OBSERVING THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS OF PEER-NOMINATED LEADERS IN URBAN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

SIMON DANIEL, ANGELA W. WANG
MAURICE J. ELIAS (FACULTY ADVISOR)

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between adolescent students' gender and racial/ethnic backgrounds and their likelihood of being identified by their peers as having leadership qualities. A survey designed to gauge peer perceptions of leadership qualities was administered to 1003 middle school students from three diverse public middle schools in a Northeastern US city. The survey asked students to nominate as many students as possible who possess specific leadership characteristics. Female students consistently received more nominations across all survey items at two schools. This pattern was observed for five out of the ten survey items at the third school. At a school with a Hispanic majority, Hispanic students received more nominations for most survey items than Asian, Black, and White students. Additionally, at a school with a Black majority, Asian students received more nominations for all survey items compared to Black and Hispanic students and for nine survey items compared to White students. The results indicate that students' gender and schools' racial/ethnic composition may have some influence on peer perceptions of leadership. Furthermore, significant differences in how youths perceive leadership among peers of different backgrounds may be indicative of bias. Educators and administrators can use this information to make sure that students from marginalized backgrounds have opportunities to grow as leaders.

1 INTRODUCTION

There is an abundance of programming in public schools that aims to help adolescents develop "leadership" skills, whether through community involvement or engaging with peers. Despite the number of programs, there is a considerable amount of uncertainty in scientific literature surrounding adolescents' understanding of leadership and whom they identify as leaders amongst their peers. There is also a lack of literature that explores the demographic characteristics of adolescents identified as leaders by their peers. Demographic characteristics, such as racial/ethnic background or gender, have been observed in broader leadership studies and should be an area of interest when studying leadership in adolescents. Observable demographic patterns within the body of students identified as leaders can help educators offer more ample leadership opportunities to students of all backgrounds.

Whitehead (2009) proposes a definition for adolescent leadership with self-authenticity, empathy, trust, and community at its core. This study draws from Whitehead's definition and, in addition, incorporates central tenets from social and emotional learning, which include responsible decision-making, emotion regulation, and personal and collective goal-oriented behavior (CASEL). Thus, this paper proposes leadership among adolescents to be perceived through strong interpersonal skills, effective emotion management, goal-oriented behavior, and community involvement. Using this definition, a classroom leader among peers could be an individual who is compassionate, helpful, communicative with peers, and involved in their school or community.

Given that this paper's definition of adolescent leadership consists of multiple dimensions, one approach for investigating the construct is to base literature searches around the various facets defined rather than the construct itself. For example, Metzger and Ferris (2013) found that in a sample of primarily White adolescents, female students were more likely than male students to find community service and prosocial behaviors more socially desirable.[5] Addi-

tionally, a study of coping strategies among German children and adolescents found that girls were more likely to use problem-solving skills in a stressful environment.[3] Though these studies do not explicitly explore the demographic differences of adolescent leadership, their implications are relevant given their areas of investigation.

Certain demographic variables may be related to how students perceive their classmates, whether in terms of perceived leadership qualities or other favorable traits. For example, Jackson *et al*. (2006) identified the importance of the racial composition of the classroom when considering peer nominations of likability.[4] In their study, African American students received more favorable likability nominations as the African American representation in the classroom increased.[4] A school's racial composition of students can also have an impact on peer relationships. While students in the racial minority may receive more nominations given an increased representation in the classroom, interracial peer relationships seem to be most prevalent in a racially balanced setting.[1] Barth *et al*. (2013) also discussed the importance of considering the nominator's race, as they discovered the presence of a positive in-group bias for favorable traits and a negative out-group bias for unfavorable traits.[1] In this case, an in-group bias for favorable traits would present as nominators assigning favorable traits to those of their race, whereas an out-group bias would present as nominators assigning unfavorable traits to those of other races.

