COLLEGE STUDENTS' EMOTIONALLY INTELLIGENT LEADERSHIP: AN EXAMINATION OF DIFFERENCES BY STUDENT ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT AND FORMAL LEADERSHIP ROLES

Paige Haber
Texas State University-San Marcos, USA

Scott J. Allen
John Carroll University, USA

Tina Facca
John Carroll University, USA

Marcy Levy Shankman
MLS Consulting, LLC, USA

The authors investigate the differences between college students' self-reported emotionally intelligent leadership (EIL) behaviors based on levels of involvement in student organizations and holding formal leadership roles. When students reported on their levels of consciousness of self, consciousness of others, and consciousness of context (the three facets of EIL), a number of findings reflect significantly higher levels of EIL for those students involved in four or more organizations and holding formal leadership roles as compared to students with less involvement. These results are shared in the context of past research and lead to implications for practice and research.

Involvement in the college experience both in and out of the classroom is consistently identified as significantly contributing to a variety of college student outcomes (Astin, 1984, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). One such outcome receiving substantial consideration is leadership development, which is often identified in institutional mission statements, emphasized in learning outcomes, and focused on in a variety of institutional initiatives (Astin & Astin, 2000; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2009; Keeling,

International Journal of Leadership Studies, Vol. 7, Iss. 2, 2012

ISSN 1554-3145

2004; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000). *Involvement* is described by Astin (1984) as "the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 518) and can include a range of experiences and activities such as studying, interacting with peers and faculty, athletics, and involvement in student organizations. Research on the impact of the college environment on student outcomes identifies that a number of these involvement experiences contribute to the outcome of leadership (Astin, 1997; Kuh, Hu, & Vesper, 2000; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

The concept of *leadership*, much like *involvement*, is a broad term, which encompasses many different meanings and possible outcomes (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; Northouse, 2007). As colleges and universities continue to emphasize leadership as an outcome, it is important that institutions focus on the type of leadership and the specific outcomes they are seeking to develop and cultivate in their students (Astin & Astin, 2000). Many institutional missions focus on developing leadership skills to better the local community and to create change and promote social responsibility. More contemporary models of leadership align with these goals (Haber, 2010). Just as colleges and universities need to better define and model the type of leadership they strive for in their missions, there is a parallel need to better understand student leadership development and the potential role of the college environment in their development.

One such contemporary framework of leadership, emotionally intelligent leadership (EIL), integrates research and scholarship on leadership theory and emotional intelligence into a mixed model designed specifically for college students (Shankman & Allen, 2008). EIL asserts that leaders understand that awareness and regulation of emotions in self and others is critical to long-term, sustainable leadership. With an intentional focus on self, others and context, emotionally intelligent leaders can better identify, diagnose, and navigate the complexities of leadership. The 21 capacities of EIL are the behaviors that equip leaders (and followers) with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to achieve results. While this model promotes the leadership capacities (e.g., developing relationships, citizenship, self-awareness, capitalizing on differences) that many colleges and universities seek to promote and develop, there is only one research study to date using this framework (Shankman, Haber, Facca, & Allen, 2010).

The purpose of this study is to better understand what differences, if any, exist in college students' EIL based on different levels of student organization involvement. A second purpose is to investigate what differences, if any, exist in college students' EIL based on whether students hold a formal leadership role in a student organization. A better understanding of the relationship between involvement and students' EIL will help scholars and practitioners better design and develop interventions to promote student leadership development and help prepare them to be emotionally intelligent leaders in, and beyond, the college environment.

Student Organization Involvement, Formal Roles, and Leadership

Student organization involvement and formal leadership roles within these organizations offer an important backdrop for understanding college student leadership development (Astin, 1984, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). These experiences provide an opportunity for students to develop their leadership capacity and engage with others in working toward group goals and affecting change. Leadership educators (college student administrators and faculty) support these students in instructional, advising, mentoring, and regulatory roles. As such,

ISSN 1554-3145

leadership educators have the potential for significant engagement with, and influence on, these students and their leadership development.

Much of the research on student organization involvement suggests positive outcomes for developing leadership capacity. These specific studies and outcomes focus on the positive association of student organization involvement with leadership ability, public speaking ability, and interpersonal skills (Astin, 1997); developing purpose, lifestyle planning, cultural participation, and life management (Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994); socially responsible leadership outcomes (Dugan, 2006; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Haber & Komives, 2009); and leadership self-efficacy (Dugan, Garland, Jacoby, & Gasiorski, 2008). In addition, a number of scholars have identified the positive role of holding a formal leadership position in developing student leadership capacity (Astin, 1997; Cooper et al., 1994; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Haber & Komives, 2009; Kuh & Lund, 1994; Posner & Brodsky, 1994; Posner & Rosenberger, 1997).

