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Abstract

This study explored student self-ratings of leaders and members of the campus activities board on the ten NACA core competencies at seven Midwest public institutions. Advisor ratings were collected and compared to students’ ratings and length of time of participation for students was also collected. Student and advisor ratings were negatively correlated and there was a statistical significant difference in the means. Student leaders and members did not show any difference on self-ratings of the ten core competencies and length of time did not impact the ratings either.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In an era of accountability in higher education, institutions are being asked to demonstrate that they are using their resources wisely. The accountability pressure comes from several stakeholders including the federal and state legislatures, students, parents, accrediting bodies, public, and employers. Employers are seeking more highly trained college graduates and this call extends to other stakeholders in higher education. Higher education institutions are evaluated by the value-added, meaning the legislature and public want to know what the product of an undergraduate education is worth. Accrediting associations are also evaluating institutions’ efforts to assess student learning (Kallison & Cohen, 2009). The call for accountability is not new; however, it has shifted from outputs such as graduation rate and the number of graduates employed to student learning outcomes (Kallison & Cohen, 2009).

Accountability for U.S. higher education arose during the 1960s to 1970s as the number of institutions in higher education expanded. For public institutions, the state’s goal was to ensure that state funds were used efficiently and that all citizens had an opportunity to benefit. In the past, compliance reporting was the primary method of accountability (Ewell & Jones, 2006). Efficiency measures focused on credits (outputs) per unit inputs. For example, access was measured by the number of students of color served, which reflected civil rights concerns. As stated by Ewell and Jones during this time period, the state was more concerned about program duplication than teaching and learning processes or student learning outcomes. This began to change in the late 1980s to early 1990s with a shift toward learning outcomes. States began calling for learning outcome assessments and quality assurance. However, these
mandates were not tied to other state polices and were enacted little by little. This movement was short lived; however, due to the economic downturn that occurred during this time.

In the 2000s, public interest in the Measuring Up publications, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and limited financial means for states re-energized the discussion and called for new approaches to accountability. Reports from the Business Higher Education Forum and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) both called for student learning measures or learning outcomes to be an important piece of accountability (Ewell & Jones, 2006). Accreditation has been a consistent measure of accountability in higher education.

Higher education institutions, public and private, are primarily accredited by regional bodies. Learning outcomes were already required for regional accreditation, so this was not entirely new. However, these organizations’ reports signaled a shift in consensus about accountability. While traditional methods of accountability such as access and efficiency have not gone away, as part of the accountability outcry, reporting on accountability measures is integrated with state policies more than before (Ewell, & Jones, 2006).

The accreditation process has existed for many years and around the 1890s the first accreditation bodies were formed. These bodies arose out of the public interest in identifying trustworthy and quality educational institutions. Accrediting organizations focused on specific criteria for institutions to become members. In the 1950s, accrediting bodies shifted to a set of standards or principles for self-study and a review system consisting of peer evaluators. Over time, the standards have evolved from quantitative to qualitative, prescriptive to mission-focused, and minimal to aspirational (Wehlburg, 2010). Presently, the focus is on student
learning to develop a continuous improvement loop student development. The accreditation process has helped keep accountability and student learning at the forefront for higher education institutions.

Student learning is not new as a focus of Student Affairs. The Student Personnel Point of View in 1937, revised in 1949 (American Council on Education), outlined holistic development of students, in other words development of the entire student. In 1994, the American College Personnel Association introduced the Student Learning Imperative for the purpose of starting a debate and discussion on student learning and personal development.

Student involvement has been part of higher education since the 1700s and continued into the 1800s with sports, honor societies, and Greek systems. The increase in these types of experiences is important because it broadened the perspective of education to include activities outside the classroom (Moore, Lovell, McGann, & Wyrick, 1998). Research studies have supported the view that out-of-classroom experiences contribute to student development and learning, persistence to graduation, and enhance leadership skills important for success in the work force (Astin, 1999; Elkins, Forrester & Noel-Elkins, 2011; Kuh, 1995; Moore et al., 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). These studies investigate leadership programs and training, student perceptions of their experiences, and out-of-class experiences. Out of class experiences could include employment, internships, leadership within specific majors, and institutional expenditures on leadership activities. Past studies have focused on more general programs and student experiences. However, measurements of specific skill developments within particular organizations are lacking.
The National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) conducts an annual survey looking at employer expectations, desired attributes and skills of employees and recruitment strategies. In the NACE Job Outlook 2014 Spring Update (2014, April), employers rated the skills and qualities in demand on a five point scale with five being extremely important to one being not at all important. The top seven skills/qualities that employers are looking for are: the ability to make decisions and solve problems with an importance rating of 4.7; the ability to verbally communicate with persons inside and outside the organization with an importance rating of 4.6; the ability to obtain and process information with an importance rating of 4.6; the ability to plan, organize, and prioritize work with an importance rating of 4.5; the ability to analyze quantitative data with an importance rating of 4.4; technical knowledge related to the job with an importance rating of 4.2; and the proficiency with computer software programs with an importance rating of 4.1. In addition, employers rated the influence of certain attributes on a five point scale with five rating as extreme influence to one as no influence at all. This factors in when there are two candidates who are equally qualified for a position. A candidate who has held a leadership position and major are the highest rated attributes that would influence the hiring of a candidate. Both of these attributes rate a three point nine (3.9) on the influence scale (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2013). This survey provides a tie between what employers are looking for and opportunities for Student Affairs to align experiences for students to gain these attributes.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. An organization exists to assist higher education institutions with assessment of student learning and development.
The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) includes a mission to, “promote the improvement of programs and services to enhance the quality of student learning and development” (2010a, para. 2). During the early part of the 20th century, student support programs were assigned to faculty to work part-time with students. This was to attend to student needs beyond the classroom. As education evolved, so did the students, their needs, and student support programs. As the field of Student Affairs matured and the responsibilities became more complex, there was a need for a complementary accountability system (CAS, 2010b).

CAS was formed in 1979 as a consortium of member associations. This initiative provided and still provides an avenue where all voices can be heard in creating the standards to guide Student Affairs practice. The collaboration of various associations allows for a broader viewpoint of the profession rather than a narrow perspective. The initial CAS publication was founded on the principle that practitioners need a valid comprehensive list of criteria by which to evaluate quality and effectiveness of programs. Furthermore, these standards embody practices that any institution could realistically achieve (CAS, 2010b). As higher education changes, so does the CAS Standards. As new functional areas arise in higher education, standards are added in CAS.

**National Association for Campus Activities.** The National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) is a higher education organization focused on campus activities. Their mission is, “providing members with the knowledge, ideas and resources to promote student learning through engagement in campus life” (2015, para. 2). This organization was founded in 1960 and today provides a variety of resources to its member campuses. These resources
include conferences, educational activities, publications, and networking opportunities. NACA also provides professional development tools for its members and created an Educational Advisory Group to assist in fulfilling its strategic plan. This group was created in 2006 to move forward educational initiatives for the development of students and professionals involved in campus activities (Brill et al., 2009). This group created an assessment guide to measure the learning and development of students engaged in campus activities. This document is called the Competency Guide for College Student Leaders. The argument for this tool is based on the idea that all student leaders engaged in campus activities should achieve certain learning outcomes as a result of their involvement. The authors used the CAS Standards in the creation of the guide.

The guide identifies ten core competencies including leadership development, event management, meaningful interpersonal relationships, collaboration, social responsibility, effective communication, realistic self-appraisal, multicultural competency, intellectual growth, and clarified values. The approach is focused on holistic development and seven additional competencies were also identified. These include enhanced self-esteem, satisfying and productive lifestyles, interdependence, healthy behavior, spiritual awareness, personal and educational goals, and career choices (Brill et al., 2009). The authors developed the guide with the interaction of student and advisor in mind. Students complete a self-assessment and then turn this in to the advisor to evaluate. The next step is the advisor and student meet to discuss the results and provide feedback to the student.
Purpose and Significance of the Study

With increased calls for accountability in higher education and an outcry in the cost of higher education, many public institutions are facing financial constraints. Colleges and universities and their respective departments are at risk of losing funding due to budget constraints in higher education. The oversight of student organizations typically falls under Student Affairs divisions which include campus activities boards. The results of this study are expected to inform funding decisions and resource allocation, and provide directors with research based arguments for keeping programs, positions, and funding. This study can also demonstrate that skill development occurs in co-curricular involvement in campus activities boards.

Statement of the Problem

The pressure to validate higher education’s claim of fostering student learning has added to the accountability demands (Doyle, 2004). If student involvement in co-curricular activities is going to continue to be supported in higher education, outcome data are needed to show the value of participation. The researcher aims to provide data about one specific organization, the campus activities board, and assess what students gain from their involvement.

Description and Scope of Research

Extracurricular activities can be considered a mode of leadership development that provides a vehicle for putting theory into practice as a learning laboratory for students. Involvement in extracurricular activities is designed for students to be active participants in the process. The theory of involvement emphasizes active participation (Astin, 1999). It
focuses on what students do. Astin (1999) stated, “student involvement refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience” (p. 518). A highly involved student is someone who expends energy studying, engages in campus life, spends time on campus, and frequently interacts with peers, faculty, and staff. A student who is not involved infrequently engages in campus life, spends little time on campus, neglects studies, and only occasionally interacts with peers, faculty, or staff (Astin, 1999).

Astin suggests that there is a direct correlation between student development and student involvement. His theory has five basic postulates that characterize involvement:

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects. The objects may be highly generalized (the student experience) or highly specific (preparing for a chemistry examination.)
2. Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum; that is, different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.
3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features. The extent of a student’s involvement in academic work, for instance, can be measured quantitatively (how many hours the student spends studying) and qualitatively (whether the student reviews and comprehends reading assignments or simply stares at the textbook and daydreams).
4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.
5. The effectiveness of any education policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement. (1999, p. 519)

These postulates provide a framework for exploring student involvement in student organizations including leadership positions and student development. Skills such as interpersonal development, decision-making, functioning effectively in groups, and programming skills are a few examples of aptitudes that students can learn by becoming involved. Other skills include resource management, social skills, conflict resolution, time
management, autonomy, self-awareness, appreciation for diversity, and various administrative skills (Kuh, 1995; Morrell & Morrell, 1986). When students become involved at the college level, there is an impact on student learning and development. Research also shows that different types of student involvement may impact learning and development differently depending on the area of involvement. This brings awareness to intentional and unintentional outcomes associated with student involvement (Moore et al., 1998).

Out of class experiences are opportunities to apply knowledge gained in the classroom through skill development. These outside activities may be the place where knowledge is tested and re-organized to be used in a meaningful way (Kuh, 1995). Involvement in student organizations provides a space to practice new skills and to enhance the development of those skills. Testing these skills in this environment is not exclusive; students can also test these skills in labs or class. However, student organizations frequently require students to be competent in many skill areas and the benefit of being competent can show rewards for the student. Students become willing to expend time and energy engaging in these activities (Kuh, 1995).

Much of the current literature focuses on student organizations as a whole and not on campus activities boards specifically (Gellin, 2003; Kuh, 1995; Logue, Hutchens, & Hector, 2005; Moore et al., 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The literature that is available on campus activities boards consists primarily of articles on skill development, programs areas, and volunteer development. These articles are not about the organization itself, but are more topical in nature to address a particular need of the entire organization or campus.
The focus of this study is to explore skill development of students involved as campus activities board officers and committee members. In addition, the study will consider differences between student officers and student committee members. Officers are more apt to spend more time with the organization and direct the course of the group. Officers tend to have more requirements placed on them per the constitution of the organization. Committee members are more likely to spend less time in the organization and have fewer requirements. It is expected there is a different level of engagement with the organization based on the role one plays in the organization. The study may also have implications for institutions of higher education by demonstrating the importance of campus activities boards as an avenue for student learning and development to compliment academic goals. The perception of the role of this type of student organization could shift from an extracurricular activity to partners in the holistic development of students. Potential resource allocation or how student fees are distributed could be a by-product of this study for the Student Affairs office that supports campus activities boards particularly in this age of effective and efficient fiscal management.

Assumptions of the study. A basic assumption of this study is that involvement in recognized student organizations positively affects student skill development while in college. This study was also based on the assumption that involvement and skill development will vary among students depending on amount of effort and time individual students put forth (Stanford, 1992). The expectation is that individuals who participate in this study will respond honestly to the survey questions. The researcher also anticipates that students have volunteered to participate in this organization on campus.
**Delimitations.** Factors that will be included are demographics, specific skills (i.e. communication, critical thinking), student perception of skill development, and amount of time spent on these activities. This study will focus on the ten core competencies in the NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders. Demographic information will be collected because it is important to know the characteristics of participants in relation to skill development and time spent. The study will focus on undergraduate students and will not include private, two-year, and proprietary institutions. The impact of Student Affairs professionals on campus activities boards will not be discussed, although this is an area that could be studied for further implications on student learning and development.

**Research Questions**

Three research questions were explored in this study as measured by the NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders:

1. What is the level of agreement between the students’ self-ratings and advisors’ responses?
2. What are the differences in ratings between student officers and student committee members?
3. What is the relationship between length of time in the organization and student ratings?

**Research Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1 will answer research question one.

H1. Students and advisors will have no difference between the ratings on the core competencies.
Hypotheses two through eleven will answer research question two.

H2. Student officers and student committee members will have no difference in ratings in leadership development.

H3. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in assessment and evaluation.

H4. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in event management.

H5. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in meaningful interpersonal relationships.

H6. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in collaboration.

H7. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in social responsibility.

H8. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in effective communication.

H9. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in multicultural competency.

H10. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in intellectual growth.

H11. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in clarified values.

Hypothesis 12 will answer research question three.
H12. Students with a longer length of time in the organization will have no relationship between time and ratings.

Summary

The accountability pressure on higher education institutions is not going away anytime soon. Measures of accountability are being integrated with state policies more consistently and institutions are asked to respond. Student learning is at the forefront for higher education and Student Affairs plays a role in assessing learning. Student involvement outside of the classroom needs to be measured and reported to articulate the value of participation in campus activities as a whole and begin to describe the value of campus activities boards specifically.

In the upcoming chapters the relevant literature will be reviewed, the methodology of the study will be discussed, an analysis of the results will be reported, and a discussion of the study including future areas for research and implications for Student Affairs professionals will be delineated.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

There are many opportunities for students to engage in leadership development on college campuses. One avenue for leadership development is involvement in student organizations. Much of the current literature focuses on student organizations as a whole and not campus activities boards specifically. Leadership literature and the theory of involvement literature were reviewed for the study to provide background information on this topic, illuminate potential types of studies, and identify gaps.

Review of the Literature

The leadership literature reviewed focused on students’ extracurricular experiences and how these experiences may influence student learning and development. Common themes discussed in the leadership literature include leadership programs and training, student perceptions of experience, out of class experiences such as employment or internships, leadership within specific majors, and institutional expenditures on leadership activities. Currently, out-of-class experiences may be viewed as add-ons or in competition with the academic goal. Each of the above mentioned themes will be discussed separately.

Leadership programs. Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, and Burkhardt’s (2001) longitudinal study assessed the effect of leadership training and education on students’ development. The study used data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) of 10 colleges and universities with a follow-up questionnaire, the College Student Survey (CSS). In addition, 20 questions were added to the CSS by the researchers. From the literature, the authors determined student involvement in the collegiate environment had positive effects on development in various areas. Specifically assessed by the researchers
were these questions; 1) are leadership programs effective in developing leadership skills and knowledge of students, and 2) is there a relationship to education outcomes such as multicultural awareness and civic responsibility? (Cress et al, 2001). The participating institutions varied in type and CIRP data was utilized from 1994 and 1998. This study focused on participants (425) and nonparticipants (450) of leadership programs at their institutions. Respondents were primarily female (68%) and white (78%) with a small group of students of color. The students of color self-identified as 8% Asian, 5% Hispanic, 3% American Indian, and 2% African American/Black with the rest of the sample selecting other or no response. The majority of the Hispanic students identified as 4% Mexican American/Chicano.

The Input-Environment-Outcome (I-E-O) model was used in this study to control for variable differences before college and after collegiate experiences began. This assisted Cress, et al. (2001) in assessing the impact of participation in leadership programs, determining if it was truly a factor of the program above and beyond anything else. Responses were compared between participants and non-participants. All students showed growth in development, but participants in leadership programs rated their change at a higher level than non-participants. The researchers found that various areas develop in student participants and can be grouped in three areas: skills, values, and cognitive understanding. These areas can be reduced down to leadership understanding and commitment, leadership skills, personal and societal values, civic responsibility, multicultural awareness, and community orientation (Cress et al., 2001).