There is little dissent that opportunities for young students to develop leadership and social-emotional skills should be maximized. In fact, researchers suggest that developing leadership skills and engaging peer leaders may be an effective way to implement interventions that promote social-emotional skills.[6] However, current literature fails to identify what qualities adolescent students consider to constitute a leader as well as any demographic trends among peers identified as possessing those qualities. This information could be used to develop programs that build on skills that students identify as leadership qualities and identify demographic groups that may benefit from leadership opportunities.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The current study aimed to explore the demographic characteristics of adolescents nominated for peer leadership. The current study's hypotheses were formed using findings from previous literature on gender differences[3,5] and the influence of a school's racial/ethnic composition in peer nomination surveys.[1,4]

Research Question 1: *How does gender relate to peer perceptions of leadership facets?*

Hypothesis 1-3: *Female students are more likely to receive nominations for being community-service oriented (1), having problem-solving skills (2), and expressing forgiveness (3) than male students.*

Research Question 2: *How does each school's racial/ethnic composition relate to the race/ethnicity of the students nominated for leadership?*

Hypothesis 4: *Students who have greater racial/ethnic representation at their school are more likely to receive nominations than students whose racial/ethnic groups are less represented.*

2 Methods

Participants

A total of 1003 6th-8th students from three public urban middle schools in a Northeastern US city made up the sample of this study. The three schools are referred to as School A, School B, and School C. Six cases were removed from the final dataset because they were recorded as having two different school IDs. Data were collected from Fall of 2015.

Materials

The Youth Leadership Survey (YLS), developed by the Rutgers Social-Emotional and Character Development Lab, is a nomination survey asking students to nominate as many peers as possible on ten facets identified in the literature as related to leadership[7]. Since the survey asks students to identify leadership in others, the YLS allows for speculation on peer perceptions of leadership rather than self-ratings of leadership. The ten facets include peer perceptions of being a good leader, being a role model, following through with commitments, making the community better, being rarely upset, demonstrating com-

passion, having communication skills, having problem-solving skills, demonstrating forgiveness, and being inclusive of others (see TABLE 2). ITEMS 4, 8, & 9 on the YLS correspond to HYPOTHESES 1, 2, & 3, respectively. The YLS demonstrated high internal consistency (10 items; $\alpha = .96$), meaning that the items in the survey were found to be closely related to each other.

PROCEDURE

The study used data collected as part of a social-emotional and character development curriculum implemented at schools selected for their diversity. The curriculum is designed to help build social-emotional skills, promote youth voice, and develop a positive sense of purpose.

Participants consented to the study through a passive consent process, in which the participants' guardians indicated if they did not wish for their student to participate in the study, approved by the school district and the university's Institutional Review Board. Students in participating schools were asked to complete nomination surveys. Students were asked to nominate as many peers as possible for each aspect of leadership covered in the survey.

Independent t-tests and analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to test for significant differences between gender and racial/ethnic backgrounds, respectively, in relation to the number of peer nominations. Additionally, post hoc testing using Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) test was used to determine which differences between racial/ethnic groups were significant.

3 RESULTS

TABLE 3 contains frequency data from the YLS. Overall, the dataset demonstrates a right-skewed distribution. Most students received zero nominations, and the frequency of students receiving more than one nomination decreases with the number of nominations received.

The first research question asked about the relationship between gender and peer perceptions of leadership. Specifically, HYPOTHESES 1-3 proposed that female students were more likely than male students to receive nominations for making the community better, having problem-solving skills, and expressing forgiveness. Independent samples t-tests were performed for both the whole sample and for each of the three participating schools. In analyses within School B, within School C, and across the entire sample, female students were more likely to receive nominations for each of the ten facets of leadership proposed in the survey. In School A, female students were more likely to receive nominations for five of the survey items: being a good leader, being a role model, showing compassion, having problem-solving skills, and including others. Analyses for the remaining five survey items for School A did not yield significant results (see TABLES 4-7 for means, standard deviations, and t-values).

The second research question proposed in this study asked how each school's racial/ethnic composition related to peer nominations of leadership. It was hypothesized that students who had greater racial/ethnic representation at their school were more likely to receive nominations than students who were not as represented. ANOVA testing was performed to identify any significant differences between racial/ethnic groups for each of the survey items. The American Indian, Multiracial, and Pacific Islander categories were excluded from the analysis because of the small number of students within those groups. Analyses were conducted with the Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White groups for each of the three participating schools.