One measure of involvement is the *number of hours* a person spends participating in student organizations; this was found to be positively associated with leadership ability and interpersonal skills (Astin, 1997). However, recent research on breadth of involvement, measured by the *number of organizations* in which a student is involved, resulted in contrary results. Breadth of involvement was not identified to be positively associated with any outcomes, and, in fact, breadth of involvement was negatively associated with the socially responsible leadership outcome of *commitment* (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Haber & Komives, 2009). So, while there seems to be consistency in the research on the role of student organization involvement when it comes to leadership outcomes, there is also some disconfirming research that suggests a potential negative relationship with the *number* of organizations in which a student is involved. Breadth of student organization involvement therefore warrants additional exploration.

The aforementioned research also suggests some consistent findings that support the role of student organization involvement and holding a formal leadership position on a variety of leadership outcomes. In addition to further exploring the experience of student involvement, there is a need to further study college students' EIL. Research has not yet been conducted on the role of student organization involvement and holding a formal leadership role using the EIL model. In fact, research on emotional intelligence (EI) as it relates to leadership with a college student population is a fairly uncharted territory.

The limited research on EI and college students focuses on students' workplace success (Liptak, 2005), social network size (Austin, Saklofske, & Egan, 2005; Van der Zee, Thijs, & Schakel, 2002), mental health (Gupta & Kumar, 2010), and academic success/achievement (Jacques, 2009; Parker, Summerfeldt, Hogan, & Majeski, 2004; Samples, 2010). The authors found only two dissertations specifically focused on college students, emotional intelligence, and leadership (Bissessar, 2009; Cavins, 2005). These two dissertations examine emotional intelligence and leadership as separate constructs and support the empirical connection between the two. The EIL conceptual model bridges the two bodies of literature and research and can shed additional insight on student leadership development with a particular focus on emotional intelligence, which is briefly highlighted in the next section.

Emotionally Intelligent Leadership

Emotionally intelligent leadership (EIL), which integrates scholarship and research on leadership and emotional intelligence (Shankman & Allen, 2008), is a contemporary leadership

ISSN 1554-3145

model that warrants additional focus in empirical research. Research suggests that effective leadership (Bass, 2008) and emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2006; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000; Petrides & Furnham, 2000) are valuable to both organizational and personal success. The integration of these concepts with a specific focus on college students allows for a more holistic approach to understanding student leadership development.

The EIL conceptual model proposes three facets of emotionally intelligent leadership: consciousness of context, consciousness of self, and consciousness of others, and 21 specific capacities across these three facets (see Table 1). Consciousness of context involves awareness of the larger environment in which leadership takes place and is a combination of the *setting* and *situation*. This facet of EIL draws heavily from the work of Fiedler (1972), who suggested that leadership is more than simply a great man or woman; leadership is a relationship between the leader, the followers, and the context or situation. Around the same time, situational leadership emerged, which suggested that leadership style is "how you behave when you are trying to influence the performance of someone else and is a combination of directive and supportive behaviors" (Blanchard, Zigarmi & Zigarmi, 1985, p. 46). Likewise, Day (2001) suggests that leadership is "a complex interaction between the designated leader and the social and organizational environment" (p. 583).

Consciousness of self emphasizes the inner work of leadership. Included in the EIL conceptual model are intrapersonal aspects of leaders that include understanding and recognizing one's strengths and limitations, emotional reactions, priorities and goals, and sense of self. This facet emphasizes the critical role that reflection and increasing self-understanding play in effective leadership. To that end, this facet demonstrates the obvious intersection of many leader-centric theories and models (Bass, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 2008) with the various models of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2006; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000; Petrides & Furnham, 2000).

Consciousness of others involves awareness of others and managing relationships, emphasizing the important role that group members have in the leadership process (Blanchard et al., 1985; Kellerman, 2008; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). To this point, Chaleff (2003) suggests that "all important social accomplishments require complex group effort, and, therefore leadership and followership" (p. 14). Other scholars have focused on followership as a concept central to leadership and organizational effectiveness, identifying aspects of effective and less-effective followership (Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988).

A unique aspect of the EIL conceptual model is that it integrates theories of social and emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Goleman et al., 2002; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000; Petrides & Furnham, 2000) into a model of leadership. The EIL conceptual model offers emotional intelligence as a foundation for effective leadership. Although an inherent controversy still challenges research on emotional intelligence (Zeidner, Roberts, & Matthews, 2008), or what some call emotional or social competence (ESC) (Cherniss, 2010), the EIL model suggests that leadership is a dynamic relationship between leaders, followers, and the context. Further, no single model of leadership or emotional intelligence can do the concepts justice. For instance, Ferris (2010) suggests that "it does not seem plausible that any one of the EI approaches by itself can meaningfully help us understand EI; they all need to be accounted for in a meaningful theory of EI" (p. 142). Like Ferris (2010) and Cherniss (2010), the authors suggest that the various models of emotional intelligence highlight varied and not mutually exclusive components of an individual (e.g., general intelligence, personality, performance). The authors

ISSN 1554-3145

suggest that to isolate any one of these would be limiting; at one time or another, demonstrating one's emotional intelligence may include any of the above, or even *all* of the above. By definition, therefore, the EIL model suggests that EI is a collection of personality traits, behaviors, competencies, knowledge, skills, abilities, and cognitive abilities. After all, each of us brings a baseline level of cognition about emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), inherent personality traits (Bar-On, 2010; Petrides & Furnham, 2000), and performance levels/competencies (Goleman et al., 2002) to any formal or informal leadership opportunity. EIL honors those complexities from both the EI and leadership literature.

