaging in their
communities and helping others, which gave them a sense of civic responsibility.

Service-learning was an important factor in the three leadership programs and how students can engage with the community, as was helping the students to understand the difference between service-learning and community service. One student commented:

The most important thing that I took away is that even as a college student, my sphere of influence is huge. It took me a while to realize it but going out into the community not only impacts my life but impacts the lives of the community I served.

Being exposed to experiential learning or “real-life” direct experiences altered the students’ views on interactions with others and therefore enabled them to reflect on their own self-efficacy and the impact they made when helping those less fortunate than themselves. This, in turn, led them to change their behavior and attitudes, especially in being flexible and open to change when addressing others’ needs. When the students got involved in the service projects and connected with those whom they were there to serve, they saw the impact on “those less fortunate” and felt a sense of satisfaction. One student expressed a sense of accomplishment:

In a service project at a local food bank, teammates and I decided on who would take what role, such as distribution of food and restocking of the warehouse based on individual strengths. This helped us be more effective in our work and gave us all a valuable experience.

Komives et al. (2009) discuss that when a person’s core values grow, the desire to act consistent with those values parallels that growth, as with Mahatma Gandhi, whose life exemplified congruence, and who expressed his moral, civil, and respectful values
through his behavior. Komives et al. (2009) believe similarly that personal goals are congruent to personal values and are aligned with leadership development.

Not only did all of the students in this study experience training in deliberation-based democracy through their direct experience in service-learning, they learned it in the classroom as well. They received lessons on language and speaking to others in ways that demonstrate understanding and empathy; they also learned tolerance and how to be patient, kind, sensitive, moral, respectful, and civil in responding to others and their needs in a democratic, multicultural, and global society. Through their service work, the students felt that they had better insights into other people, especially those less fortunate than themselves, and that giving them the proper respect is important. The word *respect* was used frequently across institutions, alone and with other key concepts. One student said: “In the program I learned reinforcement of important themes—kindness, respect, reciprocity. It also gave some empirical background about how we interact and what socialization should look like to be most healthy.” Students felt they had learned a whole new meaning of respect when it came to their classmates, peers on campus, and those in the community. Another student observed:

First, I learned to always be respectful of others’ opinions, even if they differ from your own. Everyone has a reason for why they believe the things they do and everyone is entitled to their own opinions. I also learned to never assume about other people just because I may think a certain way or have been taught that something is ‘right’ or ‘normal’. This helps me stay mindful and sensitive to others' opinions.

They learned how to discuss issues among themselves and engage in dialogue that was deliberative and democratic, eventually arriving at consensus or at a point where they
could “agree to disagree.” Most of the students felt they had learned how to listen to others, whether in the classroom, on campus, or in the community. This was one of the key factors they felt helped them to become better communicators and more confident, yet humble, about their interactions when reaching outside their comfort zones. One student expressed the importance of active listening:

People should first and foremost be respectful of others when they are communicating. They should be active listeners and really try to understand what the other person is saying or thinking from their point of view. Being a selfish communicator will not lead to a successful interaction.

Ferraiolo (2004) claims that nurturing students in civic skills and attitudes, and by forming community partnerships in order to promote civic engagement, will enable students to receive civic knowledge in the classroom, through co-curricular activities and everyday college life, as well as through service-learning and community activities. Further, Pruitt et al. (2007) assert that, in this process, the students engage through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation to explore others’ views and discover differences and commonalities; foster respect and understanding by providing deep listening; and work together to resolve specific problems.

All students across the three institutions learned the value of others’ opinions and of the contributions, large or small, that each person can bring to a situation. They also learned the importance of collaboration, teamwork, and compromise in making decisions for the common good. Peer support and building a strong network among the students were integral components, especially with the living-learning communities. This involved building trust among the students, so that they were able to know that others were there to
support them through the good and bad experiences. One student shared that the experience was “excellent, really bonded with my team. Learned about my strengths and felt like we worked and communicated well.” Moreover, they looked at what they learned about different social justice or political issues that affect local communities and how those concerns might affect the way they should respond when voting on issues or when supporting or debating policy or causes that may have implications for the benefit of the community. Promoting civic engagement through service-learning provided the students with a direct pathway to understanding why it is important to “step up” as good neighbors and citizens and understand residents’ needs in order to push for transformative change and build more livable communities. One student stated:

Service-learning promotes citizenship because when you help and give back to the people around you, you build a stronger sense of community. Service-learning creates a connection between the people in an area and brings us closer together, and being closer to your community, in my opinion, makes me feel closer to the public and like I am being an active citizen of my country.