Analyses for School A indicated a significant difference in the number of nominations students received for being a good role model across the four racial/ethnic groups [$F(3,300) = 2.81$, $p = 0.04$]. In School A ($n = 310$), Black students ($n = 171$) represented the majority, followed by Hispanic ($n = 86$) students. Post hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the average number of nominations for Hispanic students ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 2.40$) was significantly different from that of Black students ($M = 1.21$, $SD = 1.64$). The means for Asian ($M = 1.67$, $SD = 2.22$) and White ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 1.86$) students were not found to be significantly different (see TABLES 8A and 8B).

Analyses for Schools B and C found a significant difference in the number of nominations students received across the four racial/ethnic groups for each of the ten survey items. Post hoc comparisons for School B ($n = 311$), where Hispanic students ($n = 127$) represented the majority, indicated that Hispanic students received more nominations than White students for all survey items except the survey item for being rarely upset. The comparisons also revealed that Hispanic students received more nominations for being good leaders than Black students (see TABLES 9A and 9B).

Post hoc comparisons for School C ($n = 382$), where Black students ($n = 169$) represented the majority, indicated that Asian students ($n = 47$) received more nominations for each survey item except the survey item for being rarely upset, compared to each racial/ethnic group. For the survey item that asked to nominate those who are rarely upset, the number of nominations Asian students received was significantly different from Black and Hispanic students, but not from White students (see TABLES 10A and 10B).

4 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This study seeks to identify key demographic characteristics of students nominated by peers for possessing leadership qualities. HYPOTHESES 1-3 proposed that female students would be more likely than male students to receive nominations for making the community better (1), having problem-solving skills (2), and expressing forgiveness (3). These hypotheses were supported by results from School B, School C, and the total sample, while results from School A indicated support for only HYPOTHESIS 2. Additionally, HYPOTHESIS 4 proposed that students whose racial/ethnic backgrounds are more represented in their schools would receive more nominations in general compared to other students. The results from comparisons of nominations between racial/ethnic groups indicated support for HYPOTHESIS 4 only in School B's analyses.

Perhaps the most notable result pertaining to the gender-related hypotheses was the consistency between Schools B and C: girls from both schools received more nominations for each survey item compared to boys. All three participating schools had about equal gender distributions, with slightly more male students at each school, which rules out the possibility that female students received more nominations because they made up more of the student population. The results from both Schools B and C complement existing literature that reports a gender difference in perceptions of community service[5] and the use of problem-solving skills in stressful situations.[3] However, it is important to note that the current study utilizes nomination data, whereas most of the existing literature assess students individually. Nomination surveys allow for speculation on peer perceptions of leadership because they are asking students to nominate peers that possess certain characteristics rather than reflecting on their own traits. In addition, girls from Schools B and C appeared to receive more nominations than boys for every survey item. A potential explanation for these nomination patterns is that students from Schools B and C may attribute the leadership facets represented in the survey more often towards female peers. In contrast, School A's results indicated that female students received more nominations than male students for only half the survey items. Leadership among peers may not be conceptualized the same way in School A as it is in Schools B and C, which could explain the difference in nomination patterns. For example, students in School A may attribute some characteristics of leadership to one gender but not other characteristics.

Existing peer-nomination literature seem to be consistent in their goal of identifying problem behaviors and indicators of aggression among adolescents; however, some studies use nomination data to gauge favorable traits and positive peer relationships. Findings from such studies include increased favorable nominations as a function of the student's racial representation in the classroom.[1,4] Results from the current study show partial support for what is mentioned in the literature. Analyses for School B, which had a Hispanic student majority, revealed that Hispanic students received more nominations for most survey items compared to White students and for a few survey items compared to Black students; however, significant differences were not found for

any survey item between Hispanic and Asian students. In contrast, Asian students at School C consistently received more nominations than other racial/ethnic groups for all but one survey item, even though Asian students represented the smallest of the four racial/ethnic groups used in the analyses. Racial/ethnic representation of the school did not appear to have as strong of an effect on peer perceptions of leadership as was hypothesized, considering that Black students did not receive more nominations in their favor at Schools A and C, where they experienced the most racial/ethnic representation. It is possible that the diverse makeup of these schools encouraged more relationships among peers from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, as mentioned by Barth *et al.* (2013).[1] In the presence of numerous relationships between racial/ethnic groups, perhaps classmates' background mattered less to students when making nominations.

