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Chapter I: Introduction

Problem Statement

The challenges, experiences and development of second-year students in higher educational settings has been a phenomenon of interest to researchers since the early 1950s. The second-year of college is the point at which higher education institutions tend to offer the least support to students at a time when expectation levels are high and needs are strongest (Jullierat, 1999). This creates isolation from faculty, staff and students, causing second-year students to become distant from the campus community, leading to dissatisfaction with the institution (Gardner, 2000; Graunket & Woosley, 2005; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Schaller, 2000).

Research has occurred on very few campuses, and with small sample populations, with limited subgroups. One subgroup that has received little attention and research are second-year males (Bellani, 2007). Recent research has shown that second-year men are more disengaged in the college experience, and this disengagement may affect their satisfaction and retention (Davis & Lacker, 2004; Gardner, 2000; Graunket & Woosley, 2005; Kellom, 2004; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Schaller, 2005). Private, liberal arts colleges have identified disengagement of second-year males more frequently than other institutions (Davis & Lacker, 2004; Kellom, 2004).

Involvement in co-curricular experiences, especially when students exercised positional leadership has resulted in improved student satisfaction and increased retention rates (Astin, 1999). Positional leadership refers to a student holding an elected executive
level of leadership (such as President or Treasurer) within a recognized college organization, or as a Resident Assistant (RA), a Mentor, or Orientation Leader (OL) [Romero-Aldaz, 2001]. Currently, second year students, especially second-year males have fewer opportunities to exercise positional leadership within recognized college organizations due the dominance of upperclassmen (juniors and seniors) students in positions of leadership, but also because second-year students, especially males lack confidence in their abilities to lead. Another factor is that second-year students have yet to make a strong connection with the institution, and lack the knowledge of what exists for them to be involved and lead (Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000). The idea that positional leadership may influence satisfaction and retention and deter disengagement, in second-year deserves attention and research.

Historical Relevance

Freedman (1956) defined this period of dissatisfaction and disengagement in the second-year as a sense of inertia and disorganization. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) expanded Freedman’s findings and coined this period of dissatisfaction as the sophomore slump. The sophomore slump lacks a universal definition, but is a period of existential transition. The slump is characterized by doubts in career choices, difficulties and changes with peer relationships, financial stress and lack of academic direction (Furr & Gannaway, 1982; Margolis, 1976; Morgan & Davis, 1981). Apathy, lack of personal identity, limited unity as a class, and lack of motivation are also symptoms of the sophomore slump (Batterman, Flanagan & Ogurstova, 2003; Richmond & Lemons, 1985; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000). Institutions have recently begun to address second-year issues more seriously because of the above factors, as well as the incidence of lower
GPA's, higher attrition rates, and student disengagement throughout the remainder of the college experience (Flanagan, 1991; Freedman, 1956; Gardner, 2000; Graunke & Woosley, 2005; Noel & Levitz, 1991; Nora, Barlow & Crisp, 2005; Pattengale, 2000; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Richmond & Lemons, 1985; Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007).

The creation of second-year programs to counteract the sophomore slump was developed after first-year programs showed great success in meeting transitional needs of first-year students. The University of South Carolina’s National Resource Center for First-Year Experience and Students in Transition (2006) fostered 128 second-year experience programs across the country. Most programs were framed around major themes including community building, class identity, opportunities to build relationships with faculty outside of class, and active involvement on campus. Additional suggestions included study abroad, internships, service-learning opportunities, personal assessment, support selecting a major and increased social networking (Stockenberg, 2007). Research stresses that programs should be unique to the institution and the second-year students they serve (Evenbeck, Boston, DuVivier & Hallberg, 2000 & Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007).

However, very few programs in existence pay special attention to second-year males (Lipka, 2006).

Gardner (2000) and Pattengale and Schreiner (2000) discovered similar themes in their research. Within recent years, assessment of second-year programs has become an area of discussion for professionals and researchers. Evenbeck, Boston, DuVivier & Hallberg (2000) suggested using established first-year assessment practices for second-year programs. Other research suggested using surveys, evaluations and focus groups to assess second-year programs (Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007). If the practices above are used
to develop second-year programs, a multi-method approach is needed to evaluate needs, satisfaction, learning outcomes, environmental factors, cost effectiveness and retention rates (Schuh, Upcraft & Associates, 2001).

Significance of Study

The second-year has recently resurfaced as a possible area of exploration to combat attrition rates, an alarming trend increasing from the first-year to the second-year and from the second-year to the third-year at many institutions (Siedman, 2005). This trend is coming at a time when institutions are competing more than ever to recruit students because of the decrease in students graduating from high school. This is causing institutions to focus on examining current satisfaction and retention rates in addition to other recruitment arenas.

One measure of examination is student satisfaction as it is deeply interwoven with retention. Student satisfaction and co-curricular involvement have been researched as a means to understand retention for years, but the examination of the co-curricular experience is broad, usually examining the entire facet of student life. This study examined a component of the co-curricular experience (positional leadership) that has not been researched as means of understanding satisfaction and retention. By examining the influence of positional leadership on second-year satisfaction and retention, this study yielded many findings that may help institutions understand second-year students (especially males) more thoroughly, improve satisfaction rates, and produce another means to battling increasing attrition rates.
Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence positional leadership plays in second-year satisfaction and retention of second-year students, especially males. The following research questions helped achieve this purpose:

• What is the effect of positional leadership in recognized college organizations on satisfaction and retention of second-year students at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

• Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students versus female students who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

• Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students who are more effective positional leaders at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

• What are the lived experiences of second-year males who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

Summary of Remaining Chapters

The remaining chapters of this dissertation helped the researcher address the research questions of this study. Chapter II: Review of Literature summarizes the relevant literature used by the researcher to explore potential limitations, research designs and methodologies so that probable causes and potential solutions could be indentified. Chapter III: Research Design and Methodology describes the research questions, variables to be studied, population and sample, and the data collection and analysis
procedures used in this study. *Chapter IV: Results* presents the results of this study while *Chapter V: Discussion* provides a detailed interpretation of the results of this study with future recommendations for professional practice, research and implications for executive leadership.
Chapter II: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

This review of the literature begins with a summary of the two theoretical frameworks used to support the research questions, followed by a review of empirical studies on positional leadership with regard to student satisfaction and retention paying special attention to second-year males. The literature indicated that there is fundamental difference between second-year students, especially males and their upperclassmen peers. The literature also indicated that there is a lack of positional leadership opportunities for second-year males, and the lack of opportunities caused disengagement and dissatisfaction, warranting further study (Bisese & Fabian, 2006; Davis & Lacker, 2004; Gardner, 2000; Graunket & Woosley, 2005; Kellom, 2004; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Schaller, 2005). The mixed method design of this study is also supported in this chapter through review of the research literature, explaining the importance of using online surveys and focus groups to address the research questions. This chapter concludes with a review of the problem statement and research questions as a means to assess the influence of positional leadership of second-year males in college recognized organizations on student satisfaction and retention.

Theoretical Framework: Chickering’s Theory of Psychosocial Development

There are different definitions of student development used in the field, and studies vary in their language and reach different, but not conflicting conclusions (Hernandez, Hogan, Hathaway & Lowell, 1999). One of the most highly regarded and praised
theories for its practicality and ease of use is Chickering's Theory of Psychosocial Development (Chickering, 1969; Evans, Forney & Guido-Dibrito, 1999). Chickering's theory described development progressing along seven vectors: developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, establishing and clarifying purpose and developing integrity (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Before describing the seven vectors, it is important to realize that these vectors can also be seen as development tasks or outcomes. In the college years, certain tasks must be done, such as learning to think, becoming independent and starting a career in adulthood. The vectors specify the nature and ranges of the tasks, along with concerns of the student, and the skills manifested during each vector (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978). “Development along each vector involves cycles of differentiation and integration” that requires environment stimulation causing a response and in turn, developmental changes (Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978, p. 21).

Students are developmentally diverse, meaning they will be at different stages developmentally. The college student population cannot be viewed as a homogeneous group (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Vector one, developing competence, is an area of primary growth for young adults and includes three spheres. Sphere one; intellectual competence consists of gaining knowledge acquisition and critical thinking skills. Sphere two, physical and manual competence is the ability for one to use their body more effectively, mastering previously unattainable skills. Sphere three, interpersonal or social competence involves
developing basic interactive and communication skills so that students can become increasingly able to work with diverse groups and manage various social situations (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Vector two, managing emotions, is dominant in young adulthood. A student develops in this vector when they are aware of their feelings, and can integrate these feelings with flexible control and expression. By doing so, students can trust their emotions to provide useful information, find new modes of expressing themselves, assess their consequences and come to a point where they can handle different feelings and with whom (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Vector three, developing autonomy, is one of the major psychosocial issues of young adulthood. This vector involves three facets. Facet one, establishing emotional autonomy, “involves a gradual decrease in the need for continual and pressing needs for reassurances, affection, or approval” (Chickering, 1969, p. 12). The first process in this facet is when students begin to break free from their parents, although this break is illusionary as students are still seeking guidance from parents, and are influenced by parental thoughts in their actions and thinking. The shift places more influence on peers versus parents and eventually one’s thoughts become the primary motivational influence. The first two vectors interplay with this facet, as they are dependent on each other. Without trust in one’s abilities and feelings as a source of information, emotional autonomy is difficult to develop. The capacity to stand up for one’s feelings encourages experimentation, and thus increases one’s areas of competence and emotional control (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).
Facet two, instrumental autonomy, (self-directness) is the ability to make plans in reaching one’s goals and to “be mobile in relation to one’s desires” (Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978, p. 23). In this facet, one gains the ability to identify resources, seek help and use systematic problem solving skills. Facet three, recognition of interdependence follows after the independent stance has occurred. The ability to be responsible for one’s own life allows one to acknowledge connectedness to others. A student in this stage has the ability to find equal ground between being himself and avoiding conformity (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

The first three vectors are a prerequisite for vector four, establishing identity, which is the most central and most elusive because it is so interwoven and difficult to distinguish. Chickering (1969) classified the task of identity as a distinct developmental step because it involves an increased ability to examine the many facets of one’s experiences and then create a stable self-image. This requires an inner sense that there are core qualities that comprise one’s being in the world. In order to move towards a stable self-image one must come to terms with one’s physical and sexual self. This is a challenge and students struggle to sift through this experience questioning who they really are versus who they appear to be. This arrival of one’s real self encourages experimentation in the vectors where decisions are required (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Interpersonal relationships are a major change that occurs in vector five: freeing interpersonal relationships, especially in the college context. Development of increased tolerance and acceptance of differences amongst people increases the capacity for mature and intimate relationships. The student develops a sense of empathy and gains the
capacities to perceive others, listen and understand different points of views in order not to pass judgments. Later these skills develop further to promote mature, intimate relationships and allow openness, autonomy and trust. This allows one to risk commitment without fear of entrapment or loss of self. Relationships become a joint venture where interaction is reciprocal and empathetic (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Vector six, developing purpose, is a major developmental change occurring in the college years. An expectation of the college years is the ability to articulate and define future career goals. This development includes clarifying interest, career options and even lifestyle preferences. Integration of these factors creates a setting for a coherent direction for one’s life. Time is needed to extensively examine interests and lifestyle preferences, but society and the collegiate institution often push the student to address purpose too quickly causing stumbling blocks to occur, affecting one’s identity (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Developing integrity is the final vector and involves the developmental task of defining a set of values and guiding one’s actions by those values. Three steps occur to get to this point: the humanizing of values, personalizing values and seeking congruence between beliefs and behaviors. Humanizing of values shifts the student from a literal set of beliefs to an awareness of the relativity of values. The student can look closely and objectively at situations and incorporate complexity when making value judgments. Personalizing values, allows a student to begin to develop a set of values that reflects them as a person and the direction they are going. This helps them create a guide for their behavior. The final step is an increased awareness of the relationship between
values and behavior and the ability to attain congruence between both (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Second-year students face the challenges of psychosocial development differently than their peers. Second-year students experience the most challenge in four vectors: achieving competence, developing autonomy, establishing identity and developing purpose. Second-year students must establish a new standard of competence in their intellectual life (determining a major, need for entry-level courses, etc.), manual skill (difficulties on the athletic field or in art or music, etc.) and in their interpersonal relationships (dating, roommates, peer acceptance, etc.). These challenges can precipitate a crisis in confidence and can come to a head in the second year (Chickering, 1969; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978). Creating earlier opportunities for positional leadership where students take responsibility for others and events offers second-year students a way to establish a higher level of competence, purpose and identity. Engaging students in positional leadership can enhance their identification with the institutional mission, their sense of competence, services and responsibility. (Bolvin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000).

The second-year challenges students in developing autonomy. Second-year students are not expected to rely on support and approval from parents. Unfortunately, this is a time when supports are needed due the possible occurrence of crisis of confidence, along with the fact that they are still relying on financial support from parents. This lack of support comes at a time when second-year students sense an inadequate interdependence and support from the campus community. Peer relations are also changing and peer dependence is low. Friendships developed during the first-year
cause a mismatch in values, expectations (drinking habits), and responsibilities (academics, co-curricular involvement, etc.) This caused many second-year students to move away from their original network to seek new friends and therefore, having less dependence on them (Schaller & Wagner, 2007).

Furthermore, colleges and universities scope of responsibility during the second-year is academic. Social, moral and interpersonal needs of students are downplayed at time when awareness of choices and tolerance is developmentally needed. Co-curricular programming including exercising positional leadership can help students to become more aware of choices and develop tolerance to assist them in developing autonomy (Bolvin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000).

The success of a second-year student in establishing identity is dependent on vectors one and two. Vectors one and two impact identity formation, self-esteem and self-concept. Second-year students question who they are, and what their purpose is. They question career choices, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and relationships. Thinking is still dualistic and anxiety develops when support is lacking to assist them in navigating the transitions and causes uncertainty in establishing identity. Varied roles for experimentation and exposure to alternative goals and beliefs exhibited by teachers, staff and peers may aid second-year students in establishing their own identity. Exposure to choice, encouragement to make decisions, meaningful achievement and time for reflection and introspection are also possible methods to improve identity. This can be accomplished in the college years, through co-curricular learning opportunities, such as exercising positional leadership (Bolvin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000).
A sense of direction and commitment is an outcome of developing purpose.

Second-year students reported they were searching for purpose and security and found neither (Bolvin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000; Chickering, 1969; Schaller & Wagner, 2007; Widick, Parker & Knefelkamp, 1978). A lack of isolation and community, along with competition, places pressure on second-year students to commit or develop purpose. A decline in GPA, lack of commitment to academics, lower levels of involvement in co-curricular activities and perceptions of uncaring faculty and staff result from this inability to develop purpose in their lives. This causes a mismatch between second-year student expectations and the reality of the second-year. Addressing this mismatch is essential for second-year success (Bolvin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000).

Theoretical Framework: Theory of Student Involvement

Alexander Astin’s Theory of Student Involvement illustrates how activities outside the classroom connect with academic success, student development, and student satisfaction (1999). Astin was looking to “identify factors in the college environment that significantly affected the student’s persistence in college” (1999, p. 523). Postulates of the involvement theory evolved from Astin’s series of longitudinal studies.

Astin’s first postulate defined involvement as the amount of physical and psychological energy that a student invests in the college experience. The second postulate showed involvement along a continuum, with students experiencing various degrees of involvement in diverse areas at different times. The third postulate stated that involvement can be measured by the specific number of hours participating in an activity (quantitatively) and by what the student learned through participating in the activity (qualitatively). Postulate four asserted that the degree of student learning and personal
development is directly proportional to the quantity and quality of student involvement in
the program. Postulate five confirmed that the effectiveness of educational policy or
practice is directly related to its capacity to increase student involvement. Astin
concluded that the greater a student's involvement in college, the greater the amount of
student learning and personal development. Astin also implied that greater amounts of
student learning and personal development aid in student satisfaction which in turn
improved retention rates (1999). Based on these findings, the examination of the
relationship between positional leadership in the second-year (especially for males),
satisfaction and retention at small, private liberal arts colleges is warranted.

Leadership Involvement on Satisfaction and Retention

Elliott (2002-2003) looked to “examine which aspects of a student’s educational
experience are more important in influencing student satisfaction” (p. 271). A
convenience sample of 1,805 students from an upper Midwest university completed the
Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) distributed by USA Group Noel-Levitz. Results
showed that student centeredness and instructional effectiveness were the key
determinants of student satisfaction. In other words, students need to feel a sense of
belonging and value a quality education. When students enjoy their time in the
classroom, engage in social activities on campus and build trustful relationships with
faculty, staff and peers, increased student satisfaction is evident (Astin, 1999; Elliott,
2002-2003; Schaller, 2005).

Research by Anderson & Schreiner (2000) found that institutions need to build
and strengthen the necessary relationships needed during the second-year. One answer
provided was to increase faculty involvement outside of the classroom and in advisement
roles of recognized college organizations. According to Arminio & Loflin (2003) who surveyed 150 undergraduate students and 3 graduate level classes using a multi-method approach "only 24% of the participants surveyed indicated they had a faculty member as a mentor, and only 43% of those who had reached their senior year had a faculty member as a mentor" (p. 42).

Arminio and Loflin's (2003) study also explored the impact of campus involvement, inviting study participants to partake in a focus group to discuss their co-curricular involvement. Results were similar between both undergraduate and graduate students. Students were most involved during their first and second-years respectively. Over four years participation decreased in all activities and opportunities. Second-year students reported higher levels of involvement in multicultural clubs and print media activities, but this involvement decreased below first-year levels following the second-year. Through open-ended questions and focus groups, the study found that students learned a great deal from their involvement, including career aspirations, leadership, improved organizational skills, self-discipline, work ethic and responsibility. Undergraduate students reported increased satisfaction, the more they became involved on campus (2003).

Barriers to involvement included lack of time management skills, motivation, poor campus communication and shyness. Students reported becoming future and career oriented after the first-year and that campus involvement was life altering (43). Campus involvement assisted participants in understanding more about their own talents, deciphering career aspirations, improved networking and development of valuable real-world skills. "Participants stated that leadership skills were listed as the most important
benefit of involvement and management skills as the most important learning outcome. Specifically they mentioned gaining organizational skills, time management, project management and financial management skills” (42).

Participants also noted that they learned social skills, improved relationships with staff and faculty, and gained experience working with diverse populations. An additional finding was that participants noted they were happier the more they became involved. One implication from this study was that what students gain from involvement depends on their development and institutions must work to keep students involved after the first-year in order to offer the life-altering learning gained from involvement (Arminio & Loflin, 2003).

Juillerat’s (2000) use of the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) found that overall, second-year students at private institutions ranked campus life issues personally more important than peers in other class levels. Campus involvement in clubs and organizations was one issue mentioned by second-year students who completed the SSI. The inventory reported that second-year satisfaction differed significantly in this area, more so than other class levels in the study (Juillerat, 2000).

The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition (2006) conducted a national survey to gain more information about second-year efforts on four-year campuses. This web-based survey, completed by chief student affairs administrators yielded a response from 382 institutions. Approximately one third of the respondents offered some type of program for second-year students. Nearly half offered a second-year class event. Findings also showed that many campuses had leadership development programs in place for second-year students. Some of these
programs emphasized leadership development through community service requirements. Students served as peer mentors at 45% of these institutions. As part of second-year programs 33.6% of the schools reported residential living communities and mandated that second-year students reside on campus (Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007). Only 29.5% of the programs, however, had assessed the results of their efforts primarily because they were still “relatively new phenomena that have not had sufficient time for formal assessments” (Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007, p. 22).

Foubert and Grainger (2006) examined levels of involvement in student organizations on development. “In particular, it was hypothesized that students who occupied leadership roles would show greater development than students who were not members of organizations, who had only attended a meeting, or who were members of an organization but did not lead it” (Foubert & Grainger, 2006, p. 171). Results of a four-year longitudinal study consisting of a sample size of 307 students showed that by senior year, students who attended meetings, joined organizations or led organizations had higher levels of development than non-involved peers did. More importantly, students who joined or led organizations reported more development than those who just attended meetings (Foubert & Grainger, 2006).

Additional research by Schaller (2005) and Vorhies, Rao & Kurtz (1998) indicated that the development of trustful and respectful relationships for second-year students with faculty and staff, along with the development of community within the second-year is crucial for student development and overall student satisfaction and success. According to Schaller (2005) offering opportunities for study abroad, serving learning and internships provides students with a means of exploring the world around
them, and developing the crucial relationships and sense of community needed within the second-year. The development of second-year seminars, defined roles for class councils or officers, living-learning communities, retreats, and campus traditions build the crucial connections necessary for second-year students to thrive (Enevbeck, Boston, DuVivier & Hallberg, 2007; Gansemer-Topf, Stern & Benjamin, 2007; Stockenberg, 2007; Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007). "A clear implication is that student affairs professionals should work to create meaningful involvement opportunities for students and should encourage them to join student organizations as a way to promote modest gains in their development" (Foubert & Grainger, 2006, p. 180).

Tinto (1993) found that the degree to which students are integrated into the academic and social environments of a college, the more likely the students will remain enrolled. Tinto's model focused on the actions of others and how those actions shape the formal and informal communities by which students operate. More specifically Tinto posits that individual characteristics that students possess as they enter college, such as family background, individual attributes and pre-college education influenced their departure decisions as well as their initial commitments and their goal of graduating. These initial commitments influenced the student's level of academic and social integration (Tinto, 1993).

Academic integration involved "meeting the explicit standards of the college or university while identifying with the values and norms inherent in the academic system (Braxton, Hirschy & McClendon, 2004, p. 8). Social integration is the degree to which students feel that their attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviors are similar to the norms of the social communities of the campus. In other words, according to Tinto (1993).
students “have to locate at least one community in which to find membership and the support membership provides” (p. 105). Initial commitments are reinforced when a student is integrated into the formal and informal academic and social relationships of the institution. Failure to become integrated weakens the initial commitments and leads to departure (Tinto, 1993).

Second-year Male Leadership Involvement on Satisfaction and Retention

Bisese & Fabian (2006) found that second-year college students, especially male students, may lack the necessary involvement to be satisfied with their college experience. Within the second-year population, researchers discovered that males are “indeed the forgotten gender” (Bisese & Fabian, 2006, p. 1). Second-year men reported struggling with many issues and had limited interactions with faculty, staff, and peers. The development of positive relationships through extracurricular activities improved satisfaction of second-year males. Nora, Barlow & Crisp (2005) stated that “the engagement of the student in classroom discussions, collaborative learning experiences, student organizations, and contact with faculty are an underlying process affecting the adjustment to college, their academic performance, and their decisions to remain enrolled to graduation” (p. 136).

Research indicated that lack of involvement among second-year college students impedes satisfaction with their college experience, especially among males. Melendez (2006-2007) examined the relationship between race/ethnicity, gender, athletic participation, and college adjustment of 207 freshmen and second-year college athletes and non-athletes. The study discovered that gender and athletic status are significantly related. Although females demonstrated higher institutional attachment scores than their
counterparts, student athletes reported higher institutional attachment scores than non-athletes. Athletics generated feelings of belonging, acceptance, pride and attachment. "Athletic participation also eased social adjustment for college student athletes" (Melendez, 2006, p. 41). This suggested that athletic participation contributed positively to the quality of bonds established between students and their institutions (Melendez, 2006). Institutional attachment is a strong indicator of student satisfaction (Astin, 1999; Melendez, 2006). Perhaps these concepts are missing in the role positional leadership in recognized college organizations plays on second-year male satisfaction and retention and warrants examination.

Richmond College developed a research-based strategy of personal assistance to give direction to second-year males. The strategy focused on three principles: building positive relationships with faculty outside the classroom, developing positive relationships with peers, and addressing stress related to career planning (Bisese & Fabian, 2006). The approach also allowed for an individual plan "based on the personal issues facing at-risk second-year men" (Bisese & Fabian, 2006, p. 2).

Schaller (2005) conducted a phenomenological study of second-year Resident Assistants (RAs) at a private institution. Researchers interviewed nine second-year RAs. Four men and five women participated over the course of two years. Second-year RAs struggled to balance their new role with the rest of their life, socially and academically. Uncertainty about purpose and direction in life stressed many of the respondents. Many RAs, especially males struggled with both existing and new friendships during the year, citing staff's expectations and confrontations with other students as factors. Overall, the RAs reported that the position led to increased self-confidence, increased self-worth, and
time management and leadership skills (Schaller, 2005). This study needs further examination to understand how staff can reduce the stresses during this critical year, and the true benefits of the position for second-year students, especially males. One answer may be to extend RA positions to second-year students residing in living-learning communities (Schaller, 2005).

Researchers also found that second-year males experienced acute adjustment issues that differed significantly from second-year females (Evenbeck, Boston, DuVivier & Hallberg, 2000; Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007). Programs should be unique to the institution and the second-year students they serve but no matter the institution, special populations (males, transfers, commuters and minority populations) need special attention for second-year success (Bisese & Fabian, 2006; Evenbeck, Boston, DuVivier & Hallberg, 2000; Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007; Melendez, 2006). Second-year students entering impacted majors (majors with enrollment caps or admissions standards) should also receive special attention. Enrollment caps or admissions standards affected students in their second-year (Evenbeck, Boston, DuVivier & Hallberg, 2000).

One might question if certain positions of leadership benefit second-year males more. Astin (1999) recommended involvement in student government. Findings from his studies showed that “involvement in student government is associated with greater than average increases in political liberalism, hedonism, artistic interests, and status needs as well as greater than average satisfaction with student friendships” (1999, p. 526). Leadership opportunities centered on pre-professional programs are valuable. Students tend to gain increased motivation for academics while building these opportunities. Leadership involvement in intramurals or club sports also provided positive benefits
(Astin, 1999). Support and training for students leading clubs and organizations helped students lead successfully (Gansemer-Toph, Stern & Benjamin, public presentation, p. 12). Failure to provide support and training for second-year students resulted in increased stress and confusion. Limited research exists regarding specific leadership opportunities that may benefit second-year males and is an area where many researchers are calling for action (Elliott, 2002-2003 & Schaller, 2005).

Summary and Conclusion

The sophomore slump exists and second-year students are clearly in a state of confusion and transition by expectations placed on them from institutions of higher learning. Institutions are working to address the slump, but programs are not specific to second-year males. Second-year males face more stress and pressures than female students do in the second-year (Bisese & Fabian, 2006). These stresses and pressures occur at a time when peer relations were changing and support was lacking from faculty and staff. This period of transition and confusion affects learning and development and in turn, student satisfaction and retention (Gardner, 2000; Graunket & Woosley, 2005; Jullierat, 1999; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Schaller, 2005). Involvement in extra-curricular leadership opportunities improved student learning and student development. Involvement was also a key factor in student satisfaction and retention (Astin, 1999). In general, second-year students lacked leadership opportunities, particularly second-year males (Bisese & Fabian, 2006).

Involvement in extra-curricular leadership opportunities for second-year males was a determinant of student satisfaction and aided learning and development. Research validated the slump that second-year students face, and how students benefit from
involvement in leadership opportunities, but the connection between the two is still relatively new, experimental, and warrants attention, both quantitatively and qualitatively to meet the needs of second-year males. This realization leads to four essential research questions:

- What is the effect of positional leadership in recognized college organizations on satisfaction and retention of second-year students at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?
- Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students versus female students who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?
- Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students who are more effective positional leaders at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?
- What are the lived experiences of second-year males who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

These essential research questions will be addressed by surveying the second-year population at CAZ, HWS and KC using an online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) in order to assess leadership effectiveness, overall satisfaction and retention. Focus groups of self-selected male positional leaders will also occur at each campus, in order to offer a qualitative perspective on the lived experiences of second-year male positional leaders on their respective campuses. Quantitative data generated from the online administration of the
Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) will be analyzed using The Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows, Version 16.0 (SPSS, 16.0, Chicago, IL) to indentify significant findings related to the research questions of this study. Coding, member checking and triangulation of each institutional focus group will generate themes that depict the lived experiences of second-year positional leaders. The quantitative findings and qualitative themes will then be interpreted and applied to theoretical research in order to strengthen the results of the study. Implications and recommendations for professional practice, research and executive leadership will result from these interpretations, leading to an extended body of research on the second-year experience and the influence positional leadership has on satisfaction and retention of second-year students, especially males.
Chapter III: Research Design Methodology

General Perspective

Researchers are discovering that significant transitional issues (referred to as the *sophomore slump*) especially for males, continues into the second year of college and, if not addressed, may affect their learning and development. This also may influence their overall satisfaction with college life resulting in lower retention rates (Davis & Lacker, 2004; Gardner, 2000; Graunket & Woosley, 2005; Kellom, 2004; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Schaller, 2005). Research has shown that involvement in extra-curricular leadership opportunities improves student learning and development, and may be a determinant of student satisfaction and retention (Astin, 1999). The connection between involvement and satisfaction is still relatively new, and therefore warrants attention, both quantitatively (to examine the relationships among the variables) and qualitatively (because little research has been conducted) to meet the needs of second-year male students (Cottrell & McKenzie, 2005; Creswell, 2007).

Quantitative research, also referred to as experimental or empirical research is used to examine relationships among variables and stresses measurement. This type of research involves stating a hypothesis, conducting a study, analyzing data and stating conclusions about the results (Cottrell & McKenzie, 2005). This approach also focuses on post positivist claims for the development of knowledge. Surveys produce statistical data and are strategies of inquiry used through this approach (Creswell, 2003). According to Creswell (2003) survey designs provide a "numeric description of trends,
attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population,” allowing a researcher to generalize or make claims about a specific population (p. 5).

Cottrell & McKenzie (2005) indicated that qualitative research is used to describe, explain and understand the complex nature of a phenomenon to provide valuable information and insight on a topic. This approach focuses on the processes and meanings that are unable to be measured in terms of frequency or quantity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). “Qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomenon in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). Qualitative research is interpretive including intense and sustained experiences between an inquirer and participants (Creswell, 2007).

Focus groups are one example of a qualitative approach that encourages different perceptions and points of view, without pressuring participants to vote, plan or reach consensus (Krueger, 1988). The group discussion is conducted several times with similar types of participants to identify trends and patterns in perceptions. Careful and systematic analysis of the discussions provides clues and insights as to how a product, service, or opportunity is perceived by the group (Marczak & Sewell, 2009).

A mixed-methods approach involves the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods of research. This approach frequently bases knowledge focused on pragmatism, a concept geared towards solutions to problems. Mixed-methods inquiry is based on the assumption that collecting various types of data can provide a deeper understanding of a research problem or question (Marczak & Sewell, 2009). The current study employed a mixed-methods approach to better understand a relatively new topic in order to address the following research questions:
• What is the effect of positional leadership in recognized college organizations on satisfaction and retention of second-year students at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

• Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students versus female students who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

• Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students who are more effective positional leaders at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

• What are the lived experiences of second-year males who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

The online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) and the completion of three focus groups with second-year male positional leaders at Cazenovia (CAZ), Hobart and William Smith Colleges (HWS) and Keuka College (KC) were used to address the essential research questions within this study.

Research Context

As defined by Grove (2009), a liberal arts college has the following characteristics: undergraduate focus (limited advanced degrees), baccalaureate degrees (Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Arts), small size (lower than 5000 students with an average between 1000 and 2500), liberal arts curriculum, a focus on teaching versus research, and a community or family-like environment. These colleges are also typically residential campuses. Under this classification, the institutions within this study,
Cazenovia (CAZ), Hobart and William Smith (HWS) and Keuka College (KC) are all considered liberal arts colleges.

CAZ, HWS and KC are all four-year institutions similar in size (ranging from approximately 1000 to 2050 students), offering primarily baccalaureate degrees, with an emphasis on residential living and learning, requiring all or most students to live on campus (approximately 800 residential students at each of the institutions within this study). Tuition ranges from just over $50,000 at HWS, to $33,974 at CAZ and $31,840 at KC while financial aid assistance ranges from 90% at CAZ and KC, to 78% at HWS. The Colleges share similar values and mission statements centered on experiential learning, student development, a value for diversity, and the creation of productive citizens (www.cazenovia.edu, www.keuka.edu, and www.hws.edu).

All three institutions are recognized by US News & Reports (2008) edition of “best colleges” for “best values” in their respective category. Co-curricular life is also recognized at all institutions as an important means for student development, with a special emphasis on leadership development through athletics, recognized campus organizations, community service, and leadership programming. All institutions are NCAA Division III, and offer a range of varsity teams, and recognized campus organizations (www.cazenovia.edu, www.keuka.edu, and www.hws.edu). Students involved in positional leadership at all three institutions include being an executive officer (President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer) of a recognized campus organization, a Resident Assistant (RA), a Mentor or Orientation Leader (OL).

Historically, CAZ and KC are predominately-female based institutions. HWS has a two-college structure, one male and one female institution. Hobart College was
founded in 1822 while William Smith was founded in 1906, as a department of Hobart College. In 1922, the first joint commencement ceremony was held between the Colleges, but baccalaureate services remained separated until 1942. In 1943, William Smith College was elevated from its original status as a department of Hobart College to that of an independent college, on equal footing with Hobart College. This led to a joint corporate identity as Hobart and William Smith College (www.hws.edu).

CAZ was founded in 1824 as the Seminary of the Genesee. The Seminary was coed, offering an area for local youth and residents to prepare for college or complete their education. In the 1940s, decreased enrollment caused the Seminary to add a junior college, changing the name to Cazenovia Junior College. In 1961, the college dropped its junior status to receive Middle States accreditation as Cazenovia College for Women, offering baccalaureate degrees. In 1982, the college returned to a coeducational environment under the name Cazenovia College (www.cazenovia.edu, 2009).

KC was founded in 1890 as the Keuka College Institute, an institution available to prepare local youth and residents for college or complete their education. With relatively little endowment, and increasing financial troubles, KC closed in 1916 and re-opened in 1921 as Keuka College, an all-women’s college. In 1985, threatening to close due to decreased enrollment, KC returned to a coeducational environment (www.keuka.edu, 2009).

Research Participants

A total of 1043 second-year students (283 from CAZ, 562 from HWS and 198 from KC) were asked to participate in the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B). The entire second-year population at all three
institutions was selected for survey administration utilizing second-year classification by credit hour. The entire population was selected to obtain an appropriate cross section of male and female students; including a sub-section of students exercising positional leadership within recognized college organizations. This population was also selected to maximize the response rate, more unlikely with a smaller population.

According to Hamilton (2003), high response rates help to ensure that survey results are representative of the target population. A survey must have a good response rate in order to produce accurate, useful results. The ideal response rate for online surveys is 85%, but according to Hamilton (2003) on average, most online surveys yield a 30% response rate, a rate sufficient enough to produce accurate, useful, valid results.

Instruments Used in Data Collection

The researcher obtained permission from Kouzes & Posner and Noel-Levitz Inc. to use their survey instruments, the Student Leadership and Practice Inventory (SLPI) and the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), Part B for creation of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B). The Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey was created using SurveyMonkey.com to mesh the SLPI and the SSI into one unified survey in order to create a user-friendly survey. Combining the SLPI and the SSI into one survey was purposeful, as there was no apparent tool available to assess the variables within the study (effectiveness of positional leaders, overall satisfaction and retention)

Usage of the SLPI and the SSI to create the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Inventory (Appendix B) resulted in 102 questions with completion taking approximately twenty minutes. The survey consisted of four parts: 1) Introduction/Consent; 2) SLPI; 3) SSI and 4) Demographics.
Part One, the Introduction/Consent provided a brief welcome to the survey and asked participants for consent to take the survey. This part also asked participants to identify what positions of leadership they held on their campus. Part two, the SLPI is an actual survey by Kouzes and Posner (2006) designed to assess current leadership skills by identifying areas of strength as well as areas needing further development. The inventory was created as an extension of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which was part of an "extensive research project into the everyday actions and behaviors of people, at all levels and across a variety of settings, as they are leading" (Kouzes and Posner, 2006, pg. 2). The SLPI helped differentiate second-year students who were high performing leaders from their less active counterparts. This assessment occurred through completion of 30 Likert Scale questions addressing the extent to which participants engaged in the five practices of exemplary leadership: *Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart.*

Participants who engaged more frequently (scored three or higher) in the five leadership practices were considered more effective leaders.

The SLPI is both reliable and valid, showing sound psychometric properties. The scale for each leadership practice is internally reliable, "meaning that statements within each practice are highly correlated with one another. A multivariate analysis indicated that the statements within each leadership practice are more highly correlated with one another than they are between the five leadership practices" (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p. 9). The reliability of the SLPI was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, which tests how well a collection of items agrees with one another. The commonly accepted rule is that a value above .70 is acceptable as proof of reliability among items (Noel-Levitz, 2005).
The Cronbach's Alpha score for this study was .998 indicating internal consistency between items.

Part Three, the SSI, Form B by Noel Levitz (2006) assessed the satisfaction of students on a number of key issues, while also measuring the importance of each issue. The SSI was the first instrument created to assess what is important to students, and how satisfied they actually are. The SSI is a proven, systematic way to pinpoint what students want, how to meet their needs, and how to improve the quality of an institution (Noel-Levitz, 2006). The inventory used a two-tier approach to rank importance and satisfaction for all 55 questions. The reliability of the SSI, Form B is extremely reliable and valid, as it has been taken by over 3,000,000 students at 2,100 campuses, giving access to exceptionally valid and varied national benchmarks (Noel-Levitz, 2006). The reliability of the SSI, Form B was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The test yielded a score of .927 indicating internal consistency between items.