Olivos (2008) proposed a solution for higher education: to consider promoting a more intrinsically motivating learning experience for students to effect social change by concurrently developing civic skills in the classroom as they study the broader sociopolitical and economic context of the problems they encounter in service-learning experiences. The findings in this study suggest that, eight years later, this is still a viable option and students are better prepared to flourish in their individual uniqueness while becoming civically engaged in a diverse global community.

This study builds on the existing knowledge of how students’ behavior and attitudes are influenced with their involvement in civic engagement by exploring first-year college
leadership programs and service-learning through the lens of the student. Rockenbach, Hudson, and Tuchmayer (2014) assert that in studying students’ service work and resulting outcomes, existing research lacks a multidimensional approach, which includes new values and norms in behavioral patterns and online connectedness for today’s Millennials—the group to which the students in this study (college sophomores, juniors, and seniors) belong. Further, Rockenbach et al. (2014) claim that “most studies have examined the factors that predict service participation and related outcomes rather than the nuances of these experiences among service work participants” (p. 56). I was able to learn from students of three institutions how their behavior and attitudes were influenced by becoming civically engaged through their involvement in first-year college leadership programs. King (1997) stresses that “helping students develop the integrity and strength of character that prepare them for leadership may be one of the most challenging and important goals of higher education” (p. 87). Further, the findings in this study suggest that despite the concern regarding higher education’s diminishing attention to its civic mission, students involved in leadership and civic engagement through service-learning opportunities show some promise of becoming “engaged citizens.” According to Dewey (1916), practicing democratic citizenship does not only involve the act of voting; it comprises a full lifestyle and philosophy of human relations.

Sixteen themes emerged from semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews and focus groups with 40 students and online surveys with similar/like questions completed by 31 students. Two main points emerged from the themes and are aligned with the literature of this study and the research questions.
Main Point 1: Value is derived through best practices in the classroom and service-learning experiences, with deep reflection and peer support, in first-year college leadership programs and therefore may influence students’ behavior and attitudes in order to promote civic engagement.

From the students’ perspectives described in this study, I discovered that there is value derived from best practices learned in the classroom and service-learning experiences in first-year college leadership programs. In relationships and interactions with others, students expressed how peer support and succeeding through leadership and civic engagement were values that propelled them to continue through any challenges and keep them focused on moving onward and upward to a bright future, as globally prepared citizens. Peers are valid resources of knowledge and help to promote approaches to leadership without official authority (Dugan et al., 2013). Further, according to Boyte (2003), “the goals of community service typically include self-esteem, a sense of personal worth, and consciousness of personal values, but they omit attention to power, politics, and community impact” (p. 737). On the other hand, service-learning and outreach activities that are guided by college faculty and administrators are a part of larger structural and institutional forces in which students’ roles and responsibilities are connected to the insight of social problems. Students are thereby committed to addressing and reflecting on those challenges as responsible citizens of local, national, and global communities. Service-learning is intended to be a complement to civic and political awareness and engagement, not a substitute for it (Ferraiolo, 2004, p. 7).
In collaboration, the impact and value of leadership programs further contribute to the development of civil behavior because students develop a sense of civic responsibility and learn the importance of helping others in their community (Shehane et al., 2012). Leadership goes beyond individual gain when combining leadership and service together. This means that leadership serves a greater purpose of making our world a better place, according to HERI (1996). Further, leadership can perhaps show us that, through colleges and universities, certain attributes can contribute to cultivation and caring in creating democratic citizens for the advancement of democracy in schools, universities, communities, and society (Hartley et al., 2010).