Limitations of Findings and Future Directions

While demographic categories such as race and ethnicity provide insight into peer perceptions of leadership, it is crucial to consider why such categories may fall short as predictors of youth leadership. Ethnic and racial groups are often composed of many subgroups, each of which may have its own view on leadership qualities. For example, there was a significant Arab population in School B in this study, but they were categorized as "White" in the school district's system of ethnic identification. The Arab subgroup, and subgroups within Asian and Hispanic categories, could not be identified separately for data analyses. Although they may be subtle, differing views within groups may influence a student's decision on which peers they nominate for displaying leadership traits. These differences may be of particular interest for future studies that explore the relationship between race/ethnicity and peer leadership perceptions more narrowly.

It is also important to mention that hypotheses favoring male students for certain leadership characteristics could not be made given the sparse literature. Additionally, another limitation of the current study is its use of survey data. As the data from this study was obtained through nomination surveys, it is possible that responses could differ based on how the survey was worded and presented. For example, students may feel more inclined to list multiple names for the first few items of the survey as opposed to the last few items.

Investigators in future studies may wish to apply a correction or adjustment to the data when dealing with unequal ethnic group sizes for more precise results on ethnicity-related hypotheses. Future studies may also benefit from running nonparametric analyses, given the positive skew in nominations. Nonparametric tests allow for more accurate analyses to be performed on data that do not meet the assumptions for parametric tests (i.e., normally distributed, non-skewed data). However, it is worth noting that nonparametric approaches did not offer any differences in overall findings for the current study.

Implications

The current study has implications for educational practice considering the partial support for its hypotheses. Educators who seek to improve leadership among adolescents should remain aware of any demographic patterns in perceptions of peer leadership. If consistent patterns are present, educators can target more opportunities to develop leadership skills toward specific student groups. School professionals may also be able to pair groups of students who lack leadership skills with those who are consistently viewed by their peers as leaders.

Lastly, findings from the present study reinforce the possibility that students' perceptions of leadership and its many facets can be biased towards specific backgrounds. Biased perceptions of leadership may prohibit the development of youth leadership skills in marginalized populations. Knowing this, educators may help shape students' perceptions of leadership by continuously emphasizing that the ability to lead is not exclusive to those from certain backgrounds; instead, it is fostered through empathy for, communication with, and commitment to others■

5 REFERENCES

[1] Barth, J. M., McDonald, K. L., Lochman, J. E., Boxmeyer, C., Powell, N., Dillon, C., & Sallee, M. (2013). Racially diverse classrooms: Effects of classroom racial composition on interracial peer relationships. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *83*(2–3), 231–243.

[2] CASEL. (n.d.). *What is SEL?* Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). HTTPS://CASEL.ORG/WHAT-IS-SEL/

[3] Eschenbeck, H., Kohlmann, C.-W., & Lohaus, A. (2007). Gender Differences in Coping Strategies in Children and Adolescents. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *28*(1), 18–26.

[4] Jackson, M. F., Barth, J. M., Powell, N., & Lochman, J. E. (2006). Classroom Contextual Effects of Race on Children's Peer Nominations. *Child Development*, *77*(5), 1325–1337.

[5] Metzger, A., & Ferris, K. (2013). Adolescents' domain-specific judgments about different forms of civic involvement: Variations by age and gender. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(3), 529–538.

[6] Scharf, M., & Mayseless, O. (2009). Socioemotional Characteristics of Elementary School Children Identified as Exhibiting Social Leadership Qualities. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *170*(1), 73–96.

[7] Whitehead, G. (2009). Adolescent Leadership Development. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *37*(6), 847–872.

