STUDENT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: DOES TYPE OF MENTOR MATTER?

David S. Fike University of the Incarnate Word dfike@uiwtx.edu

Barbara Aranda-Naranjo University of the Incarnate Word

Ricardo Gonzalez University of the Incarnate Word

Abstract

This survey-based study, conducted in 2015 and 2018 at a private university, focused on answering the question "Does a student's type of mentor (faculty, academic/student affairs, parent/guardian, student, employer, community member) have a bearing on the development of student leadership capacity?" Analysis indicated that faculty, academic/student affairs, parent/guardian and student mentors were not significantly associated with student leadership capacity. However, students mentored by employers and community members had significantly higher measures of student leadership capacity in both 2015 and 2018. This finding demonstrates the potential benefit of including employer and community member mentors in student leadership development. Exploring ways to promote mentorship of college students by employers and community members and implementing novel mentorship programs in higher education may be in the best interest of higher education institutions and their students.

Keywords: student leadership, leadership development, mentor, mentoring, mentorship

Introduction

Developing student leadership capacity is a desired outcome from the college/university experience. Competent, educated leaders are needed to serve in business, government and social organizations as these organizations transition into the future. "The significant gap between leadership needs and perceptions of leadership capacity contributes to higher education's positioning as arbiters of leadership development responsible for the preparation of future generations" (Campbell, Smith, Dugan, & Komives, 2012, p. 595).

Acknowledgement: Data used in this article were collected as part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership 2015 and 2018. For further information regarding that study, please visit <u>www.leadershipstudy.net</u>.

Approaches to development of leadership capacity in college students vary from students finding opportunities to serve in leadership roles on and off campus, to more formal approaches such as participation in structured leadership programs and even pursuit of a degree majoring in leadership. Regardless of these approaches, one of the potential mechanisms contributing to leadership development is mentoring (Campbell, Smith, Dugan, & Komives, 2012). According to Campbell and colleagues (2012), mentoring is a predictor of leadership growth, though how mentorship contributes is not fully understood. Research is needed to further elucidate the relationship between mentoring and undergraduate student development of leadership capacity. This study focuses on the relative contributions of differing types of mentors to students' leadership capacity.

Background

The comprehensive review of the literature on mentorship of college students conducted by Crisp and Cruz states that "it appears that mentoring research has made little progress in identifying and implementing a consistent definition and conceptualization of mentoring, is largely atheoretical and is lacking in terms of rigorous quantitative research designs that allow for testing the external validity of findings" (2009, p.526). Crisp and Cruz (2009) note that mentorship of students is widely practiced and valued, yet assessing its effectiveness warrants further review. The definition and focus of mentorship varies in different contexts or settings (Crisp, 2009). Crisp (2010) further differentiates mentoring in the context of the community college from that of four-year institutions, given that community-college students are often less academically prepared, less likely to be enrolled full time, likely to spend less time on campus and more likely to work than their four-yearcollege student counterparts. Community college students may have less access to support systems and they are less likely to persist, so research focusing specifically on support services in the community college environment is warranted (Crisp, 2010). The need persists for formalized mentoring research that is contextualized and grounded in theory.

Though some higher education institutions have formal mentorship programs, in other institutions students may be mentored informally via relationships with faculty members, student affairs personnel, and possibly other students. In many cases, the structure, process, and duration of mentorship varies considerably (Luna & Cullen, 1995).

The focus and outcomes of mentorship may also be distinct, ranging from general guidance on life coping skills, to academic performance and to professional/career development (Jacobi, 1991). Student leadership capacity, in particular, is an outcome that merits assessment (Seemiller, 2010). Priest, Kliewer, Hornung and Youngblood (2018) suggest that leadership educators who work with individuals and groups should recognize and facilitate student leadership development through appropriately designed stages of mentoring experiences. However, Bureau and Lawhead (2018) state that "due to the personal nature of mentoring, coaching, and advising relationships, it is often an afterthought" (p. 84). Thus, research is needed to elucidate the role and impact of various forms of mentorship on the development of student leadership capacity.