Table 1: The Three Facets and 21 Capacities of Emotionally Intelligent Leadership

Consciousness of Context	
Being aware of the environment in which leaders and followers work	
Environmental awareness	Thinking intentionally about the environment of a leadership situation
Group savvy	Interpreting the situation and/or networks of an organization
Consciousness of Self	
Being aware of yourself in terms of your abilities and emotions	
Emotional self-perception	Identifying your emotions and reactions and their impact on you
Honest self-understanding	Being aware of your own strengths and limitations
Healthy self-esteem	Having a balanced sense of self
Emotional self-control	Consciously moderating your emotions and reactions
Authenticity	Being transparent and trustworthy
Flexibility	Being open and adaptive to changing situations
Achievement	Being driven to improve according to personal standards
Optimism	Being positive
Initiative	Wanting and seeking opportunities
Consciousness of Others	
Being aware of your relationship with others and the role they play in the leadership process	
Empathy	Understanding others from their perspective
Citizenship	Recognizing and fulfilling your responsibility for others or the group
Inspiration	Motivating and moving others toward a shared vision
Influence	Demonstrating skills of persuasion
Coaching	Helping others enhance their skills and abilities
Change agent	Seeking out and working with others toward new directions

ISSN 1554-3145

Conflict management	Identifying and resolving problems and issues with others
Developing relationships	Creating connections between, among, and with people
Teamwork	Working effectively with others in a group
Capitalizing on difference	Building on assets that come from differences with others

Note: Taken from *Emotionally Intelligent Leadership for Students: Inventory* by M. L. Shankman, S. J. Allen, and T. M. Facca, 2010, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Reprinted with permission from Jossey-Bass.

Due to the recent emergence of the EIL conceptual model, research using this framework to study college student populations is in its infancy. One recent study examined gender and EIL measures within the college student population (Shankman, Haber, Facca, & Allen, 2010). The study found that a number of emotionally intelligent leadership behaviors differed by gender. Women reported demonstrating higher levels of EIL across multiple measures of *consciousness of self* and *consciousness of others* (Shankman, Haber, Facca, & Allen, 2010). Although the study did not focus on student organization involvement directly, the researchers did examine gender differences across different levels of involvement, resulting in gender differences based on these different levels of involvement. This finding suggests a need for further research into the relationship between student organization involvement and the EIL.

As discussed above, student organization involvement and holding formal leadership roles in organizations are valuable experiences associated with student leadership development. Likewise, emotional intelligence and effective leadership have been shown to facilitate individual and organizational success in a number of contexts (Bass, 1990; Bar-On, 2006). Further examining these research findings in the college context through studying the relationship between student involvement and emotionally intelligent leadership can shed additional light on college student leadership development and the college experience. It can also enable leadership educators, scholars, and practitioners to gain a better understanding of where to best allocate time and resources. For instance, this research can be used to more purposefully design, construct, and promote student involvement experiences to meet established learning outcomes of the institution and prepare students to be effective and emotionally intelligent leaders. Additional research using EIL can expand researchers' and leadership educators' understanding of the conceptual model to better serve student leadership development needs.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

This study examined differences in college students' emotionally intelligent leadership self-reported behaviors based on differing levels of student organization involvement and holding formal leadership roles. This purpose suggests the following two research questions:

RQ1. What differences, if any, exist in college students' emotionally intelligent leadership based on different levels of student organization involvement?

RQ2. What differences, if any, exist in college students' emotionally intelligent leadership based on whether students hold a formal leadership role in a student organization?

ISSN 1554-3145

Methods

This quantitative study examined self-reported emotionally intelligent leadership behaviors of 566 college students from 139 higher education institutions throughout the United States. Data were collected in Spring 2008 using a pre-published version of the Emotionally Intelligent Leadership for Students-Inventory (Shankman, Allen, & Facca, 2010). The survey instrument, data collection procedures, participants, and analysis procedures are described below.

Instrument

The Emotionally Intelligent Leadership for Students-Inventory (EILS-I) is a 24-item inventory designed to measure students' self-reported emotionally intelligent leadership behaviors. Eight items make up each of the constructs of consciousness of context, consciousness of self, and consciousness of others (Shankman, Allen, & Facca, 2010). Sample items in the survey are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Sample Items from EILS-I

Facet of EIL	Sample Items
	When serving in a formal or information leadership role, I…
Consciousness of Context	*Learn the expressed and implicit values of the group*
	Recognize patterns of behavior
Consciousness of Self	*Monitor how my emotions affect my interactions with others*
	Work on my limitations
Consciousness of Others	*Help others enhance their skills and abilities*
	Work to build a sense of team

The survey items are measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *Never* to *Always.* After responding to the 24 statements, the participants' scores for the variables that fall into each construct category were added to arrive at a score between 8 and 40 on each of the three constructs (assuming full completion of the survey). Participants also completed a series of demographic and involvement questions. Because the EILS-I is a self-report instrument, the findings reflect the students' assessment of their own leadership capacities. Like other self-reported data, there is the potential for participants to respond in ways that are socially desirable as opposed to how they actually lead or how others perceive them as leading. Well-documented challenges exist regarding self-report instruments (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002; Gonyea, 2005).

Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of the scales measuring the three consciousness facets (context, self, others). Reliability of the assessment tool ensures that the facets (scales) of emotionally intelligent leadership are statistically reliable constructs. Each scale achieved a strong level of internal consistency reliability (Consciousness of Context, $\alpha = .81$; Consciousness of Self, $\alpha = .73$; Consciousness of Others, $\alpha = .82$).

ISSN 1554-3145

Data Collection

Professionals involved in student leadership development at small, medium, and large public and private institutions identified students involved in leadership programming, courses, and activities. This strategy of data collection and identifying participants was used to recruit students from a range of institutional types and to identify students who were experienced with and involved in campus life. Identified students received an email link to an online assessment. Participation was purely voluntary and an informed consent page stated that responses would be anonymous.

Participants

A total of 566 students from 139 colleges and universities in the United States participated in this study. The respondents reflect a reasonable distribution of women (69%) and men (31%), mostly aged 18-23 from varied class ranks, primarily Caucasian (87%), yet with 13% representing other racial groups (Table 3). Likely due to how the participants were recruited, participants reflected high levels of campus involvement. Because of this, it is important to note that the population studied was primarily what can be called *involved* students and does not reflect the general student population. Thus, the scope of this study is limited to these involved students; although it does not reflect an average subset of college students, it does allow for the examination of differing levels of involvement. Only 5% of responses reported no involvement in student organizations, while 10% percent reported involved in one organization, 31% in two organizations, 25% in three organizations, and 29% in four or more organizations. For the purpose of this study, students were grouped into three involvement categories: *no* involvement (5%); *some* involvement, which includes one to three organizations (66%); and *much* involvement, which includes four or more organizations (29%). Eighty-six percent of the participants served in a leadership role in an organization at the time of the study.

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 566)

Characteristic	%
Gender	
Women	69%
Men	31%
Age	
18-23	92%
24+	8%
Class year	
Freshmen	10%
Sophomores	28%
Juniors	32%
Seniors	22%
Graduate students	7%
Race/ Ethnicity	
Caucasian/ White	87%
Hispanic/ Latino	4%

ISSN 1554-3145

Asian/ Pacific Islander	3%
African American	2%
Middle Eastern	1%
Multi-Racial	3%

Data Analysis

To answer both research questions, t-tests were used to identify significant mean differences between the constructs (the facets of consciousness of context, self, and others) and the 24 specific measures of leadership behaviors that reflect consciousness of context, self, and others. For research question one, significant differences were tested across three groups of students: those with *no* involvement, those with *some* involvement (one to three organizations), and those with *much* involvement (four or more organizations). For research question two, significant differences were tested between those students who held a formal leadership role and those who did not.

Results

The findings from the two research questions are presented below. First, differences by involvement are presented, followed by findings on EIL differences between students who held a formal leadership role and those who did not.

Differences by Involvement

As mentioned previously, t-tests were used to answer research question one: *What differences, if any, exist in college students' emotionally intelligent leadership based on different levels of student organization involvement?* Results for the mean difference indicated significant differences between participants across the three different levels of organizational involvement.

No involvement and some involvement. In examining the overall constructs of *consciousness of context*, *consciousness of self*, and *consciousness of others*, significant differences emerged for all three constructs between those students with *no* involvement in organizations and those with *some* involvement (one to three organizations) (Table 4). For each of these differences, those students with *some* involvement scored significantly higher than those with *no* involvement on consciousness of context, $t = 4.27(392)$, $p < .001$, which was the most significant difference, as well as consciousness of others, $t = 3.58$ (383), $p < .001$, and consciousness of self, $t = 3.51$ (385), $p < .001$.

Table 4: Construct Differences - No Involvement and Some Involvement

	No Involvement		Some Involvement				
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Context	27.14	5.30	30.78	4.27	392	4.27	.000

ISSN 1554-3145

Others	29.14	3.32	32.17	4.38	383	3.58	.000
Self	30.23	2.93	32.74	3.56	385	3.51	.001

A number of significant differences emerged between students with *no* involvement and those with *some* involvement. Those with *some* involvement scored significantly higher on each of the measures in Table 5 compared to *no* involvement. The five specific measures that resulted in the highest significance (as captured by the t statistic and the *p* value) lie within the consciousness of self and consciousness of context constructs.

Some involvement and much involvement. Similar to findings comparing students with *no* involvement to *some* involvement, significant differences emerged across all three consciousness constructs between students with *some* involvement (one to three organizations) and *much* involvement (four or more organizations) (Table 6). The highly involved are significantly more conscious of self, $t = 2.62$ (523), $p < .01$, conscious of others, t (508) = 2.11, $p < .05$, and conscious of context, $t = 1.99$ (510), $p < .05$.

A number of significant differences emerged for the individual EIL measures between those with *some* and *much* involvement (Table 7). Again, each of these significant differences reflects higher scores with more involvement. All three consciousness constructs are represented in the specific measures that emerged as significant, and all three consciousness constructs are also represented among the five measures reflecting most substantial difference between highly involved students compared to those with some involvement.

Table 5: Significant Differences - No Involvement and Some Involvement

		No Involvement		Some Involvement				
Specific Measure	Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Work on my limitations	Self	2.93	.55	3.54	.87	36	5.30	.000
Understand how group environment influences my leadership style	Context	3.04	.96	3.74	.87	395	4.09	.000
Monitor how my emotions affect interactions with others	Self	3.29	.81	3.95	.84	396	4.0	.000
Try to understand informal traditions of a group	Context	3.11	.99	3.82	.81	29	3.68	.001
Learn expressed/implicit values of a group	Context	3.32	.91	3.96	.76	29	3.63	.001

ISSN 1554-3145

Work to resolve conflicts	Others	3.64	.78	4.15	.85	396	3.09	.002
Align disparate viewpoints	Others	3.29	.71	3.77	.87	393	2.87	.004
Listen carefully to what is and isn't being said	Others	3.61	.92	4.07	.84	395	2.82	.005
Recognize patterns of behavior in a group	Context	3.61	.74	3.99	.80	396	2.46	.014
Identify external influences on a group	Context	3.32	1.0	3.72	.85	395	2.37	.018
Consider needs of others	Others	3.93	.66	4.25	.73	396	2.47	.024
Think about how decisions are received	Others	3.68	.72	4.06	.83	395	2.36	.019
Help others enhance skills and abilities	Others	3.43	.92	3.82	.89	394	2.25	.025
Establish positive tone	Self	4.00	.67	4.28	.73	32	2.15	.039
Work toward a shared goal	Self	4.07	.60	4.32	.69	33	2.09	.045
Tailor leadership style to situation	Context	3.64	.99	3.98	.83	394	2.01	.045

Table 6: Construct Differences - Some Involvement and Much Involvement

	Some Involvement		Much Involvement				
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Self	32.74	3.57	33.64	3.43	523	2.62	.009
Others	32.17	4.38	33.04	4.15	508	2.11	.036
Context	30.78	4.27	31.60	4.41	510	1.99	.047

No involvement and much involvement. In examining significant differences in the three consciousness constructs between students with *no* involvement and those with *much* involvement (four or more organizations), significant differences are found for each of the three consciousness constructs (Table 8). The largest differences exist for the consciousness of context construct, t (185) = 4.79, $p < .001$, followed by consciousness of self, t = 4.77 (173), $p < .001$, and consciousness of others, t = 4.70 (181), $p < .001$.

Numerous significant differences emerged for the specific measures of EIL between those with no involvement and those highly involved. Students with *much* involvement scored

ISSN 1554-3145

significantly higher on all but four measures compared to students with *no* involvement. Each of the measures that emerged as significantly different in the prior two comparisons (*none* vs. *some* and *some* vs. *much*) emerged as significant, with the exception of *understanding how group members relate* (context), which was significant for *some* vs. *much* involvement groups. The five measures that reflected the largest significant differences were: *working on one's limitations* (self), $t = 5.20$ (56), $p < .001$); *taking time to understand the informal traditions of a group* (context), $t = 4.53$ (33), $p < .001$; *understanding how the group environment influences leadership style* (context), $t = 4.39$ (187), $p < .001$; *listen carefully to what is said and what is not being said* (others), t (187) = 3.99, $p < .001$; and *learn the expressed/implicit values of the group* (context), t (34) = 3.98, $p < .001$. These significant differences reflect the three consciousness constructs, with three of the five being consciousness of context measures.

In examining those measures that were significantly different for *no* involvement vs. *much* involvement, compared to the other two comparison groups, two additional measures were significantly different. These significant differences are: *thinking how leadership styles align with group culture* (context), t (187) = 2.29, $p < .05$, and *capitalize on my strengths* (self), t (185) = 2.16, $p < .05$.