Simon Daniel is an undergraduate student at Rutgers University – New Brunswick, currently in his senior year, majoring in Psychology and Cognitive Science and pursuing an undergraduate certificate in Data Science. Simon is a senior and administrative research assistant at the Rutgers Social-Emotional and Character Development (SECD) Lab, directed by Dr. Maurice Elias. During his time at the SECD Lab, he has been awarded the Cooper Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship and Interdisciplinary Research Team Fellowship awards for his research contributions. Simon is also a research assistant at the Youth Anxiety and Depression Clinic (YAD-C), housed within the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology.

Simon's research interests include the social-emotional development of youth and the use of prevention science to foster positive mental health outcomes. After graduating from Rutgers, Simon plans on applying to research-centered doctoral programs in clinical psychology.

Simon can be contacted at: SIMON.DANIEL@RUTGERS.EDU

6 TABLES

CATEGORY	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=1003)	SCHOOL A (N=310)	SCHOOL B (N=311)	SCHOOL C (N=382)
GENDER				
MALE (%)	532 (53)	160 (51.6)	167 (53.7)	205 (53.7)
FEMALE (%)	471 (47)	150 (48.4)	144 (46.3)	177 (46.3)
RACE/ETHNICITY				
AMERICAN INDIAN (%)	4 (0.4)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.5)
ASIAN (%)	99 (9.9)	27 (8.7)	25 (8)	47 (12.3)
BLACK (%)	413 (41.2)	171 (55.2)	73 (23.5)	169 (44.2)
HISPANIC (%)	306 (30.5)	86 (27.7)	127 (40.8)	93 (24.3)
MULTIRACIAL (%)	3 (0.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0.8)
PACIFIC ISLANDER (%)	9 (0.9)	5 (1.6)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.8)
WHITE (%)	169 (16.8)	20 (6.5)	84 (27)	65 (17)
FREE OR REDUCED LUNCH				
FREE (%)	696 (69.4)	222 (71.6)	236 (75.9)	238 (62.3)
REDUCED (%)	51 (5.1)	28 (9)	9 (2.9)	14 (3.7)
PAID (%)	256 (25.5)	60 (19.4)	66 (21.2)	130 (34)

TABLE 1: *Demographic Data of Study Participants*

VARIABLE NAME	QUESTION
1. GOOD LEADER	WHO DO YOU THINK IS A GOOD LEADER?
2. ROLE MODEL	WHO ACTS LIKE A ROLE MODEL FOR OTHER STUDENTS?
3. FOLLOW THROUGH	WHO FOLLOWS THROUGH ON THINGS THEY START?
4. COMMUNITY	WHO WANTS TO MAKE YOUR SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY BETTER?
5. RARELY UPSET	WHO RARELY GETS UPSET OR ANGRY?
6. COMPASSIONATE	WHO IS COMPASSIONATE AND SHOWS CONCERN FOR OTHERS?
7. COMMUNICATION	WHO COMMUNICATES WELL WITH OTHERS?
8. PROBLEM SOLVER	WHO IS HELPFUL IN SOLVING A PROBLEM OR GETTING SOMETHING IMPORTANT DONE?
9. FORGIVENESS	WHO FORGIVES OTHERS EASILY AND DOES NOT HOLD GRUDGES?
10. INCLUDES YOU	WHO INCLUDES YOU IN WHAT THEY ARE DOING?

TABLE 2: *Youth Leadership Survey Questions*

SURVEY ITEM	NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING NOMINATIONS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6+
GOOD LEADER	412	162	105	77	57	44	146
ROLE MODEL	438	169	120	68	59	42	107
FOLLOW THROUGH	430	168	129	96	42	39	99
COMMUNITY	496	178	115	70	40	28	76
RARELY UPSET	401	168	141	104	75	29	85
COMPASSIONATE	452	198	115	73	48	51	66
COMMUNICATION	446	184	119	85	53	34	82
PROBLEM SOLVER	479	180	119	59	56	34	76
FORGIVENESS	461	188	131	73	50	29	71
INCLUDES YOU	403	178	146	94	60	47	75

TABLE 3: *Nomination Frequencies by Item for Total Sample* ($n = 1003$)

NOTE. The "6+" column represents the frequencies of students receiving six or more nominations.