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) instrument was developed to provide a theory-based, broadly encompassing assessment of student leadership, grounded in the social change model of leadership (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). Based upon the social change model of leadership, Crisp and Alvarado-Young state that

socially responsible leadership capacity considers seven leadership values: (a) consciousness of self (e.g., awareness of values), (b) thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency (congruence), (c) commitment to serve the collective effort, (d) collaboration, (e) work with a shared/common purpose, (f) recognizing and respecting differences (controversy with civility), and (g) responsibility to one's community and society (citizenship; 2018, p. 40).

The MSL instrument, crafted to assess student leadership, includes items assessing student leadership capacity and mentorship of students. Crisp and Alvarado-Young (2018) indicate that mentors may be faculty, student affairs personnel, family, students, alumni and others. The MSL instrument specifically collects data on six mentor types: faculty, academic/student affairs staff, employers, community members (not employers), parents/guardians and student peers (Multi-Institutional Study, 2019).

Given the lack of definitive research findings regarding the impact of mentorship on student leadership capacity development, this study was initiated. Specifically, this study was initiated to assess the relative contribution of different types of mentors on the development of student leadership capacity. Of particular interest is the impact of mentors

external to the higher education setting as compared to that of mentors within the higher education setting. Findings from this research may help to inform the design and implementation of mentorship programs that promote student leadership development.

Theoretical Framework

This study's theoretical framework is based upon Astin's (1991) Inputs-Environment-Outputs (I-E-O) model. The I-E-O model indicates that student outputs should be assessed in terms of student inputs as well as environment factors. Input, environment, and output data for this study were collected from student responses to the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) instrument in 2015 and 2018 (Multi-Institutional Study, 2019). The student output variable being evaluated in this study is the Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity which is an aggregate measure of leadership traits including Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility, and Citizenship. Student input variables include gender, academic classification (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior), age, transfer status, present/former military status, first generation, sense of belonging score and preleadership (baseline) score. Environment variables include whether the student was mentored by faculty, academic/student affairs staff, employers, community members, parents/guardians, or peer students. Per Astin's I-E-O model, qualities the student brings to the university in conjunction with environment factors will influence student outputs (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Conceptual I-E-O Model



Outputs

•Overall measure of student leadership capacity

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the relative contribution of types of mentors to student leadership capacity. The primary research questions were:

- 1) Are types of mentors associated with student leadership capacity?
- After controlling for student characteristics including baseline (pre-leadership) scores, does specific mentor type impact student leadership capacity?
- 3) Is the answer to question 2 consistent over time, based upon the two independent samples (2015, 2018)?

Answers to these questions will provide insights useful to higher education institutions and their students, with a focus on improving the leadership capacity of full-time, undergraduate students.

Methods

Setting

This study was conducted at a private university in an urban setting in the southwest US. The university, federally designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), has annual enrollments of about 10,000 students with roughly half of the students being of Hispanic ethnicity. The majority of the students are non-residential and about half of the students work off campus. The university offers baccalaureate, masters and research/professional doctoral degrees.

Design

The study implements a cross-sectional survey design. Following Institutional Review Board approval, a randomly selected sample of undergraduate students participated in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) in 2015, and another independent group was randomly selected for participation in 2018. The MSL was administered at many higher education institutions in 2015 (the sixth administration) and in 2018 (the seventh administration); the survey was not administered in the interim years. Though the MSL was administered across the US, this study is based solely upon the student responses at one institution. Since some students may have participated in both 2015 and 2018, each year's data were evaluated separately to allow for the use of statistical methods which assume independence of observations. Though this study was cross-

sectional, the MSL includes questions about students' attributes prior to enrollment in higher education, so students' pre-college experiences can serve as a baseline when assessing leadership capacity while in college.