Table 7: Significant Differences - Some Involvement and Much Involvement

		Some Involvement		Much Involvement				
Specific Measure	Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Work toward a shared goal	Self	4.32	0.69	4.51	0.65	525	2.87	.004
Help others enhance skills and abilities	Others	3.82	0.89	4.04	0.83	323	2.73	.007
Build sense of team	Others	4.08	0.80	4.27	0.74	523	2.53	.012
Try to understand informal traditions of a group	Context	3.82	0.81	4.00	0.75	327	2.53	.012
Improve my abilities	Self	4.02	0.75	4.19	0.76	298	2.45	.015
Listen carefully to what is and isn't being said	Others	4.07	0.84	4.26	0.78	528	2.42	.016
Understand how group members relate	Context	3.88	0.85	4.06	0.83	528	2.18	.029

ISSN 1554-3145

Table 8: Significant Differences by Construct - No Involvement and Much Involvement

	No Involvement		Much Involvement				
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Context	27.14	5.30	31.60	4.41	185	4.79	.000
Self	30.23	2.93	33.64	3.43	173	4.77	.000
Others	29.14	3.32	33.05	4.16	181	4.70	.000

Differences Based on Holding a Formal Leadership Role

Research question two was also analyzed utilizing t-tests. The research question read: *What differences, if any, exist in college students' emotionally intelligent leadership based on whether or not students hold a formal leadership role in a student organization?* Results from the second research question indicate a consistent pattern that holding a formal leadership role is associated with higher levels of emotionally intelligent leadership.

Results for the mean differences in the consciousness constructs indicate significant differences between leaders (those who hold a formal leadership position) and non-leaders (those who do not hold a formal leadership position). The consciousness of context construct was significantly higher for leaders at 31.09 while non-leaders scored 29.30, t (552) = 3.34, $p < .001$. The consciousness of others construct was also significantly higher for leaders at 32.46 as compared to non-leaders at 31.16, t (539) = 2.45, $p < .05$. The consciousness of self construct did not result in a significant difference between leaders and non-leaders.

Table 9 highlights the results for specific measures in which significant differences were identified between the means of the leader versus non-leader groups. Significant differences span the three consciousness constructs. More significant differences emerged for the consciousness of others construct than for the other two consciousness constructs.

Table 9: EIL Measure - Formal Leadership Roles

		Leader		Non-leader				
Specific Measure	Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Try to understand informal traditions of a group	Others	3.89	0.79	3.51	0.93	99	3.43	.001
Learn expressed/implicit values of a group	Context	4.00	0.77	3.70	0.83	103	2.97	.004
Align disparate viewpoints	Others	3.78	0.82	3.48	1.00	96	2.48	.015
Help others enhance skills and abilities	Others	3.91	0.89	3.66	0.90	555	2.20	.024
Think about how decisions are received	Others	4.10	0.85	3.88	0.74	556	2.27	.023

ISSN 1554-3145

Understand how group environment influences my leadership style	Context	3.78	0.89	3.51	1.00	99	2.25	.027
Capitalize on my strengths	Self	4.16	0.71	3.98	0.75	556	2.10	.037
Understand how group members relate	Context	3.96	0.84	.208	0.88	557	2.04	.041

Discussion

These findings reflect a consistent pattern of significant differences between level of involvement in student organizations and self-reported EIL behaviors. These findings also support the existing literature on the role and impact of student organization involvement in developing student leadership outcomes (Astin, 1997; Cooper et al., 1994; Dugan, 2006; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Haber & Komives, 2009). The results of this study corroborate that involvement in student organizations matters. This study finds that students who are highly involved (four or more organizations) report significantly higher levels of EIL behaviors compared to those more moderately involved (one to three organizations). This applies across all three facets of EIL (consciousness of context, self, and others).

The results of this study add to the limited research base on EIL. The only other study to date that examines EIL focused on gender differences in EIL behaviors and gender differences, and identified gender differences in EIL based on differing levels of student organization involvement (Shankman, Haber, Facca, & Allen, 2010). The present study adds to this research, suggesting that EIL behaviors vary across different levels of involvement and whether a student holds a formal leadership role. While this study identifies that more involvement is associated with significantly higher EIL behaviors, findings from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership suggested that, in some cases, breadth of involvement was actually a *negative* predictor of socially responsible leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Haber & Komives, 2009). Further research into the relationship between socially responsible leadership and EIL outcomes could help clarify the impact of breadth of involvement. This concept of breadth of involvement on leadership outcomes warrants additional exploration as to how involvement is defined and in what ways it benefits, detracts from, or does not affect leadership outcomes. Additionally, broadening this research to examine breadth and depth of involvement together might provide additional insight on *how* students are involved and how this relates to leadership outcomes.

The result that students who held a formal leadership role in student organizations reported higher levels EIL behaviors is also consistent with past research on formal leadership roles (Cooper et al., 1994; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Haber & Komives, 2009; Kuh & Lund, 1994). Holding a formal leadership role in a student organization appears to facilitate student leadership development in the EIL facets of consciousness of context and consciousness of others but not consciousness of self. From this, one could conclude that the experience of holding a formal leadership is associated with developing a greater understanding and ability to work with others in a specific context. However, an important implication of this study is that further investigation is necessary to better understand the relationship between holding a formal leadership role and consciousness of self.

Of particular importance are the findings related to consciousness of others. The consciousness of others construct and a number of the specific measures for consciousness of

ISSN 1554-3145

others (e.g., building a sense of team, listening carefully to what is and isn't being said, and helping others enhance their skills and abilities) were significantly higher based on greater involvement, as well as whether the student held a formal leadership role. Perhaps the breadth of involvement and leadership experience advances students' understanding of leadership as relational in which "others" (members, followers, etc.) play a major role, rather than a minor one. These findings may also suggest that greater levels of involvement and holding formal leadership roles are associated with students' understanding of leadership as less "leader-centric" and more as a collaborative endeavor. This parallels the leadership identity development (LID) model, which suggests that, as students engage in a number of experiences and developmental processes, their understanding and practice of leadership progresses from a positional focus to more of a relational focus (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). As students' leadership identity becomes more relational as they make "a commitment to developing leadership in others and having a passion for issues or group objectives that the person wants to influence" (Komives et al., 2009, p. 14). Future research examining EIL alongside LID could provide insight and greater understanding of how students' leadership views and behaviors develop.

Consciousness of context was the facet of EIL that evidenced significant differences across three of the tests in this study (*no* involvement vs. *some* involvement, *no* involvement vs. *much* involvement, holding a formal leadership role). This suggests that at least some student organization involvement or holding a leadership role in an organization is associated with a significantly different experience for students as it relates to the EIL facet of consciousness of context. This also suggests that hands-on experience, as either a member or formal leader in a student organization, is associated with an increase in students' awareness and understanding of the internal dynamics of a group and the role the environment plays in student organizations.

These consistent findings that student involvement matters in students' development of emotionally intelligent leadership can inform the practice of college student educators. As leadership continues to be valued and promoted as an outcome of higher education (Astin & Astin, 2000; CAS, 2009), the role of student involvement should continue to play a prominent role in the student experience. Encouraging students to get involved in student organizations should continue to be promoted and valued as a part of the college experience. This research suggests that involvement in *more* organizations is associated with higher self-reported levels of emotionally intelligent leadership behavior. It is also important to note that in this research involvement in four or more organizations was one category; there could be a point of saturation or over-commitment that was not captured in the framework of this study. Thus, promoting involvement in a few different organizations (such as an academic club, an intramural team, and a special interest group) could promote leadership development. In addition, given that those holding a formal leadership role reported significantly higher levels of EIL behaviors, college student educators should continue to encourage students to seek out these roles and advise student leaders to create new leadership opportunities and roles within organizations for other students, such as chairs or co-chairs of sub-committees, for other members of their organizations.

Limitations should be considered when reviewing the findings of this study. The present study used non-probability sampling (purposive), which has similar limitations to a convenience sample (e.g., self-selection error). Therefore, it may not be appropriate to generalize the current findings to a larger, uninvolved student population. A second limitation is the self-report nature of the inventory used to gather data. Well-documented challenges exist regarding self-report instruments (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002; Gonyea, 2005), which were briefly discussed in

ISSN 1554-3145

the methods section above. A third limitation is the EILS-I instrument itself. Given the short amount of time this assessment survey has been in use, more work is needed to determine predictive and construct validity of the assessment, which are "determined usually after years of experience by numerous investigators" (Litwin, 1995, p. 45). Predictive and construct validity are therefore determined over time and not yet established for this instrument. A fourth limitation is that the quality and depth of student involvement is not examined. As a result, these findings simply report breadth of involvement and cannot be generalized to depth or quality of involvement. Perhaps an opportunity for further research is to examine how depth and quality of involvement impact students' EIL.

Conclusion

The present study adds to the body of literature underscoring the importance of involvement in the leadership development of college students and supports the efforts of college campuses to promote student involvement. Students involved in multiple organizations report a higher level of consciousness of self, others, and context as compared to peers with less involvement. Further, students who serve in leadership roles report significantly higher levels of EIL behavior with regard to others and context as compared to their peers who did not hold formal leadership roles.

According to Astin (1984), "Student involvement refers to the quantity and quality of the physical and psychological energy that students invest in the college experience" (p. 528). This study supports the value of "quantity of energy" measured in the form of student involvement suggesting that student involvement and self-perceived leadership ability are related. In their original work on the concept of EIL, Shankman and Allen (2008) suggest that the collegiate environment provides a "practice field" for leadership and its development. This study contributes to the growing empirical evidence that student involvement matters by demonstrating that student organization involvement and holding a formal leadership role is in many cases associated with greater self-reported EIL behaviors.

About the Authors

Paige Haber, Ph.D., is assistant professor and program coordinator of the Higher Education and Student Affairs Program at Texas State University-San Marcos. Email: paige.haber@gmail.com

Scott J. Allen, Ph.D., is assistant professor of management at John Carroll University in University Heights, Ohio. Email: scott@cldmail.com

Tina Facca, Ph.D., is assistant professor of marketing at John Carroll University in University Heights, Ohio.Email: tfacca@jcu.edu

Marcy Levy Shankman, Ph.D., is principal of MLS Consulting LLC in Cleveland, OH and teaches at Case Western Reserve University and John Carroll University in Cleveland. Email: shankman@mlsconsulting.net

ISSN 1554-3145

References

Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297-308.

Astin, A. W. (1997). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., & Egan, V. (2005). Personality, well-being and health correlates of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 547-558.

Bar-On, R. (1997). *The Bar-On emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psichothema, 18*(Suppl), 13-25.

Bar-On, R. (2010). A broad definition of emotional-social intelligence according to the Bar-On model. Retrieved from http://www.reuvenbaron.org/bar-on-model/essay.php?i=2

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-38.

Bass, B. (2008). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bissessar, C. S. G. (2009). College students' emotional intelligence, extrinsic and intrinsic motivation as measurement of students' transformational leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 69*, 4240.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager.* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Cavins, B. J. (2005). *The relationship between emotional-social intelligence and leadership practices among college student leaders*. Unpublished dissertation. Bowling Green State University.

Chaleff, I. (2003). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: Toward clarification of a concept. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3,* 110-126.

Cooper, D. L., Healy, M. A., & Simpson, J. (1994). Student development through involvement: Specific changes over time. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(2), 98-102.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education [CAS] (2009). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Day, D. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 581-613.

ISSN 1554-3145

Donaldson, S. I., & Grant-Vallone, E. J. (2002). Understanding self-report bias in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(2), 245-260.

Dugan, J. P. (2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(3), 335-343.

Dugan, J. P., Garland, J. L., Jacoby, B., & Gasiorski, A. (2008). Understanding commuter student self-efficacy for leadership: A within-group analysis. *NASPA Journal, 45*(2), 282-310.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Ferris, W. P. (2010). Bringing together the three major emotional intelligence paradigms. *Organization Management Journal, 7*(2), 141-142.

Fiedler, F. E. (1972). The effects of leadership training and experience: A contingency model interpretation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*(4), 453-470.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Gonyea, R. M. (2005). Self-reported data in institutional research: Review and recommendations. In P. D. Umbach (Ed.), *Survey research emerging issues: New directions for institutional research no. 127* (pp. 73-89). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gupta, G., & Kumar, S. (2010). Mental health in relation to emotional intelligence and self efficacy among college students. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 36*(1), 61-67.

Haber, P. (2010). Progressive leadership: Models and perspectives for effective leadership. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, Vol. 1 (pp. 312-320). Thousand Oaks, CA Sage Publications.

Haber, P., & Komives, S. R. (2009). Predicting the individual values of the social change model of leadership development: The role of college students' leadership and involvement experiences. *Journal of Leadership Education, 7*(3), 123-156.

Jacques, E. T. (2009). The relationships between emotional intelligence and the academic performance and selection of a major of college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 70*, 1193.

Keeling, R. P. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: National Association of Personnel Administrators and the American College Personnel Association.

Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kelley, R. E. (1988, November-December). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 142-148.

Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 55-69.

ISSN 1554-3145

Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F., Osteen, L., Owen, J. E., & Wagner, W. (2009). Leadership identity development: Challenges in applying a developmental model. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(1), 11-47.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 593-611.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2008). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco: San Francisco, CA.

Kuh, G. D., Hu, S., & Vesper, N. (2000). "They shall be known by what they do.": An activities-based typology of college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(2), 228-244.

Kuh, G. D., & Lund, J. P. (1994). What students gain from participating in student government. In M. C. Terrell & M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *Developing student government leadership*, Vol. 66 (pp. 5-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Liptak, J. J. (2005). Using emotional intelligence to help college students succeed in the workplace. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 42*(4), 171-178.

Litwin, M. S. (1995). *How to measure survey reliability and validity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–34). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 528-549). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Parker, J. D. A., Summerfeldt, L. J., Hogan, M. J., & Majeski, S. A. (2004). Emotional intelligence and academic success: Examining the transition from high school to university. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 163–172.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Petrides, K., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*(2), 313-320.

Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1994). Leadership practices of effective student leaders: Gender makes no difference. *NASPA Journal, 31*(2), 113-120.

Posner, B. Z., & Rosenberger, J. (1997). Effective orientation advisors are also leaders. *NASPA Journal, 35*(1), 46-56.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition, and personality, 9*(3), 185–211.

ISSN 1554-3145

Samples, G. M. (2010). Emotional intelligence and academic success among Bible college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 70*, 2940.

Shankman, M. L., & Allen, S. J. (2008). *Emotionally intelligent leadership: A guide for college students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shankman, M. L., Allen, S. J., & Facca, T. M. (2010). *Emotionally intelligent leadership for students: Inventory*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shankman, M. L., Haber, P., Facca, T. M., & Allen, S. J. (2010). Gender and leadership through the lens of emotionally intelligent leadership. *Leadership Review, 10*, 88-103.

Van der Zee, K., Thijs, M., & Schakel, L. (2002). The relationship of emotional intelligence with academic intelligence and the big five. *European Journal of Personality, 16*, 103–125.

Zeidner, M., Roberts, R. D., & Matthews, G. (2008). The science of emotional intelligence: Current consensus and controversies. *European Psychologist, 13*(1), 64-78.

ISSN 1554-3145