SURVEY ITEM	MALE STUDENTS (N=532)		FEMALE STUDENTS (N=471)		T-TEST
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	1.77	2.66	3.25	4.53	-6.22***
ROLE MODEL	1.40	2.10	2.74	3.77	-6.84***
FOLLOW THROUGH	1.42	2.05	2.43	3.28	-5.74***
COMMUNITY	1.16	1.95	2.09	3.47	-5.12***
RARELY UPSET	1.56	1.91	2.04	2.35	-3.54***
COMPASSIONATE	1.06	1.66	2.33	2.99	-8.17***
COMMUNICATION	1.26	1.77	2.18	2.84	-6.07***
PROBLEM SOLVER	1.09	1.66	2.17	3.06	-6.83***
FORGIVENESS	1.17	1.66	1.93	2.51	-5.58***
INCLUDES YOU	1.38	1.78	2.18	2.45	-5.82***

TABLE 4: *Independent t-test Comparing Nominations Between Male and Female Students (Whole Sample)*

NOTE. $*** p < .001$.

SURVEY ITEM	MALE STUDENTS (N=160)		FEMALE STUDENTS (N=150)		T-TEST
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	1.59	1.93	2.35	3.09	-2.58*
ROLE MODEL	1.12	1.49	1.79	2.32	-2.99**
FOLLOW THROUGH	1.10	1.28	1.43	1.94	-1.78
COMMUNITY	0.91	1.37	1.05	1.68	-0.84
RARELY UPSET	1.10	1.38	1.25	1.78	-0.85
COMPASSIONATE	0.77	1.17	1.17	1.57	-2.56*
COMMUNICATION	0.93	1.31	1.04	1.41	-0.74
PROBLEM SOLVER	0.79	1.19	1.21	1.88	-2.29*
FORGIVENESS	0.75	1.16	0.94	1.36	-1.32
INCLUDES YOU	0.93	1.13	1.25	1.61	-2.07*

TABLE 5: *Independent t-test Comparing Nominations Between Male and Female Students (School A)*

NOTE. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$.

SURVEY ITEM	MALE STUDENTS (N=167)		FEMALE STUDENTS (N=144)		T-TEST
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	2.27	2.99	4.22	4.71	-4.29***
ROLE MODEL	1.88	2.31	3.58	3.90	-4.59***
FOLLOW THROUGH	2.03	2.37	3.15	3.17	-3.49**
COMMUNITY	1.76	2.57	3.15	3.30	-4.11***
RARELY UPSET	2.09	2.13	2.67	2.28	-2.31*
COMPASSIONATE	1.58	1.83	3.24	3.14	-5.60***
COMMUNICATION	1.86	2.04	3.16	3.06	-4.33***
PROBLEM SOLVER	1.63	2.08	3.00	3.05	-4.55***
FORGIVENESS	1.71	1.93	2.70	2.68	-3.71***
INCLUDES YOU	2.06	2.03	2.93	2.52	-3.32**

TABLE 6: *Independent t-test Comparing Nominations Between Male and Female Students (School B)*

NOTE. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$. $***p < .001$

SURVEY ITEM	MALE STUDENTS (N=205)		FEMALE STUDENTS (N=177)		T-TEST
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	1.51	2.83	3.24	5.23	-3.93***
ROLE MODEL	1.23	2.26	2.86	4.43	-4.44***
FOLLOW THROUGH	1.19	2.16	2.69	4.01	-4.46***
COMMUNITY	0.88	1.63	2.10	4.36	-3.53**
RARELY UPSET	1.49	1.98	2.21	2.65	-2.95**
COMPASSIONATE	0.87	1.75	2.58	3.45	-5.94***
COMMUNICATION	1.03	1.73	2.35	3.22	-4.89***
PROBLEM SOLVER	0.88	1.48	2.32	3.62	-4.94***
FORGIVENESS	1.07	1.64	2.15	2.83	-4.46***
INCLUDES YOU	1.19	1.83	2.35	2.71	-4.83***

TABLE 7: *Independent t-test Comparing Nominations Between Male and Female Students (School C)*

NOTE. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$

SURVEY ITEM	ASIAN		BLACK		HISPANIC		WHITE		F(3, 300)
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	2.22	3.22	1.71	2.07	2.43	3.17	1.60	2.74	1.70
ROLE MODEL	1.67	2.22	1.21	1.64	1.90	2.40	1.00	1.86	2.81*
FOLLOW THROUGH	1.15	1.63	1.11	1.41	1.64	1.98	0.90	1.37	2.49
COMMUNITY	1.00	1.24	0.83	1.33	1.23	1.86	1.00	1.84	1.33
RARELY UPSET	1.44	1.65	1.08	1.57	1.31	1.60	0.70	1.13	1.32
COMPASSIONATE	0.89	1.12	0.87	1.26	1.29	1.71	0.50	1.19	2.61
COMMUNICATION	1.00	1.27	0.92	1.30	1.16	1.56	0.55	0.95	1.30
PROBLEM SOLVER	1.48	2.06	0.87	1.24	1.17	1.99	0.65	1.35	1.94
FORGIVENESS	0.85	1.10	0.78	1.19	1.00	1.50	0.50	0.83	1.06
INCLUDES YOU	0.93	1.24	1.01	1.37	1.23	1.47	1.05	1.36	0.62

TABLE 8A: *One-Way Analysis of Variance Comparing Nominations Between Ethnic Groups (School A)*

NOTE. $* p < .05$.

SURVEY ITEM (I)	ETHNICITY (J)		
	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
ROLE MODEL			
ASIAN	0.46	-0.23	0.67
BLACK		-0.69*	0.21
HISPANIC			0.90

TABLE 8B: *Post hoc Comparisons for Survey Items with Significant Mean Differences (School A)*

NOTE. Mean difference values were calculated as I-J. $* p < .05$.

SURVEY ITEM	ASIAN		BLACK		HISPANIC		WHITE		F(3, 305)
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	4.64	4.86	2.47	3.48	4.06	4.23	2.07	3.39	6.37***
ROLE MODEL	4.96	4.46	2.22	2.86	3.30	3.21	1.46	2.70	10.91***
FOLLOW THROUGH	4.20	3.32	2.11	2.51	3.09	2.75	1.68	2.71	8.15***
COMMUNITY	3.44	3.78	2.12	2.97	2.90	3.04	1.64	2.54	4.25**
RARELY UPSET	3.52	2.18	1.97	1.89	2.65	2.09	1.93	2.51	5.01**
COMPASSIONATE	3.56	3.24	1.79	1.94	2.94	2.80	1.58	2.48	7.73***
COMMUNICATION	2.96	2.62	2.15	2.37	3.10	2.61	1.67	2.70	5.93**
PROBLEM SOLVER	4.08	2.90	1.79	2.08	2.66	2.60	1.60	2.81	7.86***
FORGIVENESS	3.76	2.65	1.74	2.10	2.60	2.31	1.45	2.22	9.28***
INCLUDES YOU	3.40	1.98	2.53	2.09	2.94	2.48	1.39	1.95	9.96***

TABLE 9A: *One-Way Analysis of Variance Comparing Nominations Between Ethnic Groups (School B)*

NOTE. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

SURVEY ITEM (I)	ETHNICITY (J)		
	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
GOOD LEADER			
ASIAN	2.17	0.59	2.57*
BLACK		-1.59*	0.39
HISPANIC			1.98**
ROLE MODEL			
ASIAN	2.74**	1.66	3.50***
BLACK		-1.08	0.76
HISPANIC			1.84***
FOLLOW THROUGH			
ASIAN	2.09**	1.11	2.52***
BLACK		-0.98	0.43
HISPANIC			1.41**

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

TABLE 9B: *Post hoc Comparisons for Survey Items with Significant Mean Differences (School B)*