Variables

Variable selection for this study was influenced by an MSL study conducted by Campbell and colleagues (2012). In their study of mentors and student leadership, they identified salient student (input) variables including gender, class year, transfer status, campus climate (belonging), and pre-college leadership outcomes. Due to the sampling institution's student composition, additional independent variables were included: student age, present or former military service, and first-generation status. Since students may have multiple mentors while in college, six environment (independent) variables based upon mentor types (faculty, student/academic affairs staff, employers, community members, parents/guardians, and peer students) were included in analyses. The output (dependent) variable of interest was the student's overall measure of leadership capacity, an interval-level variable with possible values ranging from 1.0 to 5.0.

Sample

The MSL survey instrument was delivered electronically to 4000 randomly selected undergraduate students in 2015, and to 3999 students in 2018. In 2015, 1673 students participated yielding a response rate of 41.8%. In 2018, 1580 students participated yielding a response rate of 39.5%. For the purposes of this study, only full-time students with complete, usable responses were selected for analyses. Based upon these inclusion criteria, the sample for this study was 898 undergraduate students in fall 2018 and 1052 students in fall 2015. Student characteristics are provided in Table 1. The samples were more heavily weighted with seniors (43% in 2018, 35% in 2015) and females (69% in 2018, 67% in 2015).

Variable	2018	2015	
	(n = 898)	(n = 1052)	
Male	277 (30.8)	347 (33.0)	
Female	621 (69.2)	705 (67.0)	
Senior	387 (43.1)	369 (35.1)	
Junior	201 (22.4)	240 (22.8)	
Sophomore	171 (19.0)	226 (21.5)	
Freshman	139 (15.5)	217 (20.6)	
Age	24.85 ± 8.31	25.92 ± 9.00	
Transfer Student	370 (41.2)	566 (53.8)	
Present/Former Military	131 (14.6)	155 (14.7)	
First Generation	244 (27.2)	317 (30.1)	
Sense of Belonging Score	3.85 ± 0.80	3.72 ± 0.84	
Pre-Leadership Score (baseline)	3.94 ± 0.61	3.94 ± 0.59	
Had Faculty Mentor	630 (70.2)	724 (68.8)	
Had Academic/Student Affairs	434 (48.3)	496 (47.1)	
Mentor			
Had Employer Mentor	341 (38.0)	438 (41.6)	
Had Community Member Mentor	236 (26.3)	303 (28.8)	
Had Parent/Guardian Mentor	564 (62.8)	644 (61.2)	
Had Student Mentor	501 (55.8)	560 (53.2)	

Table 1. Student Sample Descriptive Statistics, N (%) or Mean ± SD

Instrumentation

The data for this study was collected through the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL), a survey conducted at over 75 colleges and universities in 2015 and 2018, with more than a quarter-million students in each national sample. For our study, only the data collected at our institution in 2015 and 2018 were evaluated. The MSL instrument consists of more than 400 variables, scales, and composite measures; it captures student demographics, college experiences (including mentoring) and outcomes including complex cognitive skills, leadership efficacy, social change behaviors, seeing alternative social perspectives, spiritual development, racial identity, resiliency, and agency. The social change model of leadership serves as the theoretical basis of the MSL (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). The instrument includes eight unique scales that measure constructs consistent with the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Campbell et al, 2012). The eight scales within the social change model (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, change) consist of five or more items with Likert-type response options. As examples, a consciousness of self item is "I could describe my personality", a congruence item is "My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs", a controversy with civility item is "Greater harmony can come out of disagreement", and a change item is "I am open to new scores within each construct. ideas." Scale scores are defined as the mean of the item Validity/reliability of the eight scales have been confirmed. The primary outcome measure of this study (overall measure of student leadership capacity) is defined as the mean of the eight scales. Extensive analyses have demonstrated validity (construct, convergent, discriminant) and internal consistency reliability of the MSL (Campbell et al., 2012; MSL, 2019).