Part Four, the demographics sections used 16 questions from the demographics portion of the SSI asking specific questions about race, gender, ethnicity, enrollment status, GPA, and residential status, among others. The survey also allowed second-year male positional leaders to provide contact information for focus group participation, and for all participants to print an incentive coupon for use at their campus bookstore, or enter a gift card give-away to Walmart upon completion of the study.

The secondary method of data collection was the completion of focus groups at each institution. At the actual focus groups, the participants, the researcher and an observer (trained graduate student or staff member at each institution) were present. The observer was present to record responses, and reflect on emotions, and observations of
the focus group participations. The focus group started with a welcome and introduction to the study by the researcher followed by completion of consent forms and confidentiality statements by participants. The researcher and the observer also signed statements of confidentiality. The consent forms explained the study, that participation was voluntary, and that participants had the ability to opt out of the focus group at anytime. Confidentiality statements signed by the participants, the researcher and the observer explained that all information mentioned in the focus group was confidential and would remain so, after the conclusion of the focus groups. After completion of the consent forms and confidentiality statements, the researcher asked a series of open-ended questions pertaining to the lived experiences of the participants as positional leaders on their campus. Following the questioning period, the participants completed a supplementary handout and were served dinner or refreshments. The handout highlighted different questions regarding the variables of the study in relationship to the participants' experiences on their campus (Appendix E: Focus Group Protocol).

Procedure for Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection and procedures. The actual process for data collection was two-pronged. The first phase included the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) to the research participants. The second phase included the completion of focus groups at CAZ, HWS and KC.

In February 2009, after receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from St. John Fisher College (SJFC) and awaiting IRB approval from CAZ, HWS and KC, the researcher piloted the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) to thirty upperclassmen (junior and senior) students at KC to address any functionality issues with
the survey prior to the actual online administration. Pilot participants were given two-weeks to complete the survey and provide feedback to the researcher regarding the feasibility and structure of the survey. After the two-week period concluded, the researcher made the necessary adjustments to the survey which included correcting grammatical errors, adjusting the line-spacing between questions, adjusting the size of the text within the survey and double-checking that all required questions were set up correctly with Survey Monkey.

In April, after receiving approval from the IRB at KC (April 7), CAZ (April 8) and HWS (April 29), the researcher administered the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) to the study participants. The researcher obtained the distribution list for second-year students at KC and sent an e-mail with the survey link to study participants at KC. The IRB Chairs at CAZ and HWS e-mailed the link for the survey to all study participants. All study participants were given a three-week period to complete the survey. An incentive for completion of the survey was given to study participants, but differed for each institution. At KC, an incentive coupon, for 10% of a shopping spree at the KC Bookstore appeared at the conclusion of the survey that study participants printed off and used. At CAZ and HWS, study participants had the chance to win two $50 gift-cards to Walmart upon completion of the survey.

Reminder e-mails (three total) were sent each week to all study participants reminding them about the survey. Five additional e-mail reminders were sent to non-respondents, and second-year students with incomplete surveys at KC in an attempt to encourage completion prior to the deadline date. After the three-week deadline, in an attempt to improve the response rate, the researcher extended the online administration of
the survey for a two-week period at each institution. Due to timeframe of the extension (closure of the academic year at each institution), study participants were given the opportunity to win two, $50 Walmart gift cards at each institution by providing their e-mail address at the completion of the survey.

While the online administration of the survey was occurring, the researcher contacted the second-year male positional leaders who expressed interest via the survey to participate in the focus groups at KC, CAZ and HWS. The researcher also contacted with second-year male positional leaders independently (those who did not complete the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey) at each institution to participate in the focus groups. At KC, the researcher had first hand knowledge (due to being an employee) of which second-year male students were positional leaders. At CAZ, the researcher recruited additional focus group participants through networking with a female Resident Assistant (RA) who worked on a second-year residence hall floor. At HWS, the researcher networked with a former colleague to recruit additional participants, who were residing, or working at HWS over the summer term. A complimentary dinner or refreshments, along with a $10 gift certificate to a selected retail outlet of the participant’s choice were offered to encourage attendance at the focus groups. In order to obtain additional participants for the focus groups, as interest was low, the researcher also used snowball sampling by asking participants to bring additional second-year male positional leaders with them to the focus groups. After the recruitment process, the researcher scheduled a conducive time to host the focus group at each campus. The focus groups were held on April 29 at KC, May 3 at CAZ and June 28 at HWS.
Data analysis. Data-analysis of the results was also multifaceted due to the quantitative (online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey [Appendix B]) and qualitative (completion of focus group) procedures used within the study. The Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) generated descriptive, statistical and correlational data to address the research questions while completion of the focus groups resulted in the examination of participants' lived experiences and emotions to address the research questions.

Use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows, Version 16.0 (SPSS, 16.0, Chicago, IL) was utilized to analyze the data collected in the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B). SPSS was used to generate descriptive statistics (frequency, percentages, measures of central tendency and crosstabs) and correlation procedures (Pearson r) to draw inferences and generalizations about the characteristics of the participants and to examine positive or negative relationships between variables within the study for significance. Independent samples t-tests were also used to analyze the qualitative data in order to compare means for significant difference.

Phenomenological data analysis was used to analyze the data from the focus groups. First, both the researcher, and a professional transcriptionist transcribed the audio content from the focus groups. After transcription, the transcripts were sent to the focus group participants for review. The researcher asked the focus group participants to review the transcripts for accuracy, and allowed them opportunity for reflection and expansion of comments provided in the official transcript. After this process, the researcher reviewed the transcripts, hand-written notes taken by the observers and the
supplementary handouts from each focus group. This resulted in the researcher highlighting significant statements, sentences, and quotes, to produce categories germane to the lived experiences of participants within each focus group. The researcher then compiled the categories from each focus group into larger themes. Next, the researcher developed meanings from the themes to interpret the data and provide recommendations for Chapter 5. This process included reporting of biases, and discrepant information, accounting for reliability and validity of the study. Usage of the Monitor Decision Trail (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997) where two additional researchers reviewed the data and followed the researcher’s qualitative data analysis completed the triangulation process.

Summary of Methodology

This study was a mixed method approach using SurveyMonkey.com to administer the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) at CAZ, HWS and KC in April 2009. The survey was sent to 1043 second-year students at the three institutions, with an incentive program put in place to maximize the response rate. At the same time the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was occurring, the researcher coordinated focus groups at each campus to gain insight on the lived experiences of second-year male positional leaders.

The conclusion of the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) in May 2009, and the focus groups at each campus in June 2009 allowed the researcher to analyze the data in July 2009. This mixed-method study resulted in the usage of SPSS to analyze the quantitative aspect of the study. Descriptive statistics, procedure correlations and independent samples t-tests were used
to assess positive or and negative relationships for significance and compare means for significance between the variables of the study.

Phenomenological data analysis was used to process the data from the focus groups by the researcher. This process included hiring a professional transcriptionist to process the audio recordings from the focus groups while the researcher reviewed the audio-recordings, notes from the observer, and the supplementary handouts. The researcher highlighted key statements, quotes and sentences into codes, and then major themes; followed by validation of results using member checking and triangulation.

Chapter Four. Chapter Four presents the results of study by displaying and describing the quantitative and qualitative data to help address the research questions. This process allowed the researcher the ability to interpret the results, address limitations of the study and provide recommendations for future practice, research and executive leadership within Chapter 5, adding to the body of the research on the influence positional leadership has on retention and satisfaction during the second-year of college.
Chapter IV: Results

Introduction

The literature on the sophomore year is limited, and what is presented depicts a student's second-year as a sense of confusion (Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Second-year students tend to have a very negative and limited view of their college experience. This includes dissatisfaction with personal relationships and with the student's current institution, which leads to a desire to transfer or drop out. Second-year students also feel a loss of identity, lack of class unity, lack of academic focus and confusion about their majors (Batterman et al., 2003; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Furr & Gannaway, 1982; Margolis, 1976; Morgan & Davis, 1981; Richmond & Lemons, 1985; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000).

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence positional leadership plays in satisfaction and retention of second-year students, especially males. In the case of this particular study, second-year students who exercised positional leadership did not have the same levels of dissatisfaction or attrition as presented within the literature, but some of the other symptoms of the sophomore slump did surface within the study.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows, Version 16.0 (SPSS, 16.0, Chicago, IL) was utilized for data analysis. Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentages and crosstabs), along with correlation procedures (Pearson r) and independent t-tests were used to analyze the quantitative data. Coding, member checking, and triangulation of each institutional focus group were used to analyze the
qualitative data. The analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data provided insight into the following research questions:

- What is the effect of positional leadership in recognized college organizations on satisfaction and retention of second-year students at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

- Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students versus female students who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

- Is there a difference in satisfaction and retention of second-year male students who are more effective positional leaders at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

- What are the lived experiences of second-year males who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State?

Description of Population

The method of sampling provided that only students who met the criteria of second-year classification (credit hours) could participate in the study. This classification resulted in a total population of 1043 second-year students from CAZ (N=283), HWS (N=562), and KC (N=198). The historical context of the institutions within this study resulted in a small population of male student participation within the study at all institutions, but primarily more so at CAZ and KC. These two institutions are historically female institutions, and the fact that this study focused primarily on second-year male positional leaders, must be taken into consideration when examining the data, and for the
Implications and recommendations in Chapter Five. The type of institution may have an influence on overall satisfaction, retention, and leadership style for male students attending predominately-female institutions.

Instrumentation

The Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) is an online survey created through Survey Monkey, utilizing Kouzes and Posner's Student Leadership Practice Inventory (SLPI) and Noel Levitz Inc.'s Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), Form B as primary sources for data collection and examination of the research questions. The survey was created in order to assess the variables (effectiveness of positional leaders, overall satisfaction, and retention) within the study because no apparent tool was available to do so. The survey included 102 questions consisting of four parts: 1) Introduction/Consent; 2) Student Leadership Practice Inventory (SLPI); 3) Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and 4) Demographics.

After reading the introduction and agreeing to participate via the consent form, 164 second-year students completed certain sections of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) based on their positional leadership status on their campus. Seventy-nine students who exercised positional leadership during the 2008-2009 academic year, (Club/Organization Officer, RA or Mentor/OL) on their respective campuses completed the entire Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B), while 85 students who did not exercise positional leadership (referred to as None or Other within the survey) completed all sections except Kouzes & Posner's SLPI (Section 2). All 164 participants also completed the demographics section. At the end of the survey, second-year male positional leaders were given the opportunity to provide contact
information in order to participate in focus groups at their respective campuses while all participants were able to print an incentive coupon for usage at their campus bookstore or were eligible for a Wal-mart gift card give-away.

The secondary method of data collection was the completion of one focus group at CAZ, HWS and KC. Each focus group lasted approximately one hour. The Focus Group Protocol (Appendix C) was used for each focus group. First, the researcher received permission via signed consent forms from each participant and then asked the focus group participants 10-12 questions centered on their lived experiences as male second-year positional leaders. Each focus group concluded by having participants complete a supplementary handout over dinner.

Results from Online Administration of Student Leadership & Satisfaction Survey

Response rate. The overall response rate for the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was calculated at 15.72%. A total of 164 students (39 from CAZ, 47 from HWS, and 78 from KC) completed the survey. An additional fifty-four surveys (13 from CAZ, 27 from HWS and 14 from KC) were returned but were deemed unusable because they were incomplete, or the data were inconsistent. Inconsistencies included surveys that had responses that were ranked the same throughout the entire survey (such as not applicable), or had data that conflicted within the survey. One student (0.09%) opted not to participate in the study (from KC) on the first e-mail.

The researcher made continued attempts to increase the response rate at all campuses. At KC, an additional give-away ($50 Walmart gift card) was added to the incentive already being offered (10% coupon to the college bookstore). Eight e-mail
reminders with the link for the survey were sent to non-respondents, and second-year students with incomplete surveys at KC. At CAZ and HWS, four e-mail reminders were sent to non-respondents at each institution and an additional Walmart gift card was given away to students who completed the survey.

Demographics. The demographic characteristics of the participants who completed the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) are summarized in Appendix E: Demographic Tables, Table A. A total of 164 second-year students from CAZ, HWS, and KC completed the survey. The characteristics of the respondents are reported according to whether or not positional leadership was exercised, the type of positional leadership held, age, gender, ethnicity, class level and college attending.

Seventy-nine of the respondents (48.2%) exercised positional leadership on their respective campuses while 85 of the respondents (51.8%) were not positional leaders on their respective campuses. Of the 79 respondents who did exercise positional leadership, 37 (22.6%) led at the executive level (President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer of a recognized campus organization). Nineteen (11.6%) were student support staff (Mentors/OLs or RAs). Eight respondents (4.9%) listed other (leadership positions held other than those defined by this study) or exercised mixed positions of leadership, positional leaders who held an executive level position and a student support position (Appendix E: Demographic Tables, Table A).

Five of the respondents (3%) were 18 years of age or under, while 156 of the respondents (95.1%) were between 19-24 years of age, and three respondents (1.8%) were 25 years of age or older. The sample consisted of 137 females (83.5%) and 27
(16.5%) males. In terms of race or ethnicity, the sample included 142 participants (86.6%) who identified themselves as White/Caucasian. Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino American participants were the next highest total with five participants (3%) followed by four participants (2.4%) identifying themselves as Multi-racial. Three participants (1.8%) identified as Asian, two (1.2%) as American Indian, and Other (1.2%) respectively. One participant (0.6%) elected not to identify (Appendix E: Demographic Tables, Table A).

Three respondents (1.8%) identified as freshman, while 84 (51.2%) identified as sophomores, 72 (43.9%) as juniors, and four (2.4%) as seniors. One respondent (0.6%) listed "other" as a class level. Although this data is contradictory to the data presented in the introduction section of this chapter, this is due to bias that occurs when respondents are allowed to self-select or self-identify with a particular category or question. Again, the researcher identified prospective respondents by their respective institutions' definition of credit hours required for second-year classification (Appendix E: Demographic Tables, Table A).

Research Question One. What is the effect of positional leadership in recognized college organizations on satisfaction and retention of second-year students at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State? Question 85 from the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was used to determine if a difference existed between the levels of overall satisfaction of positional leaders versus non-leaders. The mean score for overall satisfaction for positional leaders was 5.86 versus 5.22 for non-leaders. Two and a half percent of positional leaders were not very satisfied compared to 5.9% of non-leaders. 3.8% of positional leaders versus
10.6% of non-leaders were somewhat dissatisfied while 2.5% of positional leaders vs. 5.9% non-leaders were neutral. 13.9% of positional leaders within this study compared to 21.2% of non-leaders were somewhat satisfied while 50.6% of positional leaders versus 45.9% of non-leaders were satisfied in this study. Finally, 26.6% of positional leaders versus 10.6% of non-leaders were very satisfied (Appendix F: Statistical Tables, Table G).

For purposes of this study, the researcher added the sums of the percentages of the following categories: somewhat satisfied, satisfied and very satisfied under the label satisfied. The same process was completed for the categories: not very satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied and neutral under the label not satisfied. An examination of this calculation resulted in 91.1% of positional leaders falling into the satisfied category compared to 77.7% of non-leaders. 8.8% of positional leaders fell into the not satisfied category compared to 22.4% of non-leaders. Positional leaders within this study were more satisfied with their college experience than non-leaders (Appendix F: Statistical Tables, Tables B).

Retention figures were also examined to determine if any difference existed between positional leaders and non-leaders within the study. Question 100 from the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was used to examine retention status within this study. Overall, only 12 (7.3%) respondents expressed interest in transferring from their current institution. Of the 12 students expressing the desire to transfer, nine (75%) were non-leaders and three (25%) were positional leaders.

Questions 1, 85 and 100 from the Student Leadership & Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) were used to help illustrate the relationship between positional leadership.
overall satisfaction and retention. A Pearson product correlation was calculated for the relationship between positional leadership, overall satisfaction and retention. A moderately strong negative correlation \( (r(162)=-.248, p < .01) \) was found between positional leadership and overall satisfaction, indicating a significant linear relationship. The negative correlation indicates that when positional leadership is not exercised, overall satisfaction decreased. Overall, this examination indicates that positional leadership influences satisfaction. A weak correlation that was not significant was found between positional leadership and retention \( (r(162)=-.130, p > .05) \). Positional leadership is not related to retention in this study (See Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Correlation between Positional Leadership, Overall Satisfaction and Retention \( (N=164) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positional Leadership</th>
<th>Overall Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.248**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to transfer?</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**
While the Pearson Product correlation indicated that positional leadership and retention are not related in this study, Table 4.1 reflects a significant linear relationship between overall satisfaction and retention at a moderately strong level ($r(162) = .444, p < .05$) for all study participants. In this study, a student’s level of overall satisfaction influenced their decision to stay at his or her current institution. This result indicates that exercising positional leadership holds no additional influence on one’s decision to stay, but that exercising positional leadership influences overall satisfaction.

*Research Question Two.* Is there a difference on satisfaction and retention of second-year male students versus female students who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State? Again, Question 85 from the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was used to determine if a difference existed in the level of overall satisfaction between male and female positional leaders. The mean score on overall satisfaction for male positional leaders was 5.94 versus 5.84 for female positional leaders. In the *not very satisfied* category, no male positional leaders chose the satisfaction response, not very satisfied as while 3.2% of female positional leaders did. 11.8% of male positional leaders versus 1.6% of female positional leaders were somewhat dissatisfied. No male positional leaders listed neutral as a satisfaction response while 3.2% of female positional leaders did. For male positional leaders within this study, 5.9% compared to 16.1% of female positional leaders were somewhat satisfied. Of male positional leaders, 47.1% versus 51.6% of female positional leaders were satisfied in this study. Finally, 35.3% of male positional leaders versus 24.2% of female positional leaders were very satisfied (Appendix F: Statistical Tables, Tables C).
Again, for purposes of this study, the researcher summed the numbers of the following categories: somewhat satisfied, satisfied and very satisfied under the label satisfied and then recalculated percentages. The same process was completed for the categories: not very satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied and neutral under the label not satisfied. An examination of this calculation resulted in 88.3% of male positional leaders falling into the satisfied category compared to 91.9% of female positional leaders. 11.8% of male positional leaders fell into the not satisfied category compared to 8.0% of female positional leaders. Male positional leaders were less satisfied with their college experience than female positional leaders within this study (See Appendix F: Statistical Tables, Table G).

Question 100 from the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was used to examine retention status between male and female positional leaders regarding their desire to transfer to another institution. A frequency analysis was used for this comparison. Results indicated that male positional leaders had a higher transfer percentage. Of male positional leaders, 5.9% indicated a desire to transfer compared to 3.2% of female positional leaders.