SURVEY ITEM (I)	ETHNICITY (J)		
	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
COMMUNITY			
ASIAN	1.32	0.54	1.80*
BLACK		-0.77	0.48
HISPANIC			1.26*
RARELY UPSET			
ASIAN	1.55*	0.87	1.59**
BLACK		-0.68	0.04
HISPANIC			0.73
COMPASSIONATE			
ASIAN	1.77*	0.62	1.98**
BLACK		-1.15*	0.21
HISPANIC			1.36**
COMMUNICATION			
ASIAN	0.81	-0.14	1.29
BLACK		-0.95	0.48
HISPANIC			1.44**
PROBLEM SOLVER			
ASIAN	2.29**	1.42	2.49***
BLACK		-0.87	0.20
HISPANIC			1.07*
FORGIVENESS			
ASIAN	2.02**	1.16	2.31***
BLACK		-0.86	0.29
HISPANIC			1.15**
INCLUDES YOU			
ASIAN	0.87	0.46	2.01**
BLACK		-0.40	1.14**
HISPANIC			1.54***

TABLE 9B CONTINUED

NOTE. Mean difference values were calculated as I-J. $* p < .05.$ $** p < .01$ $*** p < .0001$

SURVEY ITEM	ASIAN		BLACK		HISPANIC		WHITE		F(3, 370)
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
GOOD LEADER	5.70	6.91	1.42	2.43	1.83	2.78	2.80	5.60	14.86***
ROLE MODEL	5.26	5.89	1.24	2.02	1.54	2.45	2.20	4.33	18.93***
FOLLOW THROUGH	4.83	5.45	1.18	1.77	1.40	2.25	2.26	4.07	18.84***
COMMUNITY	4.09	5.17	0.75	1.40	0.95	1.67	2.00	5.18	15.78***
RARELY UPSET	3.02	2.82	1.49	2.05	1.55	2.02	2.18	2.70	6.55***
COMPASSIONATE	3.64	4.18	1.18	1.99	1.32	2.10	2.05	3.63	11.05***
COMMUNICATION	3.62	4.04	1.18	1.89	1.29	1.97	1.89	3.12	12.40***
PROBLEM SOLVER	3.36	4.31	0.94	1.54	1.37	2.31	2.02	3.74	10.95***
FORGIVENESS	3.19	3.06	1.09	1.71	1.38	1.95	1.98	3.02	11.80***
INCLUDES YOU	3.17	3.10	1.33	1.83	1.51	2.05	1.88	2.75	8.57***

TABLE 10A: *One-Way Analysis of Variance Comparing Nominations Between Ethnic Groups (School C)*

NOTE. *** $p < .001$.

SURVEY ITEM (I)	ETHNICITY (J)		
	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
GOOD LEADER			
ASIAN	4.28***	3.87***	2.90**
BLACK		-0.41	-1.38
HISPANIC			-0.97
ROLE MODEL			
ASIAN	4.02***	3.72***	3.06***
BLACK		-0.30	-0.96
HISPANIC			-0.66
FOLLOW THROUGH			
ASIAN	3.65***	3.43***	2.57***
BLACK		-0.21	-1.08
HISPANIC			-0.86

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

TABLE 10B: *Post hoc Comparisons for Survey Items with Significant Mean Differences (School C)*

SURVEY ITEM (I)	ETHNICITY (J)		
	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
COMMUNITY			
ASIAN	3.33***	3.14***	2.09**
BLACK		-0.20	-1.25*
HISPANIC			-1.05
RARELY UPSET			
ASIAN	1.53***	1.47**	0.84
BLACK		-0.06	-0.69
HISPANIC			-0.64
COMPASSIONATE			
ASIAN	2.46***	2.32***	1.59*
BLACK		-0.15	-0.87
HISPANIC			-0.72
COMMUNICATION			
ASIAN	2.43***	2.33***	1.73**
BLACK		-0.11	-0.71
HISPANIC			-0.60
PROBLEM SOLVER			
ASIAN	2.42***	2.00***	1.35*
BLACK		-0.43	-1.08*
HISPANIC			-0.65
FORGIVENESS			
ASIAN	2.10***	1.82***	1.21*
BLACK		-0.29	-0.90*
HISPANIC			-0.61
INCLUDES YOU			
ASIAN	1.84***	1.67***	1.29*
BLACK		-0.17	-0.55
HISPANIC			-0.37

TABLE 10B CONTINUED

NOTE. Mean difference values were calculated as I-J. $* p < .05.$ $** p < .01$ $*** p < .0001$