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS 25 (IBM, 2017). Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, N's, and percentages were produced to describe the sample. Independent sample T-tests were conducted to determine if mean student leadership capacity differs between students mentored and those not mentored. Hierarchical regression modeling was used to characterize the association of mentoring by faculty, student/academic affairs staff, employers, community members, parents/guardians, and peers with the overall measure of leadership capacity of full-time students, after controlling for student covariates including gender (M/F), age, academic classification, transfer (Y/N), sense of belonging score, present/former military (Y/N), first generation (Y/N), and pre-leadership (baseline) score (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Assumptions for use of regression modeling were reviewed. Categorical variables were dummy-coded. Cases with standardized residual outliers exceeding +/- 3.5, and cases with

missing data were excluded from analyses. For all analyses, the *a priori* level of significance was .05.

Results

In 2018, mean scores for Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity were significantly greater for students who had Faculty (mean difference = .078, p = .020), Employer (mean difference = .136, p < .001) or Community Member (mean difference = .092, p = .011) mentors. In 2015, mean scores for Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity were significantly greater regardless of type of mentor, with mean differences ranging from .065 to .157. The largest differences in leadership capacity in 2015 were for students mentored by Employers (mean difference = .156, p < .001) and Community Members (mean difference = .157, p < .001). In answer to research question 1, there were significant differences in student leadership capacity based upon type of mentor, though these differences were not adjusted to control for other salient student characteristics. In both 2015 and 2018, students with Employer and Community Member mentors had the largest positive difference in student leadership capacity scores. This is noteworthy, given that about 40% of the students had Employer mentors and over 25% had Community Member mentors. These analyses collectively indicate the beneficial effect of mentoring of students, but more detailed analyses further clarify the relative impact of type of mentor on student leadership capacity.

2018 MSL Data Analysis

There were 898 full-time students with complete (usable) data for analysis. Initial regression analysis indicated 5 cases (< 1% of cases) with standardized residuals > 3.5. These cases were excluded from analysis, leaving a sample of n = 893.

Variable	В	SE	t	р
Male	095	.030	-3.142	.002
Senior	.168	.044	3.851	<.001
Junior	.113	.045	2.522	.012
Sophomore	.119	.046	2.612	.009
Transfer Student	.042	.034	1.258	.209
Sense of Belonging Score	.168	.018	9.558	<.001
Age	.007	.002	3.185	.001
Present/Former Military	018	.046	393	.694
First Generation	.055	.030	1.830	.068
Pre-Leadership Score	.333	.023	14.379	<.001
Had Faculty Mentor	.038	.035	1.099	.272
Had Academic/Student Affairs	020	.030	666	.506
Mentor				
Had Employer Mentor	.066	.030	2.188	.029
Had Community Member Mentor	.083	.034	2.462	.014
Had Parent/Guardian Mentor	018	.034	515	.607
Had Student Mentor	024	.032	754	.451
(Constant)	1.876	.169	11.081	<.001

Table 2. Final 2018 Regression Model^a

^a Dependent Variable: Overall Measure of Student Leadership Capacity

Hierarchical linear regression was conducted (Table 2). Covariates (input variables) were entered in the first block, then the primary independent variables (environment variables) were entered in the second block. The final model produced $R^2 = .372$, indicating the 37% of the variance in the Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity score is explained by the model.

The ANOVA goodness-of-fit test indicated that the final model produced a significantly better fit than the null model, F(16, 876) = 32.394, p < .0005.

The distribution of residuals was normal. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were < 1.25 and bivariate correlations of independent variables were < .6, indicating multicollinearity was not present.

2015 MSL Data Analysis

There were 1052 full-time students with complete (usable) data for analysis. Initial multiple regression analysis indicated 8 cases (< 1% of the cases) with standardized residuals > 3.5. These cases were excluded from analysis, leaving a sample of n = 1044.

