



# Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

## Leadership Cohorts Aggregate Report

Center for the Study of Student Life

---

December 2021



**THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OFFICE OF STUDENT LIFE

## INTRODUCTION

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) is an international survey that investigates the extent to which higher education institutions develop student leaders. First administered in 2006, the MSL adapted a version of Astin's (1993) "input-environment-output" (I-E-O) college impact model to conceptually shape the study and the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (SCM) as the theoretical framework (HERI, 1996) with the goal of studying socially responsible leadership development. Over time, the MSL evolved to include a wider set of theoretical concepts beyond the SCM, including contemporary leadership theory, social psychology and human development, and critical and justice-based perspective (MSL, 2015).

In 2021, the survey was administered to a random sample of 4,000 undergraduate students on The Ohio State University's Columbus campus. Because Latinx and international students were underrepresented in previous administrations of the MSL, these groups were oversampled in 2021. A total of 715 students from the random sample and Latinx and international student oversamples responded for a response rate of 15.4%. Throughout this report, this group of students will be referred to as the non-leadership group.

Additionally, students holding leadership positions or participating in leadership-related programs on the Columbus campus were also invited to take the survey. Out of the 1,296 students in the leadership sample who were invited, 286 students responded for a response rate of 22.1%. There were 27 students included in both the leadership and non-leadership groups; for the purposes of this report, these students were excluded from the non-leadership group sample and included solely in the leadership group.

This report compares student leadership outcomes among the leadership and non-leadership groups. When interpreting the comparisons found within this report, please consider the following:

- Results for an individual leadership cohort group were provided when 20 or more students within that group responded to the survey. *T*-tests were used to examine differences between mean scores for each leadership group and the non-leadership group.
  - Descriptive statistics for a collection of leadership cohort groups within an overseeing department are provided when fewer than 20 but at least 10 students within that overseeing department responded to the survey.
  - Departments with fewer than 10 students responding included Buckeye Leadership Fellows and Involved Living Organizations (i.e., the Black Student Association, Cultural Ambassadors for Resident Enrichment, National Residence Hall Honorary, Off the Lake Productions and Residence Halls Advisory Council). These groups were not reported on due to these small sample sizes.
- Small sample sizes and/or high variability in responses could decrease the ability of statistical tests to detect statistically significant differences between a cohort group and the non-leadership group. Therefore, non-significant findings should be interpreted with caution when sample sizes are small.
- Although the overall survey response rate was acceptable, small response rates could influence the generalizability of survey responses for some cohort groups.
- The research design does not control for prior differences between group members. Differences in group demographics, year in school, prior leadership experience and other factors could influence responses. Therefore, observed differences between groups *should not be causally attributed* to group participation.

Students from the following leadership cohort groups or group participants responded to the survey:

### **Student Life Recreational Sports**

- J. Michael Dunn Sport and Wellness Scholars
- Recreation Center managers<sup>1</sup>

### **Student Life Residence Life**

- Community Council Executive Boards<sup>2</sup>
- Resident and Community Advisors (RAs/CAs)
- Involved Living Organizations (ILO)<sup>3</sup>
  - Black Student Association (BSA)
  - Off the Lake Productions (OTL)
  - Residence Halls Advisory Council (RHAC)

### **Student Life Student Activities**

- Buck-I-SERV<sup>4</sup>
- OSU Votes<sup>4</sup>
- Pay It Forward<sup>4</sup>
- Student Leadership Advocates<sup>4</sup>
- Mount Leadership Society Scholars

### **Student Wellness Center**

- Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Prevention
- Body Project<sup>5</sup>
- Buckeye Food Alliance<sup>5</sup>
- Front Desk<sup>5</sup>
- Peer Access Line<sup>5</sup>
- Scarlet and Gray Financial<sup>5</sup>
- Wellness Ambassadors<sup>5</sup>

### **Other Student Life Cohort Groups**

- Buckeye Leadership Fellows<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Recreation Center managers included managers of the Recreation and Physical Activity Center (RPAC) Aquatics Center, Adventure Recreation Center, Jesse Owens North Recreation Center, Member Services, Outdoor Facility Management and RPAC Facilities Operations. Due to small sample sizes, only descriptive data were reported for Recreation Center managers.

<sup>2</sup>Community Council executive boards included Archer-Torres-Drackett-Blackwell Community Council, Bradley-Paterson/Mack-Canfield Community Council, Fabulous Unique Neighborhood (FUN) Community Council, Houston-Taylor Community Council (HOT CC), Jones-Nosker Community Council, Mendoza-Norton-Scott-Blackburn-Haverfield Community Council, Park-Stradley/Baker West Community Council, Raney-Bowen-Busch-Halloran Community Council, Siebert/Morrison Community Council, Smith-Steeb/Baker East Community Council and Towers Community Council.

<sup>3</sup>Due to small sample sizes, this group did not receive its own report.

<sup>4</sup>Due to small sample sizes, these groups were combined into a single Student Activities leadership group.

<sup>5</sup>Due to small sample sizes, these groups were combined into a single Student Wellness Center leadership group.



## KEY MEASURES FROM THE MSL

The MSL includes several scales that measure student development and socially responsible leadership. Below are brief descriptions of the key scales examined in this report. The MSL includes a proprietary mix of scales created specifically for the study and scales for which permissions have been granted for use.

*Scales should not be copied, used or adapted without permission from the MSL.*

Scale	Description of Scale
Consciousness of Self	General self-awareness with particular attention toward the beliefs, values, attitudes and emotions that motivate one to take action (Dugan et al., 2014; HERI, 1996).
Congruence	Thinking, feeling and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity and honesty towards others; actions are consistent with most deeply held beliefs and convictions (HERI, 1996).
Commitment	The psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort; implies passion, investment and follow-through directed toward both the group activity as well as its intended outcomes (HERI, 1996).
Collaboration	The ability to work with others effectively in a common effort; constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust and shared responsibility (HERI, 1996).
Controversy with Civility	Recognition of two fundamental realities of any group effort: that differences in viewpoint are inevitable, and that such differences must be aired openly, but with civility (HERI, 1996).
Citizenship	Occurs when one becomes responsibly connected to the community/society by working for positive change interdependently with others (Dugan et al., 2014; HERI, 1996).
Omnibus Leadership Capacity	The knowledge, skills and attitudes associated with the ability to engage in leadership (Day et al., 2009; Hannah et al., 2008).
Resiliency	The characteristics that enable one to persist in the midst of adversity and positively cope with stress (Connor & Davidson, 2003).
Socio-Cultural Discussions with Peers	An individual's ability to clarify and articulate one's own perspective, seek a better understanding of others' worldviews, comprehend how personal values fit into larger social structures and perspectives and discern how to work with different communities to initiate positive change (Dugan et al., 2013).
Social Change Behaviors	An individual's involvement in organizations or activities that address specific social problems, whether local or global.
Leadership Efficacy	One's internal belief in the likelihood that they will be successful when engaging in leadership (Bandura, 1997; Hannah et al., 2008).
Hope	Capacity to initiate action towards and sustain motivation for good.
Social-Perspective Taking	The ability to take another person's point of view and/or accurately infer the thoughts and feelings of others (Gehlbach, 2004; Underwood & Moore, 1982).
Social Generativity Scale	An individual's concern for future generations and engagement in actions to advance the future of a community (Morselli & Passini, 2015).
Emotional Intelligence	Being aware of one's emotional state (i.e., emotional self-awareness) and being able to regulate one's emotions (i.e., emotion self-regulation; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2013; Levy Shankman, Allen, & Haber-Curran, 2015).
Cultural Competence	The ability to meaningfully engage across lines of cultural difference (Chiu & Hong, 2005).
Innovation	The ability to envision and work toward creative solutions, including characteristics and skills such as curiosity, integrative thinking, and creative problem-solving (Levey & Cannon, 2016; World Economic Fund, 2018).



## OVERALL COMPARISON

The following table lists 20 scales from the MSL and compares the mean scores of all students in the leadership groups (called *Overall Leadership Group*,  $n = 228$ ) to a random sample of students at The Ohio State University Columbus campus (called *Non-Leadership Group*,  $n = 542$ ). Students were not required to complete each item in the assessment; mean scores were computed from the respondents who completed all items on a scale. Mean scores between the Overall Leadership Group and the Non-Leadership Group were analyzed for statistically significant differences, which are noted in the final column of the table.

Scale	Scale Range	Overall Leadership Group	Non-Leadership Group	Statistical Significance
Consciousness of Self	1 – 5	4.07	3.88	***
Congruence	1 – 5	4.39	4.20	***
Commitment	1 – 5	4.48	4.33	**
Collaboration	1 – 5	4.35	4.16	***
Controversy with Civility	1 – 5	4.35	4.22	**
Citizenship	1 – 5	4.31	3.85	***
Omnibus Leadership Capacity	1 – 5	4.33	4.11	***
Resiliency	1 – 5	3.68	3.57	
Socio-Cultural Conversations	0 – 3	1.90	1.60	***
Social Change Behaviors	0 – 3	1.68	1.00	***
Leadership Efficacy	1 – 4	3.30	3.07	***
Hope	1 – 5	3.99	3.80	***
Social Perspective Taking	1 – 5	4.01	3.96	
Social Generativity	1 – 5	3.70	3.32	***
Emotional Self-Awareness	1 – 5	3.93	3.72	*
Emotional Self-Regulation	1 – 5	3.81	3.69	
Cultural Competence	1 – 5	4.11	4.03	
Curiosity	1 – 5	3.85	3.51	**
Integrative Thinking	1 – 5	3.71	3.53	
Creative Problem-Solving	1 – 5	3.64	3.47	