The authors queried if these growth indicators were the subject of self-selection and not an impact of the leadership program. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multivariate analysis was used to control for various inputs. Therefore, if student participation in the
leadership development program was still significant beyond the other variables (demographics, academic major, predisposed to leadership, and involved on campus) taken into account, then it could be posited that there is a direct impact on student development from leadership programs (Cress et al., 2001). The researchers further state on the impact of the five factors, statistically significant gains were seen on four of the five measures for participants in leadership programs verses non-participants. Leadership understanding and commitment provided gains four years after graduation. Civic responsibility, multicultural awareness, and community were also developed by participation in a leadership program. Leadership skills were enhanced as well. Demographics such as gender and race did not have any significance on the outcomes except for Mexican American/Chicano’s on multicultural awareness and community orientation. Leadership programs may distance themselves from students of color due to the hierarchical nature of the program thus any potential growth opportunities are missed. However, the authors suggest for other individuals of color who do participate in a leadership program, it is likely that there would be multiple educational gains.

Students who volunteer, intern, or participate in class projects may likely develop as leaders and show positive outcomes in the five factors without participation in a leadership program. Growth from volunteer work takes place in the leadership skills and knowledge, civic responsibility, personal and social values, and multicultural and community issues. Internships provided growth in similar areas except personal and social values. Class projects provide growth in leadership skills, leadership understanding, multicultural and community awareness, and personal and societal values. The authors concluded that there is evidence to support a direct impact on student development by leadership education and training.
including an increase in students’ knowledge and skills (Cress et al., 2001). Other areas that emerged included opportunities for service, experiential activities (internships), and class projects or active learning through collaboration. However, with any study there are limitations. The degree of involvement of each student in the leadership program was beyond the scope of the study. Attention to individuals of color and gender due to the sample numbers might provide further information on impact or relationships. Other areas might include faculty interaction or facilitation of student development or application of the five factors after matriculation. In this study the researchers did however demonstrate involvement in intentional leadership programs (training and education) can result in a variety of developmental outcomes for students.

A study by Morrell and Morrell (1986) called for structured techniques for learning of leadership skills, including effective methods of training, using a student development transcript and portfolios. This study reinforced previous opinion pieces, books, and articles read and did not provide any new information. It focused learning on interpersonal skill development and organizational processes. This article was a more tangible “how to” article about training, student development measures, and institutional impact.

From the literature, leadership programs and training do have an impact on student development and increases knowledge and skills. However, student organizations are not usually formal leadership programs and training. Student organizations are more informal venues for development.

**Student perceptions of their experiences.** In contrast, review of a phenomenological study by Logue et al. (2005) provided information on student leader experiences within
student organizations or extracurricular activities. This study focused on students’ perceptions about leadership experiences, mostly in context of extracurricular activities. Students self-selected to participate in this study and the sample size was six individuals. The only other qualifying criterion was individuals had to hold an officer position within a registered student organization at the university. Two males and four females volunteered for this study. Class standing was self-reported and included one sophomore, two juniors, and three seniors. Organizations in which students participated ranged from two Greek organizations, where one student held two positions within the organization; a business club leader and member of several religious organizations, another student held leadership roles in two academic groups, and one exclusively was a leader in a religious organization. The overall student body at time of collection was 87.7% white and 52% female which the sample reflected. Also, five of the six students held leadership roles in multiple organizations.

Interviews were conducted with all participants in an open format. Each interview began with, “Please describe for me in as much detail as possible your experience of being a student leader” (Logue et al., 2005, p. 397). Responses were transcribed and shared with the research team. Themes emerged from the team process. Leadership as a positive experience was the underlying piece to each theme. Negative aspects were also discussed as pressure or hard work, but overall it was described as a positive experience. People, action, and organization were the overlapping themes from all participants. Interpersonal experience within the context of the leadership role is defined as “people”. It encompassed various participants and elements such as motivation and helping others, and was focused on the experience of the participant not the leader.
Three subthemes emerged within the people theme. The first one, leading people, focused on the participant and leader interactions. The opportunity to join a group, make friends, build relationships, or work as part of a team was the second subtheme. Its focus was collaboration, being a part of something bigger than themselves, or finding a niche. Serving others or helping people was the third subtheme. It took various forms including service to others, education, support, or outreach. Goal orientation or being driven characterizes the second main theme of action. All of the participants sought out the leadership role and with the exception of one, held various positions in multiple organizations. The student, who was the exception, led the biggest organization on campus. All participants were full-time students. Focusing on the process embodies the first subtheme of getting things done. Success was defined in terms of the consequences of actions. The last subtheme was a busy lifestyle. One student discussed how lifestyle contributed to his success as a student (Logue et al., 2005).

The last theme was organization, or the identity that was provided for the leader by the organization. Leadership was defined in terms of involvement with organizations. Three subthemes emerged and one was defining events. These events described the role and purpose of the organization. A leader versus member was another subtheme. It provided different identities for the roles each played in the organization. Structure of the organization was the last subtheme. Structure is specific to the organization, its requirements, goals, and assignment of tasks. All of the themes discussed are fairly well interconnected. Positive and negative aspects of being a leader were also discussed but all participants agreed the benefits outweighed the costs. The participants’ perception of leadership experiences was significant
and could contribute to skill development. The study was limited by the diversity of the sample; results could be unique to participants or institution. Since students self-selected to participate this could be considered a limitation. The number of participants was small and cannot be generalized to all student experiences.

Another recent study discusses student engagement and the effects on personal and social learning outcomes. A study by Strayhorn (2008) looked at the relationship between engagement in educational activities and student perceived personal and social learning outcomes. Astin’s inputs-environment-outcomes model was the theoretical framework used in this study. The student measures came from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education-16 learning domains. Data was reviewed from the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) taken in 2004-2005. Eight thousand undergraduates were randomly selected representing 61% women, 94% single/not married, and 42% first-year students (Strayhorn, 2008). Student engagement for this study included in-class discussions, faculty-student interactions, interactions with peers, and active learning.

Results indicated a highly significant relationship between personal/social learning outcomes and faculty-student interactions, interactions with peers, and active learning. High levels of perceived personal and social learning were reported by undergraduates who frequently engaged with faculty, peers, and in active learning. The implication is for institutions to pay attention to how these interactions can be cultivated and encouraged for student growth. Examples could be service learning activities, book clubs, student organizations, peer mentoring, and living-learning communities may be useful in achieving the intended outcomes of personal/social learning (Strayhorn, 2008). Establishing a
meaningful relationship with faculty through mentoring or research projects has a higher personal/social learning outcome. Peer interactions yield the greatest influence on student learning. Activities that encourage students to interact with peers have great potential to influence student learning. These types of activities should be designed using outcomes based assessment. Focusing on peer interactions in these organizations may yield interesting results.

Case studies are another avenue to explore leadership development such as the Student Leadership Development Institute (SLDI) at Rutgers University. The SLDI suggests that leadership development should be systematic, multidisciplinary, research oriented, and have several outcomes (Connaughton, Lawrence, & Ruben, 2003). This article provides nine principles to support the SLDI initiative. While the article gave a good overview of leadership and its many contexts, it did not provide any additional information about extracurricular activities and learning.

Another article that focused on student leadership development and gender and ethnic identity was informative in regard to two leadership variables (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000). Results suggest that leadership opportunities are important for all groups, but different types are helpful to sub-group (gender and ethnicity) leadership development. This article looks at two specific factors of leadership development for women and African Americans. It does not include other ethnic backgrounds. For this review, it is helpful in regard to the context of leadership and reinforces that not every opportunity will provide learning for all students. It is good information to take into account to narrow the topic for future research. The next section focuses on a broader view of out-of-class experiences.
Out-of-class experiences. There is some overlap in information among the Kuh study in 1995 and previous studies reviewed. Kuh’s study focused on seniors and how they associated their learning and development to out of class experiences. His study utilized Astin’s involvement theory (1984) and the changes associated with the impact of college attendance. Basically, the involvement theory suggests that what you put in (effort and time) is what you get out (benefits). The more a student puts in to out-of-class experiences the more s/he will get out of that experience. College impact frames the question from an external environment and sociological perspective. Attending college provides different forces that impact students and there are particular changes or growth experienced by students during this time period and in this environment. Datum was collected by personal interviews at institutions known to provide rich out of class experiences and developmental opportunities for undergraduates. The total number of participants was 149 with the majority (129) being traditional age (18-23) and 20 students older than 23. Sixty-nine men and 80 women participated. In this study, 6 were international students, 6 Hispanic, 6 Asian American, 30 African Americans, and 101 self-identified as white.

All participants were asked five questions and the interviews were transcribed. Five outcome factors and eight types of experiences were reported. The outcomes were interpersonal competence, cognitive complexity, knowledge and academic skills, practical competence, and humanitarianism. Out-of-class experiences were described as interaction with peers (79%), academic related activities (68%), other (68%), institutional ethos (60%), faculty (46%), work (32%) and travel (22%). However, 85% of the participants described one
or more benefits from activities that required them to perform tasks such as planning, organizing, managing, and decision making (Kuh, 1995).

Interpersonal competence reported the most gains (46%) with cognitive complexity, humanitarianism, knowledge and academic skills, and practical competence following. Interpersonal competence was linked with peer interactions, specific leadership responsibilities, other, and institutional ethos. Work and leadership responsibilities were linked with practical competence. Faculty contact and academic activities provided gains in knowledge and academic skills. Cognitive complexity was divided across several areas. These areas included peers, academic activities, other, ethos, and leadership responsibilities. Peer interactions and leadership responsibilities were linked to humanitarianism. A few differences in developmental gains in the five outcomes were reported across race, gender, and type of institution for different out-of-class experiences. A small number of students traveled and this experience often had a meaningful impact on the outcomes.

This leads to some limitations of the study. The sample size was relatively small so the results cannot be generalized to other institutions. Also, the institutions chosen were known to provide quality out-of-class experiences, so this could potentially skew the data. A particular student is more likely to engage in out-of-class experiences and may be attracted to these particular types of institutions which could also slant the data. The institutional environment could influence student patterns of involvement that might be different at other institutions. These issues could be a limitation. The article did not discuss any negative effects of out-of-class experiences, while it was not the focus of the study, it could also be considered a shortcoming. The level of involvement from student to student varied and may not be
consistent or have similar outcomes for others who engage in similar activities. The study focused on five outcomes within the context of eight experiences and this cannot be comprehensive of every experience or outcome. It is also hard to determine if the factors are interconnected.

Students view the out-of-class experience as a “real world” laboratory that has the potential to provide valued outcomes on learning (Kuh, 1995). The activities that required sustained effort were the more powerful experiences as students interacted with different groups. Another finding determined that how students spent their out of class time mattered the most. Again there was some variance of experiences based on institutional type and the context of the institution. Students attributed more than a tenth of their learning and personal development gains to institutional ethos (Kuh, 1995). Work place competencies (decision making, group process, etc.) are developed and encouraged by students’ involvement in leadership roles, internships, and work. Students describe this as a benefit of involvement in extracurricular activities (student organizations) and the nature of these groups require that students develop in these areas. Potential shifts in institution policies to recognize out-of-class experiences as essential to student goals or development may be the next step. An assessment of these benefits may require more attention in the future.

These studies demonstrate that out of class experiences contribute to learning and development for students. While experiences in student organizations were mentioned as having an impact by the participants, the studies did not focus on the student organization experience. These studies provide support that out of class experiences are beneficial to students and this area could use more research.
In the literature, there was one dissertation found that discussed what students learn by being a chairperson and/or officer of a program board. This study used a mixed methods approach and was conducted at 17 private four-year institutions in the state of Iowa with 147 participants. The study used a quantitative approach with two open-ended questions. There were two instruments used in the study. One was a demographic instrument with factors for gender, class year, ethnicity, and types of involvement. The other instrument used a framework based on Howard Bowen’s Investment in Learning (Riepe, 2011). This second instrument had 25 learning outcomes broken down into cognitive learning, affective (feeling) and practical competence. Participants rated themselves on a scale of -10 to +10 on the 25 learning outcomes. This study found that students articulated learning the following skills as result of their involvement on a campus activities board: leadership, future orientation, adaptability, creativeness, personal self-discovery, verbal skills, intellectual tolerance, need for achievement, rationality, psychological well-being, human understanding, economic productivity, wisdom, fruitful leisure, teamwork, networking, time management, organization budgeting and socializing (Riepe, 2011). The identified skills were further broken down by score and the top eight skills students identified are: leadership, future orientation, adaptability, creativeness, personal self-discovery, verbal skills, intellectual tolerance and need for achievement. These had the higher mean score and had greater positive impact on students involved in campus activities boards. The skills identified that had an impact in a positive direction are citizenship, sound family life, quantitative skills, esthetic sensibility, substantive knowledge, health and spiritual interest (Riepe, 2011). These seven skills had lower mean scores.
There is a similarity between Riepe’s study and this one; both studies had a similar question about length of time. Riepe’s (2011) study supports that length of time as an officer and/or chairperson in the campus activities board is more likely to have a relationship with the top eight skills identified as having a positive impact. Time also had impact on the lower of the seven skills identified although not as significant of an impact. This research study also include two open-ended questions that asked participants to articulate the most important skills they learned as an officer and/or chairperson and what was the single most beneficial experience and what was learned from it. Five themes emerged from the most important skills learned. They are organizational skills, time management, team building, leadership and communication.

The second open-ended question regarding the single most beneficial experience had 12 common themes. These are: opportunity to lead a diverse group of individuals and allow them to grow, communication is vital to an organization like ours, helped me network in the college community, time management is key to accomplish everything, taught me how to successfully organize to meet the needs of the student body, I have been able to work with a budget, attending NACA helped me understand how the programming boards work at other schools, able to improve my creative skills, I have learned what it means to truly work together for a common goal, seeing all the people enjoy the events we put on and knowing our hard work paid off, the most beneficial experiences would be through my failed events and can be frustrating and depressing at times to not have adequate student support (Riepe, 2011). From the two open-ended questions, the responses were consistent with the skills reported previously and also provided new areas to consider.
There are differences between Riepe’s study and this research. For example, Riepe’s (2011) study focused solely on officers for program boards at private institutions and did not include members as participants. Riepe added two open-ended questions and had two instruments which were administered in person by the advisor of the campus activities board. One of the instruments was supported by literature from Bowen in 1977 and the terminology used is a bit out dated in today’s context. On the instrument there is no mention of multicultural competence and the descriptions of the skills may or may not apply to the activity of being in a program board. Substantive knowledge is an example; the description is western and other cultures, philosophy, natural science, art/literature, world events, vocabulary, and ideas in one or more academic areas. Nonetheless, there are similarities in the instrument used for Riepe’s study and the NACA core competencies. Both allude to leadership, event management, accomplishing goals, collaboration, communication, budgeting and others.

This research study supported many of the articles already reviewed in relation to what students gain by being involved outside of the classroom. It also supported the hypothesis that not much is known about the benefits of campus activities boards and provides evidence that campus activities boards do contribute to student learning.

**Extracurricular activities.** In the literature, a few studies focus on extracurricular activities and how this supports the liberal arts curriculum or how these types of activities can be incorporated in the curriculum. McNamara and Cover (1999) suggest that leadership activities support the general education goals for the institution studied. This study differentiated between membership in extracurricular activities, leadership in these activities,
and volunteering. Parallels between involvement and support of the liberal education goals were drawn with the greatest support from leaders. Two other studies discuss pedagogical strategies to incorporate activities that promote learning, including, Kuh (1995) and the Cooper, Healy, and Simpson (1994) study which was informative. This was a 3-year study using the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI). The inventory has three developmental tasks, with two broken into smaller sub-tasks. Establishing and clarifying purpose, developing mature interpersonal relationships, and academic autonomy are the three developmental tasks. Sub-tasks include educational involvement, career planning, lifestyle planning, life management, cultural participation, peer relationships, tolerance, and educational autonomy (p. 99). On the various tasks and subtasks, leaders scored more positively than non-leaders. The goal of the study was to ascertain the impact of leadership activities on the academic experience. This study suggested a positive relationship between leadership activities and the academic experience. Future growth of these skills was also suggested.

In the Foubert and Grainger (2006) study, the researchers sought to examine the connection between students who have differing levels of involvement in student organizations and the students’ psychosocial development along Chickering and Reisser’s vectors (p. 166). The Student Development Task and Lifestyle Inventory was used to measure students’ development and administered at the beginning of their first year, the beginning of their sophomore year and during the spring of their senior year. The study focused on three vectors: moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing interpersonal relationships and establishing and clarifying purpose (Foubert & Grainger, 2006). The
differing levels of involvement in student organizations were not involved in a club, attended a meeting, joined a club, led a club and founded a club. As hypothesized those students who attended a meeting, joined or led an organization showed a higher level of development than those students who were not involved in student organizations. Joining a club or leading a club showed the highest levels of development but there were no developmental differences between these two areas. This study supports a connection between involvement in student organizations and higher levels of development along the indicators for psychosocial development. Specifically in establishing and clarifying purpose, educational involvement, career planning, life management and cultural participation (Foubert & Grainger, 2006).