I also learned, through the student lens, that the three first-year college leadership programs do influence civic engagement through service-learning experiences. According to Owen (2015), “both the leadership and the service-learning research provide evidence to support leadership learning from community engagement” (p. 87). In these programs students became committed to the people and service sites they were assigned to serve. They felt that, as leaders and engaged citizens, they were empowered through the lessons learned in the classroom to make an impact in their respective communities. Having an effect on their communities in need gave the students a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment. They felt as though they were able to contribute to making the world a better place in which to live. When asked to write a reflection about a service-learning experience, one student said:

Oh, I just did service. Now I have to write about it? But it’s actually really helpful—it puts everything into perspective and makes you realize how important it is what you did. I thought that was really important.
Through the students’ experiential learning at service sites, and after deep reflection on their activities, students felt empathy and altruism in that they could understand what it was like to walk in someone else’s shoes and to give from the heart. The students expressed that they had learned many “life lessons” that would carry them through the rest of their lives. One student described an empathic “life lesson” from the service-learning experience: “You get the chance to step in other people's shoes and see life from their perspective.” Another student recommended being “willing to engage and seek out a better understanding of things you may not be familiar with, and to not be afraid to do so.” When this question was asked of the students about an “important life lesson,” they were very thoughtful in responding. They felt that they had learned so much about serving others during their first-year college leadership program experience and service-learning. One student suggested that “service-learning encourages good behavior and involvement that will likely only reinforce good actions and involvement later on.” Another student said:

I learned a lot about myself through living and learning with others. I learned the importance of personally being flexible-minded and open to change; of branching out and embracing things outside of your comfort zone.

The interviews with the students in this study enabled me to witness the literature come to life through the lens of each one of the participants. Students felt that their attitudes and behavior had changed since arriving in their first-year college leadership programs—by collaborating with their peers in teams and in working in the community with others who were different from or less fortunate than they. As the literature suggests,
the practice of leadership cannot be learned in the abstract but through experiences that are connected to working collaboratively with others in addressing real social issues and challenges that affect our environment. This involvement provides ambiguity and complexity of leadership processes and practices, which, when presented well, are connected to increased leadership capacity and self-efficacy (Dugan et al., 2013).

Self-awareness and self-efficacy are both important in the students knowing who they are and believing that they have the ability to work with others who are less advantaged than they. Honesty and truth were words used by the students when they described the feelings they were unable to reveal openly at first but that became easier with the nurturing effect of the classroom environment as a “safe” space and with the support of their teams, TAs or group leaders, and instructors. After the students acquired trust among each other, they were able to feel “safe” outside the classroom, on campus, at home, and in the community. These safe spaces are where issues can be discussed or debated honestly among people from diverse backgrounds, without any prejudice or malice. There is deep listening and a willingness to form relationships and build trust among the participants (McCoy et al., 2002).

The students felt that they came from privileged backgrounds but also felt that the opportunity to serve others was a privilege for them. At least 95% of students in this study had participated in some type of community service activity while in high school, with or without their families. They did not realize upon entering college that they would learn more about what they knew already about community service. They mentioned that, going into college, they “knew it all” about giving to others. They spoke about not being
honest about admitting that they were learning principles that would be life-changing. Even as they feel that they always will be privileged, they felt that this would only put them in a position to do more for others less fortunate. According to Rockenbach et al. (2014), “Becoming a more compassionate and socially aware person as a result of service work is positively linked to committing oneself to a meaningful life marked by helping others, civic engagement, and service” (p. 312).

Main Point 2: Best practices or principles of first-year college leadership programs prepare students to communicate democratically and deliberatively when engaging and interacting with others.

The second main point learned informs this study of what best practices or principles of first-year college leadership programs prepare students to communicate deliberatively and engage with others. The teaching and learning in the classroom seemed to be the first effective place to accomplish the goal of building capacity for the students’ ability to learn and understand the principles and practices of civic engagement through service-learning. Besides being one of the places where students started to learn about “individual values,” which taught them the principles of leadership and self-awareness as they increased their capacity for self-efficacy, in the classroom students learned of morality, civility, respect, diversity, and being committed to others. They also learned “group values,” in which they were taught how to collaborate, communicate through democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation with a common purpose using positive language and listening [deep], transparency and trust, and how to serve others by being tolerant and sensitive to their needs. Last, the students learned about “community values” in the
classroom and at service sites, through which they saw positive change for residents, community organizations, and neighborhoods as a result of the students’ involvement in service-learning projects and the communities’ connection to their university. These best practices are consistent with the three levels of the SCM even though they may differ slightly within each level based on the themes that emerged from the participants of this study (HERI, 1996, p. 22). The students made it clear that they understood that service-learning without the classroom instruction was only community service, which did not increase their capacity to understand fully the impact of being knowledgeable of civic responsibilities to be more effective citizens. A good example of this is when one student described his community service involvement at a soup kitchen while in high school. He explained how different that was from the engagement through his first-year college leadership program, which included service-learning. He explained it this way:

When I was in the soup kitchen just serving food, I didn’t say more than what was necessary while filling the plate with food and giving it to the person receiving it. With my college experience, I learned how to engage with the people and how to speak respectfully, listening to them and what their needs were. My classroom instruction and the program administrator were very important to me in better understanding what I was facing. When I went to the site, I sat down with people and got to know them and their stories. It took me off my feet! Our reflection exercises helped me to think about my experiences, but even in my dorm, I thought deeply about those people and their stories. I saw the whole picture differently, as well as my role in everything. Man, that was something!

In order for students to develop the capacity to understand self and others better in creating positive change to make the world a better place, there is evidence in the research from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) that suggests the educational practice of engaging in sociocultural conversations with peers in informal
and formal dialogue regarding differences—which include lifestyle, social issues, political values, race/ethnicity, or religious beliefs—is a strong predictor of socially responsible leadership capacity across demographic groups of students (Dugan et al., 2013; Segar, Hershey, & Dugan, 2008). This was a primary reason for the three institutions in this study to meet the criterion of having an overlay of the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development practices as core principles in their first-year college leadership programs, even if they did not follow precise SCM-influenced curricula. Every first-year college leadership program may not follow these same principles, or be considered equal, but that is not to say they are not effective. However, SCM has validated its methodology and has data indicating that its practices are successful. The literature in this study is aligned with the findings, such as discussed in Dugan (2011) regarding the value of leadership programs, especially those that follow SCM ideologies. Foundational skills that the students in this study learned—which included active listening, SPT (after reflection, one is able to see another’s point of view and accurately surmise others’ thoughts and feelings), deep learning, and critical self-reflection—enabled them to benefit from the varied discussions they had with their peers (Dugan et al., 2013).

Ehrlich (2000) asserts that students can better embrace responsibilities and be active citizens who participate in civic activities by having access to a curriculum on civic engagement and experiential practices through service-learning. Having the experience of democratic deliberation, connecting collective decision-making and collective action or public work, students are able to face and weigh moral differences and norms that are
associated with democracy, which include respect for others, equality, freedom, and justice (Kettering Foundation, 2008). According to Pruitt et al. (2007), in leadership programs, the aforementioned principles promote democratic dialogue in a democratic setting. This can be more conducive to listening and is how participants can learn from each other in civil discourse and engagement. To further stress that higher education institutions are vital to a community’s civic infrastructure for students and communities (Mathews, 2002), several sources emphasize that universities and colleges occupy an important place in the United States by providing potential “safe” spaces for public deliberation and operational democracy; leadership programs made available from the time students enter college allow students to exercise this opportunity to have deliberative dialogue in discussing and learning about democracy when serving the community (CIRCLE, 2006; Ehrlich, 1999; Giroux, 2006).

**Importance of First-Year College Leadership Programs**

A big challenge faced at the onset of this study was finding first-year college leadership programs, especially those meeting the criteria discussed in Chapter 3. Many higher education institutions have leadership programs but not in the first year of college. During the exploration of these programs, a few administrators expressed the view that first-year college students are *not* quite ready for leadership training at this stage of their development. As discussed in Chapter 2 through the literature, it could be argued to the contrary. For example, providing first-year college leadership programs with a service-learning component could enable students to start earlier in learning principles and practices that could influence their behavior, attitudes, and understanding of the value of
“community” as they continue the academic journey toward shaping their futures and democratic citizenship. Moreover, because of the concern in higher education about receiving students who are less civic-minded (as stated in the Introduction), being made aware of leadership ideals earlier in college could instill or encourage moral values through civic engagement and position those students seeking leadership roles in college and the community to be more cognizant of what it might take to make democracy viable, along with good citizenship.