Hierarchical linear regression was conducted (Table 3). Covariates were entered in the first block, then the primary independent variables were entered in the second block. The final model produced $R^2 = .410$, indicating the 41% of the variance in the Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity score is explained by the model.

The ANOVA goodness-of-fit test indicated that the final model produced a significantly better fit than the null model, F(16, 1027) = 44.688, p < .0005. The distribution of residuals was normal. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were < 1.28 and bivariate correlations of independent variables were <.6, indicating multicollinearity was not present.

Variable	В	SE	t	р
Male	013	.026	512	.609
Senior	.112	.034	3.286	.001
Junior	.031	.036	.861	.389
Sophomore	.025	.036	.694	.488
Transfer Student	078	.029	-2.649	.008
Sense of Belonging Score	.179	.014	12.357	<.001
Age	.004	.002	2.216	.027
Present/Former Military	.034	.037	.906	.365
First Generation	.015	.026	.561	.575
Pre-Leadership Score	.375	.021	17.897	<.001
Had Faculty Mentor	.019	.031	.613	.540
Had Academic/Student Affairs	.023	.026	.879	.379
Mentor				
Had Employer Mentor	.065	.026	2.505	.012
Had Community Member Mentor	.103	.028	3.703	<.001
Had Parent/Guardian Mentor	.042	.031	1.371	.171
Had Student Mentor	.016	.028	.565	.572
(Constant)	1.956	.108	18.136	<.001

Table 3: Final 2015 Regression Model^a

^a Dependent Variable: Overall Measure of Student Leadership Capacity

Comparison of 2018 and 2015 Results

Several similarities exist among the control variables in the two samples. Sense of Belonging Scores and Pre-Leadership (baseline) Scores were positive and significant in both 2015 and 2018, and they were the strongest contributors among the control variables. Seniors had significantly higher Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity scores relative to freshmen (reference category) in both years. The coefficient for Age (years) was significant and positive in both samples, indicating that as students increased in age, their Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity increased. First Generation and Present/Former Military variables were not significant in either year.

After controlling for the covariates, the adjusted contribution of the 6 primary mentor variables was consistent in both years. Faculty, Academic/Student Affairs, Parent/Guardian, and Student Mentor variables were not statistically significant in either of the years. Employer and Community Member Mentor variables were positive and statistically significant in both years, with the Community Member variable providing the strongest contribution to the Overall Measure of Leadership Capacity. Answering primary research questions 2 and 3, of the 6 mentor types, only Employers and Community Members contributed in a positive, significant manner to the students' overall leadership capacity, and this finding held for both the 2015 and 2018 samples.

Discussion

A number of the findings with regards to student input variables warrant consideration. Both age and student classification support the notion that student leadership capacity tends to increase as a student ages and progresses through the college experience. The process of aging, an indicator of maturity, may convey some benefit to leadership capacity. Furthermore, though there is some variability between the 2015 and 2018 samples in student leadership capacity based upon grade classification, a consistent finding is that seniors have significantly higher leadership capacity relative to freshmen. This may suggest that leadership capacity development tends to accelerate for students as they near completion of their undergraduate degree. This is encouraging since increased leadership capacity is a desired outcome from the college experience.

Military service, past or present, and first-generation status are not significantly associated with student leadership capacity. Though military experience may demonstrate leadership models and methods to individuals and thus help to shape their perspectives on leadership, military service did not confer a significant increase in leadership capacity for the students. This finding is surprising given that it may be inconsistent with a commonly held belief that military service develops leadership skills. Though one may posit a variety of potential reasons for this finding, further detailed research is needed to provide a meaningful explanation. Status as a first-generation student also was not significantly

associated with leadership capacity. Given the challenges that first generation students face as they enter and progress through the academic process, it is encouraging to find that first generation students are not disadvantaged with regards to development of leadership capacity.