One new area emerged in this study, significant gains in academic autonomy and lifestyle planning occurred for students involved in student organizations at the beginning of the sophomore year. Involvement early in students’ academic career may have an impact on development in an influential way. This particular finding suggests more research in this area. There were limitations of this study. It occurred at one institution and the students were traditional aged. All of the participants lived in the residence halls their first year, and the population was slightly over represented by Caucasian women. In addition, most students attending this institution were in the top 10% of their high school class, had a middle to upper socioeconomic status and had SAT scores at least one standard deviation above the mean (Foubert & Grainger, 2006). This study cannot be generalized to other campuses and does not account for the institutional environment that may attract a particular type of student. It also does not account for the motivation of the students who may have self-selected to be involved on campus.
This study differed from the previous studies reviewed because the focus was not on supporting the liberal arts curriculum; however the results are similar and support the previous findings. The finding support involvement in student organizations has a strong connection to psychosocial development on students’ establishing and clarifying purpose, educational involvement, career planning, life management and cultural participation. These studies illuminate the impact of extracurricular activities on student learning and the application to the educational goals of institutions. However, the impacts of the activities themselves were not measured.

**Specific majors and leadership.** Another theme in the literature involved specific majors and leadership. For accounting and agriculture majors, students who had matriculated placed a higher emphasis on learning non-technical (decision making, communication, leadership) skills than the technical (major specific) skills in comparison to non-matriculated students. Usoff and Feldmann (1998) discuss skills that employers desire in comparison to students’ perception of what employers desire. The students’ awareness of non-technical skills and their importance to employers grows with educational progress and experience. This was mirrored in the Zekeri (2004) study with agricultural students. Non-technical skills are valued as well as a foundation in the major. Both of these articles were specific to academic majors and skill development, but did not really add to the topic of learning and extracurricular activities. These articles would be helpful in making the connection to employers and skills desired in the work force.

Wells and Grabert (2004) discuss mentoring and service learning activities as an effective approach for psychology students. However, the study seemed to be very specific to
the two particular courses it paired and increased students’ interest in community service. While the respondents had a positive experience and did fulfill the requirements for class, the study did not completely describe the learning from the activity. The other paper that was specific by major or area of study was a call for medical schools to educate students from a social change perspective. Grande and Srinivas (2001) describe curricular changes for medical schools in order to educate medical students to serve as change agents in the health system. It called for leadership development opportunities and experiential learning in the course work, support of student projects, and formal leadership programs. This was specific to medicine and was similar in scope to the Wells and Grabert (2004) study.

The last study reviewed was in relation to marketing majors and the impact of a professional student organization as a complement to the curriculum. The study surveyed members of the collegiate American Marketing Association on four areas. These are strategic and tactical activities, interpersonal and networking skills, entrepreneurial and venture experience, and contacts with professionals. The survey also assessed students’ satisfaction with these activities and with the chapter overall. Implications of this study indicate the importance of these types of student organizations for developing practical experience needed in the work force, this organization is a safe place to practice skills such as networking, and that students had an increased satisfaction with the collegiate experience over time (Peltier, Scovotti, & Pointer, 2008).

These studies did a great job of linking academic majors to student involvement on campus and did articulate some of the benefits of involvement. However, the literature only provides evidence for a few majors, which signals an opportunity for further research.
Institutional expenditures. The role of higher education is to promote student growth and development. Institutions are continually being held accountable for the cost of higher education and student development. Smart, Ethington, Riggs, and Thompson (2002) studied the linkage between institutional spending patterns and student leadership. This study looked at over 300 colleges and universities expenditure patterns and students self-reported leadership ability over a 4-year period. The researchers stated students who enter college with a strong emphasis on leadership are likely to seek out leadership development activities. Students’ emphasis on leadership may also affect the choice of academic major. Students’ perception of how the institution funds student services seems to impact involvement. If the student perceives that a higher amount of money is spent on student services then the student will participate more freely in leadership activities. The opposite is true if the student perceives less money is spent on student services. This article provided some interesting information about student perception and expenditures, but really did not address the original question. The amount of effort a student directed to his/her own leadership development will affect the outcome when measured. Student perception is not always correct, but it does provide an area of growth or more transparency about expenditures in this area.

Another study by Ryan (2005) reviewed expenditures and student engagement. This study looked at 142 institutions with data from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDs), National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the U.S. News and World Report. The sample was limited and non-random. Instruction, academic support, student services, and institutional support expenditures per full-time student were the independent variables. The results showed some evidence of a relationship between student
engagement and institutional expenditures. Administrative expenses had a negative effect on student engagement, but instructional expenditures had a positive relationship. This study provided some contradictory and complementary results with the Smart et al. (2002) study. Ryan’s study lends some support to student effort, including how interactions are the driving force for how college affects students.

The last study reviewed that discussed institutional structures and student engagement was by Porter (2006). This study focused on how selectivity, size, and research orientation affected student development and engagement. It used the Beginning Post-secondary Student survey (BPS), IPEDs surveys, and the Barron’s and Peterson’s college guidebook data. The analysis included student engagement in the first year of college. Porter was looking at this from the 10,000 foot level, a broad perspective across the parameters reviewed. It did not really add to this theme other than to reinforce peer effects on students’ behavior.

While these studies were informative about how institutional structures such as expenditures, size, etc. impacted student engagement, this is not the focus of this study. It is good information to consider and may be an area to further explore.

Leadership literature discussion. A review of the literature uncovers a few themes. Across many of the studies leadership skill development was evident and had an impact on students. Also, peer interactions, volunteering/service learning, active learning/class projects, and academic activities also had an impact on student development. Cress et al. (2001) stated that leadership education and training had an impact on student development. They contend that volunteering, class projects, and internships without the leadership program would also provide student development. Several other studies supported this statement (McNamara &
Cover, 1999; Strayhorn 2008; Wells & Grabert, 2004). Essentially, the Cress et al. (2001) study articulated two pathways of leadership development. Kuh (1995), Cress et al. (2001), McNamara and Cover (1999), Strayhorn (2008), and Cooper et al. (1994) called for institutions of higher education to pay closer attention to leadership programs and the impact on student development. These studies showed the impact of these experiences on students, and how these experiences can assist the larger mission of the institution.

Out-of-class experiences or extracurricular activities provide opportunities for students to utilize knowledge, skills, and abilities that are obtained in the classroom in a practical application and vice versa. This was supported by the Grande and Srinivas (2001) article that discussed curricular changes. Several of the studies also referenced the importance of faculty involvement using different avenues such as active learning or mentoring. A number of studies (Cooper et al., 1994; Kuh, 1995; McNamara & Cover, 1999; Strayhorn, 2008; Wells & Grabert, 2004) reveal that faculty-student interactions are a key element for student learning. These studies discuss the mentor role, but not specifically in the context of student organizations. The structure of institutions could also fit in this area since the primary purpose of higher education institutions is academics. Smart et al. (2002), Ryan (2005), and Porter (2006) discuss expenditures and institutional structure on student engagement. Ryan (2005) and Porter’s (2006) studies focused on academic expenditures while Smart et al.’s (2002) study discussed student perception of expenditures on leadership development activities.

The information suggested in the studies provides a different approach or perspective on how to view extracurricular activities and learning. It seems that many positive effects are associated with these experiences and there are various approaches to studying them. It also
seems there are various ways to define out-of-class experiences, extracurricular activities, and leadership development. All three terms could describe the same thing or something completely different. Many of the studies did refer to student organizations as a vehicle used to develop skills. However, further information is needed that may define extracurricular activities or provide other ways of thinking about learning and these experiences.

Future areas of research that were illuminated from the studies reviewed include negative aspects to extracurricular activities. For example, do these outweigh the benefits; is there a particular time or type of extracurricular activity to get involved with that would maximize student development; what is it about these activities that encourage or support student development; is it the structure that contributes to student development; do particular types of institutions enhance these experiences; should these experiences be part of a structured program as the Cress et al. (2001) study suggests; and what is the effect of gender and ethnicity on leadership development. These are just a few of the questions that were illuminated from the literature. Many more questions arose through this review that has not yet been answered. The literature reviewed does not support or refute the main topic which is skill development of campus activities board officers and leaders. Several items in the literature skirt around this particular area but none specifically address it. Many studies comment on extracurricular activities as a place where learning or development occurs, but none have studied how it happens and how to capitalize on that learning. Extracurricular activities seem to be important, but the literature reviewed does not clearly identify why or how.
Literature that specifically focused on Greek organizations, service learning, and intramurals was excluded for this review. These topics have been explored quite extensively and were not the focus for this study. Strayhorn’s (2008) article provided a method for how to begin to frame this question of extracurricular involvement. This article used the CAS 16 learning domains as a framework, “Evidence thus far does lend some support to efforts by higher education leaders and government to pursue strategies that enhance support for non-administrative functions and review mandates that require growth in non-academic administrative expenditures” (Ryan, 2005, p. 246). It is clear from the literature that extracurricular experiences can enhance academics in various ways.

Student involvement opportunities are an allocated resource by the institution, and the collection of student fees are used to support various student activities. Research studies (Kuh, 1995; Moore et al., 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) have supported the view that out-of-classroom experiences contribute to student development and learning, persistence to graduation, and enhance leadership skills important for success in the work force. These experiences can enhance students’ application of knowledge gained in the classroom. Many of the above studies also provide evidence for institutions to justify the existence of out of class experiences and opportunities for students, such as student organizations. Student Affairs professionals must be purposeful about demonstrating and assessing the impact of extracurricular activities on student learning, growth, and development. This information needs to be shared broadly across the institution to inform all members of the community of the impact, which may provide new areas of collaboration and integration. Student Affairs professionals can provide knowledge of different theoretical frameworks to colleagues that
might provide a better understanding of student development and the strategies used in extracurricular activities. The theoretical framework may vary by institution due to organizational culture, the student body or staff familiarity.

**Theoretical Framework**

There are many theories of student development. Some focus on the psychosocial such as Chickering’s, while others focus on the cognitive development like Perry (Astin, 1999). These types of student development theories are arranged in stages or have multifaceted approaches. The focal point for these theories considers the “what” of student development. For instance, Astin’s (1999) theory of involvement describes the amount of energy a student expends on a particular activity. Involvement, in this context, is considered an active term and focuses more on the behavior of students. How a student behaves and what a student does defines and identifies involvement. The theory of involvement is focused on the “how” of student development. The emphasis is on active participation by the student in the process of learning.

The theory provides a framework or context for thinking about student involvement or engagement in the various arenas in collegiate life. These arenas include the classroom, on campus employment, extracurricular activities, and others. The level of involvement depends on the amount of energy or effort expended by the student. In addition, the student shares some of the responsibility with regard to taking advantage of the opportunities and resources that higher education institutions offer. The theory of involvement provides a structure or lens with which to view students’ participation in campus activities boards and has been used to measure learning and development.
**Assessment approaches.** The theory of involvement has been used to determine learning outcomes and development of students in various aspects of collegiate life. However, involvement can affect students on multiple levels and in multiple ways. The focal point in the literature has been the impact of college on various outcomes. These outcomes range from academic to job related to programming. One of these outcomes is critical thinking. Examples are athletics, Greek affiliation, general activities, place of residence, interaction with peers and faculty, and employment. Gellin (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature to determine an overall critical thinking score of a .14 effect gain for students involved in the following activities: Greek life, faculty and peer interactions, living on campus, student organization involvement, and employment. This effect gain is the impact of involvement on critical thinking. A .14 effect is a small effect and the expectation is there is gain on critical thinking scores for those students involved compared to non-involved students. Other outcomes can include academic or soft skill development such as conflict resolution or decision-making skills. A brief overview of some of the literature in these areas follows.

**Student government.** The research on student government has produced positive gains in several areas. These areas include political liberalism, greater satisfaction with peers, frequent peer interaction, and enhanced leadership skills such as conflict resolution, management, and group dynamics (Astin, 1999; Moore et al, 1998). Other developmental areas in which student growth has been measured include collaboration, compromise, nurturing of group consensus, autonomy, decision-making skills, and the overall governance process (Moore et al., 1998).
Programs. Honors programs and orientation programs are two examples included in research studies about involvement. For honors programs, the outcomes have positively impacted student gains in artistic interests, intellectual self-esteem, interpersonal self-esteem, persistence to graduation, and student satisfaction in the classroom and with faculty interactions (Astin, 1999). Students in honors programs may be more likely to engage with faculty on various projects, but this could also take time away from interaction with peers.

For orientation programs, the outcome is retention of students. The focus of orientation programs is to assist students in the transition to collegiate life and attainment of their educational goals. Moore et al.’s study focused on orientation courses and the impact on students. The course provided peer-to-peer interactions, provided information and discussion on relevant personal and academic issues, and provided information on various services for student support. Grade point average of students who completed the orientation course was compared to students who did not complete the orientation course. Those students who did complete the orientation course had a higher grade point average (Moore et al., 1998).

Faculty and Peer Interactions. Faculty-student interaction is strongly related to satisfaction with college. Students are more likely to demonstrate gains in the ability to comprehend, interpret, evaluate materials and methods, and apply concepts from a significant amount of interaction with faculty. Studies also show some differences in student characteristics in some areas, such as gender or ethnicity. Men were more likely to assign gains in cognitive complexity to faculty interaction than women. Students of color attribute knowledge and academic gains to faculty interactions more so than white students. Adult learners also felt faculty initiated and supported student involvement which students believed
contributed to their overall development (Hernandez, Hogan, Hathaway, & Lovell, 1999). The focus of these studies has been on faculty-student interactions, but the research has not considered the impact of staff-student interactions on student learning or development.

Attention has also been paid to the peer-to-peer influence on student learning. Gains in openness, diversity and challenge, interpersonal competence, cognitive complexity, moral development, and humanitarianism have been ascribed to peer-to-peer influence (Hernandez et al., 1999). Students of color attribute interpersonal competence gains to peers more often than their white counterparts. Cognitive complexity for women was attributed to peers more often than for men. In the current research, there is not a distinction between true peers and non-peers. A peer is someone who has the same rank, experience, and ability. A non-peer is someone who has greater authority or who is in a leadership positions (Hernandez et al., 1999). Examples of non-peers are resident assistants, student organization leaders, or non-traditional students.

**Research on involvement and impact on ethnicity.** Several studies on involvement focus on the African American community. This body of research has a small sub-division regarding the impact on African American men. Some of these studies have been conducted at predominantly white institutions (PWI) as opposed to historical black colleges and universities (HBCU). One study was found that focused on the impact on Native Americans (Lundberg, 2007) and one study that focused on the intersection of first generation, ethnicity, and involvement. Literature for other ethnic backgrounds was not found.

**Involvement and the African American student.** Research has shown that participation in student organizations for African American and white students differ. Further
research has suggested that racial identities of students impact the participation level on campus (Flowers, 2004). Overall, involvement experiences for African American students are attributed to gains in understanding arts and humanities, personal and social development, vocational preparation, understanding science and technology, and thinking and writing skills. Involvement also assisted in African American students’ decisions to persist in college (Flowers, 2004; Littleton, 2002). From the studies, the quantity, type, and quality of involvement impacted the educational outcomes for African American students. Academic related activities were more positively associated with outcomes than recreational (music, art, theatre, activities in the student union) experiences. Watching television served as a distraction for students and minimized involvement opportunities. There were other negative effects on African American student development on outcomes such as attending social events in the student union, participating in class discussion, using the card catalog to locate resources in the library, serving on committees, and having a regular exercise schedule or athletic practice (Flowers, 2004).

Littleton’s (2002) study indicated faculty influence was the number one factor in persistence for the African American students. This was also supported by a study by Watson and Kuh (1996). They investigated students’ perception of the environment and relationships with faculty, staff, and peers. These variables were measured to determine impact on educational gains for African American students. Students who attended HBCUs showed greater gains compared to the white majority and black minority students attending PWIs educationally. In addition, organizations for African American students at PWIs assist in the transition for these students (Guiffrida, 2004; Kimbrough & Hutcheson, 1998). Organizations
that are related to the cultural/ethnic group benefit African American students at predominantly white institutions. It helps bridge the gap for students between college and home, and assists in social integration.

However, there is conflicting research that states student involvement takes time away from academics for African American students and this can be a detriment to them (Guiffrida, 2004). After interviewing high achieving students and students with a low grade point average, the impact on the two groups of students was different. For students with a low grade point average, they felt that involvement with student organizations hindered their academic achievement. For students with a high grade point average (high achieving), involvement with student organizations was important but not to the detriment of their academics. From Guiffrida’s study, student involvement could be an asset or liability.

For African American men at predominantly white institutions, the more comfortable they were with their racial identity the more likely they were willing to participate in campus activities. Conversely, the more involved African American men were on campus, the greater the contribution to higher stages of racial identity development were reported (Taylor & Howard-Hamilton, 1995). This same study also demonstrated a positive relationship between Greek affiliation, involvement, and a more positive racial identity.

Involvement and the Native American student. The assumption that students must be involved in collegiate life may be a bit unnerving for Native American students or other non-dominant groups, especially if the student has not been a member of the dominant culture. Additional barriers can be created with the preference for non-Native cultures that are exhibited in higher education institutions. Competition, goal setting, and achievement are
prized by the American higher education system. This is in opposition to the culture of Native Americans that values collaboration, community goals, and the present time orientation. Future orientation can be a foreign concept for a Native American student (Lundberg, 2007). Planning for educational opportunities that would separate a Native American student from his/her family when the characteristic of the culture is family, community, and land may be unfamiliar to these students.

The focus on involvement is not enough for Native American student success. It needs to be coupled with an institutional emphasis on diversity. Students make this decision based on interactions with faculty, staff, students, programs, services, and policies. The responsibility is shared between the student and the institution to create a welcoming institution for all students to engage in (Lundberg, 2007).

Involvement and the first-generation student. Research indicates that a student’s ethnicity or first-generation status contributes to the student’s pattern of involvement and learning. First generation students are less likely to engage in the classroom, which hinders learning gains. This could also be a cultural barrier for students of color depending on their background. For groups such as first generation students, higher education can be foreign or a new culture to learn, know, and navigate. Currently the burden is placed solely on the student, but research states this responsibility is shared (Lundberg, Schreiner, Hovaguimian, & Slavin Miller, 2007). Institutions should look at programs to engage first-generation and students of color in the culture of the institution. Activities that foster a supportive environment, validate student experience, and involve collaboration with others are suggestions from the literature.
to increase learning gains for these students in particular. One program idea will not solve all problems because students function differently and become engaged differently.

**Critiques of the theory of involvement.** The theory of involvement framework underestimates the cost of involvement for students of color or first-generation students. It depends entirely on the student effort and discounts the role institutions of higher education play (Littleton, 2002; Lundberg et al., 2007). There can be many mitigating factors influencing a student as to why s/he is not involved in the institution. Some of these can be financial, lack of social capital, commuting, or family obligations. Any obligation that draws student effort away from college has a negative effect on learning (Lundberg et al., 2007). The environment of involvement opportunities may not feel welcoming for students of color, first generation, or any group that is from the non-dominant culture. Institutions need to identify barriers to involvement and seek ways to break down the barriers and engage students (Littleton, 2002; Moore et al., 1998). The barriers may be as simple as the perception of the institution and the value of diversity. Diversity behaviors are observed by students in every facet of the college experience. If the surroundings are not perceived as welcoming to students, a decline in involvement is possible (Lundberg, 2007; Lundberg et al., 2007; Watson & Kuh, 1996).

As previously described, different types of involvement may positively or negatively impact students’ development. The bulk of the evidence tends to indicate a positive impact. However, the literature does not describe what area has the greatest impact on development (Flowers, 2004; Hernandez et al., 1999; Moore et al., 1998). The assumption is that involvement increases learning. However, one area that needs further research is in regard to
the limits of involvement or the point in which involvement produces less desirable results for students (Guiffrida, 2004).

Student Affairs divisions should reflect on whether or not staff are encouraging too much involvement for students that can produce a negative impact on development. Much of the literature was based on sampling white students and there is little conclusive research on other populations such as adults, commuters, students who are not involved on campus, and students of color (Lundberg et al., 2007). One exception seems to be African American students; however, the benefits do not seem to be as great for these students as it is for white students at PWI’s. Also the gender implications have not been fully explored. The literature is not consistent on the definition of involvement, development, and learning and many of the studies are based on self-reported data. Some inherent bias could be displayed in the results (Hernandez et al., 1999). Participants could have responded on how they thought the researcher would like them to respond instead of reality. Additional research on involvement and the link to development needs to be conducted.

**Applications to Student Affairs practice.** The theory of involvement provides a framework for continued research in Student Affairs to better determine the impact on student development and learning. It also provides another tool to design more effective environments for learning (Astin, 1999). By creating a more engaging and welcoming institution, faculty, staff, and students can work to develop the “whole student” (Lundberg, 2007; Lundberg et al., 2007; Moore et al., 1998). Additional research on the types of involvement, and student characteristics, to determine positive and negative impacts would add to the current literature. The impact is determined by the amount of effort from the student, but barriers may prevent
this. Student Affairs professionals need to identify the barriers and work to break them down and foster positive change. In addition, different types of students may have different involvement needs that will lead to student success. This information can lead institutions of higher education to evaluate the resources that surround involvement and look to make changes that will utilize the resources more effectively for student development. By demonstrating how student involvement assists in facilitating the goal of higher education, we can create collaborative activities that integrate the academic curriculum with the co-curriculum to increase the benefit to students (Gellin, 2003). This can also demonstrate the value added by Student Affairs professionals to the goals of higher education.

Astin’s (1999) theory of involvement refers to the energy an individual invests into an experience. The focus is on the active participation of the student in the learning process. The level of learning that occurs depends on the level of involvement by the student. The nature of campus activities boards lend themselves to be an engaging organization for student involvement to occur. Because involvement is a continuum and students manifest this continuum differently, this was a useful lens to view this study. The amount of energy invested into the organization will be different for each student. This energy can be measured quantitatively such as by the number of office hours a student does on behalf of the organization to qualitatively such as the information the student can articulate about the organization and its processes during student organization fairs. The quality and quantity of student involvement is associated with the amount of student learning and development. The effectiveness of the activity is directly related to its capacity to increase student involvement.
Campus activities boards tend to draw students in to the organization through the experiences for skill development and increased involvement. The organization provides experiences for students that can be highly specific such as implementation of a particular program to more general investment of energy such as attending meetings of the organization. Many times, the campus activities board programs plan high visibility events such as homecoming activities, family weekend events, concerts and other large scale events. These activities require a lot of time and effort to successfully implement. These events also tend to attract students to be engaged in the activity itself or in the planning of the activity. Examples of Astin’s (1999) five postulates for the theory of involvement can all be found within the campus activities board on most campuses. Campus activities boards focus on active involvement of its members and officers and provide a space to practice and enhance the development of skills.

Summary

Across many of the studies leadership skill development was evident and had an impact on students. There are many ways to view student development and study it. Peer interactions, volunteering/service learning, active learning/class projects and academic activities had an impact on student development. Intentional leadership education and programs had a higher impact on student development; however, student development still occurs without it (Cress et al., 2001; MacNamara & Cover, 1999; Strayhorn, 2008; Wells & Grabert, 2004). Out of class experiences and/or extracurricular activities provide opportunities for students to utilize knowledge, skills and abilities that are obtained in the classroom in a practical application and vice versa. Faculty involvement with students is supported as a key
element for student learning through active learning or mentoring, but this is not specific to student organizations.

The literature reviewed supported extracurricular activities have an impact on students learning. However, the types of involvement varied from peer interaction, volunteerism/service learning, active learning in the classroom, leadership development programs and many more. None of the literature was specific to a particular student organization such as CAB and the learning that may occur. This study will focus on campus activities boards and explore student’s skill development from this experience. The theory of involvement provides a framework for viewing these student experiences.

This study will focus on one particular student organization and measure student’s perception of their learning and compare it to observations by the advisor of the group. The study desires to illuminate the skill development that occurs in campus activities boards and identify areas of growth for the student participants. The study will potentially demonstrate a positive outcome for students in CAB.

The next chapter includes the methodology for this study. It outlines participant characteristics, the survey, research design, procedures and timeline, and data collection. Chapter 3 will also outline the data analysis method used.
Chapter 3: Method

The purpose of this study was to measure the student self-ratings of campus activities board officers and members. The study was conducted at seven public universities in the Midwest. This chapter includes information about participants, the instrument used for data collection, research design, analysis, procedures, and time-line.

There is a lack of understanding in regard to the impact of skill development by participating in campus activities boards. Existing literature focuses on student organizations as a whole and not campus activities boards specifically. This study investigated student self-ratings across the ten core competencies in the NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders. These core competencies are leadership development, assessment and evaluation, event management, meaningful interpersonal relationships, collaboration, social responsibility, effective communication, multicultural competency, intellectual growth, and clarified values (The NACA Education Advisory Group, 2009). These core competencies are mapped back to the six domains of learning expressed in the CAS Student Learning and Development Outcomes (see Appendix A).

Human Subjects Approval—Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the St. Cloud State University Institutional Review Board committee (see Appendix B). Participants were asked for their tech ID number and/or self-identifier so advisors can identify the participant and respond appropriately. Once advisors have responded and the data is linked, tech ID numbers and/or self-identifiers were destroyed. Email addresses of the participants were used to distribute the
survey, but were not linked to responses of participants. The online software does not permit the researcher to view this information.

**Participants**

The participants chosen for this study are officers and members of campus activities boards at seven public universities in the Midwest. The student bodies of the public universities vary in size and campus location. Five institutions in this study are part of a statewide system. The statewide system has 31 institutions within it (Minnesota State Colleges & Universities, 2012). Seven of the 31 institutions are four year universities; however, one of these universities serves primarily non-traditional and upper division students. This institution was excluded because the student population is unique to that campus and differs than the other universities. One other state institution was excluded due to the high staff turnover in the student activities area. Three of the institutions were regional institutions of the land grant institution for the state. These institutions were added to increase sample size and had similar populations to the five institutions in the statewide system. One institution did not respond to the survey leaving seven institutions with valid data.

The sample consists of a combined total of 71 students from seven institutions including seven advisors. Participants had at least one semester of experience in the organization and regularly attend meetings of the organization to be considered for this study. Advisors of the campus activities boards were contacted via email for the list of members who met the criteria for the study. Students were contacted via email to participate in the study. Demographic data about the students and advisors was collected through the survey instrument.
Survey. The NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders was used and administered using an online survey tool (see Appendix C). The instrument itself was comprised of demographic questions and multiple choice questions for each of the 10 core competencies for students to self-rate. An identical survey was sent to the advisor of each group to rate each student on the same criteria (see Appendix D). The students’ tech ID number and/or self-identifier was available from a pull down menu for the students and advisor to select. The advisor and student completed the surveys independently. Demographic information for students includes the institution the participants attend, class status, age, gender, length of involvement in campus activities boards, and role within the campus activities board. Advisor demographics included their institution of employment, gender and length of time advising the campus activities board.

Currently, the survey instrument is hard copy, but was presented in an electronic format to the participants. The instrument was adapted slightly to focus the respondents on their involvement with the organization by asking the respondents to consider their role with the organization and then rate themselves on the statements. An institution outside of the statewide system was chosen to pilot this study. The pilot institution has similar characteristics as the institutions in the study. This is to verify that the instrument translated correctly electronically and that the data displays appropriately. The pilot study was administered over a 2-week period via the same online survey tool. Pilot participants were asked to give feedback via email to the researcher about the ease of use for the electronic format, any technical concerns accessing the online survey, clarity of the questions and other comments. The pilot study sample size was 19 students and one advisor with a 53% response.
rate from students. Positive feedback was received from the pilot group about the instrument. The only refinement to the instrument was to underline “your role” in the survey questions after the pilot period. Therefore the pilot data was included in this study.

During the data collection period, the students had three weeks to respond. The advisors had 6 weeks to rate each member of their group. Advisors had more time since they had to rate each student on the ten core competencies.

The survey design used self-reports from the participants. Research has indicated that self-reports are expected to be legitimate under five conditions:

1) the information requested is known to the respondents;
2) the questions are phrased clearly and unambiguously;
3) the questions refer to recent activities;
4) the respondents think the questions merit a serious and thoughtful response; and
5) answering the questions does not threaten, embarrass or violate the privacy of the respondent or encourage the respondent to respond in socially desirable ways. (Pike, Kuh, & Gonyea, 2003, p. 246).

The survey design also provided an opportunity to verify the students self-reports against the advisor’s observations of individual respondents.

Data Sources and Collection Methods

Selecting contact persons. Seven student union directors and one associate union director were contacted via email (Appendix E) to illicit assistance in finding contact information for campus activities boards, number of members, and to gain interest in the study. The email also asked for the union director and associate director to forward this email to the staff member who works with this group if it is not the person who received the email. The union directors forwarded this email to the staff members who are assigned to work with campus activities boards. The researcher tried to determine the staff contact via an internet search to communicate to staff directly. Follow-up emails were sent to ask for assistance, after
2 weeks, when no response was forthcoming. Follow up phone calls were offered and accepted by one advisor to further explain the study.

Individuals who received this email consented or declined to participate in the study (Appendix F). All staff members were contacted for email and tech ID number and/or self-identifier lists of student participants. The dates of the survey were shared with the staff members to let students know to look for the email invitation.

**Data collection.** Data were gathered through an online survey. Student participants received an email invitation to participate in the study. Each email contained a unique link per user. The unique link allows each respondent to answer the survey once. An incentive was offered through a random drawing for participants of the study. The incentive was an opportunity to win one of three $20 VISA gift cards. The survey was open for 3 weeks for students to respond. Reminders were sent via email to those individuals who have not responded during the 3-week period. Data collection for students occurred during May and August to November 2012. Student participants who had not responded in May were included in the August to November time frame. Advisor data collection occurred in May to June and August to November 2012.

Advisors were sent an email invitation to participate in the study. This was a generic link so advisors could complete all ratings within the specified time period. Reminder emails were sent to advisors throughout the six week period.

**Data procedures.** The researcher collected the data via an online survey tool (Campus Labs) and data was exported in Excel and SPSS formats. These files were emailed to the Statistical Consulting and Research Center at St. Cloud State University for analysis using the
SPSS software. The quantitative data was analyzed using a variety of techniques. Demographic data was analyzed descriptively. Statistical tests used were analysis of variance (ANOVA), t-tests, and Pearson correlations.

**Research Design**

This exploratory quantitative study is designed to measure student self-ratings of campus activities board officers and members. Three research questions were examined.

Research Questions One: What is the level of agreement between the students self-ratings and the advisor’s response?

H1. Students and advisors will have no difference between the ratings on the core competencies.

Research Question Two: What are the differences in ratings between student officers and student committee members?

H2. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in leadership development.

H3. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in assessment and evaluation.

H4. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in event management.

H5. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in meaningful interpersonal relationships.

H6. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in collaboration.
H7. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in social responsibility.

H8. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in effective communication.

H9. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in multicultural competency.

H10. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in intellectual growth.

H11. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in clarified values.

Research Question Three: What is the relationship between length of time in the organization and student ratings?

H12. Students with a longer length of time in the organization will have no relationship between length of time and ratings.