**Implications for Higher Education Institutional Best Practices and Policy**

Several implications emerged from this study for higher education institutions. Evidence from the findings of this study suggest that first-year college leadership programs with service-learning components for civic engagement may have a positive influence on students and their interactions with others at the beginning of their college experience. This may, in turn, possibly yield a positive impact on the college culture overall. Therefore, I believe that these types of programs should be created, developed, and integrated into every university and college curricula in the United States. With the gap in racial/ethnic civic knowledge, as indicated by the literature in this study, there also needs to be ongoing professional development for college faculty (and other stakeholders—e.g., staff, administration, board directors) on civics. They may create competitive civics events and awards to encourage students to learn more about their country and their rights as citizens in this globally diverse world. The curricula for classroom learning should include matters of social justice and how policy has affected changes in the community. Students should gain an understanding of civics in these
programs/courses in order to better understand good citizenship and the democratic processes involved with the privilege of living in the United States. Further, we need high school advisers or teachers to target first-year college leadership programs for students who are socioeconomically challenged or do not have parents or family supporters or are not involved in community activities. These students may not have access to or knowledge of these programs. Community and regional colleges should increase civics learning and community engagement, with faculty taking the helm. Service-learning programs can be incorporated into the pedagogy, and incentives for civics knowledge can be offered to students to help them become motivated toward active citizenship. In all colleges and universities across America, programming around responsible voting practices should be ongoing and not just during presidential or other key election periods. Finally, colleges and universities need to link first-year leadership programs to their broader efforts toward engagement in communities, so that they can connect students early in their college education to assist in truly making the community a better place. This may generate a deeper appreciation among students for being more engaged with their communities in the areas of need, help students to understand policy and practice, and perhaps, in the future, contribute to the emergence of new community leaders.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012) stresses that “in the public space of generative partnerships, democratic values can be tested and civic skills honed; participants challenged to work collectively across differences; and civic aspirations transmuted into collective civic action” (p. 65). Despite
the deficits highlighted in the literature of this study regarding the civic knowledge of some high school students, ongoing social challenges faced by communities, and the lack of the full and more motivated commitment by higher education to return to its civic mission, scholars must seek ways to connect incoming college freshmen to leadership and community engagement. Moreover, the literature suggests clearly defined pathways of incorporating democratic dialogue and democratic deliberation into the mix.

Based on the findings in this study, the following suggestions for future research may be worth investigating. It may be of interest to delve into the strong positive relationship between parents’ community involvement and students’ participation in first-year college leadership programs, which may inform research if this dynamic is more likely to influence these students over others in seeking first-year college leadership program opportunities. Many of the students in this study were involved in community service prior to entering college. They had positive experiences and felt that they had made an impact with their involvement in the community. There may be similarities and differences between more affluent and socioeconomically challenged students in their attitudes regarding community service as they are about to approach college. Research could reveal what steps may be taken to promote civic engagement where there may be a deficit in community involvement in either of these two groups of students. The outcomes of the “About You” protocols in this study indicate that many of the sophomores, juniors, and seniors who participated are still involved in some type of service-learning and/or community service. (See Tables 3 and 4.) It may be interesting to conduct a longitudinal study to explore what levels and types of behavioral change occur
over time in students who participated in first-year college leadership programs and continue to serve the community. While this study did not use academic competency as a criterion for the participants, it may be worth investigating if it affects the decision of high school students in selecting first-year college leadership programs. Further, the level of civic engagement after students’ complete first-year college leadership programs and how long this engagement persists may also be worth exploring.

Similar to this study, which involved three research institutions, it may be of interest to research how community colleges and regional institutions may evaluate the influence that their first-year college leadership programs, and others with a service-learning component, may have on students’ behavior and attitudes. The first-year college programs in this study did not practice SCM, but they did have an overlay of its principles. Investigating how the SCM’s seven key assumptions align with leadership programs in colleges that do not follow its principles might be of interest. The three programs studied involved students who did interact with other students outside their first-year college leadership programs. Once students are engaged in leadership and service-learning, it may be worth exploring whether and how the behavior and attitude changes of participants affect those around them who are not participants. Students who go through leadership programs may go on to become leaders in some capacity. Investigating the impact on career success or the ability to make more money for participants in first-year college leadership programs might be worth researching. Further, it may be interesting to explore whether participants in first-year college leadership programs become more philanthropic when they make good salaries. After
going through first-year college leadership programs that involve service-learning, it may be worthwhile to investigate whether participants in these programs are likely to pursue elected or appointed public office. And, finally, another longitudinal study that may be conducted in order to inform research on whether first-year college leadership programs have a lasting impact on students and whether the effects continue throughout their college career and beyond.

According to Brukardt et al. (2004), hope for the future of higher education lies in civic engagement. By returning to a mission where the common good of all is fueled by collaborative partnerships and the advancement of discovery and learning, a vision that is appropriate for our time can stimulate higher education to promote a clear direction for our world, especially if American higher education seeks to excel in its global leadership role. Moreover, as asserted by Horton (1998), “the best ways of educating people is to give them an experience that embodies what you are trying to reach. When you believe in a democratic society, you provide a setting for education that is democratic” (p. 68).
# Appendix A. – Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition (as used in this study)</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic action</td>
<td>The practice of engaged citizenship, wherein citizens are empowered to and do act on behalf of themselves and others by exercising their rights within the statutes and limitations of the United States Constitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic aspirations</td>
<td>Hoping to be civically competent by learning about democracy, government, governance, and citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic education</td>
<td>Preparing students to be responsible citizens throughout their lives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Community connectivity and commitment in being motivated and involved to serve others in hopes of making a difference and making this world a better and more valuable place to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic knowledge</td>
<td>Having learned about democracy, government, governance, and citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic learning</td>
<td>Being educated about democracy, government, governance, and citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic-mindedness</td>
<td>Identifying with citizenship and practicing its principles responsibly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic mission</td>
<td>Colleges and universities have a civic mission which includes providing forums for democratic dialogue; and promoting civic education at the college level, so students can be more effective and responsible citizens in a globally diverse world</td>
<td>CIRCLE (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic purpose</td>
<td>“The preparation of an enlightened and productive citizenry and engaging in scholarship that both addresses pressing problems and holds a mirror to society to allow for self-reflection and self-correction”</td>
<td>Saltmarsh et al. (2012, p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic responsibility</td>
<td>Understanding the importance of participating in the community and helping others</td>
<td>Shehane et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic skills</td>
<td>Having the knowledge and aptitude to perform responsible duties as an effective citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics recession</td>
<td>A decline in civics education in America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil discourse and</td>
<td>Listening and speaking with others respectfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>When a team creates a solution through collaborative input from its members that may be outside of the ‘norm’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Voluntary work in non-profit community service-based organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Civic purpose</td>
<td>In higher education, preparing students to graduate as responsible citizens in a globally diverse world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic citizen</td>
<td>Being competent, knowledgeable, and motivated to action in matters of democracy, consistently practicing its principles as a responsible citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic citizenship</td>
<td>The act and practice of being a democratic citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic deliberation</td>
<td>Connecting collective decision-making and collective action or public work for the common good of all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic dialogue</td>
<td>“The process of people coming together to build mutual understanding and trust across their differences and to create positive outcomes through conversation”</td>
<td>Pruitt and Thomas (2007, p. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic engagement</td>
<td>Engagement with the community with a larger sense of purpose and distinctive ways strengthening our communities while building a participatory democracy</td>
<td>Saltmarsh and Hartley (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic government</td>
<td>Government that is vested by the people and for the people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic setting(s)</td>
<td>An environment that is conducive to listening and learning from each other through civil discourse and engagement</td>
<td>Pruitt and Thomas (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic values</td>
<td>Values expressed in the United States Constitution and the Declaration of Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Providing another individual with information on the performance of that person’s words or actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedforward</td>
<td>Providing another individual with information from which the giver has benefited that will enable the receiver to benefit from the information as well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX A. – GLOSSARY OF TERMS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION (as used in this study)</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Identity Development Model (LID)</td>
<td>A theory in which an individual progresses through six stages as their identity as a leader develops</td>
<td>Komives et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participatory democracy</td>
<td>Democratic engagement in interactions with others in dialogue and deliberation when making decisions for the good of all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service-learning</td>
<td>Students can better embrace the responsibilities of active citizenship and civic participation while learning in the classroom through &quot;transformational pedagogy&quot;</td>
<td>Transformational pedagogy (Saltmarsh et al., 2012, p.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development by HERI (1996)</td>
<td>“Purposeful, collaborative, values-based process resulting in positive social change”</td>
<td>Komives et al., 2009, p. xii; Komives et al., 2011, p. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Construction of Leadership</td>
<td>Students use their own images of leadership from their own perceptions in comparison to others</td>
<td>Grint (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Perspective-Taking (SPT)</td>
<td>When students begin to recognize others’ points of view, and through reflection, consider others’ thoughts and feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX C. - Sites for Conducting Research Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Wharton, University of Pennsylvania</th>
<th>University of Maryland</th>
<th>The Ohio State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Management Department</td>
<td>College of Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>John Glenn College of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Management 100: Leadership and Communication in Groups</td>
<td>CIVICUS Living and Learning Program</td>
<td>John Glenn Civic Leadership Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or Programmatic</td>
<td>Academic (Required for all Wharton freshmen)</td>
<td>Academic (Required for CIVICUS freshmen)</td>
<td>Academic (Required for JGLC freshmen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program or Course Description      | Through the process of action, reflection, experimentation, and application in developing leadership, teamwork, and communications skills through service, to speak persuasively, and to work collaboratively with a diverse group of individuals | Civil society: citizenship, leadership, community service learning, community building in a diverse society, and scholarship | The program seeks to cultivate the essentials of our democracy: citizens, leaders, and ideas. The four central pillars of the learning community include:  
- Policy  
- Academics  
- Social  
- Service  
The students typically have a passion for issues of service and policy and they study a wide variety of academic majors and participate in activities and events that center around the four pillars. |
| When offered and for how long?     | First semester of first year (Fall)  | First-year for two years (Fall) | First semester of first year (Fall) |
| Credit bearing?                    | 1 full credit, which is equivalent to 3 credits elsewhere | 14 credits for 6 classes over 4 semesters | 1 credit hour |
| Number of Students                 | 540                                  | 135                    | 70                        |
## APPENDIX C. - Sites for Conducting Research Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Wharton, University of Pennsylvania</th>
<th>University of Maryland</th>
<th>The Ohio State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Learning objectives (Must encompass individual, group, and community values) | • To strengthen ability to exercise leadership through service  
• To speak and write persuasively  
• To work collaboratively with a diverse group of individuals  
• To heighten sense of individual strengths and opportunities for growth | • To understand the social and historical foundation of a civil society  
• To identify the roles of individuals, groups, social institutions, and community services  
• To grasp domestic and societal issues from political, economic, and policy perspectives  
• To serve in a local, direct-service non-profit organization  
• To understand contemporary social problems through sociological perspectives  
• To delve into a detailed study of selected social problems including social conflict and social inequality (Note: More objectives are taught in second year.) | • To have a better connection to the learning community in the John Glenn College of Public Affairs and be able to explore and assess personal values, beliefs, and purpose as they develop their own leadership potential  
• To gain appreciation for social justice, social change and ethics, and values in a public sector  
• To understand public policy and be comfortable having in-depth discussions and communicating clearly about relevant policy topics  
• To serve in a local, direct-service non-profit organization  
• To have a better understanding about procedures, entities, and tactics that significantly impact Ohio government |
APPENDIX C. - Sites for Conducting Research Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Wharton, University of Pennsylvania</th>
<th>University of Maryland</th>
<th>The Ohio State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCM or Overlay of SCM Principles</td>
<td>Overlay of SCM</td>
<td>Overlay of SCM</td>
<td>Overlay of SCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning component?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-studies conducted by institution?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenable to participating in this study? (List date of agreement after I confirm.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will be needed from their institutional IRB?</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania—8/5/15</td>
<td>Approval by Email—9/10/15</td>
<td>Approval by Email—8/5/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D. – Protocol for semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews

Part I—What You Feel

Q1 Please tell me about your most significant leadership experiences in high school and what made these experiences significant for you.

Q2 Tell me about your experience in [name of program].

Q3 Describe what you have learned from [name of program] with regard to interacting with others.

Q4 In [name of program], what skills did you learn that prepared you to communicate with others in the classroom, on campus, and in the community?

Q5 How different are your skills in this area from when you first entered college?

Q6 How should people treat one another when communicating and interacting with one another?

Q7 Tell me about your service-learning experience in [name of program].

Q8 What was the most important “life lesson” that you took away from your service-learning experience in [name of program]?

Q9 Briefly describe a service-learning experience in which you and your team had to make a collective decision that worked for the common good of all those involved.

Q10 How does service-learning promote good citizenship?

Q11 What is/was important for you to succeed in [name of program]?

Q12 What else would you like to tell me about your experience in [name of program]?
APPENDIX E. – Protocol for Focus Groups

Part I—What You Feel

Q1 Please tell me about your most significant leadership experiences in high school and what made these experiences significant for you.

Q2 Tell me about your experience in [name of program] as a student and now as a TA or team leader.

Q3 Describe what you have learned from [name of program] with regard to interacting with others as a student and now as a TA or team leader.

Q4 In [name of program], what skills did you learn that prepared you to communicate in the classroom, on campus, and in the community?

Q5 How should people treat one another when communicating and interacting with one another?

Q6 In [name of program], what skills did you learn that prepared you to lead others?

Q7 What was the most important “life lesson” that you took away from your service-learning experience in [name of program]?

Q8 Briefly describe a service-learning experience in which you and your team had to make a collective decision that worked for the common good of all those involved.

Q9 How does service-learning promote good citizenship?

Q10 What is/was important for you to succeed in [name of program]?

Q11 What else would you like to tell me about your experience in [name of program]?
APPENDIX F. – Protocol for Online Survey

Part I—What You Feel

Q1 What were your most significant leadership experiences in high school?

Q2 Describe your first-year college leadership experience in [name of program].

Q3 As the result of being in [name of program], what did you learn about interacting with others?

Q4 In [name of program], what skills did you learn that prepared you to communicate with others in the classroom, on campus, and in the community?

Q5 How should people treat one another when communicating and interacting with one another?

Q6 What was the most important “life lesson” that you took away from your service-learning experience in [name of program]?

Q7 Briefly describe a service-learning experience in which you and your team had to make a collective decision that worked for the common good of all those involved.

Q8 How does service-learning promote good citizenship?

Q9 What is/was important for you to succeed in [name of program]?
APPENDIX G. – Protocol for About You (Demographics)

Part II

Now I would like to know a few things about you. Please complete the following general questions and select only one answer from the multiple-choice questions.

Q1 During my freshman year in college, I participated in the following leadership course/program: [NOTE: Only the relevant institution was seen by the students.]

☐ Institution #1
☐ Institution #2
☐ Institution #3

Q2 What is your current class year?

☐ Sophomore
☐ Junior
☐ Senior

Q3 What is your major?

☐ My major is: _________________
☐ Undeclared

Q4 What is your age?

☐ My age is: _________________

Q5 What is your home state or country if not the USA?

☐ My home state is: _________________
☐ My home country is: _________________
☐ Not applicable (my home country is the USA)
Q6 What is your current student role?

- Student Leader other than TA
- Teaching Assistant (TA)
- Student
- Other ____________________

Q7 What is your gender identity?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Other ____________________

Q8 What is your ethnic or racial identification?

- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- White
- Other ____________________

Q9 How would you characterize your engagement in college activities?

- High
- Medium
- Low
- No engagement

Q10 Are you involved in: (Please check all that apply and briefly describe.)

- Service-Learning? ____________________
- Community Service? ____________________
- Other service? ____________________
APPENDIX H. – Assessment Information for the Three Leadership Programs

**JGLC**

Students’ grades encompass service-learning, with the entire seminar course itself, and the students’ participation in the CLC (John Glenn Civic Leadership Council) programs, which include engagement in in-depth policy discussions. The grades are given at the discretion of the instructor.

**CIVICUS**

Students are evaluated on their participation and assignments, based on the syllabus. Other than the opening service project or the service day during the spring retreat, CIVICUS students are also evaluated on the individual short reflections of their service projects. At the end of each academic year, students participate in an annual evaluation of their service experiences via a survey; and during a course, BSCV 182, students are asked to evaluate their service sites, which include almost 300 annual projects, especially the newer ones.

**Management 100**

Fifty percent of a student’s grade is individual and the other 50% is team-based. The individual assignments include 1) a leadership essay—5%; 2) status report presentation—20%; and 3) individual performance for class participation, student’s contribution to group dynamics, and the student’s productivity—25%. With the team assignments, the client presentation is worth 25% and the team performance review is valued at 25% for the team’s productivity, internal dynamics (interaction of team members), and relationship with the clients. Similar to CIVICUS, students in Management 100 complete
a survey at the end of the semester to provide feedback on the clients and the service sites.
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