Of the six primary independent variables (the mentor types), only Employer and Community Member variables were related to the overall leadership capacity of students. There are a variety of plausible reasons why mentoring by employer and community members have stronger associations with development of student leadership capacity. Employers and community members may have better firsthand knowledge of what is needed and expected of college graduates when the students move from the academic setting to pursue careers. Students who are mentored by employers and community members may be selected for mentorship based upon the students' leadership potential or leadership skills. The knowledge and experiences of employers and community members may equip them to better mentor the students in terms of career preparation and career advancement. Students may place more emphasis on mentorship provided by employers and community members for a similar reason; the students may perceive employers and community members as being better informed about what is needed as the students move from the academic setting to the workforce. Mentorship by faculty and academic affairs personnel may be viewed as having a limited duration, in some cases perhaps a semester or less, whereas employers and community members may have the potential for longer-term mentoring relationships with students. Though students may believe that faculty and academic support staff can provide useful mentoring with respect to navigating the academic experience, employers and community members may be viewed as providing greater and longer-lasting benefits, particularly in regards to leadership.

The relationship of mentors and students may also be influenced by the presence or absence of shared cultural beliefs. Per Campinha-Bacote's Model of Cultural Competence, mentors need to recognize and understand the culture of mentees and provide support consistent with this cultural framework (2010). Mentors should consider the unique cultural context of each individual student to optimize mentoring outcomes (Darling, Bogat, Cavell, Murphy & Sánchez, 2006). With cross-cultural mentoring, "a sense of trust and

understanding between mentor and mentee is a crucial element in the relationship" (Crutcher, 2014, p. 26). Students may experience stronger cultural congruence with employer and community member mentors than with faculty and academic affairs personnel from the university setting, particularly if cross-cultural training is not provided. Thus, cultural congruence and trust may have a bearing on mentoring outcomes, including the development of student leadership capacity. Though these collective factors may contribute to the significant association of employer and community member mentorship with student leadership capacity, further research is needed to confirm or reject these possible contributors to leadership development.

In summary, undergraduate student leadership capacity was most closely associated with mentorship from employers and community members, as compared to faculty, academic affairs personnel, peer students, and parents. This finding was replicated in two independent samples, each randomly drawn in 2015 and 2018 from within the university.

Implications for Practice

Though higher education institutions often provide some form of mentoring by institution employees (faculty, student/academic affairs), it may be useful to explore opportunities for forging relationships with individuals outside of the institutions. In particular, incorporating programs that promote student mentorship by employers and community members may provide benefits. Exploring options to engage employers of students to serve as mentors may have merit, but this may be limited since many students are not employed and those that are employed may not stay with the same employer for extended periods. Alternatively, establishing programs to link community members who will serve as mentors to students may be worthy of pursuit. For institutions, this may be challenging on a large scale. Regardless, developing preliminary pilot mentoring programs with community members may yield benefits in terms of student leadership development, and this may provide the foundation for implementation of larger-scale initiatives.

Specific implications for practice among university academic programs in areas such as Education, Business, and Sciences follow.

- Practitioners within these disciplines may be good candidates to serve as mentors. University academic programs may reach out to practitioners, including alumni, to serve as mentors to their students.
- University faculty and staff that formally mentor students may improve their mentoring services by learning how practitioners mentor those to whom they provide services.
- Curriculum within academic programs may be revised to incorporate study of the impact of mentor type and mentoring practice on student outcomes.
- Academic programs may establish advisory boards with defined expectations that board members serve as mentors to students in addition to other typical responsibilities.
- 5) As higher education programs evolve over the coming years, there may be increased linkages, cooperative agreements, and partnerships between universities and external entities. Academic programs that engage in these blended arrangements may facilitate mentorship opportunities for practitioners.

Academic programs have many opportunities to strengthen evidence-based best practices in mentoring. By embracing steps such as those noted above, academic programs may improve student leadership capacity while concurrently elevating the status of their programs.