Analysis

This research study will apply quantitative methods to perform data analysis. Detailed data analysis methods and descriptions are available for each hypothesis in Table 1.
Table 1

Data Analysis Method and Description by Alternative Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Analysis Method and Explanation</th>
<th>Analysis Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H1. Students and advisors will have different ratings on the core competencies.  
   *DV = Core competencies*  
   *IV = Students, Advisors* | Two-tailed t test: Two independent samples with within subjects with ordinal data | Measured level of agreement between students and advisors |
| H2. Student officers will have higher ratings in leadership development.  
   *DV = Leadership development*  
   *IV = Role in CAB* | One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data.  
   Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data. | Measured rating differences between officers and members.  
Tested the association between leadership development and role in CAB. |
| H3. Student officers will have higher ratings in assessment and evaluation.  
   *DV = Assessment and Evaluation*  
   *IV = Role in CAB* | One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data.  
   Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data. | Measured rating differences between officers and members.  
Tested the association between assessment and evaluation and role in CAB. |
| H4. Student officers will have higher ratings in event management.  
   *DV = Event Management*  
   *IV = Role in CAB* | One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data.  
   Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data. | Measured rating differences between officers and members.  
Tested the association between event management and role in CAB. |
| H5. Student officers will have higher ratings in meaningful interpersonal relationships.  
   *DV = Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships*  
   *IV = Role in CAB* | One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data.  
   Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data. | Measured rating differences between officers and members.  
Tested the association between meaningful interpersonal relationships and role in CAB. |
| H6. Student officers will have higher ratings in collaboration.  
   *DV = Collaboration*  
   *IV = Role in CAB* | One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data.  
   Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data. | Measured rating differences between officers and members.  
Tested the association between collaboration and role in CAB. |
| H7. Student officers will have higher ratings in social responsibility.  
   *DV = Social Responsibility*  
   *IV = Role in CAB* | One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data.  
   Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data. | Measured rating differences between officers and members.  
Tested the association between social responsibility and role in CAB. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis Method</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H8.</td>
<td>Student officers will have higher ratings in effective communication.</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data. Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data.</td>
<td>Measured rating differences between officers and members. Tested the association between effective communication and role in CAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV=Effective Communication</td>
<td>IV=Role in CAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9.</td>
<td>Student officers will have higher ratings in multicultural competency.</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data. Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data.</td>
<td>Measured rating differences between officers and members. Tested the association between multicultural competency and role in CAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV=Multicultural Competency</td>
<td>IV=Role in CAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10.</td>
<td>Student officers will have higher ratings in intellectual growth.</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data. Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data.</td>
<td>Measured rating differences between officers and members. Tested the association between intellectual growth and role in CAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV=Intellectual Growth</td>
<td>IV=Role in CAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11.</td>
<td>Student officers will have higher ratings in clarified values.</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with categorical data. Pearson chi-square: Two independent samples between subjects with categorical data.</td>
<td>Measured rating differences between officers and members. Tested the association between clarified values and role in CAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV=Clarified Values</td>
<td>IV=Role in CAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12.</td>
<td>Students with higher length of time will have a positive relationship between time and ratings.</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA: Two independent samples, between subjects with ordinal data.</td>
<td>Test the relationship between length of time in the organization and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV=Core Competencies</td>
<td>IV=Length of Time in CAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This study used a quantitative design to investigate student self-ratings across 10 core competencies for officers and members of campus activities boards at seven public institutions in the Midwest. In Chapter 4, the results of the analysis are presented. In addition, descriptive information about the sample is provided.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to measure the student self-ratings of campus activities board officers and members. Three research questions were asked and measured by the National Association for Campus Activities Competency Guide for College Student Leaders. This instrument measures 10 core competencies. There are three research questions in this study and 12 hypotheses.

Research question 1: What is the level of agreement between the students’ self-ratings and advisors’ response?

H1: Students and advisors will have no difference between the ratings on the core competencies.

Research question 2: What are the differences in ratings between student officers and student committee members? Each core competency has its own hypothesis.

H2. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in leadership development.

H3. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in assessment and evaluation.

H4. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in event management.

H5. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in meaningful interpersonal relationships.

H6. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in collaboration.
H7. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in social responsibility.

H8. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in effective communication.

H9. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in multicultural competency.

H10. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in intellectual growth.

H11. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in clarified values.

Research question 3: What is the relationship between length of time in the organization and student ratings?

H12. Students with a longer length of time in the organization will have no relationship between length of time and ratings.

This chapter will report the research findings including the subject demographics, results for each hypothesis, and summary of the findings.

**Research Findings**

The survey “NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders” (Appendix C) assessed the ten core competencies that students are believed to gain while participating in campus activities boards. Each core competency was defined and four questions were asked on each competency. Students were asked to rate themselves on each competency on a scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree that the students had gained this
competency while involved with CAB. Advisors rated each student from their institution on the same scale for each competency.

The survey was disseminated to seven public universities in the Midwest to campus activities board officers and members. Seven advisors were also included in the study. The student survey was dispersed to 71 individuals. Thirty-six participants completed the survey for a 51% response rate. Students from one institution did not respond to the survey. Overall advisor response rate was 90%. One advisor did not respond and this advisor data was not used in this study. To create matched pairs to answer research question one, both advisors and students from the same institution needed to complete the survey; however if students responded and the advisor did not, this data was used for research question two and three.

**Subject demographics.** Demographic information was collected for all of the respondents. The focus of the study was students, so more information was collected from these respondents. Advisor information was also collected. Demographics are useful to describe the survey sample and inform the results.

**Student.** The information collected on student demographics include age, gender, class status in school, the number of semesters the participant had been involved in the campus activities board and the position currently held in the organization. The age of the student participants ranged from 18 years old to 24 or older with the 11 participants selecting 20 years old. Twenty-one years old had the next highest number with 10 respondents followed by eight respondents choosing 22 years old, and four respondents choosing 19 years old. The 24 or older had two respondents and 18 years old had one respondent. The order of class status in school from highest to lowest number of respondents was senior with 14 respondents, junior
with 12, sophomore with six, and freshman with two respondents. The other category had two respondents which included fifth year and just graduated. These two respondents were included in the senior category.

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents identified their gender as female and 33% as male. Eleven participants identified their position on the campus activities board as a member while ten participants chose Committee Chair. President and vice president had three participants each with treasurer and secretary selected once respectively. Seven individuals choose “other” for position on CAB, but after review of the information, these seven could be considered committee chairs as well. The number of semester’s students had been involved with the campus activities board ranged from one to eight semesters. Seven students each chose two and three semesters, six students each chose one and four semesters, four students selected eight semesters, three students each chose five and six semesters, and no one chose seven semesters of involvement in the campus activities board. While the majority of respondents were juniors and seniors in college, the highest number of involvement by semester was two and three semesters. This may indicate that students are joining the campus activities board later in their collegiate career. The reported class statuses of junior and senior are consistent with the reported ages of the respondents.

**Advisor.** Information collected on advisors was gender and the number of semesters they had advised the organization. While only eight advisors were invited to participate in the study, there were responses from ten total advisors. Advisors may have shared the link with co-advisors or mistakenly chosen the incorrect gender when filling out the survey. In addition, it is not uncommon to have shared advising responsibilities at larger institutions for the
campus activities board. At larger institutions, there can be more committees, programs, and students involved and impacted by the programs. The duties for advisement are split between advisors to help facilitate the organization, share the responsibility, and reduce staff burn out.

Five advisors identified their gender as female and five as male. One of the institution’s advisors did not rate any of the students. The length of time the advisors had been serving in this role with the campus activities board ranged from one semester to 46 semesters. This number of semesters is referring to the academic year, or fall and spring semesters only. While the staff still retains responsibility for the summer semester, campus activities boards have minimal commitments in the summer. Typically, not many students are around at this time. Combined experience for female advisors was 77 semesters and for male advisors it was 75 semesters. Collectively the male and female advisors had almost the same length of time advising and both genders were equally represented. The above demographic information describes the population surveyed for both the student participants and advisor participants. The next section will address responses to each hypothesis.

**Results of the hypothesis.** Each research question will be discussed with the corresponding hypothesis or hypotheses. Statistical tests are identified for each hypothesis and results will be shared. The results will determine if hypotheses are supported or not.

**Research Question One.** What is the level of agreement between the students’ self-ratings and the advisor’s response?
H1. Students and advisors will have no difference between the ratings on the core competencies.

The first hypothesis assessed the difference between student self-ratings and advisor ratings on the core competencies. Students and advisor data was paired on the core competencies. A total score was identified for each competency by group. The groups were students and advisors. From the data, there were 28 matched pairs of students and advisors. The matched pair indicates the advisor and a student from the same institution both responded to the survey.

A paired sample t-test was used to determine if there was a difference between the means of the student ratings and the advisor ratings. The test yielded significant differences between the student ratings and the advisor ratings, $t = 2.601$, $t$ critical value $= 2.052$ with an alpha level of .05. There is also a negative relationship between means. The negative relationship between the means identifies that as the student self-ratings increased the advisor ratings decreased or vice versa. Paired Sample t-test results are presented in Table 2.
Table 2

Paired Samples T-Test Results for Student and Advisor Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Total Competency</td>
<td>133.2500</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.02597</td>
<td>2.46168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Total Competency</td>
<td>121.5357</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.12607</td>
<td>3.42550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Correlations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Total &amp; Advisor Total Competencies</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Total &amp; Advisor Total Competencies</td>
<td>11.71429</td>
<td>23.82787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Total &amp; Advisor Total Competencies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>2.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these findings the data does not support hypothesis 1. There is a difference in means on the core competencies between students and advisors. To answer the first research question, the level of agreement between student and advisor ratings is an inverse relationship.

Research Question Two. What are the differences in ratings between student officers and student committee members? Not all students completed each of their ratings on the core
competencies. Event management competency had 33 respondents. Collaboration, effective communication, and assessment and evaluation had 34 respondents. A total of 35 respondents completed their ratings on the following competencies: leadership development, meaningful interpersonal relationships, social responsibility, multicultural competency, intellectual growth, and clarified values. The means for each core competency were calculated for all the observed outcomes. The standard deviation for each core competency was also calculated to determine the distribution of scores. The standard deviation is used to judge if the mean is representative of the average response. In this study, the means and standard deviation did not tell the whole story. The scores for each core competency are close to the mean and displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Each Core Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Competency</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.8000</td>
<td>1.69428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.1429</td>
<td>1.83340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Management</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.4000</td>
<td>2.56905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.6571</td>
<td>1.60775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.5714</td>
<td>2.10442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.8571</td>
<td>1.59305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.1143</td>
<td>1.96695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Competency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.1429</td>
<td>1.80103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Growth</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.1143</td>
<td>1.74510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarified Values</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.3143</td>
<td>1.81126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For hypotheses 2 through 11, the Pearson chi square test was used. This test determines if there is a difference between the observed and expected frequencies.

For all Pearson chi square calculations in hypotheses two through eleven, data was combined into two student categories, executive officers and members. The executive committee
officers included the president, vice president, treasurer, and secretary positions. Members included all other categories. Student scores were then grouped into a high and low category. These categories were identified from the individual scores of students on each competency. There was a natural break in the data that determined the lower and upper scores. For all scores on the core competencies, the lower scores are 13 or less and upper scores are 14-16. This was done to create a large enough sample size to determine if a relationship exists. Social responsibility scores were the only core competency that did not have individual scores as high as identified above. This was an interesting item of note. This could mean that social responsibility as defined by this instrument is not focused on during students’ engagement with campus activities boards or students did not identify this core competency as highly with this organization and maybe attribute this competency to another student experience. This could be as simple as social responsibility is not part of the purpose of the campus activities board and therefore not a focus of students engagement with the organization. Social responsibility lower scores are nine and below and upper scores is 10-12. Then an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was completed to determine if there was a difference among the mean scores of the groups. Each test was completed for each core competency.

Hypotheses 2 through 11 are all student self-ratings for each competency. Due to the role of executive officers, these students tend to have additional responsibilities for leading the organization then members. The time involved to complete these responsibilities may have enhanced a student’s skill while fulfilling these roles. Each hypothesis will be discussed below.
H2. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in leadership development.

Hypothesis 2 assessed the differences between student officers and members on the leadership development core competency. After reading the description on the survey for leadership development, participants answered questions related to their role in CAB and rated themselves on four questions using a Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. These questions were: understands the skill set of the membership and utilizes it effectively for engaging them in accomplishing the group’s goals; hold self and members accountable; develops an organization inclusive of teambuilding, collaboration, and strategic planning; and encourages institutional pride and community building among student body. A one-way ANOVA was used to measure differences between the groups. The test yielded no statistically significant differences, F (8, 27) = 0.529, p = 3.841.

Pearson chi square cross tabulation was also completed to look at the relationship between board position and leadership development. Cross tabulation frequencies, showing frequencies of executive committee and members, are present in Table 4. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the leadership development core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.

Table 4

Observations of Board Positions by Leadership Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chi square still showed no relationship between position on the board and leadership development. The data supports hypothesis two.

**H3. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in assessment and evaluation.**

The third hypothesis measured the differences between student officers and members on assessment and evaluation. Assessment and evaluation was defined on the survey for participants to review before responding to the questions. The questions asked included the ability to connect the goals and functions of the organization to the programs; ability to design programs and gather evidence to foster intended learning outcomes; ability to measure effectiveness through internal assessments; and the ability to measure service and impact on the student body. The one-way ANOVA, which measured differences between groups, produced no statistical significant differences, $F(8, 26) = 1.000$, $p = 3.841$.

Pearson chi square cross tabulation was also completed to look at the relationship between board position, and assessment and evaluation. This test did not produce any relationship. Frequencies of executive committee and members are displayed in Table 5. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the assessment and evaluation core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.
Table 5

*Observations of Board Positions by Assessment and Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment and Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between assessment and evaluation and board position. The data supports hypothesis 3.

**H4. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in event management.**

Hypothesis 4 evaluated the differences between student officers and members in regards to event management. Questions regarding event management were answered by participants after the opportunity to review a definition of event management. Four questions were asked about this competency. These questions included utilize personnel and financial resources appropriately; implements appropriate risk management strategies; negotiates contract adhering to university policies and practices; and manages program development, implementation, and evaluation in an organized manner. A one-way ANOVA was used to measure differences between the groups. The test yielded no statistical significant difference, $F (8, 25) = .774$, $p = 3.841$.

Cross tabulations using the Pearson chi square test were completed to look at the relationship between board position and event management. Cross tabulation frequencies, showing frequencies of executive committee and members, are present in Table 6. This table
shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the event management core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected frequencies are similar.

Table 6

*Observations of Board Position by Event Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Management</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member</strong></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No relationship was found between board position and event management. The data maintains the fourth hypothesis.

**H5. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in meaningful interpersonal relationships.**

The fifth hypothesis assessed the difference between meaningful interpersonal relationships of student officers and members. Meaningful interpersonal relationships were defined on the survey for participants to review before responding to the questions. The questions included establishing mutually trustworthy and rewarding relationships with various constituents; listen to and reflect upon others’ points of view; treats others with respect and demonstrate that oneself and others matter; develop and maintain satisfying interpersonal relationships that support and clarify personal values, goals and interests. The one-way ANOVA, which measured differences between groups, produced no statistical significant differences, $F(8, 27) = .524$, $p = 3.841$.

Pearson chi square cross tabulation was calculated to determine if a relationship exists between board position and meaningful interpersonal relationships. This test did not produce
any relationship. Frequencies of executive committee and members are displayed in Table 7. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the meaningful interpersonal relationships core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.

Table 7

*Observations of Board Positions by Interpersonal Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Relationships</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no relationship between board position and meaningful interpersonal relationships. The data supports the fifth hypothesis.

**H6. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in collaboration.**

Hypothesis 6 measured the difference between student officers and members ratings on collaboration. Questions regarding collaboration were answered by participants after the opportunity to review a definition of collaboration. Four questions were asked about this competency. These questions included working cooperatively with others, seeking their involvement and feedback; utilizes delegation as a means to involve members; creates formal and informal networks with other leaders to build awareness of issues facing the organization; and promotes and conducts joint programs between organizations. A one-way ANOVA was used to measure differences between the groups. The test generated no statistical significant difference, F (8, 26) = .378, p = 3.841.
Cross tabulations using the Pearson chi square test were completed to look at the relationship between board position and collaboration. Cross tabulation frequencies, showing frequencies of executive committee and members, are present in Table 8. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the collaboration core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected frequencies are similar.

Table 8

*Observations of Board Positions by Collaboration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between collaboration and board position. The data supports the sixth hypothesis.

**H7. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in social responsibility.**

The seventh hypothesis evaluated the difference between student officers and members on social responsibility. Social responsibility was defined on the survey for participants to review before responding to the questions. The questions included appropriately challenges the unfair, unjust or uncivil behavior of other individuals or groups; participates in service/volunteer activities and understands the importance of civic engagement; and understands, abides by and participates in development, maintenance, and/or orderly change of community, social, and legal standards or norms. The one-way ANOVA,
which measured differences between groups, produced no statistical significant differences, \( F(8, 27) = .727, p = 3.841 \).

Pearson chi square cross tabulation was calculated to determine if a relationship exists between board position and social responsibility. This test did not produce any relationship. Frequencies of executive committee and members are displayed in Table 9. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the social responsibility core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.

Table 9

*Observations of Board Positions by Social Responsibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Responsibility</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows no relationship between social responsibility and board position. The data supports the seventh hypothesis.

**H8. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in effective communication.**

Hypothesis 8 assessed the difference between student officers and members on effective communication. Questions regarding effective communication were answered by participants after the opportunity to review a definition of effective communication. Four questions were asked about this competency. These questions included convey messages and influences others through writing, speaking or non-verbal expression; develops and facilitates
thoughtful presentations; works in teams and multicultural settings; and illustrates the effective use of listening skills. A one-way ANOVA was used to measure differences between the groups. The test produced no statistical significant difference, $F(8, 26) = .849$, $p = 3.841$.

Cross tabulations using the Pearson chi square test were completed to look at the relationship between board position and effective communication. Cross tabulation frequencies, showing frequencies of executive committee and members, are present in Table 10. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on effective communication core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected frequencies are similar.

Table 10

*Observations of Board Positions by Effective Communication*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Communication</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between effective communication and board position. The data supports the eighth hypothesis.

**H9. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in multicultural competency.**

The ninth hypothesis measured the difference between student officers and members on multicultural competency. Multicultural competency was defined on the survey for participants to review before responding to the questions. The questions included recognizing the contributions diversity brings to their own campus and society; seeks involvement with
different people from oneself; advocates for equality and inclusiveness; and positively impacts others’ perspective on diversity. The one-way ANOVA, which measured differences between groups, produced no statistical significant differences, $F (8, 27) = .529, p = 3.841$.

Pearson chi square cross tabulation was calculated to determine if a relationship exists between board position and multicultural competency. This test did not produce any relationship. Frequencies of executive committee and members are displayed in Table 11. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on multicultural core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.

Table 11

*Observations of Board Positions by Multicultural Competency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multicultural Competency</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between multicultural competency and board position. The data supports the ninth hypothesis.

**H10. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in intellectual growth.**

Hypothesis 10 evaluated the difference between student officers and members in intellectual growth. Questions regarding intellectual growth were answered by participants after the opportunity to review a definition of intellectual growth. Four questions were asked about this competency. These questions included apply previously understood information and concepts to new situations or settings; produces personal and educational goal statements;
uses complex information from a variety of sources including personal experience and observation to form a decision or opinion; and makes connections between campus involvement and curricular studies. A one-way ANOVA was used to measure differences between the groups. The test produced no statistical significant difference, $F(8, 27) = .981$, $p = 3.841$.

Cross tabulations using the Pearson chi square test were completed to look at the relationship between board position and intellectual growth. Cross tabulation frequencies, showing frequencies of executive committee and members, are present in Table 12. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the intellectual growth core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected frequencies are similar.

Table 12

*Observations of Board Positions by Intellectual Growth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intellectual Growth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between intellectual growth and board position. The data supports the tenth hypothesis.

**H11. Student officers and student committee members will have no differences in ratings in clarified values.**

The eleventh hypothesis assessed the difference between student officers and members in clarified values. Clarified values were defined on the survey for participants to review before responding to the questions. The questions included demonstrates willingness to
scrutinize personal beliefs and values; identifies personal, work, and lifestyle values and explains how they influence decision making; understands how culture influences one’s own values; and acts and makes decisions in congruence with personal values and mission of the institution. The one-way ANOVA, which measured differences between groups, produced no statistical significant differences, $F(8, 27) = .927, p = 3.841$.

Pearson chi square cross tabulation was also completed to look at the relationship between board position and clarified values. This test did not produce any relationship. Frequencies of executive committee and members are displayed in Table 13. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by group on the clarified values core competency. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.

Table 13

*Observations of Board Position by Clarified Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarified Values</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between clarified values and board position. Therefore, hypothesis 11 is supported by the data.

**Research Question Three.** What is the relationship between length of time in the organization and student ratings?

**H12. Students with a longer length of time in the organization will have no relationship between length of time and ratings.**
The twelfth hypothesis assessed the difference between length of time and total student ratings. Individual student scores per competency were totaled. This created a range of scores from 94 to 156. A natural break occurred at 132 and 133. Students were divided into two groups based on these scores. Group one scores were 94 to 132 and group two scores were 133 to 156. Length of time was measured by semesters and to increase sample size were divided into two groups. Group one included one, two, or three semesters of involvement and group two included four, five, six, and eight semesters. A Pearson chi square cross tabulation was completed to look at the relationship between length of time on the campus activities board and total student ratings. The test produced no statistical difference between the groups, \( p = .229 \), \( p \text{ critical} = 3.841 \).

Frequencies of length of time and total student ratings are displayed in Table 14. This table shows the observed and expected frequency of students by semester, length of time and total student ratings. From this sample, the observed and expected occurrences are similar.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Student Ratings</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show no relationship between length of time and total student ratings. Therefore, hypothesis 12 is supported by the data.
Summary

For research question one regarding the difference between student and advisor ratings, there was a negative relationship and a difference between ratings. As one score increased the other score would decline and vice versa. Regarding research question two, on the differences between student officer and student member ratings, there was no difference found between the groups on any of the ten core competencies measured. There was also no relationship indicated between board position and individual core competencies. For research question three with respect to length of time and total student ratings, no relationship was indicated. Length of time had no effect on overall student ratings.

For each core competency, all hypotheses were supported by the data. Ratings were similar between members and officers. Length of time did not appear to be a factor either on student ratings. It appears that involvement with the campus activities board may have an effect on skill development among the ten core competencies. The level of involvement as a member or executive may not be a contributing factor.

However, the advisor and student ratings are negatively correlated and had a statistically significant difference in ratings. The negative correlation means that as one score goes up the other declines and vice versa. For example, student A may rate themselves very high, but the advisor’s score for student A would be low. Initially this was a surprise, but made sense after it was reviewed. Self-observation is different than a third party observation.

Data analysis was presented in Chapter 4 to explore three research questions. The analysis pertained to comparing student ratings to advisor ratings, core competencies, and length of time and total student ratings. Core competencies included leadership development,
assessments and evaluations, event management, meaningful interpersonal relationships, collaboration, social responsibility, effective communication, multicultural competency, intellectual growth, and clarified values. Itemized results by hypothesis are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

*Results Summary by Hypothesis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported/Not Supported</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Students and advisors will have no difference between the ratings on</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Paired sample t-test indicated a difference in ratings and a negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the core competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>relationship between student and advisor ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Student officers and student committee members will have no</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in ratings in leadership development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Student officers and student committee members will have no</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in ratings in assessment and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Student officers and student committee members will have no</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in ratings in event management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Student officers and student committee members will have no</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in ratings in meaningful interpersonal relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leadership development and meaningful interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Student officers and student committee members will have no</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in ratings in collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leadership development and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Student officers and student committee members will have no difference in ratings in social responsibility.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups. Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and social responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Student officers and student committee members will have no difference in ratings in effective communication.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups. Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and effective communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Student officers and student committee members will have no difference in ratings in multicultural competency.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups. Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and multicultural competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Student officers and student committee members will have no difference in ratings in intellectual growth.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups. Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and intellectual growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11: Student officers and student committee members will have no difference in ratings in clarified values.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference among groups. Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between board position and clarified values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12: Students with a longer length of time in the organization will have no relationship between length of time and ratings.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Pearson chi-square indicated no relationship between length of time and ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the data analysis, conclusions based on the results, and limitations of the study. This chapter will also include recommendations and a summary.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The first two chapters of this dissertation introduced the research study and the literature review that was conducted prior to this study. The literature reviewed included a variety of extracurricular involvement such as leadership programs and training, students’ perception of out of class experiences, leadership within specific majors, and institutional expenditures on leadership activities. The review also identified the lack of research on campus activities boards. In chapter three the research study was described, including the targeted population, methodology, and instruments used for this study. Chapter 4 presented the findings that emerged from this study. This study measured student self-ratings of campus activities board leaders and members at seven public Midwest institutions. Discussion of the results presented in chapter four and conclusions from the data will be outlined in this chapter. Recommendations for additional research areas will be provided.

Discussion

As previously articulated through the review of other research studies regarding extracurricular involvement, there are many ways students benefit from their involvement outside the classroom. Benefits such as interpersonal development, decision making, functioning effectively in groups and programming skills are examples (Kuh, 1995, Morell & Morrell, 1986). Campus activities boards are one of these opportunities for students to be engaged on campus. It is reasonable to consider that the benefits identified from other leadership opportunities that some benefits would be demonstrated by students who participate in CAB. This study supports this hypothesis for these institutions. Due to the small sample size, this study cannot be generalized to other campuses. The sample consisted of 67%
female and 33% male participants. The participant ages fell within the traditionally aged students and class status was represented with participants from the freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior class. The response rate for participants was 51% and there was a strong advisor response at 90%. Each research question will be discussed below.

Comparison of student self-ratings and advisor ratings. Student self-ratings and advisor ratings results on the ten core competencies were negatively correlated and statistically significant. A negative correlation indicates that as one number increases the other will decrease and/or as one number decreases the other increases. For example, if a student self-rated high on the core competencies; the advisor rating for that student would be low. This provides an opportunity for discussion between the student and advisor. The student’s self-perception may not be an accurate representation of the student’s skill level. An outside observer of the student’s behavior provides a benchmark for the student to compare to for growth and self-awareness. Each core competency had a definition so a common language was used for each group. The instrument uses 10 core competencies and also provides a score for each individual core competency. This is similar to a recent study by Peck (2015) that surveyed students and employers on the student skills level. Students’ self-evaluations were higher than what the employers rated them. This raises questions of how to assist students in gaining the skills and communicating the desired skills to an employer. What the study did not illuminate was did the students actually have the desired skills or did they not effectively articulate examples of the desired skills (Peck, 2015).

This is similar to the students and advisors scores. The results show an inverse relationship and it provides an opportunity for students and the advisor to review each core
competency individually to identify areas of similarity and difference. Comparisons could be run to identify those areas by student, compared to advisor ratings, for a more robust discussion between the two groups. This discussion could also bring critical areas to light that the advisor was not aware of in regard to the student skill or behavior. It could also provide the student an opportunity to provide examples on each core competency and how the student felt s/he met each item of the core competencies. As an advisor working with many students, it is hard to know each student in depth and observe all behavior for each student if the advisor has a large campus activities board to work with. Additionally, an advisor may not connect with each student in the same way. The discussion and reflection are the important pieces for the students and the advisor.

Student sport club leaders reported improved skills in organizing, planning, delegating, balancing academic personal and professional roles, mentoring and motivating others, decision making, working with diverse others, and giving and receiving feedback by being involved when student affairs professionals supervised the activity. (Peck, 2015, p. 3)

This is a similar relationship to student leaders in campus activities boards and their advisors. Advisors to CAB are typically Student Affairs professionals and are trained to pull out meaning of learning activities (Peck, 2015). Advisors also need to take into account the mission, purpose, responsibility, time and breadth of their roles and the institutions which could impact scores in various ways. Advisors can also structure training to provide intentionality in the activities to maximize students’ development.

The skills identified above are similar to the components of the 10 core competencies. This suggests that similar experiences in the co-curricular areas lead to skill development. In addition, students who participated or were leaders of student organizations had gained skills
while in college (Peck, 2015). Advisor ratings may also have been higher on a core competency than the individual student scores and provide a confidence boost to the student. The advisor could provide examples to the student on how the core competency was met and provide language for the student to articulate his/her skill development. Often times it is easier to identify skills and examples of those skills in others than ourselves. As an individual observes behavior in a peer, sometimes it is harder to identify that same behavior in themselves and therefore, the student may have rated themselves lower than others see them. Since aggregate scores were used, this does not illuminate the individual scores per core competency. There may be many or few differences per core competency per student and advisor.

These types of discussions between student and advisor are a frequent occurrence with campus activities boards and their advisors. The instrument used provides a framework to continue the conversation. In addition, the advisor can begin to assist the student in constructing meaning of the activities and applicability to academics and their future employment. While the study does not illuminate if the difference is large or small, it does provide an opportunity for further research into the relationship between the advisor and the student. In addition, students who are already involved when they enter college or once at college may have sought out this experience themselves. This may impact the student scores. If a student has already been involved s/he may tend to think highly of his/her skills more than is realistically warranted. This would be different compared to the student who was encouraged by an advisor, who saw potential in that student to join the organization. A student who was encouraged to join CAB may be unsure of his/her skills and would rate
herself/himself lower than the advisor or have a harder time identifying their individual competency for particular skill. This provides an area for future research to compare scores of the students who self-selected into the organization versus those students who were recruited. As Riepe (2011) articulated there may be a difference between the intentional and unintentional skill development that students experience as part of their involvement. The next research question focused on the differences between officers and members on the core competencies.

**Comparison of student officers and student committee members.** For all 10 core competencies there was no statistical difference between student officers and committee members. The 10 core competencies are leadership development, assessment and evaluation, event management, meaningful interpersonal relationships, collaboration, social responsibility, effective communication, multicultural competency, intellectual growth, and clarified values. Scores were compared by board position and each individual core competency. Board positions were executive officers which included the president, vice president, treasurer and secretary positions. All others were considered to be in the member group which included committee chair. To increase the sample size for the comparison the categories were condensed by total ratings. Lower and upper scores were determined based on the individual scores of students on each competency. A natural break in the data was identified. The core competencies had similar scores and used the same numbers to define the upper (14-16) and lower scores (13 and below). Only the social responsibility competency had a different scale. The upper score was 10-12 and lower score was nine and below. Even
with the different scale, there is not a difference between student officers and committee members. The scores are similar on all the core competencies.

In addition, for all the core competencies, the standard deviation was small which means the scores are grouped around the mean for each competency. The scores had a very small distribution. All scores were within two standard deviations of the mean for each competency. This could also account for why there is not a difference between officers and members on the core competencies.

Campus activities boards are structured to provide activities for the student body. Responsibility is shared among all CAB participants because the organization tends to have a committee structure and there is always an opportunity to be in a leadership role in some way. Many of these activities can be traditions such as homecoming, little sib’s, or family weekend which require many hands to successfully host these events. These organizations tend to be well organized, on-boards new members pretty well, and has a strong support system with a dedicated advisor. There are many opportunities for students to practice the core competencies throughout the academic year. Knowledge is tested and reorganized in a meaningful way within these outside activities (Kuh 1995).

For example, campus activities boards tend to have a good filing system or record keeping process. This can assist an individual or the group in achieving their task by providing a blueprint for event planning, what worked well in the past, and various other suggestions or tips so the students are not re-creating the process for traditions that occur on campus. This is different in comparison to other student organizations on campus. Responsibility may only be shared among the officers and not delegated to the members as
much. With CAB, everyone has responsibility for a task for most events. There are more opportunities to practice the skills identified in the core competencies because events change and tasks change. The nature of the campus activities board provides a wide variety of activities and is not focused in one particular area such as student government or a service organization like Circle K.

Larger or more heavily funded organizations, such as campus programming boards, offer students the opportunity to select outside speakers or performers to appear on college campuses. These are learning opportunities for both the participants and the event coordinators as they consider the wants and needs of their campus community. (Wooten, Hunt, LeDuc, & Poskus, 2012, p. 52)

Training for the organization is usually broad based and not unique to the position that a member holds. Expectations of all members are similar and opportunities to engage in all of the core competencies are open to all individuals to gain experience. The organization as a whole might be the environment for individuals to develop the core competencies. Members and leaders work side by side and provide a peer leadership opportunity which assists with the strength of the organization. Content knowledge is passed on to create successful programs (Wooten et al., 2012).

Additionally, while the survey instrument asked the students to reflect on their experiences within the campus activities board, students may have already developed these core competencies in another student organization and applied them within the new context of CAB. It may have been hard for the participants to separate their experiences to just the campus activities board. The students involved may have been involved in other organizations which could have contributed to these findings. The last research question focused on length of time and student ratings.
Comparison of length of time and ratings. In the comparison of length of time to student ratings, there was no statistical difference. From the sample, a student could be involved in one semester and up to eight semesters and have gained the same benefit on the core competencies. This was surprising because ideally more time builds greater knowledge and experience in a particular activity. Length of time does not appear to impact student ratings on the core competencies. However, this was a composite score over time. There may be individual differences on the core competencies that identified development for an individual student. The individual differences cannot be seen in the composite score and this may have been balanced out in the total score. For example if student A rated herself with a strongly agree on event management and student B rated himself with disagree on that same competency and then on the interpersonal relationships competency student B rated himself as a strongly agree and student A rated herself as disagree, the composite score would be the same for these students. This is different than the results from the Riepe (2011) study. Length of time was a factor in making an impact on skill development.

This could also be attributed to each participant had to be in the organization for at least a semester to participate in the study. One semester of involvement provides a certain level of knowledge, experience, and understanding of the group’s inner workings. The learning curve may be steep the first semester, but level-off after a student has familiarity. A better assessment might be to compare students in their first semester to those with more semesters of experience or a longitudinal study of the same student for individual growth assessment.
In addition, students who have been in the organization longer may have a more accurate assessment of their skill level than a student who has only been in CAB for a short period of time. For example, seniors may rate themselves in comparison to other student leaders or have more exposure to other student leaders on campus and this could affect their rating; whereas a freshman or sophomore may not have that same peer circle or exposure to other leaders for comparison.

In summary, the campus activities board experience is a student involvement experiences that impacts students. From this study, it was shown that there is a negative inverse relationship between the student scores and advisors scores and that no difference in scores was reported between officers and members. In addition, time did not affect scores. However, this raises interesting questions about why this organization does not show a difference between officers and members and why does length of time in the organization not have an impact. While this study did illuminate the negative inverse relationship between advisors and students, it does not speak to the influence that relationship has on the student scores. The relationship between the advisor and student could be underestimated or the impact the relationship has on skill development. How much time does the advisor have to spend on the relationship could impact the scores as well. In addition, if the advisor is burnt out in their current role or brand new to their position, this could affect the relationship and student skill development. Advisors may not connect with all students equally so a closer relationship might influence the scores too. “Many nonacademic events and relationships which occur in college effect student development and learning. These influences need to be cultivated, measured and reported in order for universities to develop students both in and out
of the classroom” (Moore et al., 1998 p. 7). This is an area for further consideration. This study has provided a few answers for students at these institutions and in turn has raised more questions.

**Limitations**

There were several limitations of this study. It was harder to get individuals to respond than anticipated. Initial inquiries to gauge interest suggested a larger sample size; however, when it came time to deploy the survey, the sample size decreased significantly. This could have been attributed to students not understanding the importance of the study and choosing not to participate or the time of year the students and advisors were asked to respond. It could have been related to the relationship the students had with advisor who asked the students to participate. The relationship could be a close or more peripheral relationship which may have inspired students to participate or not. The students could also have felt that the survey had no impact on them. Lastly, the students may not have trusted their responses were truly anonymous.

The response rate for the sample size was good; but one institution’s students did not participate at all. Inquiries to determine the cause were not returned. This entire institution had to be excluded from the study. In the beginning, eight institutions were invited to participate in the study. If 10 institutions had been invited, this may have increased the sample size and could have allowed for attrition. The small sample size does not allow for generalization to other campuses. Sample size also required some grouping of data into categories which loses specificity of the results. An increased sample size may have shown differing results. The increased number of advisors rating the students may or may not have
impacted the results. Consistency of ratings between the advisors at the same campus was not addressed in this study. Accounting for the culture of each campus and the impact on the students was not controlled for in this study.

All individuals volunteered for this study and this does not account for maturation of the individual. Other experiences that the student has engaged in while in the collegiate environment may contribute to the student ratings score, but may not have been observed by the advisor. Another limitation may be students might have responded to the questions with the researcher in mind and not necessarily with their perspective in mind. Examples of this could be answering the questions from the perspective of what would my advisor like to hear or see and what would be helpful for the researcher in this study. Depending on the campus and if the campus was experiencing any financial constraints that students were aware of, answering the questions in a positive manner could provide research to continue support of these activities and may have influenced students responses. Another limitation might be the survey does not specify the quantity or quality of involvement. An example of this could be asking the students to quantify their involvement in CAB on a Likert scale from little involvement such as attending weekly meetings to moderate involvement which could be attending meetings and completing assigned tasks to a high level of involvement. A high level of involvement could be spending time in the Student Life office several times a week. The scale could also be measured by hours per week or month spent on campus activities board tasks. This could be added to the demographic data collected.
Implications for Research

1. Future areas of research could include broadening the survey area to increase the sample size. If the sample size was increased it could allow for more specificity of the results by position type and potentially a difference between officer and member scores may arise or may support these findings. This could also allow for any differences in demographics to be used and could show other findings that may indicate an impact or a relationship. Examples could be a comparison of experiences by gender or by type of institution that would allow for institutions to promote the value added of these types of experiences and provide context for usefulness of Student Affairs. In addition, potentially adding one or two opened ended questions to provide some qualitative data around student provided examples to illustrate how they built the skills could enhance the usefulness for Student Affairs and add context to the experience. Riepe’s study (2011) found an impact on gender and the open-ended questions offered specific examples of what was gained by students.

2. Identifying the number of advisors at each institution who would contribute to the survey and providing a rubric for scores to the advisors could increase the consistency of scores between advisors. A rubric provides a guideline with which to observe and comment on behavior. While the instrument has common definitions for each core competency, providing a rubric would define the expectations for students and advisors to know what to look for and reduce any subjectivity. The rubric could be shared with the students after an initial pre-test as they enter the organization. A post-test could be administered when the student leaves the organization to determine growth.
3. Administering this instrument on campus activities board alumni of the institution one year after graduation to determine if these competencies are used in the work force is another area to consider for future research. As evidenced by the NACE Job Outlook Spring Update (2014, April), employers are seeking employees who have decision making, problem solving, and communication skills along with leadership experience, this could provide an opportunity to identify if these experiences in CAB are being used beyond the collegiate environment and to what extent. This could provide the data for Student Affairs to align and design extracurricular experiences to enhance these skills for the workforce. From the departmental perspective, research like this would allow the staff to understand the impact beyond the immediate impression that is made with student. The Cress et al. study (2001) supports the idea of gains from co-curricular experiences in alumni.

4. Identifying the impetus for students to get involved might provide Student Affairs staff the ability to better assist students in finding the right fit for extracurricular activities that will enhance their collegiate experience. Did the student self-select to be in the organization or were they recruited. Is there a greater or similar impact on students who self-select or are recruited to participate in extracurricular activities could shift efforts and resources for departments. Identifying if the student is involved in other organizations on campus and what role would also be useful to determine in the context of motivation and identifying skill development. The student may be involved broadly on campus and truly is part of the student leaders on campus so there may not be a distinct difference if they are a member or officer in CAB. In addition, compare the scores of student involved with the campus activities board and other organizations might yield interesting results or see if they are the same.
Broadening the instrument to see if it applies to other student organizations within the institution might provide new ideas on how to construct the student life experience. The instrument itself might be useful with other organizations such as student senate, hall councils/residence hall associations, civic engagement activities and others. In addition, Logue et al. (2005) also identified other areas of research such as the negative effect of leadership roles, the goals and objectives of extracurricular activities, and the long term effects of the busy lifestyle on students. While the literature supports the positive nature of student involvement, there may be negative effects overlooked. This is an important consideration when creating an environment for skill development.

5. The relationship between the advisor and student is another area for future research. Looking into the advisor and student relationship within student organizations may provide opportunities to create best practices for intentional skill development and growth for the student and the advisor. Does the advisor-student rapport impact skill development within student organizations advising which could provide useful information to enhance these experiences. From the literature, peer mentoring and faculty-student mentoring has been shown to have an impact on student learning (Cooper et al., 1994; Kuh, 1995; McNamara & Cover, 1999; Peck, 2015; Strayhorn, 2008; Wells & Grabert, 2004). This particular area has not been explored within the context of student organizations. In addition, did the student self-select to be involved in the organization or was the student recruited into the group and is there an impact on the relationship and students skill development would be another area to explore.
Implications for Theory

Astin’s (1999) theory of involvement refers to the energy an individual invests into an experience. The focus is on the active participation of the student in the learning process. The level of learning that occurs depends on the level of involvement by the student. The nature of campus activities boards lend themselves to be an engaging organization for student involvement to occur. Because involvement is a continuum (based on one of the five postulates of the theory) and students manifest this continuum differently, this was a useful lens by which to view this study (Astin, 1999). Student ratings on the core competencies were on a continuum, while there was no statistical difference; all the scores were not the same. There was a range. In the analysis, scores were grouped as needed into upper and lower scores. Students were also engaged in the organization for various lengths of time. While this study did not fit Astin’s theory of the more energy invested into an activity, the more learning occurs, the theory itself does not account for what an individual brings into the experience. It also does not account for the structure of campus activities boards which provide many opportunities for everyone to have responsibility for the organization outcomes. However, creating a baseline for each member of the study, then time may be a factor and could be in line with the theory. Increasing the sample size might also support Astin’s theory and looking at each competency individually over time could also be a factor. In addition, Riepe’s study supports the greater the length of time a student experience in the campus activities board the more likely s/he would develop skills on various factors (2011).
Implications for Practice

As mentioned earlier, research has demonstrated the value of extracurricular experiences, but there is limited research that specifically pertains to campus activities boards. This study begins to fill the gap. Recommendations for the field include:

1. Encouraging other student organizations to broaden their organizational structure.

On the NACA ten core competencies, there was not a significant difference between an officer and member rating. There was an inverse relationship between the students and advisor ratings and length of time in CAB did not indicate a significant difference. This study provides an opportunity for Student Affairs professionals to think about how advisors engage with students in organizations, the importance of recruitment of students who may not self-select into the organization, and replication of the CAB structure to other student organizations. Campus Activities Board officers and members learn about the various needs of their fellow students when programming different events. This enhances their ability to analyze situations and identify potential opportunities (Wooten et al., 2012). This responsibility for planning events for their peers provides CAB students with practical application of their leadership skills and the responsibility is on all members of the group, not just the officers. The interesting part of this study was the lack of difference between officers and members on the core competencies. Campus activities boards are unique in their purpose and structure. Members are getting just as much out of the organization as the officers are in skills, abilities and knowledge. Replicating the committee structure or a broader structure to other organizations could provide a positive impact on the student body as a whole.
Oftentimes the advisor may do the initial training for the students. The goal of advising is to produce growth, self-determination and learning along with sharing one’s wisdom and experience, information and opinion (Riepe, 2011). Advisors should work with the returning students who can create and implement training topics to teach their peers. This enhances the returning student’s skills as well as the incoming students.

2. Designing training around learning outcomes based on the core competencies, using this instrument to collect data to look for trends, assisting in students articulating this experience for future employers and as a discussion tool to deepen the conversation between advisor and student. The NACA core competencies defines each area and leadership not only by position, but also as those who take responsibility for any role in facilitating a campus program (Wooten et al., 2012). This provides an opportunity to further strengthen that out of class activities are educational purposeful and have an impact on the student experience by being more intentional in the design of these activities. This also provides Student Affairs staff a foundation to underscore the importance of these activities and demonstrate that involvement contributes to student skill development (Wooten et al., 2012). The NACA core competencies guide is also a tool that can be used to evaluate students’ experience.

3. Documenting and assessing activities such as the Campus Activities Board as a tool for students to use as they enter the workforce. As discussed in chapter one, employers are looking for individuals who can make decisions and be a problem solver; communicate with various constituents inside and outside the organization; obtain, analyze and process information; and plan, organize and prioritize tasks (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2014 April). All of these skills are found in the core competencies of leadership
development, assessment and evaluation, event management, meaningful interpersonal relationships, collaboration, social responsibility, effective communication, multicultural competency, intellectual growth and clarified values. The challenge is articulating the student experience in the campus activities board into the language of the employer. Employers are influenced by candidates who have held a leadership position (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2013). Using this information to educate Student Affairs professionals to include leadership experiences on student resumes and assist students in how to translate these experiences to the world of work is the next step in creating the tie. A useful tool to assist in the tie might be a co-curricular transcript or other mechanism that can provide a way for students to document their skill development for the various competencies (Parnell & Green, 2016).

In addition, this is one tool that can be used for articulating how the campus activities board experience compliments the academic curriculum. From the literature review, many of the core competencies were identified as supporting the collegiate experience and learning for students (Astin, 1999; Cress et al., 2001; Kuh, 1995; McNamara & Cover, 1999; Moore et al., 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). This data could be useful in providing additional justification of why the campus activities board exists and the resources associated with the organization. The data could also be used to influence how student activity fees are constructed and the programs that it supports. This study can lead institutions to evaluate the resources identified for involvement and look to make changes to be more effective for student development.
Conclusions

Previous research has reinforced the notion that out of class experiences contribute to student development and learning, persistence to graduate and enhance leadership skills that are important in the work environment (Astin, 1999; Kuh, 1995; Elkins et al., 2011; Moore et al., 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Current literature focuses on student organizations as a whole and not on a specific organization. The purpose of this study was to explore student self-ratings of leaders and members of one out of class experience, the campus activities board, on the NACA ten core competencies. The core competencies are leadership development, assessment and evaluation, event management, meaningful interpersonal relationships, collaboration, social responsibility, effective communication, multicultural competency, intellectual growth and clarified values. This study supports the existing research regarding extracurricular activities and found that students involved in campus activities boards reported skill development from their involvement.

This study set out to answer three research questions related to a targeted population and that goal was achieved. The first involved the level of agreement between the students’ self-ratings and advisors’ responses. The study found that the student and advisor ratings were negatively correlated and statistically significant. This provides an opportunity for the student and advisor to compare ratings on each core competency to find similarities and differences to direct and encourage more development on the competencies.

The differences in ratings between student officers and student committee members was the second research question. The study compared officers and members on each of the ten core competencies and there was no statistical difference between the groups. The scores
were similar on all competencies with the exception of social responsibility. This raised interesting questions for future areas of research to look at how the campus activities board functions and how responsibilities are shared among all participants to practice and develop the skills of the core competencies.

The final research question was, what is the relationship between length of time in the organization and student ratings? There was no statistical difference found between time and student ratings. To be included in the study all participants had to have been involved for at least a semester in the campus activities board. The semester of involvement provided a certain level of knowledge, experience and understanding of the organization's inner workings. This is different than other studies that looked at length of time and skill development and Astin’s theory of involvement.

In addition, the study contributes to the literature focusing on a specific area of extracurricular involvement, campus activities boards, which little research exists. The results are specific to the institutions that participated and cannot be generalized to other campuses. Although the goals of this study were reached, more work remains to determine a more holistic picture of what skill development looks like from the campus activities board.
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### Appendix A: CAS Standards Map to NACA Core Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS Domains</th>
<th>CAS Dimensions</th>
<th>NACA Core Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge acquisition, construction, integration and application | Understanding knowledge from a range of disciplines  
Construing knowledge  
Relating knowledge to daily life  
Connecting knowledge to other knowledge, ideas & experiences | Assessment and Evaluation  
Intellectual Growth |
| Cognitive Complexity                 | Critical thinking  
Reflective thinking  
Effective Reasoning  
Creativity | Event Management |
| Intrapersonal Development            | Realistic self-appraisal, self-understanding, & self respect  
Identity development  
Commitment to ethics & integrity  
Spiritual awareness | Clarified Values |
| Interpersonal Development            | Meaningful relationships  
Interdependence  
Collaboration  
Effective leadership | Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships  
Collaboration  
Leadership Development |
| Humanitarian & Civic Engagement      | Understanding & appreciation of cultural & human differences  
Global perspectives  
Social responsibility | Multicultural Competency  
Social Responsibility |
| Practical Competence                 | Pursing goals  
Communicating effectively  
Technological competence  
Managing personal affairs  
Demonstrating professionalism  
Maintaining health & wellness  
Living a purposeful & satisfying life | Effective Communication |
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Appendix C: NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders--Student Survey

1. I attend:
   A. Northern Midwest State University
   B. Southern Midwest State University
   C. Western Midwest State University
   D. Central Midwest State University
   E. Eastern Midwest State University
   F. U of Flagship—Northern Region
   G. U of Flagship—Eastern Region
   H. U of Flagship—Western Region

2. My Tech ID number is:______________

3. I am a:
   A. Freshman
   B. Sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior
   E. Other—Please Specify:_________________

4. My age is:
   A. 18
   B. 19
   C. 20
   D. 21
   E. 22
   F. 23
   G. 24+

5. My gender is:
   A. Female
   B. Male
   C. Transgender

6. How many semesters have you been involved with CAB?___________

7. On the program board, I am:
   A. A member
   B. President
   C. Vice-President
   D. Treasurer
   E. Secretary
   F. Committee Chair
   G. Other Executive Role—Please Specify:______________________
I. Leadership Development

**Description:**
Leadership involves a broad spectrum of skills and character qualities. Student leaders involved in campus activities must understand that their role is to be a positive change agent, to influence others and create a vision. Leadership is a process rather than a position. Leadership is relationship oriented and situational in nature.

In **your role** with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Understands the skill set of the membership and utilizes it effectively for engaging them in accomplishing the group’s goals

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

B. Hold self and members accountable

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

C. Develops an organization inclusive of teambuilding, collaboration and strategic planning

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

D. Encourages institutional pride and community building among student body

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

II. Assessment and Evaluation

**Description:**
Student leaders involved in campus activities should make knowledge-based decisions in regard to resources allocated for the campus programs planned and implemented by their organization. Leaders should possess the ability to effectively evaluate programs as well as assess their campus and community culture. Program evaluations will assure the continued improvement of campus activities and comprehensive assessment will allow campus activities offerings to meet the community development needs of the entire campus.

In **your role** with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Ability to “map” or connect the mission or primary goals or functions of the organization to the activities and programs that the organization facilitates.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
B. Ability to design the right programs, as well as gather the right evidence to foster the intended learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. Ability to measure organizational effectiveness through internal assessments (e.g. pre- and post-membership surveys, leadership & advisor feedback)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. Ability to measure service and impact on student body (or appropriate constituency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### III. Event Management

**Description:**
Student leaders engaged in campus activities have a unique opportunity to learn and practice effective event management. Student leaders should strive toward understanding the appropriate steps and issues involved in event planning and management. Some of the most transferable skills are developed and honed in this area such as contract negotiation, program planning and event promotion.

In **your role** with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Utilizes personnel and financial resources appropriately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Implements appropriate risk management strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. Negotiates contract adhering to college/university policies and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. Manages program development, implementation and evaluation in an organized manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
IV. Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships

Description:
Establishing meaningful interpersonal relationships are critical for successful leadership in campus activities. Student leaders often rely on committee volunteers to carry out the essential tasks related to providing programs and services. The work of campus activities is often supported by several on and off-campus constituencies. Professionalism, diplomacy and recognizing the support of others will enhance organizational effectiveness.

In your role with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Establishes mutually trustworthy and rewarding relationships with students, faculty and staff members, friends, and colleagues

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

B. Listens to and reflects upon others’ points of view

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

C. Treats others with respect; gives value by actively demonstrating that oneself and others matter

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

D. Develops and maintains satisfying interpersonal relationships that support and clarify personal values, goals and interests

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

V. Collaboration

Description:
Collaboration involves seeking the involvement of others and working well with people. Student leaders should actively contribute to the achievement of a group goal. They would seek feedback from others and exhibit growth in their skills as a result of working collaboratively.

In your role with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Works cooperatively with others, seeking their involvement and feedback

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree
B. Utilizes delegation as a means to involve group members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. Creates formal and informal networks with other student leaders to build awareness of the issues facing their organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. Promotes and conducts joint programs between organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VI. Social Responsibility

_Description:_
Student leaders must role model social responsibility at all times but especially when representing the college/university. On and off campus behaviors should match the values of the organization and institution leaders represent.

*In your role* with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Appropriately challenges the unfair, unjust, or uncivil behavior of other individuals or groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Participates in service/volunteer activities and understands the importance of civic engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. Understands, abides by, and participates in the development, maintenance, and/or orderly change of community, social, and legal standards or norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VII. Effective Communication

_Description:_
Effective communication is a core competency needed by student leaders to ensure organizational achievement of goals. When communication is a focal point of student learning individuals will personally benefit and organizations will be run more efficiently.

*In your role* with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.
A. Conveys messages and influence others through writing, speaking, or non-verbal expression
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

B. Develops and facilitates thoughtful presentations
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

C. Works in teams and in multicultural settings
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

D. Illustrates the effective use of listening skills
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

VIII. Multicultural Competency

Description:
Multicultural competency is developed through celebration of diverse cultures, advocacy for the needs and identities of all members within the community, recognition of the diverse communities within the campus community and beyond, education and awareness of the concerns of those diverse communities, and support of the ongoing inclusion, understanding and dignity of all members within and beyond the campus community. Being able to understand one’s own identity, as well as recognizing the similarities and differences of others, will equip students to serve and lead as citizens in a global society.

In your role with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Recognizes the contributions diversity brings to their own campus and society
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

B. Seeks involvement with people different from oneself
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

C. Advocates equality and inclusiveness
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

D. Positively impacts others’ perspective on diversity
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
IX. Intellectual Growth

Description:
Intellectual Growth is central to the mission of higher education and must be a focus in all endeavors inside and outside the classroom. Campus Activities offers a fertile practice field for intellectual development when student leaders and programmers engage in critical thinking, problem solving and decision making. Student leaders should be cognizant of this learning opportunity and apply knowledge learned to enhance organizational goals and personal development.

In your role with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Applies previously understood information and concepts to a new situation or setting

   Strongly Agree     Agree     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

B. Produces personal and educational goal statements

   Strongly Agree     Agree     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

C. Uses complex information from a variety of sources including personal experience and observation to form a decision or opinion

   Strongly Agree     Agree     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

D. Makes connections between campus involvement and curricular studies

   Strongly Agree     Agree     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

X. Clarified Values

Description:
Understanding personal and organizational values play a significant role in achieving effective leadership in Campus Activities. Clarified values offer the leader a compass to navigate through a variety of leadership situations and challenges. Student leaders and programmers should reflect and engage in the process of values clarification to enhance personal growth and organizational effectiveness.

In your role with CAB, please rate yourself based on each of the statements below.

A. Demonstrates willingness to scrutinize personal beliefs and values

   Strongly Agree     Agree     Disagree     Strongly Disagree
B. Identifies personal, work, and lifestyle values and explains how they influence decision-making

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

C. Understands how culture influences one’s own values

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

D. Acts and makes decisions in congruence with personal values and the mission of the institution

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

Thank you for completing this survey. If you wish to enter the random drawing for a chance to win one of the VISA gift cards, please click the ‘Drawing’ link below. Please note that your survey responses will be stored in a database separate from your personal information for the drawing.

Drawing
Or
Finish
Appendix D: NACA Competency Guide for College Student Leaders--Advisor Survey

1. I work at:
   A. Northern Midwest State University
   B. Southern Midwest State University
   C. Western Midwest State University
   D. Central Midwest State University
   E. Eastern Midwest State University
   F. U of Flagship—Northern Region
   G. U of Flagship—Eastern Region
   H. U of Flagship—Western Region

2. My gender is:
   A. Female
   B. Male
   C. Transgender

3. How many semesters have you been advising CAB?__________

Please choose a student’s Tech ID number from the drop down menu to rate. Please rate each student only once on the criteria.

Student Tech ID number is:_______________

XI. Leadership Development

Description:
Leadership involves a broad spectrum of skills and character qualities. Student leaders involved in campus activities must understand that their role is to be a positive change agent, to influence others and create a vision. Leadership is a process rather than a position. Leadership is relationship oriented and situational in nature.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

   E. Understands the skill set of the membership and utilizes it effectively for engaging them in accomplishing the group’s goals

         Strongly Agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

   F. Hold self and members accountable

         Strongly Agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
G. Develops an organization inclusive of teambuilding, collaboration and strategic planning

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

H. Encourages institutional pride and community building among student body

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

XII. Assessment and Evaluation

Description:
Student leaders involved in campus activities should make knowledge-based decisions in regard to resources allocated for the campus programs planned and implemented by their organization. Leaders should possess the ability to effectively evaluate programs as well as assess their campus and community culture. Program evaluations will assure the continued improvement of campus activities and comprehensive assessment will allow campus activities offerings to meet the community development needs of the entire campus.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Ability to “map” or connect the mission or primary goals or functions of the organization to the activities and programs that the organization facilitates.

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

F. Ability to design the right programs, as well as gather the right evidence to foster the intended learning outcomes.

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

G. Ability to measure organizational effectiveness through internal assessments (e.g. pre- and post-membership surveys, leadership & advisor feedback)

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

H. Ability to measure service and impact on student body (or appropriate constituency)

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

XIII. Event Management

Description:
Student leaders engaged in campus activities have a unique opportunity to learn and practice effective event management. Student leaders should strive toward understanding the
appropriate steps and issues involved in event planning and management. Some of the most transferable skills are developed and honed in this area such as contract negotiation, program planning and event promotion.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Utilizes personnel and financial resources appropriately
   Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

F. Implements appropriate risk management strategies
   Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

G. Negotiates contract adhering to college/university policies and practices
   Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

H. Manages program development, implementation and evaluation in an organized manner
   Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

XIV. Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships

Description:
Establishing meaningful interpersonal relationships are critical for successful leadership in campus activities. Student leaders often rely on committee volunteers to carry out the essential tasks related to providing programs and services. The work of campus activities is often supported by several on and off-campus constituencies. Professionalism, diplomacy and recognizing the support of others will enhance organizational effectiveness.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Establishes mutually trustworthy and rewarding relationships with students, faculty and staff members, friends, and colleagues
   Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

F. Listens to and reflects upon others’ points of view
   Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree
G. Treats others with respect; gives value by actively demonstrating that oneself and others matter

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

H. Develops and maintains satisfying interpersonal relationships that support and clarify personal values, goals and interests

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

XV. Collaboration

*Description:*
Collaboration involves seeking the involvement of others and working well with people. Student leaders should actively contribute to the achievement of a group goal. They would seek feedback from others and exhibit growth in their skills as a result of working collaboratively.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Works cooperatively with others, seeking their involvement and feedback

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

F. Utilizes delegation as a means to involve group members

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

G. Creates formal and informal networks with other student leaders to build awareness of the issues facing their organizations

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

H. Promotes and conducts joint programs between organizations

   Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

XVI. Social Responsibility

*Description:*
Student leaders must role model social responsibility at all times but especially when representing the college/university. On and off campus behaviors should match the values of the organization and institution leaders represent.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.
D. Appropriately challenges the unfair, unjust, or uncivil behavior of other individuals or groups

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

E. Participates in service/volunteer activities and understands the importance of civic engagement

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

F. Understands, abides by, and participates in the development, maintenance, and/or orderly change of community, social, and legal standards or norms

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

XVII. Effective Communication

Description:
Effective communication is a core competency needed by student leaders to ensure organizational achievement of goals. When communication is a focal point of student learning individuals will personally benefit and organizations will be run more efficiently. Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Conveys messages and influence others through writing, speaking, or non-verbal expression

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

F. Develops and facilitates thoughtful presentations

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

G. Works in teams and in multicultural settings

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

H. Illustrates the effective use of listening skills

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
XVIII. Multicultural Competency

Description:
Multicultural competency is developed through celebration of diverse cultures, advocacy for the needs and identities of all members within the community, recognition of the diverse communities within the campus community and beyond, education and awareness of the concerns of those diverse communities, and support of the ongoing inclusion, understanding and dignity of all members within and beyond the campus community. Being able to understand one’s own identity, as well as recognizing the similarities and differences of others, will equip students to serve and lead as citizens in a global society.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Recognizes the contributions diversity brings to their own campus and society
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

F. Seeks involvement with people different from oneself
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

G. Advocates equality and inclusiveness
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

H. Positively impacts others’ perspective on diversity
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

XIX. Intellectual Growth

Description:
Intellectual Growth is central to the mission of higher education and must be a focus in all endeavors inside and outside the classroom. Campus Activities offers a fertile practice field for intellectual development when student leaders and programmers engage in critical thinking, problem solving and decision making. Student leaders should be cognizant of this learning opportunity and apply knowledge learned to enhance organizational goals and personal development.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Applies previously understood information and concepts to a new situation or setting
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
F. Produces personal and educational goal statements

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

G. Uses complex information from a variety of sources including personal experience and observation to form a decision or opinion

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

H. Makes connections between campus involvement and curricular studies

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

XX. Clarified Values

Description:
Understanding personal and organizational values play a significant role in achieving effective leadership in Campus Activities. Clarified values offer the leader a compass to navigate through a variety of leadership situations and challenges. Student leaders and programmers should reflect and engage in the process of values clarification to enhance personal growth and organizational effectiveness.

Please rate the student identified above based on each of the statements below.

E. Demonstrates willingness to scrutinize personal beliefs and values

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

F. Identifies personal, work, and lifestyle values and explains how they influence decision-making

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

G. Understands how culture influences one’s own values

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

H. Acts and makes decisions in congruence with personal values and the mission of the institution

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
Thank you for completing this survey. Do you have another student to rate? If so, click Continue and you will be taken back to the beginning of the survey to select another student.

Continue
Or
Finish
Appendix E: Sample Emails to Colleagues

Greetings,

As some of you may know, I am a doctoral student at St. Cloud State University, in Higher Education Administration and I am writing my dissertation. My topic is “Campus activities boards: Student self ratings for officers and committee members”. I am currently looking for institutions that would be interested in participating in my study.

Here is what I need:
1) A contact person for the campus activities board (UPB, etc.)
2) Total number of members of CAB
3) A commitment to participate in this study which includes providing a list of CAB participants, their tech ID number and email address. As advisors, your commitment will be to rate each student on the criteria.

Would you mind forwarding this email to the person who works with the program board at your campus or sending me their contact information? I would be very appreciative of the help.

My hope is that all institutions who agree to participate will accept the SCSU IRB since we’re all in the same system and this is a low level survey in regard to confidentiality.
I appreciate any help.
Thanks,
Mary

Sample Follow-Up Email to Colleagues

Greetings,

This is a follow up to my email dated (insert date) regarding seeking your assistance for my dissertation study. I have not heard back from you or another member of the staff at your institution. I would like to include your institution in my study, but I need to hear back from you by (insert date). I’m including my original message in this email just in case.

Thanks again for any assistance,
Mary

Sample Email to Contact Person for CAB if found via internet

Dear (insert name),

As you may know, I am a doctoral student at St. Cloud State University, in Higher Education Administrations and I am writing my dissertation. My topic is “Campus activities boards: Student self ratings for officers and committee members”. I am currently looking for institutions that would be interested in participating in my study.

Here is what I need:
1) Total number of members of CAB
2) A commitment to participate in this study which includes providing a list of CAB participants, their tech ID number and email address. As advisors, your commitment will be to rate each student on the criteria
My hope is that all institutions who agree to participate will accept the SCSU IRB since we’re all in the same system and this is a low level survey in regard to confidentiality. I appreciate any help.

Thanks,

Mary

Sample Email Confirmation to Contact Person for CAB

Greetings,

Thank you for agreeing to be in my study. I wanted to provide some additional information to you about my timeline. I anticipate the survey will be sent to the students on (insert date). Students will have two weeks to respond. Two reminder emails will be sent to students who have not responded as the deadline approaches. I would appreciate an announcement about this survey to the organization at your next meeting to encourage participation.

I will need a list of student names, tech ID numbers and email addresses so I may send out the survey. I am looking for members who have at least 1 semester of experience with the organization and regularly attend meetings/functions.

I am happy to share institution specific results with you after my dissertation is completed. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to ask.

Thanks,

Mary
Appendix F: Campus Activities Board: Student Self-Ratings for Officers and Committee Members

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in this study to determine self ratings of campus activities board officers and leaders. You were selected as a possible participant because you have been a member of the organization for a minimum of half a year (one semester) and regularly attend meetings/functions. This research project is being conducted by Mary Tosch, to satisfy the requirements of a Doctorate of Education at St. Cloud State University.

Background Information and Purpose
The purpose of this study is to provide information about campus activities boards.

Procedures
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey. It should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Risks
There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study.

Benefits
It is my hope that the information gained by participant responses will improve current student involvement and perhaps encourage students to strengthen other areas. I realize that due to the number of members on your campus, some of the information may be fairly specific to an individual. Data will only be examined in group format. Your information will be kept confidential and no answers that could identify a specific individual will be used.

Confidentiality
Information obtained in connection with this study is confidential and will be reported in aggregated (group) results. To prevent identification of research subjects, data will be presented in aggregate form or with no more than 1-2 descriptors presented together.

Research Results
Upon completion, my dissertation will be placed on file at St. Cloud State University’s Learning Resources Center.

Contact Information
If you have any additional questions, please contact the researcher, Mary Tosch, at toma0804@stcloudstate.edu or my advisor, Dr. Christine M. Imbra at cmimbra@stcloudstate.edu
Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal
Participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with St. Cloud State University, the researcher, or your institution. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Acceptance to Participate
Your completion of the survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and your consent to participation in this study. If you are interested in learning the results of the survey, feel free to contact toma0804@stcloudstate.edu. Thank you.

Compensation
Upon completion of the survey, you will have the opportunity to enter a drawing for one of three $20 VISA gift cards. Your entry in this drawing is not connected to your survey responses.
Campus Activities Board: Student Self Ratings for Officers and Committee Members
Advisor Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in this study to determine self ratings of campus activities board officers and leaders. You were selected as a possible participant because you advise the campus activities board at your institution. This research project is being conducted by Mary Tosch, to satisfy the requirements of a Doctorate of Education at St. Cloud State University.

Background Information and Purpose
The purpose of this study is to provide information about campus activities boards.

Procedures
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey. It should take approximately 10 minutes to complete per advisee.

Risks
There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study.

Benefits
It is my hope that the information gained by participant responses will improve current student involvement and perhaps encourage students to strengthen other areas. I realize that due to the number of members on your campus, some of the information may be fairly specific to an individual. Data will only be examined in group format. Your information will be kept confidential and no answers that could identify a specific individual will be used.

Confidentiality
Information obtained in connection with this study is confidential and will be reported in aggregated (group) results. To prevent identification of research subjects, data will be presented in aggregate form or with no more than 1-2 descriptors presented together.

Research Results
Upon completion, my dissertation will be placed on file at St. Cloud State University’s Learning Resources Center.

Contact Information
If you have any additional questions, please contact the researcher, Mary Tosch, at toma0804@stcloudstate.edu or my advisor, Dr. Christine M. Imbra at cmimbra@stcloudstate.edu

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal
Participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with St. Cloud State University, the researcher, or your institution. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.
Acceptance to Participate
Your completion of the survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and your consent to participation in this study. If you are interested in learning the results of the survey, feel free to contact toma0804@stcloudstate.edu. Thank you.