The overall satisfaction score of male positional leaders was compared to the overall satisfaction score of female positional leaders using an independent samples $t$-test. No significant difference was found ($t(79)=.333, p > .05$). Overall satisfaction of male positional leaders ($m=5.94, sd=1.25$) was not significantly different from the overall satisfaction of female positional leaders ($m=5.84, sd=1.09$). An independent samples $t$-test was also calculated to compare retention of positional leaders by gender. No significant difference was found ($t(79)=-.502, p > .05$). Overall, the mean for retention
of male positional leaders ($m=1.94, sd=.243$) was not significantly different from the mean for retention of female positional leaders ($m=1.97, sd=.178$).

**Research Question Three.** Is there a difference on satisfaction and retention of second-year male students who are more effective positional leaders at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State? Kouzes and Posner’s Five Practices of Exemplary Leaders (questions 1-30 on the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey [Appendix B]) were used to examine leadership effectiveness quantitatively. First, an analysis was completed looking at overall effectiveness percentages for all positional leaders. Two (.01%) positional leaders were ineffective, as determined by the SLSS, compared to 77 (99.99%) who were effective positional leaders.

Exploring leadership effectiveness by a comparison of means for Kouzes & Posner’s Five Practices of Leadership showed that positional leaders were more effective in the practices that *Encourage the Heart* ($m=.9451, sd=.998$), *Modeling the Way* ($m=.9390, sd=.996$) and *Enabling Others to Act* ($m=.9390, sd=.995$). Positional leaders were less effective at *Challenging the Process* ($m=.9207, sd=.982$) and *Inspiring a Shared Vision* ($m=.9268, sd=.984$), although still fairly strong (Appendix F: Statistical Tables, Table G).

An independent samples $t$-test was calculated comparing the overall mean scores of leadership effectiveness of positional leaders by gender. No significant difference was found ($t(79)=.484, p>.05$). The mean scores for leadership effectiveness of male positional leaders were not significantly different from the mean scores for female positional leaders.
A deeper look into leadership effectiveness of positional leaders by gender resulted in finding no significant difference in the leadership practices of male positional leaders. When calculated, all five practices yielded a mean of 2.000, sd=0. Female positional leaders, on the other hand, exhibited more variance in leadership effectiveness by practice. Female positional leaders were most effective in leadership practices that Encourage the Heart \( (m=1.9516, sd=.282) \) and least effective in practices that Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process \( (m=1.8871, sd=.367) \). Overall, male positional leaders were more effective than female positional leaders in all practices (Appendix F, Statistical Tables, Table E).

The completion of the data analysis for this research question also yielded findings about the level of positional leadership (executive level, support staff, mixed or other) on satisfaction and retention. A Pearson product correlation was calculated on the positional leadership and overall satisfaction. A weak correlation that was not significant \( (r(164)=.003, p > .05) \) was found between positional leadership and overall satisfaction. A weak correlation that was not significant \( (r(164)=-.038, p > .05) \) was also found between level of positional leadership and retention. Being a positional leader influenced satisfaction, but the type of position exercised played no role in overall satisfaction or retention within this study (See Table 4.2).
Table 4.2

Correlation between Level of Positional Leadership and Overall Satisfaction and Retention (N = 164)

| Level of Positional Leadership | Overall Satisfaction | Do You Plan To Transfer?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164 164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164 164 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Other significant findings. Through the completion of the quantitative data analysis, some additional significant findings were discovered that did not relate to the study’s research questions. These findings, however, are pertinent to report for future implications regarding the context of this study. The influence that involvement in campus organizations has on overall satisfaction and retention of participants in this study was found to be significant in this study. Question 101 on the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was used to examine that relationship. Use of frequencies identified nineteen respondents who were not involved in any campus organizations (11.6%) while the majority of respondents (76) in the study were members of one or two campus organizations (46.3%). Forty-seven (28.7%) respondents were
involved in three or more campus organizations, and 22 respondents (13.4%) were involved in five or more campus organizations.

A Pearson product correlation was calculated to examine the relationship between campus membership, overall satisfaction and retention. A moderately strong positive correlation was found ($r(164)=.175$, $p < .05$) indicating a significant linear relationship between campus membership and overall satisfaction. Students who were more involved in campus organizations were more satisfied. Concerning retention, a weak correlation that was not significant ($r(164)=.116$, $p > .05$) was found between campus membership and plans to transfer. Campus membership and retention are not related in this study (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Campus Memberships</th>
<th>Do You Plan to Transfer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Memberships</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do You Plan to</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer?</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Data analysis of leadership effectiveness by position or level revealed that positional leaders who held mixed level leadership were the most effective in each practice. All 22 (100%) of the positional leaders with mixed levels of leadership were effective. Support staff were the least effective in practices that *Inspired a Shared Vision* (15.8%) and *Challenge the Process* (15.8%). Support staff were more effective than executive level leaders in practices that *Model the Way, Enable Others to Act* and *Encourage the Heart*, with all leaders (100%) classified as effective. This analysis showed that, overall, executive leaders were the least effective, although still at a high level of effectiveness within this study (See Table 4.4).

**Table 4.4**

*Examination of Leadership Practice Effectiveness by Positional Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Exec (duplicated)</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pearson product correlation was used to determine the relationship between overall leadership effectiveness, overall satisfaction and retention. A moderately strong correlation was found \((r(79)=.235, p < .01)\), indicating a significant linear relationship between overall leadership effectiveness and overall satisfaction. Positional leaders who were more effective were also more satisfied at their institution. When retention was examined using the Pearson product correlation, a weak correlation that was not significant was found \((r(79)=.128, p > .05)\) indicating that leadership effectiveness and retention are not related in this study (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation between Leadership Effectiveness, Overall Satisfaction and Retention of Positional Leaders ((N=164))</th>
<th>Overall Leadership Effectiveness</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Do You Plan to Transfer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to transfer?</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Focus Group Results

Research Question Four: Focus groups were conducted at all three institutions to answer the following research question: what are the lived experiences of second-year males who exercise positional leadership at three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York State? A phenomenological analysis was conducted using coding, member checking and triangulation. The researcher coded each focus group by reviewing the transcripts from the audio recordings, hand-written notes taken by the observer and the researcher, along with all supplementary handouts. The first coding scheme involved denoting categories that were germane to the topics of interest that arose out of the discussion in each focus group. The second coding scheme involved compiling the categories from each focus group into larger themes as a whole. This led to the extraction of illustrative statements and the following major themes: involvement, bonds formed via social experiences, self-perception of leaders as role models, leadership roles fostering skill development and formal and informal mentoring relationships.

The researcher also provided all eight focus group participants with a copy of the final transcript from each focus group. Focus group participants were asked to review the transcripts for accuracy. They were also allowed the opportunity to reflect and expand upon any comments provided in the official transcript. The usage of three different focus groups to gather data, and then a comparison of the data as a whole, along with the quantitative component of the study meets two basic requirements of triangulation. The use of an observer during the focus groups, and use of theory for interpretation of results in Chapter Five completes the requirements for triangulation.
Response rate. Focus group participation was open to all second-year male positional leaders at CAZ, HWS, and KC. The original intent was to recruit interested participants for the focus groups at each campus from the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) by allowing second-year male positional leaders to express interest in participation at the end of the survey. The intent of the researcher was to have a total of five to eight students in attendance at each focus group. However, this approach led to very limited response at all three institutions (0 responses from CAZ, five responses from HWS and eight responses from KC), thereby necessitating other avenues to improve attendance at the focus groups.

At KC, the researcher e-mailed the eight second-year male positional leaders who expressed interest via the survey to participate in the focus group along with an additional group of seven second-year male positional leaders. The incentives offered for focus group participation included a complimentary dinner and a $10 gift certificate to a selected retail outlet. The researcher received responses from four students refusing participation in the focus group. Two additional students clarified that they actually did not exercise positional leadership on their campus. Five students had did not respond to the e-mail sent by the researcher. The researcher again encouraged those agreeing to participate to bring any second-year male positional leaders with them to the focus group and offered the same incentives to those individuals. The result of these efforts was a focus group with four participants at KC.

At CAZ, the researcher e-mailed ten second-year males (recruited by a RA on a second-year residence hall floor) to seek their participation in the focus group. The researcher received responses from four second-year males. Three expressed interest in
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attending the focus group and one student declined due to other commitments. The remaining six students did not respond to the researcher’s e-mail request for participation. The researcher encouraged those agreeing to attend the scheduled focus group to bring additional second-year male positional leaders with them to the focus group, using the snowball sampling effect to try to increase numbers. An incentive for attendance ($25 gift certificate to a retail outlet of their choice) was also offered. These efforts resulted in a focus group of three participants from CAZ.

At HWS, five second-year male positional leaders expressed interest in participating in the focus group via the survey. Upon contacting these students and offering free lunch as an incentive, two students chose to participate in the focus group. With assistance from a staff member at HWS, an additional seven second-year male positional leaders were also e-mailed to ask for their participation in the focus group. One student agreed to participate. Again, the researcher expressed to those attending to bring additional second-year male positional leaders to the focus group. One second-year male positional leader attended the focus group at HWS.

Demographics. Eight second-year male positional leaders participated in the focus groups, three (37.5%) from CAZ, one (12.5%) from HWS and four (50%) from KC. All participants (100%) were White/Caucasian between the ages of 18-24. Due to the purpose of the focus groups, all participants were second-year male positional leaders. Three participants (37.5%) were Criminology/Criminal Justice Majors, while one person (12.5%) represented each of the following majors: Education, Marketing, Pre-Med, Social Science and Theatre. One participant (12.5%) was a transfer student, who
transferred to another institution from KC, and then transferred back to KC after one semester (see Appendix E: Demographics Tables, Table B).

Four participants (62.5%) exercised positional leadership at the executive level serving as President (n=4), Vice President (n=2) and Treasurer (n=1) positions. Six (75%) served in Student Support positions, as Mentor or OLS (n=2), and as RAs (n=4). Many of the participants also held other leadership positions including serving as representatives for various campus organizations (Student Senate, Student Athletic Advisory Committee, and Hillel Board Member). Other participants served in service positions (Lifeguard and Fire Department Liaison) and one participant served as the Assistant Director for campus theatre productions (Appendix E: Demographics Tables, Table B).

Seven of the participants (87.5%) were involved in campus organizations. Three of the participants (37.5%) were involved in one or two campus organizations, while four (50%) were involved in three or four campus organizations. One participant (12.5%) was not involved in any campus organizations. Four of the participants (50%) were also involved in athletics at their institution. Two were lacrosse players, one was a member of cross-country, and another was a member of the men’s soccer team. Four participants (50%) did not participate in recognized intercollegiate athletics (Appendix E: Demographics Tables, Table C).

Involvement. When the focus group participants described their involvement on campus as positional leaders, a sense of connection to their institution was revealed. They felt more involved in their campus community, became more familiar with
administration, staff and faculty and gained more knowledge about clubs and organizations and events occurring on campus because of their positions of leadership:

*Charlie:* It [positional leadership] has made a positive impact. I have thought about transferring for a while but it [positional leadership and involvement] is what has kept me here. If it wasn’t for all the positions I have taken on campus I would have been gone a lot sooner.

*Kyle:* If you get more involved in campus, I never have any time to do anything else. I feel more involved in the campus community.

*Tyler:* As a freshman, I didn’t really know about any programs or clubs or anything like that so I decided to join CAB which is the Campus Activity Board and that helped me as a freshman get to where I am because I got to know more people [higher ups], know important people and help plan all the events for our college.

*Bonds formed via social experiences.* When focus group participants were asked to tell about their lived experiences as a student, and a second-year male who exercised positional leadership at CAZ, HWS and KC, the focus group participants captured how the formation of bonds in the social context was meaningful to them. The focus group participants acknowledged that they met some of their best friends through the social experiences they were a part of, and that being a positional leader played a role in the friendships they formed, expressing similarity to family-bonds between club members. The formation of these bonds made it easier, socially, for the focus group participants. Kyle, Pat and Tyler articulated the importance of these bonds:
Kyle: As a student, I mean I’ve met some of my best friends here, actually all my friends here are better than my friends back home... I mean the people here are like my best friends so when it comes to socially, I mean this place has treated me great. If you become involved on the campus, you can always go to any type of group you’re involved in, like club hockey... me personally, I always rely on my guys because we’re like a little family.

Pat: Being the Vice President of the Drama Club is sort of like a family, we are all involved in each other outside of drama and theatre so it is easier.

Tyler: I got to meet other people and people knew I was just involved and it was easier to get that social life because you meet new people that you wouldn’t have met to begin with, a different group of people, and it was great working with people like that.

Self-perception of leaders as role models. When the focus group participants were asked via the supplementary handout (Appendix C: Focus Group Protocol) if their return to campus was due to the positions of leadership they held, many of the respondents viewed themselves as role-models with a heightened level of accountability. They felt accountable to not only their positions, but to the campus organizations, they were leading, the college and other students. The focus group participants shared that being a role model motivated them to be more responsible and do better academically, and that people were counting on them:

Kyle: I would be more of a leader that would just use my words through actions instead of actually telling people what to do. I would show through maybe my
grades or as a good role model. I’m usually pretty polite, don’t get into too much trouble so in that aspect, like I said, I’m more through actions not words.

*Patrick:* Being an RA has helped me immensely...just staying on track because I know I’m a role model for a lot of people so that sort of motivates me to be more responsible and to do my school work and to not skip class every day so it puts pressure on you to rise above perhaps maybe what you did or didn’t do in the past.

*Phillip:* People are depending on you, so you have that added responsibility. So with the added responsibility, of course it changes how you view everything and how you act and how you work cause you have to...people look to us as an example...you need to carry yourself properly in the public eye, that’s important.

*Formal and informal mentoring relationships.* The concept of formal and informal mentoring relationships and the influence these relationships had on the focus groups experiences was also revealed. Many of the respondents indicated that academically their advisers served as professional Mentor to them, but that the informal support systems in place seemed to guide them more through their college experiences and develop them into positional leaders. Phillip and Tyler represented this sentiment:

*Phillip:* I had a few Mentors last year actually...they were all really involved in the fire department. There were older firefighters, they’ve been doing it for a few years, and they taught me a lot about the fire department and about school because they were also students...they help you build your sense of self, even if you’re learning from someone you build who you are based on what they teach
you...it's great to have them [Mentors] if not in a professional setting, then in a casual setting.

*Tyler:* It was the Mentors that I had that made me want to stay here because I would have missed them [Monica, previous Director of Student Activities and lacrosse captains] a great deal and I don’t think I would have been able to find other people like that at other schools...I wouldn’t be here at this school if it wasn’t for the Mentors that I had.

*Leadership roles fostering skill development.* Overall, the focus group participants expressed positive remarks about being positional leaders on their respective campuses. Focus group participants acknowledged that they developed many skills due to being positional leaders. These included civic responsibility, improved organization, improved time management and improved communications skills:

*Chris:* This semester I’ve been a lot more involved with things and I feel so much more progress has been getting done in my classes this semester and I can see the results so far on my grades. So, I think the more involved you get, the more things you do, it helps you stay organized and budget your time.

*Rory:* I find it an opportunity to go out and help others and look out for their well being...I’m learning how and when to get stuff in on time...I’ve learned how to budget my time.

They also articulated that they were positional leaders who set personal examples, treated others with dignity and respect, who listened to others, and exhibited flexibility and patience when dealing with others:
Chris: I'd say another important thing to being a good leader is to have patience no matter what you’re doing...another thing is just to stay motivated and do what you have to do to the best of your ability.

Phillip: You have to have communication that is the thing. You can’t yell at everybody and make them work, that only works for certain groups and certain attitudes in certain places. Just various ways of persuasion and communication will be the best skill to have and the best way to motivate people...You just have to know the people and adapt your skills...so you just get to know your environment and get to know the people that you’re going to lead and you’ll know what works effectively.

These traits helped them to develop relationships with others and helped them adapt to the gender dynamics associated with being male positional leaders on a predominately-female based campuses. The focus group participants also discussed how they were able to adapt their leadership styles accordingly:

Phillip: If you’re going to take any leadership position, you’re going to have a lot of females underneath you or competing for the same positions that you’re trying to get...since there are more girls, there will be more females in leadership roles and for some people that may spark an inferiority feeling, but it’s just the fact that there’s several more female students here than males. and that’s an entirely different dynamic. I mean if you’re coming from high school where you were a leader on an all-males sports team, or if you were a leader in Boy Scouts, like I was, and you were dealing with all males, it's a different dynamic to work with a mixed group or predominately-female group pertaining to leader that is. It takes a
little more convincing with a group of girls, guys you can just kind of muscle the issue through or use different ways, but there's different techniques you have to use to convince a group of females of your way of thinking, of your position.

The focus group participants also expressed challenges associated with being positional leaders on their campuses. Pressures associated with gaining respect and trust were problems for the second-year male RA's who were working with upperclassmen students:

*Paul:* You have to get used to the different types of personalities that everyone will have towards you just because you're in that role, because if they're older than you they may or may not have the same respect that someone the same age or younger than you will have towards you because you're in that role.

*Pat:* Speaking in terms of being a second-year student working in an upperclassmen dorm, it's a little intimidating at first because you're working with senior and juniors, people who are literally older than you and it's kind of intimidating to be the person to have to tell them what to do.

*Tyler:* Now the downside to moving to another building is that I'm only a second-year student here at CAZ so like all the residents I'm working with now, they're all seniors and juniors, so it's kind of harder to gain the respect in that way too because some of them don't like how someone younger holds more power than them, and it's like they don't like being told what to do by a younger person...the upperclassmen don't really listen to you when you say it's quiet hours...they just give you attitude and they continue to be loud and obnoxious.

Another challenge was delegating responsibilities:
Charlie: When need be, I am good at delegating... I definitely need to improve on that... I need to definitely have more trust in my other members. If I have the feeling it is not going to get done, I take it on myself.

Kyle: I think one of the main problems with that whole issue is I need to sort of disperse some of the requirements to other people. I mean it's got to be a group thing, it's sort of hard for just me to do it all... I would rather do things myself and put it on myself than tell someone, give orders.

Rory: I've always had to go out and actually do certain things just to get it done. or else I knew it wouldn't happen.

Other significant findings. Some additional findings that came out of the focus groups, through probed questions by the researcher, and through the supplementary handout (Appendix C: Focus Group Protocol) complemented the results discovered throughout this study. These findings were not coded as themes because the responses varied by focus group, resulting in less validity, but were still pertinent to report as lived experiences. The findings centered on the overall satisfaction and retention, grade point averages (GPA) and student expression as a means of overall satisfaction for study participants.

Satisfaction and retention. The overarching response from the focus group participants indicated that they were satisfied with their college experience, and that exercising positional leadership played a role in their overall satisfaction. The following quote from Kyle helped capture the effect positional leadership had on overall satisfaction:
Kyle: Educationally, I feel like I’m getting a great learning experience here...as a leader it’s like I said, it’s helped me keep on track, it’s stopped me from procrastinating and I enjoy it, and especially by organizing club hockey...it definitely pays off. So, I think when you feel that feeling of fulfillment and like you’ve accomplished something it makes you happier than anything really.

All eight respondents indicated they would return to their current institution and continue their leadership positions for the upcoming academic year. Focus group participants stated that exercising positional leadership and being involved on campus made an impact on their decision to stay at their current institution:

Charlie: It [positional leadership] has made a positive impact. I have thought about transferring for a while, but it [positional leadership and involvement] is what has kept me here. If it wasn’t for all the positions I have taken on campus I would have been gone a lot sooner.

Rory: Yes, I plan on returning. I would feel bad to leave everything that I started.

GPA. With the exception of one focus group participant, all participants indicated improvement in their grade point average (GPA) due to being a positional leader on their campus:

Kyle: I think it’s [GPA] better because I budget my time severely and I find that I can get more done instead of checking out this thing and doing this and that, just wandering around like I did last year before when I had all this time, but now that I have very little time to get stuff done I find that I do better work. So I think my GPA has increased.
Pat: I think this is going to be one of my strongest semesters because like I’ve said before, I’ve learned how to be more responsible by being an RA...I know this semester is going to be much, much better than past semesters.

Tyler: I think it affects your GPA in a positive way because being an athlete you have to maintain a 2.0 average. Now that sets the bar that you have to strive for...then being a resident advisor that ups it to a 2.5 GPA, cumulative GPA....last semester was my highest GPA...my highest GPA score since I’ve been here.

Student expression. The positional leaders who participated in the focus groups felt they could express themselves freely and openly at their campuses, but also understood how other students might not feel the same way:

Charlie: This campus is a very closed-minded campus, it is very conservative, when they preach that they are very open. I mean you can definitely express yourself, but I feel that there is a lot of censorship through certain activities. I mean we’ve have been having the gay life and homosexual concerns on campus. and how it has been an issue. In that sense I feel like its definitely a homophobic campus... a lot of students come from conservative backgrounds and a lot of faculty and staff come from the same, no matter how liberal they think they are. I mean it is definitely a small campus and the legacy is a big thing at HWS. so they get those ideas passed down.

Kyle: It really depends on how you wish to express yourself, that’s the main thing I’m trying to understand here.

Pat: A lot of it is the intolerance that maybe was reflected by those answers to
that question based on ignorance and I think the school does a really great job trying to break down those walls that were built by...families or built by communities that the students have come from.

Students linked freedom of expression with ideas about the size of their school:

*Kyle:* I think going along with the smaller school everybody knows something about everybody else, or thinks they do. I mean we’ve all been there when gossip goes everywhere.

*Rory:* I think one of the problems too is people can be singled out because it’s a smaller campus, smaller school so I mean it might be harder for someone to express themselves because they’ll be more noticed than say at a bigger school.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence positional leadership plays in second-year satisfaction and retention of second-year students, especially males. Descriptive statistics, correlational procedures and independent sample t-tests were used to analyze the quantitative data. Coding, member checking, and triangulation of each institutional focus group were used to analyze the qualitative data. The findings from this process helped to provide insight into the research questions of this study.

Overall, 164 students (39 from CAZ, 47 from HWS and 78 from KC) completed the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B), yielding a 15.72% response rate. The majority of respondents did not exercising positional leadership (51.8% versus 48.2%). Of the 79 respondents who did exercise positional leadership, the majority led at the executive level (22.6%). Of the 164 respondents, 137 (83.5%) were
female and 27 (16.5%) were male. The majority of the respondents were White/Caucasian (86.6%) and classified (by credit hour) as sophomores (51.2%).

Eight second-year male positional leaders participated in the focus groups. Three were from CAZ, one was from HWS and four were from KC. All participants were White/Caucasian and were sophomores between the ages of 18-24. Participants' majors varied, with the majority being Criminology/Criminal Justice majors (37.5%). Four of the focus group participants (62.5%) exercised positional leadership at the executive level while six (75%) served in Student Support positions, as Mentor or OLs ($n=2$), and as RAs ($n=4$). Many of the participants also held other leadership positions as representatives for various campus organizations while other participants served in civic service related positions.

Research Question One. The mean score for overall satisfaction was higher for positional leaders (5.86) than for non-leaders (5.22) in this study. A designed calculation was computed to compare overall satisfaction rates between positional leadership and non-leaders, resulting in more positional leaders being satisfied than non-leaders within this study (91.1% versus 77.7%). In regard to retention, only 12 respondents (7.3%) expressed a desire to transfer. Of these 12 respondents, nine respondents (75%) were non-leaders and three respondents (25%) were positional leaders. More non-leaders than positional leaders expressed interest to transfer. It was determined that when positional leadership is not exercised, overall satisfaction decreased.

Positional leadership influenced satisfaction within this study. A weak correlation that was not significant between positional leadership and retention was also determined, indicating that positional leadership and retention are not related in this study. There was
a moderately strong significant relationship between overall satisfaction and retention.
Overall satisfaction influenced retention, but being a positional leader did not influence one's decision to stay within this study.

Research Question Two. The mean score for overall satisfaction was higher for male positional leaders (5.94) than for female positional leaders (5.84) in this study. A designed calculation was computed to compare overall satisfaction rates between positional leaders by gender, resulting in female positional leaders being more satisfied than male positional leaders within this study (91.9% versus 88.3%). It was also determined that male positional leaders are more likely to transfer than female positional leaders in this study (5.9% versus 3.2%). No significant difference was found between positional leaders by gender for overall satisfaction and retention.

Research Question Three. Two (.01%) positional leaders were ineffective, as determined by the SLSS compared to 77 (99.99%) who were effective positional leaders. Positional leaders were more effective in the practices that Encourage the Heart (m=.9451, sd=.998) and were less effective at Challenging the Process (m=.9207, sd=.982). No significant difference was found between the overall mean scores of leadership effectiveness of positional leaders by gender indicating that the leadership effectiveness of male positional leaders was not significantly different from the mean scores for female positional leaders.

No significant difference in the leadership practices of positional leaders was also determined. When calculated for male positional leaders, all five practices yielded a mean of 2.000, sd=0. Female positional leaders were most effective in leadership practices that Encourage the Heart (m=1.9516, sd=.282) and least effective in practices
that *Inspire a Shared Vision* and *Challenge the Process* ($m=1.8871, sd=.367$). Male positional leaders were more effective than female positional leaders in all practices within this study. A weak correlation that was not significant was found between positional leadership, overall satisfaction and retention. Being a positional leader influenced satisfaction, but the type of position exercised played no role in overall satisfaction or retention.

*Research Question Four.* Analysis of the focus group data, using coding, member checking and triangulation resulted in major themes regarding the lived experiences of the eight second-year male positional leaders within this study. These themes were involvement, bonds formed via social experiences, self-perception of leaders as role models, leadership roles fostering skill development and informal and formal mentoring relationships. Focus group participants felt their involvement made them feel more connected to their institution, and heightened their level of accountability, and personal perception of being role models. They felt more accountable not only to themselves, but to the campus organizations, they were leading, the college and even the general student body.

Positional leaders within this study set personal examples, treated others with dignity, and were good listeners. They modeled appropriate leadership behaviors, instead of telling others what to do and possessed communication skills so that they were motivators for others. The RAs who participated in the focus groups were challenged by their underclass status when exercising positional leadership with upperclassmen and recognized their inability to delegate responsibilities to others. The focus group participants, especially those from CAZ and KC were aware of gender dynamics that
existed on their campus (due to being predominately female campuses), and understood the need to modify their leadership approaches appropriately.

*Other significant findings.* Additional quantitative and qualitative findings resulted from the data analysis. Although these findings were not directly related to the research questions of this study, they are still important to report. Involvement in campus membership was found to have a moderately strong positive correlation, indicating a significant relationship between campus membership and overall satisfaction within this study. Students who were more involved in campus organizations were more satisfied. Regarding retention, a weak correlation that was not significant was found between campus membership and plans to transfer. Campus membership and retention are not related within this study.

The data analysis also showed that positional leaders who held mixed level leadership were the most effective in each practice while support staff were the least effective in practices that *Inspired a Shared Vision* and *Challenge the Process*. Support staff were more effective than executive level leaders in practices that *Model the Way, Enable Others to Act* and *Encourage the Heart*. This analysis showed that overall, executive leaders were the least effective, although still at a high level of effectiveness.

A moderately strong correlation was found between overall leadership effectiveness and overall satisfaction, indicating a significant linear relationship. Positional leaders who are more effective tend to be more satisfied at their institution within this study. When retention was examined, a weak correlation that was not significant was found. Overall, leadership effectiveness and retention are not related in this study.
Qualitatively, overall, all focus group participants were satisfied with their college experience, and had no desire to transfer. Exercising positional leadership influenced the focus group participants desire to remain at their current institution. Some of the focus group participants noticed improved academic success, especially in their GPAs, which they felt was due to being a positional leader. Many of their positions of leadership had GPA requirements that they had to maintain, but they also felt that being a role model to others students improved their GPA.

The positional leaders who participated in the focus groups felt they could express themselves freely and openly at their campuses, however, they understood how other students might not feel the same way. Focus group participants linked freedom of expression with ideas about the size of their school. However, for some, being a male positional leader on a predominately-female campus had huge advantages. Having their voice heard was one of them.

Chapter Five. Chapter Five will interpret the data and explore the implications of the findings described in this chapter in order to give meaning to the data and to understand the significance of these findings. The researcher will provide credible recommendations for future research and practice, along with implications for leadership. In turn, this will result in a deeper body of knowledge regarding the second-year, and the role positional leadership plays in overall satisfaction and retention of second-year students.
Chapter V: Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence positional leadership played on second-year satisfaction and retention of second-year students, especially males. Second-year students, in this study, especially those who exercised positional leadership, did not have the same levels of dissatisfaction or attrition as presented within the literature. However, some of the other symptoms of the sophomore slump did surface within the study.

This chapter presents a discussion about the study and its results and implications for future practice and research. The chapter includes: a) a description of the relationship of the findings to prior research and describes the results of the study; b) implications and recommendations for future research, professional practice and executive leadership; c) a discussion about the limitations of the study and d) some conclusions about the study.

Relationship of Findings to Prior Research

The research literature indicated that there is a fundamental difference between second-year students, especially males, and their upperclassmen peers. Research also stated that females demonstrated higher institutional attachment scores than their male counterparts (Astin, 1999; Melendez, 2006). This may explain why more second-year females completed the survey than second-year males and why the researcher had difficulty getting response and participation in the focus groups from second-year male
positional leaders. This finding was also true regarding positional leadership and gender. More second-year female positional leaders completed the survey than second-year male positional leaders.

The literature also indicated that positional leadership opportunities are lacking for second-year males, and that the lack of opportunities causes disengagement and dissatisfaction in second-year males (Bisese & Fabian, 2006; Davis & Lacker, 2004; Gardner, 2000; Graunket & Woosley, 2005; Kellorn, 2004; Pattengale & Schreiner, 2000; Schaller, 2005). This may explain why more second-year female positional leaders completed the survey than male positional leaders. Females may be exercising positional leadership more frequently than their male counterparts. This may be an integral aspect to this study being that two out of the three institutions were historically female-based campuses, with a current female to male ratio of 2:1. Naturally, more females would hold positions of leadership due to having more females on campus. More females in support staff positions such as Resident Assistants (RA’s), Mentors and Orientation Leaders (OLs) would also be needed to work with or reside on female populated floors because of the fact that there are more females, than males attending and residing on campus, especially at Cazenovia College (CAZ) and Keuka College (KC).

Another finding of this study was that positional leaders tended to be more satisfied than non-leaders within the study. In a study by Armino and Loflin (2003), undergraduate students reported that the more they became involved on campus, the happier they were (Armino and Loflin, 2003). In this study, the data generated by the Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) found that students who more involved in recognized campus organizations were more satisfied than students who did not
participate or were less involved. This finding supports research by Astin and his theory of student involvement. Astin (1999) concluded that the greater a student's involvement in college the more likely they are to be satisfied with their college experience and graduate.

Data from the focus groups supported the finding that positional leaders develop transferable skills, such as improved communication, time management, organization, character and leadership development through their involvement in positional leadership. This finding supports prior research by Arminio and Loflin (2003) who discovered that "leadership skills were listed as the most important benefit of involvement and management skills as the most important learning outcome" among the participants in the study (Arminio and Loflin, 2003, p. 42).

This development of transferable skills illuminated by the focus group participants supports the notion of student development in higher education, and Chickering's Theory of Psychosocial Development. Chickering (1969) concluded that much of this development occurs during the first and second-year of college by establishment of higher levels of competence, purpose and identity. The development of the transferable skills illuminated by the focus group participants is specific to intellectual development by garnering the necessary skills to become critical thinkers. Improved communication and the ability for the focus group participants to adjust leadership styles to different groups they are leading, including gender differences, meets aspects of Vectors 1 and Two, by developing interpersonal social and emotional competence. The ability for one to assess their own feelings, and then control these feelings within
different environments and with different individuals, according to Chickering (1969) meets interpersonal social and emotional competence.

Exercising positional leadership within this study also related to Vectors 5, Interpersonal Relationships and Vector 7, Integrity as the focus group participants were able to associate empathy, character and trust in their own leadership. This processes occurred by allowing them to perceive others feelings, listen, and serve as role models to other students. Finally, co-curricular involvement within this study allowed for varied roles for experimentation, exposure to alternative goals and beliefs, choice and decision-making, reflection and introspection. These experiences, according to Chickering (1969) help to develop students during the college years.

In this study, the qualitative findings connected social experience, and informal and formal mentoring relationships with satisfaction and retention of second-year male positional leaders, supporting Tinto's Model of Student Departure. Tinto concluded that integration is essential to college persistence and that this integration occurs through two primary pathways—academics and social experiences. Socially, students “have to locate at least one community in which to find membership and the support membership provides” (1993, p. 105). Failure to become integrated can weaken initial commitments and lead to departure from the institution. In this study, the focus group participants clearly identified at least one support system or community they utilized for support when needed. Many of these support systems were not professionally based, but rather informal networks through peer circles, athletics or recognized campus organizations.
Implications and Recommendations

Implications for professional practice. This study adds to the limited body of knowledge about the second year, by demonstrating how positional leadership influenced overall satisfaction and retention for participants, especially males. The study also adds to the body of knowledge about second-year male positional leaders' experiences at the three institutions within the study. Recently, researchers have noted decreasing retention rates for second-year students. At the same time, higher levels of disengagement in the campus community are being reported by second-year males. This disengagement heightens the growing concern that college men are becoming a minority at institutions of higher learning (Wilson, 2007). Currently, research about the benefits of co-curricular learning and involvement dominate the field of higher education.

The quantitative findings of this study revealed that students who were more involved in recognized campus organizations were more satisfied, and that positional leaders were more satisfied than students who did not exercise positional leadership. This information adds a dimension of understanding to the limited body of knowledge about second-year involvement, especially for males. Institutions of higher learning can use the knowledge revealed through the focus groups, and the quantitative data to inform best practices for second-year students, especially males, as an aid to improve satisfaction and retention.

The findings of this study may also be useful to certain constituencies. Higher education administrators within residence life, orientation departments, leadership development programs and second-year experience programs may be able to link the results of this study to their current practice. More female second-year students
completed this study than second-year males. More importantly, more second-year female positional leaders than second-year male positional leaders completed the study. Although, within this study, these findings may have resulted from the selection of predominately-female based institutions, second-year male leadership at many institutions, according to the research noted within this study is lacking. Research also noted that second-year students, especially males lack information about the opportunities to lead on their campuses and that they lack confidence to lead when given the opportunity. Higher education administrators can use this information to develop recruitment techniques to increase the number of second-year males in leadership positions.

Usage of a campus wide nomination process is one such recruitment technique. At the conclusion of the first-year, the administration in charge of involvement or retention can seek from staff, faculty and upperclassmen students, names of second-year male students who have potential for leadership on campus. With assistance from the President, personalized letters would be sent to these second-year male students expressing their leadership potential and the how leadership benefits their overall development as a student. The letter would also provide a listing of the leadership opportunities available to second-year students, and the processes involved in obtaining these leadership opportunities. Being that second-year students are still developing and progressing along the seven vectors of Chickering's Theory of Psychosocial Development (1969), a personalized nomination letter from the President may give these second-year male students the confidence to consider a leadership opportunity on campus.
by confirming their competence, helping to increase their self-esteem and motivate them to clarify purpose within their lives.

The creation of a recruitment fair for student leaders would be another valuable recruitment technique. The fair, opened to second-year students would be organized similarly to an employment fair where various members of the campus and local community would register in seek of student leaders for their campus and community organizations (clubs/organizations, Resident Assistants, Student Mentors, Orientation Leaders, campus wide committees, Big Brother...Big Sister, Rotary International, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, etc.). In addition to information on immediate ways for second-year students to become leaders on campus, an on site application and interviews process would be available for second-year students to apply for positions involving selection. The fair would allow second-year students to understand the benefits of involvement, and have readily available to them, the leadership positions they can obtain.

The quantitative results of this study also showed a significant connection between campus memberships and overall satisfaction. In other words, the more involved students were, the more satisfied they were at their current institution. As mentioned by Astin (1999), involvement encompassed a wide array of student experiences that range from the academic classroom to co-curricular activities, and even working on campus. Quantitative findings within this study also revealed that second-year males were exercising positional leadership less than their female counterparts. With this in mind, higher education administrators need to provide environments where students can yield as many opportunities for involvement as possible, during every year of college, not just their first and last year on campus. One idea would be to examine
ways to expand leadership opportunities on campus through the establishment of new
campus organizations, involving second-year students in campus committees with
decision-making power, and also through peer mentoring leadership programs. This
would allow for the expansion of leadership opportunities for second-year males without
taking away from the leadership opportunities of upperclassmen, or the need to have
more female leaders on predominately-female based campuses.

One way to expand the leadership opportunities would be to create additional
campus organizations for them to lead. Focus group participants within this study
indicated that the process to start a new campus organization was straightforward and
encouraged them to start a new organization to lead. Administrators can seek support
from second-year male students to determine interest for future campus organizations and
then simplify the application process to help interested students establish these
organizations. This in turn, allows additional second-year male students to become
involved, develop into student leaders, and in turn, become more satisfied with their
campus experience. In addition, giving second-year males the opportunity to serve on
campus wide committees, run committee meetings, make important decisions regarding
institutional policy, and teach leadership training sessions to their peers would increase
leadership opportunities for males, improve their current personal development, and lead
to improved satisfaction and retention.

The creation of second-year class council activities would also prove to be a
valuable program. At many institutions, the junior and senior classes are responsible for
certain aspects of campus life, such as Commencement, Senior Week, Spring Weekend
or Spring Fest. However, at most institutions, the sophomore and freshman classes are
without specific responsibilities, leaving them with a lack of direction, motivation and desire to accomplish something purposeful on their own. For second-year students, this escalates the conditions of the *sophomore slump*, and produces an environment detrimental to self-development. Assigning a specific responsibility to the second-year could produce astounding results. It is a proactive way to combat symptoms of the *sophomore slump*, and provide opportunities for leadership.

One specific responsibility is the creation of a Sophomore Transition Program for rising second-year students. The program would give rising second-year students the skills and resources needed to succeed within the second-year. The program, organized by the second-year Class Activities Council would organize programs centered on the developmental milestones associated with the second-year. Possible sessions could center on how to select a major, how registration and housing work within the second-year and how to create or update a professional resume for work-study positions, select leadership positions, and possible summer internships. Other sessions could include an informational session on leadership opportunities available for second-year students, career information specific to majors, and academic advising. Finally, the program would include social events, also organized by the Class Activities Council to assist second-year students in finding their social circle, building their formal and informal network.

Qualitative findings within this study revealed that the development of formal and informal relationships aided in satisfaction. with informal relationships enhancing their experience the most. Peer to peer training may be promising for second-year students, especially males. Peer to peer training is "grounded in the understanding that other"
students are often the most influential people in the life of any given college student” (Simmons and Easley, 2006). In understanding how students change and develop, as well as how the college experience enhances student development, researchers such as Newcomb (1954), Chickering (1969), Astin (1999), Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) provide a foundation of the importance of peer influence and the potential of peer-to-peer training. In some circumstances, peer consultants can be as effective, if not more effective, than professional advisers can, are most cost effective, and have greater acceptance and accessibility (Zunker, 1964, 1975; Zunker & Brown, 1966; Habley, 1978; Gordon and Habley, 2000). Peer to peer training has also been linked to institutional connectedness, a sense of belonging, and shared responsibility. These outcomes are all predictors for second-year success, and therefore, translate into higher satisfaction and retention benefits for institutions (Russell & Shinkle, 1990).

The 4+4 Mentoring Program is a new program designed to guarantee that students have mentors for the four years they are on campus and the four years following graduation from college. First year advisors or seminar professors would serve as Mentors during the first and second-year while advisers within their major would serve as Mentors during their third and fourth year. Successful alumni or alumnae, along with faculty and staff would serve as professional Mentors upon graduation. This process could also involve Peer Mentors (second-year students) during the first-year, via orientation programs (Simmons and Easley, 2006). This process would allow second-year students another opportunity for leadership, along with the ability to have additional resources available on campus for support during the transitional process associated with second-year.
The results of this study revealed a variety of different outcomes between levels of positional leadership. Second-year male positional leaders showed no statistical difference between Kouzes and Posner's Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership. However, variances occurred between second-year male positional leaders and female positional leaders, resulting in stronger results for male positional leaders. These differences may be a condition of the psychosocial development of second-year students. At this stage in their college experience, second-year students, especially males, may not be developmentally able or confident enough to engage effectively in the leadership behaviors that are associated with the more demanding practices (Chickering, 1969 and Kouzes and Posner, 2006). Higher education administrators, through this study, are at a significant advantage knowing this, and this may help them to develop different training strategies to improve second-year students' overall leadership effectiveness.

Differentiating training strategies may allow second-year positional leaders to meet the development vectors sooner rather than later. Doing so would allow for introduction of the leadership behaviors within each Practice sooner, giving students the necessary tactics to build effective leadership behaviors in a supported environment. One recommendation is to build a mandatory leadership course for second-year students around Kouzes and Posner's Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership. The course would include scheduled class time twice a week, with a practical leadership lab once a week for one semester, equaling four academic credits. The required reading, The Leadership Challenge by Kouzes & Posner, would aid in instruction on transformational leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership, leadership within a diverse world, leading organizational change and global leadership. Each practical leadership lab activity would
place the students in real world leadership opportunities associated with the major leadership theories. This style would allow for the integration of leadership theory and hands on application of leadership skills. Such a course would give second-year students, especially males, the necessary skills and confidence to lead. Through preferential leadership (serving as a Resident Assistant, Peer Mentor or Orientation Leader) upon completion of the course, more leadership opportunities for second-year students would also occur, combating another condition of the sophomore slump, improving satisfaction and retention rates.

Frequent assessment by higher education administrators regarding the second-year is also critical. The use of a web based survey and focus groups during the second-year would be key to the success of a second-year program. Such a model allows for second-year concerns to be tracked for possible trends, involvement and leadership benchmarks to be generated, and monitored, along with an interest scale for programming needs. An assessment model would best be monitored by a Second-year Taskforce consisting of students, staff, and faculty who would not only oversee assessment, but work to educate the campus community on the special needs of second-year students, oversee all second-year programming, and keep a critical eye on retention and satisfaction of second-year students.

Recommendations for future research. One finding of this study showed that executive level leaders are the least effective in Kouzes and Posner’s Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership, even more so than second-year student in support staff positions or second-year students exercising mixed levels of leadership. In many cases, students in support staff positions, such as RA’s and Mentors/OLs are paid. There are also typically
involved in more extensive selection processes that include GPA and judicial requirements for support staff positions held by students. Executive level positions on the other hand, tend to be more volunteer orientated and typically have little to no required selection process for obtaining a position. Training protocol for support staff is also very different than for executive level leaders. Future researchers may wish to examine these differences and the outcomes associated with these differences on leadership effectiveness. Further studies examining whether or not the variables of paid versus volunteer positions, selective application processes and extensive training affects overall satisfaction and retention may also contribute to the current field of study.

Qualitative studies utilizing personal interviews or focus groups with junior and senior students may also provide valuable information. Sometimes when participants are "in the moment," the findings revealed can be different than if the same participants were involved in the process a year or two later. This approach allows participants better perspective, insight, and reflection regarding the actual experience. This process would also allow for greater data and possible longitudinal studies tracking retention rates, overall satisfaction and measures of leadership effectiveness over time of participants. Future research in this area may help to create involvement and leadership benchmarks to develop best practices for higher education professionals.

The creation of a survey specific to positional leadership, overall satisfaction and retention would also prove useful for future studies. The survey used within this study used two instruments, Kouzes and Posner's SLPI and Noel-Levitz's SSI to assess the research questions. The combination of the two instruments was chosen because no current instrument was available to assess the variables of this study. Although both
instruments are reliable and valid, and they produced the necessary results for this study, a great deal of additional information was asked that was not relevant to the purposes of this study. Furthermore, pertinent information addressing the variables of this study were also not included. The creation of a tool or instrument that examines the variables more specifically would produce more reliable and valid results.

Research indicates that second-year programs and activities are surfacing across the country. However, because these programs are relatively new, assessment has been limited, and the overall effectiveness of such programs is still unknown. This is also true for many leadership programs. Research studies that focus on program evaluation will be critical to the future success of second-year students and the programs created to assist them.

Implications for executive leadership. Although many of the above recommendations for professional practice may be fulfilled by executive leaders, there are specific implications and action items resulting from the findings within this study that should involve executive leaders, such as Board of Trustee (BOT) members, College Presidents and the administrative cabinet of the President. Recommendations include a) the hiring of appropriate personnel to meet the needs of second-year students; b) restructuring of budget allocations to support second-year programs; c) improvements or changes in campus wide policies and procedures and d) fulfilling the moral imperative to develop students into productive citizens.

There is a critical need for BOT members and College Presidents to make student success in the second-year an institutional priority. This priority is critical, not only because some students experience distress and transition as a result of limited support
from the institution, but also because the personal development of the students suffers and the outcome may be less productive citizens upon graduation. Not doing so defeats the purpose of any higher education institution within the United States, and perhaps globally. This moral imperative extends beyond just the institution to the livelihood of a global economic community with individuals who are prepared for the complex and changing dynamics of an ever-changing world (Siedman, 2005). The secondary benefit to higher education is that by improving satisfaction and retention rates, institutions improve enrollment that in turn yields more net revenue.

This top-down approach should include the necessary processes to create buy-in from cabinet officers, department managers or directors, support and service staff. The issue of student success, student satisfaction and retention are not one person's or one department's job on campus, but rather everyone's focus (Siedman, 2005). Use of a change agent model such as the Inclusive Excellence Model, produces a holistic environment with effective evaluation and assessment outcomes intertwined throughout the campus.

Additional charges by BOT members and College Presidents, and administrative cabinet members to make second-year student success an institutional priority include academic and student development staff to create second-year experience programs on college campuses. This includes personnel to provide oversight to such programs and retention counselors to work jointly with academic advisers during the second-year. Programs and efforts to promote second-year success need financial support, and upper-level administrators must be willing to shift budget allocations and other resources to support such causes. Monetary support for human resources, professional development,
programming initiatives and assessment are all critical to the long term success of second-year programs. Decision-making regarding where to shift funds is a necessity until the net benefit of improved satisfaction and retention rates within subsequent years improves institutional revenue.

In addition to the monetary support, BOT members, College Presidents and administrative cabinet members must support departmental managers or directors in policy and procedure changes in order to make the campus more conducive to developing second-year students. Senior level administrators should also encourage and reward the expansion of and improvement of the selection processes for positional leaders during the second-year, along with use of different training models and adjustments to policies and procedures during the second-year.

**Limitations**

To answer the research questions, the researcher used a mixed methods approach to explore the influence positional leadership in recognized college organizations has on satisfaction and retention of second-year students, particularly males. A sequential exploratory strategy beginning with the collection and analysis of quantitative data, followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data (Creswell, 2003) occurred. Phase One consisted of using the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) to explore the quantitative research questions of the study. The Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey used Kouzes & Posner’s SLPI (2006) and Noel-Levitz SSI (2005) as the main components of the survey. Use of these two instruments as the main components of the survey was intentional, to aid in reduction of completion time, and provided a more consistent, uniformed survey in order to maximize response rate. These
two instruments were also independently reliable and valid instruments used previously in many research studies, at many institutions of higher education, and therefore provided the researcher with a reliable and valuable survey. The second phase of this study focused on the qualitative aspect of the study and included the completion of a focus group at each of the institutions within the study. The purpose of the focus groups was to explore the lived experiences of second-year males exercising positional leadership.

Due to the nature of the study, generalization to a larger population is limited. First, the generalizability of this study may be limited only to second-year students. Also, this study only focused on traditional-age students, and residential versus commuter students, and may not be reflective of the special populations that other institutions may have. Study participants were from three private, liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of New York. Results of this study cannot be generalized, unless other small private, liberal arts colleges have similar school biographies. School biographies must also include the condition of being historically female dominated institutions. The results of this study may be very different if re-produced on campuses that are private, larger in size, with different demographics, and without the condition of historical high populations of female students. The same applies for public institutions of higher learning, as the characteristics for such institutions are drastically different than the institution selected for this study.

Although reproduced from two reliable and valid instruments, the instrument also has limitations. The Likert-type questions rating satisfaction were very similar, and may have been confusing to students who completed the online survey. Participants self-reported their own levels of leadership effectiveness and satisfaction within the survey.
resulting in possibly higher or lower levels of leadership effectiveness and satisfaction than their actual levels. Females typically report higher scores on instruments that ask participants to self-report because females are more open to sharing their experiences (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). If this is the case, the results of this study may have been affected. The use of surveys also makes it difficult to determine causal relationships. The subjective style of focus groups leads to different interpretations, both by the participants and the researcher. An assumption that the information shared by the participants within the focus groups is an accurate replication of the actual lived events and emotions is also a concern.

The response rate for the quantitative aspect of the study was also considerably lower than derived. This was primarily due to the timing of the survey, occurring late in the academic year, prior to the start of finals, and for HWS students, after the completion of the academic year. Even with appropriate incentives, students' primary focus at this time of year is the completion of last minute assignments, preparation and completion of exams, securing summer employment, and managing the move-out process. The institutions selected for this study, may have also been a limitation to the response rate of this study. Two of the institutions had a higher population of female students, and are historically predominately-female based institutions. This in itself, may have led to a higher concentration of second-year female students completing the survey, resulting in less opportunity for second-year male to participate in the focus groups.

In addition, by this time of the academic year, students are surveyed out, as many institutions administer similar, if not the same, surveys that were used in this study. If students took the same survey at their institution prior to the online administration for this
study, they may have had an idea of the intention of the survey, resulting in a different outcome in their response and therefore, the creation of survey bias. The notion of surveying a population that is possibly experiencing symptoms of the sophomore slump may have also caused a pre-cursor for the study, decreasing the response rate prior to the survey being administered. The consideration of these circumstances in future studies may yield more responses, increase the response rate, and therefore, allowing the findings to be generalized to a larger population.

The focus groups completed at each campus also had limitations. The experiences of second-year students at the three institutions within this study may be very different than experiences of second-year students at other institutions and may not be representative. Due to the limited number of second-year male positional leaders who participated in the study, saturation was not achieved. Saturation occurs only when the researcher has heard the same responses, to an extent that the responses become predictable. This typically occurs through multiple focus groups with a total at least 15 participants. The focus group took place at each campus, at the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, resulting in similar timing circumstances as mentioned above for the online survey administration. Consideration of these circumstances in future studies would improve saturation, and allow for the possible creation of more themes, making the qualitative aspect able to more generalized, and reinforce or complement the quantitative findings of a mixed-method studies.

Although this study had several limitations, these limitations do not detract from the overall contributions of this study. This study was useful because it extended the body of knowledge regarding the influence positional leadership plays on overall student
satisfaction and retention for second-year students. In addition, this study provides an array of recommendations for higher education administrators and executive leaders to improve not only the overall satisfaction and retention rates of second-year students, but also presents practical implications and possible best practices for improving student life and personal development of second-year students, especially those in leadership positions, and second-year male students.

Conclusion

This study examined the influence positional leadership plays in second-year satisfaction and retention of second-year students, especially males. A mixed methods approach was employed to explore the research questions through the completion of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B), and the completion of focus groups at Cazenovia College (CAZ), Hobart and William Smith Colleges (HWS) and Keuka College (KC). The method of sampling provided that only students who met the criteria of second-year classification (credit hours) could participate in the study. This classification resulted in a total population of 1043 second-year students from CAZ (N=283), HWS (N=562), and KC (N=198).

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows, Version 16.0 (SPSS, 16.0, Chicago, IL) was utilized for the quantitative data analysis. Descriptive statistics along with procedure correlation (Pearson r) and independent samples t-tests were used to analyze the quantitative data. Coding, member checking, and triangulation of each institutional focus group were used to analyze the qualitative data.

The overall response rate for the online administration of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey (Appendix B) was calculated at 15.72%. A total of 164
students, 39 from CAZ, 47 from HWS, and 78 from KC completed the survey. Eight second-year male positional leaders participated in the focus groups. Three were from CAZ, one was from HWS and four were from KC.

Survey results indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between overall satisfaction and retention of study participants. In addition, a statistically significant negative relationship was found between positional leadership and overall satisfaction. No statistically significant relationship was found between positional leadership and retention or between positional leaders by gender. There was also no statistically significant relationship found between male and female positional leaders level of leadership effectiveness. No statistically significant relationship was found between level of positional leadership and overall satisfaction and retention. This study also found a statistically significant relationship between involvement in campus memberships and overall satisfaction, but no significant relationship between involvement in campus memberships and retention. Finally, a statistically significant relationship was found between overall leadership effectiveness and overall satisfaction, but no significant relationship was found between overall leadership effectiveness and retention.

Analysis of the focus group data resulted in the formation of major themes regarding the lived experiences of the eight second-year male positional leaders within this study. These themes were involvement, bonds formed via social experiences, self-perception of leaders as role models, formal and informal mentoring relationships and leadership roles fostering skill development. Overall, all focus group participants expressed overall satisfaction with their current institution and no desire to transfer.
Focus group participants felt their involvement made them feel more connected to their institution and the bonds formed via social experiences, such as involvement in recognized campus organizations helped form this connection and their overall self-development. The focus group participants felt a level of accountability because of their position of leadership. They felt more accountable not only to themselves, but to the institution, to the campus organizations they were leading, and even the general student body. Many of the participants saw themselves as role models and set higher standards for themselves because of it.

Focus group participants also indicated the development of transferable life skills through exercising positional leadership. Time management and organizations skills, along with the ability to communicate with others were developed through their experiences as positional leaders. Positional leaders within this study also lead by example, treating others with respect and dignity, listened to others in order to motivate and built relationships that were open and honest. They were able to recognize weaknesses in delegation of responsibilities and that gaining respect and trust was difficult for them as underclassmen RA's working with upperclassmen students. The focus group participants were also able to recognizable the differences in gender dynamics that exist at predominately female campuses and the need to adapt or change their leadership styles because of it.

The positional leaders who participated in the focus groups felt they could express themselves freely and openly at their campuses, but they could see how other students may not feel the same way. Some focus group participants expressed intolerance and close-mindedness on their campus. The level of institutional support regarding the
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expressed intolerance and close-mindedness varied by campus. The smaller school environment and the possibility of being singled out if and when a student does choose to express ideas, or issues was concerning for the focus group participants. However, for some, being a male positional leader on their campus, which are predominately female, had huge advantages. Having their voice heard was one of them.

In addition, this study provides an array of recommendations for higher education administrators and executive leaders to improve not only the overall satisfaction and retention rates of second-year students, but also presents practical implications and possible best practices for improving student life and personal development of second-year students, especially those in leadership positions, and second-year male students. Higher education administrators within residence life, orientation departments, leadership development programs and second-year experience programs must link the results of study to their current practice in order to foster involvement and improve personal and leadership development.

Although many of these recommendations could be fulfilled by executive leaders, there are specific implications and action items resulting from the findings within this study that should involve executive leaders, such as Board of Trustee (BOT) members, College Presidents and the administrative cabinet of the President. These include the hiring of appropriate personnel and restructuring of budget allocations for second-year programs and supporting mid-level management in improving or changing campus wide policies and procedures. The moral imperative to develop students into productive citizens is another implication for executive leaders, and is the most critical. The need
goes beyond student satisfaction and retention to the imperative for a more productive, ethically charged world.

The examination of how paid versus volunteer positions, selective application processes and extensive training affects overall satisfaction and retention of second-year students would prove critical for future research. In addition, interviewing junior and senior students versus second-year students would allow for greater perspective, and reflection regarding the second-year experience. The demographic qualities of special populations such as second-year commuter students, second-year non-traditional students, and diverse students within the second-year would also be a future research area that could prove beneficial for second-year students overall student satisfaction and retention. Finally, the creation of assessment tools, such as a survey specific to the variables within this study, along with the creation of a program evaluation for second-year leadership programs would aid in the creation of best practices within the second-year, and overall improvement of such programs.

Overall, this study showed that students who exercised positional leadership did not have the same levels of dissatisfaction or attrition as presented within the literature, but some other symptoms of the sophomore slump did surface within the study. This study adds to the body of knowledge about second-year students by understanding how exercising positional leadership during the second-year influences overall satisfaction and retention at three private, liberal arts institutions. The study also adds to the body of knowledge about second-year male positional leaders experiences at the three institutions. Recently, researchers have noticed decreasing retention rates for second-year students and at the same time are noticing higher levels of disengagement in the
campus community by second-year males. This disengagement heightens the growing concern that college men are becoming a minority at institutions of higher learning (Wilson, 2007). At the same time, research about the benefits of co-curricular learning and involvement dominate the field of higher education. This study can add a dimension of understanding to the limited body of knowledge about the second-year, especially about second-year male students. Institutions of higher learning can use this knowledge to inform best practices for second-year students, especially males, as an aid to improve satisfaction and retention.
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Appendix A

Definition of Terms


Student Satisfaction: a student's cognitive evaluation of the overall quality of his/her college life at a particular institution of higher education (Okun, M.A. & Weir, R.M, 1990) measured by questions 32-75 and 84-86 of the Student Satisfaction and Involvement Survey (Appendix B).

Student Retention: “ability of a college or university to successfully graduate the students that initially enrolled at that institution” (Seidman, 2005, p. 3) measured by questions 84-86 and 99-100 of the Student Satisfaction and Involvement Survey (Appendix B).

Positional Leadership: holding an elected position within a recognized campus organization or serving as a Resident Assistant (RA), Mentor or Orientation Leader (OL) (Romero-Aldaz, 2001).

Private Liberal Arts Colleges: Typically four-year private colleges supported primarily by individuals or groups not affiliated with governmental agencies or corporations with a curriculum aimed at imparting general knowledge and developing general intellectual capacities, in contrast to a professional, vocational, or technical curriculum.
Sophomore Slump: a complex developmental period resulting in a lack of commitment to school, absenteeism, educational goals, extracurricular activities, and perceptions of faculty-staff interactions contributing to decreased satisfaction and retention rates for second-year students at institutions of higher learning (Wilder, 2003).

Effective Positional Leaders: second-year students who hold an elected position within a recognized campus organization, or RA, Mentor or OL that has scored a three or above in each of the five leadership practices created by Kouzes & Posner (2006) in the Student Satisfaction and Involvement Survey (Appendix B).

Elected Position: a student elected as President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer of a recognized campus organization (Romero-Alfaro, 2001).

Recognized Campus Organization: an established, officially sanctioned club or organization, recognized by the student governing body at an institution of higher education (Keuka College (2005), Student Life Webpage, www.keuka.edu).

Student Involvement: the amount of physical and psychological energy that a student invests in the five main areas of the college experience: active participation in the students' academic program, frequent interaction with faculty and staff, living on campus, working on campus and active participation in extracurricular activities (Astin, A.W., 1999).
Appendix B

Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey & Cover Letters

The copy of the Student Leadership and Satisfaction Survey below was used at Cazenovia College. The surveys used at Hobart and William Smith Colleges (HWS) and Keuka College (KC) are identical to this survey with the exception of Part One: Introduction/Consent to Participate. Section One for HWS and KC are included at the conclusion of this appendix as a reference. The incentive coupon offered as the first incentive for KC is also included at the end of this appendix.
My name is Jennifer L. Furner and I am doctoral candidate in the Executive Leadership program at St. John Fisher College. I am conducting a study on the influence of positional leadership (holding a position of office in a club or organization, or serving as a Resident Assistant or Orientation Leader) has on satisfaction and retention of second year students. I would appreciate your participation in this study, as it will help understand more about satisfaction and retention, and the role involvement plays in this.

Procedures
This study involves an online survey. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Data is being collected from approximately 993 students at three institutions, Keuka College, Cazenovia College and Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Risks and Benefits
There is little risk in taking this survey. You will be required to answer some questions while others are not required, and be skipped if you are not comfortable answering them. Completion of the survey will result in your eligibility to win one of two $50 gift cards to Wal-mart.

Confidentiality
Participation in this study is completely ANONYMOUS. There is no way to directly identify through this study, or any publication of the data who you are. All data will be in aggregate form. Individual data will not be released to other agencies.

If you complete the study and agree to provide your contact information at the end of the study, to participate in the focus groups occurring on your campus, your responses to the actual survey will still remain ANONYMOUS. Your contact information will be used only by the researcher to contact you regarding scheduling of the focus groups on your campus.

Freedom to Withdraw
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Decision not to participate will involve no penalty. If you choose to withdraw, any information collected from you will be destroyed. Please realize that if you do not complete the entire survey, you are not eligible for the gift card give-aways.

The survey will be available for completion from June 2-14, 2009. You will be able to save your survey at any time and return to complete at a later date.

If you have any complaints about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write to the chairs of the Cazenovia College or St. John Fisher IRB:
Chair IRB
Cazenovia College
22 Sullivan Street
Cazenovia, NY 13035
315 655-7233

IRB Chair
St. John Fisher College
Dr. Eileen Marges
emarges@sjfc.edu

Contact Information:
Once the study is completed, I will be glad to give the results to you. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please feel free to ask or contact me. My contact information is:
Jennifer L. Furner
Keuka College
Keuka Park, NY 14478
315 279-5264 (o)
315 694-0561 (c)
315 536-6098 (h)
jfurner@mail.keuka.edu
*I have received an explanation of the study and agree to participate. I understand that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

☐ I AGREE to participate.
☐ I DO NOT AGREE to participate.

* 1. What current leadership positions do you hold on your campus?

☐ President of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Vice President of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Secretary of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Treasurer of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Mentor or Orientation Leader
☐ Resident Assistant (RA)
☐ None

Other (please specify)
Instructions:
There are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate yourself in terms of how frequently you engage in the behavior described. This is not a test, therefore, there are no right or wrong answers. The usefulness of the inventory for the researcher will depend on how honest you are with yourself and how frequently you actually engage in each of these behaviors.

Consider each statement in the context of your leadership in campus organizations which you are now involved with. As you respond to each statement, maintain a consistent perspective to your leadership within the organization(s).

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

Please respond to every statement. If you can't respond to a statement (or feel it does not apply), answer "rarely or seldom".
How frequently do you typically engage in the following behaviors and actions. Click on the choice to the right of each statement using the scale, that best applies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rarely or Seldom</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I praise people for a job well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I spend time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed upon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I seek new ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I actively listen to diverse points of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. I have clear goals for our organization and express support and appreciation for their accomplishments.

16. I give people in our organization the freedom to decide what the right thing to do is.

17. I listen to feedback about how my actions affect other people's performance.

18. I talk with others about how my actions and the actions of others may be affecting the values of our organization.

19. I help others to get their work done.

20. I support the decisions that other people make about the organization.

21. I support the organization's mission and values.

22. I build teams based on the organization's mission and values.

23. I am upbeat and enthusiastic when discussing our organization's prospects.

24. I make sure that people are held accountable for their actions.

25. I give others a great deal of freedom in deciding what to do.

26. I give others a great deal of freedom in deciding how to do it.

27. I talk about the values and principles that are important in our organization.

28. I build teams based on what we value.
29. I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.

30. I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.

31. I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.
Dear Student,

The researcher is interested in systematically listening to you and your peers. Therefore, your thoughtful and honest responses to this inventory are very important.

You are being asked to share your feedback about your college experience thus far. Your responses will give the researcher insights about the aspects of college that are important to you as well as how satisfied you are with them.

-Thank you for your participation.

Student Satisfaction Inventory

4-Year College and University Version, Form B
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Dear Student,

The researcher is interested in systematically listening to you and your peers. Therefore, your thoughtful and honest responses to this inventory are very important.

You are being asked to share your feedback about your college experience thus far. Your responses will give the researcher insights about the aspects of college that are important to you as well as how satisfied you are with them.

-Thank you for your participation.
* Each item below describes an expectation about your experiences on this campus.

On the left, tell us how important it is for your institution to meet this expectation.

On the right, tell us how satisfied you are that your institution has met this expectation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance to me...</th>
<th>...My level of satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. The campus staff are caring and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Registration processes are reasonable and convenient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The campus is safe and secure for all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The content of the courses within my major is valuable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Administrators are available to hear students' concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Billing policies are reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Admission staff provide personalized attention prior to enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Financial aid awards are announced in time to be helpful in college planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Library resources and services are adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Financial aid counseling is available if I need it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(adequate space, lighting, heat, air conditioning, telephones, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Computer labs are adequate and accessible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. My academic advisor is available when I need help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. There are sufficient courses within my program of study available each term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Residence hall staff are concerned about me as an individual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Tutoring services are readily available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. This campus provides online access to services I need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I am able to take care of college-related business at times that are convenient for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Counseling services are available if I need them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. This institution helps me identify resources to finance my education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Security staff respond quickly to calls for assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Faculty use a variety of technology and media in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>There is an adequate selection of food available on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Students are made to feel welcome here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Faculty provide timely feedback about my academic progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their recruiting practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>I seldom get the &quot;run-around&quot; when seeking information on this campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>There is a strong commitment to diversity on this campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>I receive ongoing feedback about progress towards my academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Student disciplinary procedures are fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Faculty are usually available to students outside of class (during office hours, by phone or by e-mail).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Students are free to express their ideas on campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
73. Mentors are available to guide my career and life goals.
74. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.
75. Student activity fees are put to good use.

* How important were each of the following factors in your decision to enroll here?

76. Cost
77. Financial assistance
78. Academic reputation
79. Future career opportunities
80. Personal recommendations
81. Distance from campus
82. Information on the campus Web site
83. Campus visit

* 84. So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?
   - 1-Much worse than I expected
   - 2-Quite a bit worse than I expected
   - 3-Worse than I expected
   - 4-About what I expected
   - 5-Better than I expected
   - 6-Quite a bit better than I expected
   - 7-Much better than I expected
* 85. Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far:
   - 1. Not satisfied at all
   - 2. Not very satisfied
   - 3. Somewhat dissatisfied
   - 4. Neutral
   - 5. Somewhat satisfied
   - 6. Satisfied
   - 7. Very satisfied

* 86. All in all, if you had it to do over again, would you enroll here?
   - 1. Definitely not
   - 2. Probably not
   - 3. Maybe not
   - 4. I don't know
   - 5. Maybe yes
   - 6. Probably yes
   - 7. Definitely yes
### Demographics
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Choose the one response that best describes you.

**87. Gender**
- 1-Male
- 2-Female

**88. Age:**
- 1-18 and under
- 2-19 to 24
- 3-25 to 34
- 4-35 to 44
- 5-45 and over

**89. Ethnicity/Race:**
- 1-Alaskan Native
- 2-American Indian
- 3-Asian
- 4-Black/African-American
- 5-Hispanic or Latino (including Puerto Rican)
- 6-Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- 7-White/Caucasian
- 8-Multi-racial
- 9-Other

**90. Primary Enrollment Status:**
- 1-Day
- 2-Evening
- 3-Weekend

**91. Current Class Load:**
- 1-Full-time
- 2-Part-time
* 92. Class Level:
  - 1-freshman
  - 2-Sophomore
  - 3-Junior
  - 4-Senior
  - 5-Special Student
  - 6-Graduate/Professional
  - 7-Other

* 93. Current GPA:
  - 1-No credits earned
  - 2-1.99 or below
  - 3-2.0-2.49
  - 4-2.5-2.99
  - 5-3.0-3.49
  - 6-3.5 or above

* 94. Educational Goal:
  - 1-Associate degree
  - 2-Bachelor's degree
  - 3-Master's degree
  - 4-Doctorate or professional degree
  - 5-Certification (initial or renewal)
  - 6-Self-improvement/pleasure
  - 7-Job-related training
  - 8-Other

95. Employment:
  - 1-Full-time off campus
  - 2-Part-time off campus
  - 3-Full-time on campus
  - 4-Part-time on campus
  - 5-Not employed
96. Current Residence:
- 1-Residence Hall
- 2-Fraternity/Sorority
- 3-Own house
- 4-Rent room or apartment off campus
- 5-Parent's Home
- 6-Other

97. Residence Classification:
- 1-In-state
- 2-Out-of-state
- 3-International (not U.S. Citizen)

98. When I entered this institution, it was my:
- 1-1st choice
- 2-2nd choice
- 3-3rd choice

99. Did you transfer to this college from another institution?
- 1-Yes
- 2-No

100. Do you plan to transfer to another institution?
- 1-Yes
- 2-No

101. Membership(s) in campus organizations, including athletics:
- 1-None
- 2-One or two
- 3-Three or four
- 4-Five or more
*102. My primary source for paying my tuition and fees is:

- 1. Scholarships
- 2. Financial aid
- 3. Family contributions
- 4. Self-support
- 5. Other
103. I would be interested in participating in a focus group on my campus regarding the impact of leadership of second-year males on satisfaction and retention.

I can be contacted at:

Name: ____________________________
College: __________________________
Email Address: ____________________
Phone Number: ____________________
Incentive Coupon

Thank you for completing the survey.

You are now eligible to win a $50 Wal-mart gift card. Two gift cards will be given away to students who have completed the survey on your campus.

If you win, you will be contacted by the researcher, Jennifer Furner, via e-mail to discuss how to redeem your gift card.

Please provide your e-mail address below if you wish to be eligible for the give-aways.

If you have any additional questions regarding the survey, or participation in the focus groups on your campus, please feel free to contact the researcher at jfurner@keuka.edu.

If you wish to be eligible for the gift card give-aways, please provide your e-mail address below:

__________________________
Introduction/Consent to Participate in Research Study

My name is Jennifer L. Furner and I am doctoral candidate in the Executive Leadership program at St. John Fisher College. I am conducting a study on the influence of positional leadership (holding a position of office in a club or organization, or serving as a Resident Assistant or Orientation Leader) has on satisfaction and retention of second year students. I would appreciate your participation in this study, as it will help understand more about satisfaction and retention, and the role involvement plays in this.

Procedures
This study involves an online survey. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Data is being collected from approximately 993 students at three institutions: Keuka College, Cazenovia College and Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Risks and Benefits
There is little risk in taking this survey. You will be required to answer some questions while others are not required, and can be skipped if you are not comfortable answering them. Completion of the survey will result in eligibility to win one of two $50 Wal-mart gift cards.

Confidentiality
Participation in this study is completely ANONYMOUS. There is no way to directly identify through this study, or any publication of the data that you are in. All data will be in aggregate form. Individual data will not be released to other agencies.

If you complete the study and agree to provide your contact information at the end of the study, to participate in the focus groups occurring on your campus, your responses to the actual survey will still remain ANONYMOUS. Your contact information will be used only by the researcher to contact you regarding scheduling of the focus groups on your campus.

Freedom to Withdraw
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Decision not to participate will involve no penalty. If you choose to withdraw, any information collected from you will be destroyed. Please realize that if you do not complete the entire survey, you are not eligible for the Wal-mart gift card give-away.

The survey will be available for completion from June 2-14. You will be able to save your survey at anytime and return to complete at a later date.

If you have any complaints about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write to the Chairs of the Hobart and William Smith Colleges or St. John Fisher IRB:

Chair IRB
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
300 Pulteney Street
Geneva, NY 14456
315 (315) 781-3304

IRB Chair
St. John Fisher College
Dr. Eileen Marges
emarges@sjfc.edu

Contact Information:
Once the study is completed, I will be glad to give the results to you. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please feel free to ask or contact me. My contact information is:

Jennifer L. Furner
Keuka College
Keuka Park, NY 14478
315 279-5264 (o)
315 684-0561 (c)
315 536-6098 (h)
I have received an explanation of the study and agree to participate. I understand that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

- [ ] I AGREE to participate.
- [ ] I DO NOT AGREE to participate.

**1. What current leadership positions do you hold on your campus?**
- [ ] President of a Recognized College Organization
- [ ] Vice President of a Recognized College Organization
- [ ] Secretary of a Recognized College Organization
- [ ] Treasurer of a Recognized College Organization
- [ ] Member of Orientation Leader
- [ ] Resident Assistant (RA)
- [ ] None

Other (please specify):
Introduction/Consent to Participate in Research Study

My name is Jennifer L. Fumet and I am a doctoral candidate in the Executive Leadership program at St. John Fisher College. I am conducting a study on the influence of positional leadership (holding a position of office in a club or organization, or serving as a Resident Assistant or Orientation Leader) on satisfaction and retention of second year students. I would appreciate your participation in this study, as it will help understand more about satisfaction and retention, and the role involvement plays in this.

Procedures
This study involves an online survey. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.
Data is being collected from approximately 993 students at three institutions, Keuka College, Canisius College, and Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Risks and Benefits
There is little risk in taking this survey. You will be required to answer some questions while others are not required, and be skipped if you are not comfortable answering them. Completion of the survey will result in your eligibility for a gift card giveaway.

Confidentiality
Participation in this study is completely ANONYMOUS. There is no way to directly identify through this study, or any publication of the data who you are. All data will be in aggregate form. Individual data will not be released to other agencies.

If you complete the study and agree to provide your contact information at the end of the study, to participate in the focus groups occurring on your campus, your responses to the actual survey will still remain ANONYMOUS. Your contact information will be used only by the researcher to contact you regarding scheduling of the focus groups on your campus.

Freedom to Withdraw
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Decision not to participate will involve no penalty. If you choose to withdraw, any information collected from you will be destroyed. Please realize that if you do not complete the entire survey, you are not eligible to receive the $50 Wal-mart gift card giveaway.

Contact Information:
Once the study is completed, I will be glad to give the results to you. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please feel free to ask or contact me. My contact information is:
Jennifer L. Fumet
Keuka College
Keuka Park, NY 14475
315 279-5264 (o)
315 694-0561 (c)
315 536-6098 (h)
jfumet@mail.keuka.edu
jlf06905@sjfc.edu

If you have any complaints about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write to the chairs of the Keuka College or St. John Fisher IRB:
Chair IRB, Dr. Andrew Beigel
Keuka College
141 Central Ave
Keuka Park, NY 14475
315 279-5442

IRB Chair
St. John Fisher College
Dr. Eileen Manges
eanges@sjfc.edu

The survey will be available for completion from June 2-14, 2009. You will be able to save your survey at
anytime and return to complete at a later date.

*I have received an explanation of the study and agree to participate. I understand that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

☐ I AGREE to participate.
☐ I DO NOT AGREE to participate.

*1. What current leadership positions do you hold on your campus?

☐ President of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Vice President of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Secretary of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Treasurer of a Recognized College Organization
☐ Mentor or Orientation Leader
☐ Resident Assistant (RA)
☐ None

Other (please specify)___
Keuka College Incentive Coupon

The Keuka College Bookstore

*Second-Year Appreciation Sale

*For participants completing Leadership & Satisfaction Survey conducted by researcher, Jennifer Furner

10% Off

One time shopping spree

Print this coupon and bring to the bookstore

Print Name Here Upon Submission of Coupon

Coupon expires on 5/1/09

Excludes textbooks, special orders and class rings

Cannot be used with any other bookstore offers or coupons
Appendix C

Focus Group Protocol

Phrases or passages in CAPITAL LETTERS are instructions for the researcher.

Part A: Welcome

WELCOME ALL THE PARTICIPANTS. HAVE EACH PARTICIPANT COMPLETE A NAME TAG (FIRST NAME ONLY) AND INTRODUCE THEMSELVES, BY STATING SOMETHING UNIQUE ABOUT THEMSELVES, AND THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN CAMPUS LIFE.

Part B: Introduction/Consent Forms

INTRODUCE THE SESSION WITH THE FOLLOWING:

Thank you for coming today. The purpose of this study is to probe more deeply into your experiences as a positional leader at <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE>. It is important for you to respond fully and thoughtfully to the questions asked. If you have comments or concerns that span a longer period, please do not hesitate to bring them up. We are recording the session so that I can study what you said, but it goes no farther than this group. Anything you say here will be held in strict confidence; we will not tell people outside this room what you said. When you have something to say, please make sure to project, speak clearly and speak in turn. At the end of the focus group, I will briefly summarize the main points and you can add or amend any comments at this time.

DISTRIBUTE CONSENT FORMS AND SAY THE FOLLOWING:

Before I can continue with the focus group, it is a requirement for the study that all participants read and sign a consent form. Please review the consent form given to you.

If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them for you. If you are unwilling
to consent to the information within the form, you have the option to leave the room without prejudice. You also have the option to opt out of the focus group at anytime, even upon signing the consent form. Once you have read and consent to all information within the form, you can sign and date the consent form and give the form back to me. A copy of the consent form will be given to you upon completion of the focus group.

Part C: QUESTIONS

ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND ALLOW APPROPRIATE RESPONSE TIME FOR PARTICIPANTS

1. Tell me what it is like for you to be a second-year male who exercises positional leadership, meaning that you serve as an officer of a recognized campus organization, or an RA or Mentor/Orientation Leader?

2. What would you tell other prospective male students about being a student at <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE>.

3. What would you tell other male students about being a positional leader?

4. Tell me what it is like to be an effective leader here at <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE>? What leadership practices are your strongest? Your weakest? Please explain.

5. Do you think being involved on your campus changes how you feel about HWS, and your experience here?

6. How has being a positional leader affected your GPA?

7. Do you feel students can express themselves freely and openly at <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE>? If so, please explain your rationale.
If they cannot, what may be the cause of this, and what effects do you think this has on your campus?

8. If a trained professional Mentor was available to guide you through your time here at <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE>, would this make a difference on your overall experience? Please explain.

9. Tell me about your plans for the rest of your college year(s), both as a student, and a positional leader?

10. What would you tell college officials about your experiences here as a student and as a student leader?

Part D: Closing/Follow-Up

That is the conclusion of the focus group. SUMMARIZE THE MAIN POINTS OF THE FOCUS GROUP AND ASK PARTICIPANTS IF THERE ARE ANY POINTS THAT NEED CLARIFICATION OR INFORMATION THEY WOULD LIKE TO ADD AT THAT TIME.

THEN STATE THE FOLLOWING:

Thank you for your time. The information gained through this focus group will be valuable to my study. To make sure that all answers you provided to the questions are correct, I would like to send all of you a transcript of the focus group today. Please feel free to respond the transcripts with any concerns, or additional thoughts. The final task is to complete the handout before leaving. Again, thank you for your time. I truly appreciate it. DISTRIBUTE HANDOUT AND STAY UNTIL LAST PARTICIPANTS LEAVES IN CASE PARTICIPANTS HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS.
Consent Form

Study of the Lived Experiences of Second-Year Male Positional Leaders

Researcher
Jennifer Furner, doctoral candidate has requested your participation in a research study for her dissertation for the completion of doctoral studies at St. John Fisher College.

Introduction
The purposes of this form is to provide you (as a prospective participant) information that affects your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research and to record the consent of those who agree to be involved in the study.

Study Purpose/Description
The purpose of the research is to explore the lived experiences of second-year male positional leaders (holding a position of office in a recognized college organization and/or serving as a RA, Mentor or Orientation Leader) on three private liberal arts colleges in the Finger Lakes area of NY State.

If you decide to participate, the focus group will last approximately one hour and consist of your active participation in answering open-ended questions directed by the researcher, Jennifer Furner.

Risks and Discomfort
There are no apparent risks associated with this study.

Benefits
The benefits you will receive from participation include having an opportunity to share your experiences as a second-year positional leader on your campus. In addition, your participation may also provide valuable information for the study and lead to improved or new practices regarding leadership of second-year males at the institutions within the study.

Confidentiality
All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless law requires disclosure. An observer will attend the focus group and the focus group will be recorded to insure accuracy when transcribing the data. The facilitator, observer and the focus group participants have signed confidentiality statements agreeing to maintain your confidentiality during the focus group process and during the verification of accuracy of transcripts (see below). Copies of the signed confidentiality statements are available to you at the completion of the focus group.

Verification of Accuracy of Transcript
The information gathered during the focus group will be transcribed and sent to you for verification of accuracy. To assure your confidentiality, all focus groups participants have signed statements of confidentiality agreeing not to release information discussed
within the focus group to anyone else but the researcher. This includes destroying all transcripts within one week after receiving and providing feedback. The researcher, in a fire proof, secured safe, will secure all notes and recordings. The results of this research study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications. It is understood that you have a choice whether your first name and any other identifiable information will be used. You also have the choice of remaining anonymous. Three-years after the end of the study, all notes and recordings will be destroyed.

Withdrawal Privilege
You are free to refuse to answer any question at any time, and you may withdraw your participation in the focus group at anytime without prejudice.

Cost/Payment for Participation
There is no cost to you for participation in the focus group.

Compensation for Illness and Injury
If you agree to participate in the study, then your consent does not waive any of your legal rights. However, in the event of (harm, injury, illness) arising from this study the college, nor the researcher are able to give you any money, insurance coverage, free medical care, or any compensation for such injury.

Questions
Any questions you have concerning the research study or your participation in the study, before or after your consent, will be answered by Jennifer Furner via e-mail at jfurner@mail.keuka.edu, via phone at 315-279-5264 during business hours, or 315-694-0561 after business hours.

If you have questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk; you can contact the Chair of the St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board, Dr Eileen Marges at emerges@sjfc.edu.

This form explains the nature, demands, benefits, and any risk of the project. In signing this consent form, you are not waiving any legal claims, rights, or remedies. You will receive a copy of this informed consent upon completion of the focus group.

Your signature below indicates that you consent to participate in the above focus group.

Signature of Participant: __________________ Printed Name: __________________ Date: __________

_____ I agree to the use of my first name or other potentially identifiable information

_____ I wish to remain anonymous
Confidentiality Statement for Focus Group Note Taker & Researcher

I, ________________________________ understand that I will be part of a research study, conducted by researcher Jennifer Furner, as a note taker in focus groups consisting of <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE> male positional leaders. I understand that the research participants in this study have agreed in good faith that their responses in the focus groups will remain strictly confidential. I understand that I have a responsibility to honor this agreement. I hereby agree not to share any information from the focus groups with anyone beyond the principal researcher, Jennifer Furner. I hereby agree to serve as an observer only and not assist in the facilitation of or participation in the focus group. I also agree to neither question participants' responses, nor address participants about responses during or after the focus group. Finally, I hereby agree to return notes and recordings from all focus groups to researcher, Jennifer Furner immediately following each focus group. Any violations of this agreement would constitute a serious breach of ethical standards, and I pledge not to do so. I understand that if ethical standards are breached, the researcher, Jennifer Furner will be obligated to inform the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and that I may face review by the IRB. I understand a breach of ethical standards may also jeopardize the research study, and affect the researcher's status as a candidate in the doctoral program at St. John Fisher.

Printed Name of Note Taker __________________________ Date __________________________

Signature of Note Taker __________________________ Date __________________________

Printed Name of Researcher __________________________ Date __________________________

Signature of Researcher __________________________ Date __________________________
Confidentiality Statement for Focus Group Participants

I, ____________________________________________, understand that I will be part of a research study, conducted by researcher Jennifer Furner, as a focus group participant at <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE>. I understand that the research participants in this study have agreed in good faith that their responses in the focus groups will remain strictly confidential. I understand that I have a responsibility to honor this agreement. I hereby agree not to share any information from the focus groups, including the focus group transcripts (provided by the researcher after completion of the focus groups) with anyone beyond the principal researcher, Jennifer Furner. Finally, I hereby agree to destroy the transcripts from the focus groups within a week of receiving and providing feedback to the researcher. Any violations of this agreement would constitute a serious breach of ethical standards, and I pledge not to do so. I understand that if ethical standards are breached, the researcher, Jennifer Furner will be obligated to inform the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and that I may face review by the IRB. I understand a breach of ethical standards may also jeopardize the research study, and affect the researcher's status as a candidate in the doctoral program at St. John Fisher.

Printed Name of Focus Group Participant ____________________________ Date ____________

Signature of Focus Group Participant ____________________________ Date ____________

Printed Name of Researcher ____________________________ Date ____________

Signature of Researcher ____________________________ Date ____________
Supplementary Handout

First Name ______________________  Institution ______________________
Date ____________________________

Directions: Please complete the questions below in an honest and accurate manner. Please return the handout to the researcher prior to leaving tonight's focus group.

1. What leadership positions do you hold on campus?

2. Does holding a position of leadership on campus influence your level of satisfaction? Explain why or why not?

3. Do you plan to return <INSERT INSTITUTION HERE> next year?

4. Is your return to campus, due in part, to the positions of leadership you hold? Explain why or why not?

5. Do you think the level or office a student holds influences his or her satisfaction or retention? Explain your answer.

6. Do you consider yourself an effective leader? If so, what skills make you an effective leader?

7. Do you think a leader's level of effectiveness may influence their satisfaction and possible return to campus? Explain your answer.

Thank you for completing this handout and your participation in the focus group! I hope you have enjoyed the snacks provided. Please make sure to return this handout to the researcher upon leaving.
Appendix D
IRB Approval Forms

February 24, 2009

Jennifer Furner
PO Box 353
409 Chestnut Street
Keuka Park, NY 14478

Dear Ms. Furner:

Thank you for submitting your research proposal to the Institutional Review Board.

I am pleased to inform you that the Board has approved the proposal entitled, "The Influence of Positional Leadership on Second-year Male Satisfaction and Retention."

Following federal guidelines, research related records should be maintained in a secure area for three years following the completion of the project at which time they may be destroyed.

Should you have any questions about this process or your responsibilities, please contact me at 385-5262 or by e-mail to emerges@sjfc.edu.

Sincerely,

Eileen M. Merges, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

File No: 989-021909-09
Application for Exempt Review

Decision of Institutional Review Board

Reviewed by:  
Subcommittee Member #1  
Date

Subcommittee Member #2  
Date

☐ Approved

☐ Not Approved

Comments:

☐ No Research  The proposed project has no research component and does not need to be in further compliance with Article 24-A.

☐ Minimal Risk  The proposed project has a research component but does not place subjects at risk and need not be in further compliance with Article 24-A.

☐ Research & Risk  The proposed project has a research component and places subjects at risk. The proposal must be in compliance with Article 24-A.

Chairperson, Institutional Review Board  
Date

http://home.sjc.edu/institutionalreviewboard/exrev.html  
1/12/2009
To: Jennifer Furner  
From: Andrew Beigel, Chair  
Institutional Review Board  
Re: Research Proposal  
Date: April 7, 2009  
Cc: Institutional Review Board File  

The Institutional Review Board of Keuka College has reviewed your research proposal entitled "The influence of positional leadership on second-year male satisfaction and retention". The members of the board who reviewed the proposal feel that it meets the standards for the protection of human subjects adopted by the faculty of Keuka College. As such the Institutional Review Board approves the proposal as submitted.

Consistent with the policies of Keuka College, it is the obligation of researchers to be familiar with the policies regarding the protection of human and to seek approval of the Institutional Review Board if any substantive changes in the research are contemplated. The members of the committee will be happy to answer any questions or address concerns that you might have regarding this process. We have retained a copy of the proposal that you submitted for our records.

The members of the Institutional Review Board wish you well in your research endeavor.

Keuka Park, N.Y. 14478-0095  
(315) 279-5300  
www.keuka.edu
IRB Letter of Approval

Date: 4-8-09

Title of Proposal: The Influence of Perceived Leadership on Second-Year Male Satisfaction and Retention

Date of Proposal Receipt: 3-24-09

Principal Investigator: John Doe

This letter is to officially notify you that the Cazenovia College IRB has determined that your research is approved according to the Code of Federal Regulations (Title 45, part 46 Protection of Human Subjects).

You are authorized to implement this study in strict accordance with your submitted proposal for no longer than one year from the date of this notice. Any proposed changes to your study must be submitted to the IRB for approval before they may be implemented, as some changes can affect the approval status of your project. Further, you should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants to the IRB immediately.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 655-7159 or reclinero@cazenovia.edu.

Good luck with your research,

Rachel Dinero
Chair, IRB Committee
Dear Jennifer,

Our IRB chair Wes Perkins received the faxed signature we requested, so I am pleased to inform you that your research proposal to Hobart and William Smith Colleges is now officially approved, paperwork and all. The effective date of the approval is retroactive to 4/29/2009.

For your records, I am attaching an electronic copy of the approved proposal which includes both your signature and that of Dr. Perkins.

On behalf of the Hobart and William Smith Colleges Institutional Review Board, we wish you well!

Ron Gerrard
Coordinator, Institutional Review Board
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Geneva, NY 14456
Application to Conduct Research with Human Subjects

Directions: This application is to be submitted to and approved as required by the IRB prior to the initiation of any investigation involving human subjects. If you believe that your research project qualifies for exception, please complete Form B. Application for Exemption from IRB Review for Research with Human Subjects. Please submit a signed paper copy and an electronic version of your application to the Office of the Provost.

Principal Investigator: Name: Jennifer L. Ferrer

HWS Department: William: not applicable

Current Address: P.O. Box 615, 409 Chester St.,
Email Address: Jennifer.Ferrer@hws.edu
Phone Number: 315-694-1803 (o), 315-694-1234 (h)

If Principal Investigator Is a Student:

Name of Thesis/Thesis Supervisor:
Supervisor’s Current Address:
Supervisor’s Email Address:
Supervisor’s Phone Number:

Note: Supervisor’s signature must appear at the end of this form.

Project

Title: The influence of positional leadership on second-year satisfaction and retention.

Anticipated Start Date: April 2009
End Date: 1 year from start, August 2009

Project Involves:

[ ] Faculty/Staff research
[ ] Student-directed student research
X Other: St. John Fisher College, Doctoral Candidate
Recent College: Director of Student Activities

Project Collaborators: None

Institutional Affiliation (if non-HWS): St. John Fisher College

Application: 01-01
Submission Date: ___________
Revision Date: ____________
Chair’s Signature: ____________
Date: ____________

148
## Table A

**Demographic Characteristics of the Online Survey Sample (N=164)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positional Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Positional Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Level</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Staff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Under</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAZ College</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B

**Demographic Characteristics of Focus Group Participants (N=8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant/College</th>
<th>Positional Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie/HWS</td>
<td>I am the team captain for the club equestrian team, serve and serve as the Hillel House board representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris/KC</td>
<td>I am a Senate Representative for Teamworks Club, and Cycling, Running and Swimming Club. I am involved in History and Political Science Club and Adventure Club, just as a member. For sports, I run cross-country. I hold next year’s position as a Mentor and I also work in the mailroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle/KC</td>
<td>I am Club President of Club Hockey. I am a member of the soccer team in SAC. I also played soccer for the school and I think that is about it....oh and I am a lifeguard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick/KC</td>
<td>I am the third floor RA in Ball Hall. I also am the Vice President of the Drama Club and I have been involved in all of the student productions since I have been here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul/CAZ</td>
<td>I am an RA in the freshman dorm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip/CAZ</td>
<td>I am an Orientation Leader for freshman orientation, President of the Criminal Justice Society, President of the National Criminal Justice Society here and I am the liaison between the Cazenovia Fire Department and the students that volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rory/KC</td>
<td>I am a RA in the upper classmen dorms. I am the Treasurer and Vice President of the Paintball Club. I am a member of Teamworks! Club and I work in the weight room...Oh and I am a Senator from Harrington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler/CAZ</td>
<td>I am also an RA resident advisor...Leader wise, okay: I am a pretty big leader on my lacrosse team. I do not want the Captain name on my team because it is too much responsibility, even though I know I can handle it, but I’d rather just be a leader and be known as a leader, silent leader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C

*Positional Leadership Characteristics of Focus Group Participants (N=8)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor or Orientation Leader</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Assistant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Leadership Positions (duplicated)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director, Theatre productions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department Liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillel Board Member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Representative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletic Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Senator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Club Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognized Athletics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Statistical Tables

Table D

Comparison (by percentage) of Overall Satisfaction of Positional Leaders ($N=79$) versus Non-Leaders ($N=85$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Satisfaction Category</th>
<th>Positional Leaders</th>
<th>Non-leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Satisfied</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E

Comparison of Overall Satisfaction (by percentage) of Positional Leaders ($N=79$) versus Non-leaders by Designed Calculation ($N=85$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Category</th>
<th>Positional Leaders</th>
<th>Non-leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table F

*Comparison (by percentage) of Overall Satisfaction of Positional Leaders (N=79) versus Non-Leaders by Gender (N=85)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Satisfaction Category</th>
<th>Male Positional Leaders</th>
<th>Female Positional Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Satisfied</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table G

*Comparison of Overall Satisfaction (by percentage) of Positional Leaders (N=17) versus Female Positional Leaders by Designed Calculation (N=62)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Category</th>
<th>Male Positional Leaders</th>
<th>Female Positional Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table H

*Examination of Leadership Effectiveness by Practice (N=79)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>.9390, sd=.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>.9207, sd=.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>.9268, sd=.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>.9390, sd=.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>.9451, sd=.998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table I

Examination of Male \((N=17)\) versus Female \((N=62)\) Positional Leaders' Leadership Effectiveness by Practice \((N=79)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Male Positional Leaders</th>
<th>Female Positional Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Model the Way</em></td>
<td>2.0000, (sd=0)</td>
<td>1.9355, (sd=.307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inspire a Shared Vision</em></td>
<td>2.0000, (sd=0)</td>
<td>1.8871, (sd=.367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Challenge the Process</em></td>
<td>2.0000, (sd=0)</td>
<td>1.8871, (sd=.367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Enable Others to Act</em></td>
<td>2.0000, (sd=0)</td>
<td>1.9355, (sd=.307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Encourage the Heart</em></td>
<td>2.0000, (sd=0)</td>
<td>1.9516, (sd=.282)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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