Implications for Future Research

This study provides a basis for several research endeavors. Replicating this study in future years may provide additional evidence of consistency of findings. Since Hispanic students comprise over 50% of the student population at this private, urban university, replicating this study at similar institutions may be beneficial in terms of establishing the generalizability of the findings. Similarly, collaborating with dissimilar institutions such as non-HSI universities, public universities, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) may provide opportunities for inter-institutional comparison studies.

Analyzing the nature of mentorship programs, including frequency, characteristics, and quality of mentoring, may provide additional insight into the impact of mentorship on development of student leadership capacity. Longitudinal studies of the impact of

mentoring during the student's college trajectory may yield further insight into how mentoring influences student leadership development. Factors such as types of mentors, duration of mentoring, and sequencing of mentoring during the student's academic progression may allow for a deeper understanding of mentorship's bearing on leadership development. Qualitative research may also help to clarify why mentoring by employers and community members is associated with increased student leadership capacity. **Limitations**

The MSL survey data were self-reported; these data were not validated. This was a cross sectional study; longitudinal analysis was not possible. Since this study does not implement an experimental design, causality cannot be established. The frequency and duration of mentoring relationships in our sample are unknown; the impact of these attributes are not evaluated in this study. Findings from this study should not be generalized to student populations or settings that differ from those in this study. Replication with similar findings from other populations and settings will serve to strengthen the external validity of this study.

Conclusion

Improving student outcomes, including the development of leadership capacity, is a goal of higher education. Mentoring college and university students is a process that can contribute to improving the development of leadership capacity. Findings from this study suggest that students from Hispanic Serving Institutions with employer and community member mentors may gain benefits in terms of leadership capacity beyond that provided by faculty, academic/student affairs staff, parents/guardians, and student mentors. Exploring ways to promote mentorship by employers and community members and implementing novel mentorship programs may be in the best interest of higher education institutions and their students.

References

- Astin, A.W. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Bureau, D.A., & Lawhead, J. (2018). Assessing student leadership development from mentoring, coaching, and advising. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 2018(158): 73-85.
- Campbell, C. M., Smith, M., Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2012). Mentors and college student leadership outcomes: The importance of position and process. *The Review of Higher Education*, *35*(4): 595-625.
- Campinha-Bacote, J. (2010). A culturally conscious model of mentoring. *Nurse Educator, 35*(3): 130-135.
- Crisp, G. (2009). Conceptualization and initial validation of the College Student Mentoring Scale. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(2): 177-194.
- Crisp, G. (2010). The impact of mentoring on the success of community college students. *The Review of Higher Education*, *34*(1): 39-60.
- Crisp, G., & Alvarado-Young, Y. K. (2018). The role of mentoring in leadership development. *New Directions for Student Leadership, 2018*(158): 37–47.
- Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(6): 525-545.
- Crutcher, B.N. (2014). Cross-cultural mentoring: A pathway to making excellence inclusive. *Liberal Education*, *100*(2): 26-31.
- Darling, N., Bogat, G.A., Cavell, T.A., Murphy, S.E., & Sánchez, B. (2006). Gender, ethnicity, development, and risk: Mentoring and the consideration of individual differences. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6): 765-780.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- IBM Corp. (2017). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, *61*(4): 505–532.

- Luna, G., & Cullen, D.L. (1995). Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed. *ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Reports*, *3*: 1–87.
- Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (2019). Retrieved from: https://www.leadershipstudy.net/about#about-msl on Apr 30, 2019.
- Priest, K.L., Kliewer, B.W., Hornung, M., & Youngblood, R.J. (2018). The role of mentoring, coaching, and advising in developing leadership identity. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, *2018*(158): 23-35.
- Seemiller, C. (2016). Assessing student leadership competency development. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, *2016*(151): 51-66.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics, 6th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson.