LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN CULTURE-BASED FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES: A STUDY OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND EXPECTATIONS

by

ERIC ATKINSON

(Under the Direction of Laura A. Dean)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine how culture-based fraternities and sororities (CBFS) support and contribute to leadership development, a subset of co-curricular learning, as a function of intensity of involvement and expectations. Specifically, what leadership skills and competencies were developed and enhanced through membership in CBFSs? The intended outcome of this study is to inform CBFSs and student affairs practitioners who work with these student groups, so they will be more intentional when advising active student members. The study was designed to evaluate CBFS members' perceptions of involvement and expectations in order to establish a foundation for future leadership studies.

The participants in this study consisted of CBFS members (n = 115) whose chapters were governed by multicultural Greek councils at two large research institutions in a single state and within a state system in the Southeast. The *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003) was utilized to measure perceptions of student leadership and skill development and is comprised of questions from Badal (2000), Beeny (2003), and Winston and Massaro (1987). The study examined how culture-based Greek letter organizations support and contribute to leadership development. Specific leadership items were identified that participants

perceived as learned skills and competencies. Several significant findings at both the 0.05 and 0.01 alpha levels were identified based on data analysis. Intensity of involvement along with organization and peer expectations were analyzed to verify leadership development as an outcome of CBFS membership.

INDEX WORDS: Student Affairs, Greek Life, Fraternities and Sororities, Culture-Based Fraternities and Sororities, Multicultural Greek Councils, Student Leadership, Student Involvement, and Expectations

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN CULTURE-BASED FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES: A STUDY OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND EXPECTATIONS

by

ERIC ATKINSON

B.S., Troy State University, 1996

M.Ed., University of Georgia, 1999

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2010

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN CULTURE-BASED FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES: A STUDY OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND EXPECTATIONS

by

ERIC ATKINSON

Major Professor: Laura A. Dean

Committee: Diane L. Cooper
Clifton L. Smith

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2010

DEDICATION

This body of work is dedicated to Rodney Bennett. Without his advice, encouragement, mentorship, and support, I would not have been able to complete the doctoral program. Rodney, thank you for making it possible and for pushing me to “finish the drill.”

I also want to dedicate this dissertation to my major professor, Laura Dean. When I started this doctoral journey, I had no idea what to expect from a faculty advisor. Laura exceeded every expectation I had of developing a positive and rewarding student/advisor relationship. I was lucky to have her counsel for the past 3.5 years. Laura taught me how to be an engaged student and better student affairs professional.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have made this dissertation journey possible. I owe each of you a debt of gratitude.

My dissertation committee led by Laura Dean guided me through the dissertation process. Diane Cooper and Cliff Smith provided both challenges and support that were essential to completing the study. I am most grateful for the committee's commitment and time in helping me make meaning of the subject matter. I was amazed by your willingness and availability to meet and your timely review of drafts and analyses. Diane, I would not have started the program without your encouragement. It was important personally to have you approve the completion of my degree. Cliff, you have been a constant resource and mentor since I first stepped foot on campus in 1997. I value our relationship, which is founded on the bonds of Sigma Chi brotherhood.

In addition to these faculty members, I also learned a tremendous amount from the other College Student Affairs Administration professors. Merrily Dunn, Michelle Espino, and Richard Mullendore helped me apply the doctoral curriculum to practice.

Special thanks is extended to Beau Seagraves, Christa Veal, Kyle Tschepikow, and Holly Kamau. They served as colleagues, confidants, gatekeepers, and friends. Beau served as my "partner in crime" throughout the doctoral program. Beau, I owe you a tremendous amount of thanks for your encouragement and friendship. I will cherish our marathon prelim study sessions at Cups Café and the weekend get-aways to Lake Lanier. Christa provided editing assistance and challenged me to dig deeper answering the "so what" or "how does this apply" questions to my

writing. Kyle mentored me through the data analysis process, volunteered to help explain statistical concepts, and always offered assistance to make the process easier. Holly, who served as the president of the Multicultural Greek Council at the host institution during data collection, supported my research interest of culture-based fraternities and sororities. She became the gatekeeper that allowed me to successfully interact with and examine CBFS students and organizations.

I would not have been able to complete this degree while working full-time without the support and love of my family. Mom, Brian, Stephanie, Lilly, and Bailey – we did it!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of Problem.....7

Purpose of Study.....8

Research Questions.....8

Operational Definitions.....9

Limitations of Study 11

Significance of Study.....12

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 14

Leadership.....14

Student Involvement and Expectations.....25

An Evolution of Culture-based Fraternities and Sororities.....34

Chapter Summary 40

3 METHODOLOGY 42

Survey Research Principles.....42

Process 43

Participants.....44

Data Collection 46
Instrumentation 47
Measures 49
Data Analysis 53
4 RESULTS 56
Questionnaire 57
Analysis of Scales 59
Results of Data Analysis 59
Chapter Summary 74
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 75
Summary of Study 75
Additional Limitations of Study 78
Discussion of the Findings 79
Implications for Practice 91
Recommendations for Future Research 96
Chapter Summary 97
REFERENCES 99
APPENDICES 110
A *Co-Curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* 110
B Author's Permission to Use Instrument 114
C Participant Consent Form and Researcher's Copy of Consent Form 115
D Recruitment Script/Instructions 119

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Culture-Based Fraternity and Sorority Prevalence and Membership by Institution.....45

Table 2: Number of Participants per Culture-Based Fraternity and Sorority 58

Table 3: Reliability Analysis for the Four Leadership Skills and Competencies Subscales (Alpha) 59

Table 4: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample – CBFS Students 61

Table 5: Correlation between Organization Expectations and Perceived Leadership According to the Subscales.....64

Table 6: Correlations between Intensity of Involvement and Perceived Leadership According to Subscales.....67

Table 7: Significance of Expectation Variables on Perceived Leadership 68

Table 8: Ranking of Means for Student Responses to Skills and Competencies Questionnaire 72

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

College and university student populations are becoming increasingly diverse. As a result, student life is experiencing a growing assortment of culture-based fraternities and sororities (CBFS) (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Fraternity and sorority life, as demonstrated through student learning and development, is a functional area tangentially related to the academic mission of higher education (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006). Leadership development is a documented purpose, primary outcome, and learning objective in mission statements of fraternities and sororities (AFA, 2009; Kimbrough, 2003; NALFO, n.d.; NIC, 2009; Sigma Chi Fraternity, 2009; Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Leadership is promoted as a prerequisite for recruitment of new fraternity and sorority members and as an outcome of organization membership (Kimbrough). Furthermore, leadership is important to the operation and performance of student organizations like fraternities and sororities (Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2004; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2006). However, Harms, Woods, Roberts, Bureau, and Green (2006) stated, “there is not a well-established body of knowledge about outcomes of serving in leadership positions or the [fraternal] organization’s ability to aid in the development of leadership skills” (p. 87). The existing literature focused on leadership skills with CBFSs is sparse with little data to support a leadership development claim. This limited research prompts a question of how much impact involvement and expectations have on CBFS leadership development. Through investigating involvement and expectations, CBFSs can be examined to verify leadership development as an outcome of membership. This

study explored the self-perceived leadership development that CBFS experience had on student members.

Greek letter organizations are important in the lives of hundreds of thousands of college students and alumni. Students who shared similar values and goals created fraternities and sororities to form close friendships on college campuses. Historically, these organizations were composed of White students, and Black Greek letter organizations have also existed since the early 20th century. However, in recent decades membership in culture-based fraternities and sororities as distinct from multicultural interest groups has rapidly expanded (Kimbrough, 2003). These organizations developed for various racial and ethnic groups including Asian Americans, Latina/os, and Native Americans, and their creeds emphasize friendship and a commitment to cultural awareness (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). However, little research has focused on the effects of student participation in CBFS. Research on this topic is needed, as higher education literature on culture-based fraternities and sororities falls short compared to that of both White and Black Greek letter organizations.

Participation in a Greek letter organization significantly affects a student's learning experience in the higher education setting. In addition to identifying themselves as social organizations, fraternities and sororities strive to create powerful learning environments that foster leadership growth and development (NIC, 2009). Developing leadership qualities has been a goal of many fraternities and sororities dating back to the initial founding principles and values as written in the initial founding charters and constitutions of these organizations (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Student affairs professionals and fraternal headquarters are committed to holding fraternities and sororities accountable for their stated values, like leadership development, which can positively transform the organization's culture and impact

student learning (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2005). Conversely, only a handful of studies report positive outcomes of Greek involvement (Astin, 1996; Hayek, Carini, O'Day, & Kuh, 2002; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Asel, Seifert, and Pascarella (2009) reported that some research suggests that Greek involvement inhibits student learning and contributes to negative health behaviors. Whipple and Sullivan (1998) and Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) point out that extensive research exists on White and Black Greek student participation in the areas of alcohol and other drug abuse, retention, satisfaction with the institution and collegiate experience, service, philanthropy, academics, leadership, involvement, and hazing. However, opportunities exist to further explore student experiences in CBFS.

One of the broad goals of higher education is to prepare leaders for the 21st century (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006; Long, 2002; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998; Wingspread, 1993). Acker (2007) questioned the value of higher education and how participation in co-curricular activities, particularly in student organizations like fraternities and sororities, prepares students for life in a global society. One way in which to view student leadership development is through a "relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change" (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007, p. *ix*). Komives et al. created the Relational Leadership Model to help undergraduate students better understand leadership and how students can work toward a goal of social change for the common good. The model focuses on the idea that leadership effectiveness depends on the ability of the student leader to create positive and rewarding relationships with other members of the student organization. The model uses a student's college experiences as the frame in which to understand leadership (Komives et al.). The focus is on students and students' relationships with others. The concept that leadership is about relationships fits well with the nature of fraternities and sororities which create unique

communities where members feel an “immediate kinship” through social interaction (p.287). Komives et al. state that fraternities and sororities also exhibit important relationship characteristics through sharing a common identity and through face-to-face interaction.

CBFS provide students with opportunities for leadership development, academic support and achievement, and campus/community involvement (Castro, 2004). Greek letter organizations likewise provide tangible avenues for students to enhance leadership skills and competencies. Greek leaders reported that they also held major leadership positions in other areas of campus life and continued this leadership in their communities after college (Whipple & Sullivan). Greek organizations often recognize famous alumni and highlight their accomplishments through quotes and statements attributing their professional success to Greek involvement and the organizations’ legacy of leadership (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005). Documenting evidence of leadership development and growth requires further research with culture-based Greek students. Therefore, determining the leadership competencies and skills that students gain through involvement experiences with CBFS is critical.

Student affairs professionals work closely advising registered and recognized fraternities and sororities. These educators hold Greek letter organizations accountable to their stated values and for their behavior as a way of helping students learn and develop. Holistic development is the hallmark of the student affairs profession. Holistic development includes promoting the intellectual, social, physical, and psychological growth and development of students (American Council on Education, 1937; 1949). Student affairs documents have encompassed a collection of perspectives and thoughts about facilitating holistic student development. The *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) provided a framework for student affairs professionals to serve as educators enhancing this holistic development with college students. Specifically, the document

challenged the profession to focus resources on creating and developing opportunities and activities that promote student learning in intentional and measurable ways. The *Student Learning Imperative* introduced six assumptions about higher education and student development:

- development and growth as a result of learning are hallmarks of a college educated student in the areas of: complex cognitive skills, ability to apply knowledge to practical problems, understanding and appreciating human differences, practical competence skills, and an integrated sense of being
- concepts of student learning and development are intertwined and inseparable
- student learning is expected under certain conditions
- intentionally created environments enhance student learning
- assessment should be used to improve practice (services) and to better understand the impact of policies and decisions on student learning
- "student affairs professionals share responsibility for creating conditions under which students choose to engage in educationally purposeful activities" (Beeny, 2003, p. 1)

Astin's (1984) research on student involvement informs higher education that participation in co-curricular activities has an impact on the collegiate experience and student development. The extent to which a student is involved in an object or activity determines how much a student will learn. Astin measured student involvement through an individual's psychological investment in the academic experience. The quantity and quality of energy exerted on the investment was also measured. Astin (1996) later studied Greek letter organizations and determined that these organizations require a significant amount of time.

Through involvement with Greek letter organizations, students better identify with other students and campus resources.

One way to enhance Greek student participation is to examine how involvement and expectations impact the leadership experiences for active Greek letter organization members and complement the institutions' learning environment (CAS, 2009; Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006). The business and education communities authored documents criticizing college graduates preparation for working in a global society, such as *The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement* (Long, 2002) and *The World Awaits: Globalizing U.S. Education* (Acker, 2007). These documents charged higher education with creating a nation of learners and preparing the country's next generation of leaders. Newman, Couturier, and Scurry (2004) stated that higher education produces college graduates who lack "cross functional skills" to compete in global economy. They asserted that the only way for college students to gain critical leadership, teamwork, problem solving and analytical thinking skills is to be exposed to diverse peers. *Learning Reconsidered* (NASPA & ACPA, 2004) calls for the student affairs profession to be an active partner in the broader campus curriculum. This document defines goals and outcomes of transformative education where learning is viewed in a larger context that includes what students know, who they are, their values and behaviors, and how they see themselves contributing to the world. With these exceeding higher education expectations, Greek organizations must now demonstrate their contribution to enhancing the learning environment. With the recent growth of CBFS, student participants should reflect on their experiences and demonstrate how this involvement has enhanced their leadership development and skills.

Statement of Problem

Higher education scholars have examined multicultural student experiences related to campus climates, cultural adjustment, racial exclusion, and ethnic identity development. Little of this research has focused on experiences with culture-based Greek letter organizations. Most of the existing research on CBFSs examines factors affecting ethnic identity development (Guardia & Evans, 2008; Layzer, 2000). While legitimate, little similar research has focused on leadership outcomes from student participation in CBFSs. These organizations have become popular co-curricular involvement opportunities for undergraduate students. Colleges and universities are witnessing a growing range of diverse Greek letter organizations across the country (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). While these organizations publicly emphasize principles of sisterhood/ brotherhood and devotion to cultural awareness, members' leadership development and growth have proven much less evident. To work more effectively with CBFSs and student leaders of these organizations, the student affairs profession must be able to study and apply theories of leadership development as an outcome resulting from involvement and expectations. Higher education must come to understand how these student organizations operate and the culture within which students learn. CBFSs come up short in demonstrating evidence of leadership development as a direct result of involvement and expectations. Without a better understanding of the factors that lead to leadership skill development, administrators and culture-based Greek student leaders cannot hope to convey reasoned explanations of membership experiences and cannot be intentional in facilitating co-curricular learning. Additional variables such as staffing patterns, faculty support, and alumni mentoring may also impact the leadership development of student members. With growing membership numbers, now is the right time to examine how CBFSs engage in leadership development. Specifically, research studies should

examine how culture-based Greek letter organizations support and contribute to leadership development. In addition, leadership development from underrepresented student populations is important to explore as higher education enrollment becomes more diverse. Further research on multicultural students in general is needed to document the attainment of leadership skills. Based primarily on the concepts of the Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007), leadership development is therefore a logical area for further research.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how CBFSs support and contribute to leadership development, a subset of co-curricular learning, as a function of intensity of involvement and expectations. Specifically, what leadership skills and competencies were developed and enhanced through membership in a CBFS? The intended outcome of this study was to inform CBFS and student affairs practitioners who work with these student groups, so they will be more intentional when advising active student members. The study was designed to evaluate CBFS members' perceptions of involvement and expectations in order to establish a foundation for future studies.

Research Questions

The research themes of involvement, expectations, and leadership skill development as a direct benefit of membership in a CBFS informed this research study. The following research questions guided the study:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between the CBFS student's evaluation of membership expectations and perceived co-curricular leadership development in the organization?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and perceived leadership development?

RQ3: To what extent is a student's perceived co-curricular leadership development explained by intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and expectation variables together?

RQ4: What variables appear to be most important in explaining perceived CBFS student co-curricular leadership development?

RQ5: To what extent is the intensity of a CBFS student's involvement (both physical and psychological) explained by leadership development and expectation variables together?

RQ6: What are the competency and skill items most and least often cited as being developed through involvement with a CBFS?

RQ7: What are the differences in the rating of items among CBFS students based on type of CBFS by cultural group?

Operational Definitions

Active Involvement: a dues paying member of a CBFS who is in good standing with the organization.

Co-curricular Involvement: student participation and involvement outside the classroom, particularly with student organizations.

Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire: questionnaire (*Appendix A*) created by Claudia Beeny (2003), based on the work of Badal (2000) and Winston and Massaro (1987).

Expectations: For the purpose of this research, expectations are considered those beliefs and hopes that members had about the organization prior to joining as well as those performance/involvement guidelines imposed on members by CBFS peers (Beeny, 2003).

Extracurricular Involvement Inventory (EII): The Extracurricular Involvement Inventory (Winston & Massaro, 1987) is an instrument developed to measure involvement in the co-curriculum. The inventory score is comprised of an Involvement Index (INIX) score.

Intensity of Involvement: "Intensity of involvement as defined by Winston and Massaro (1987) is the product or the interaction of the quality and quantity of effort, as measured by the INIX. Quantity of involvement in the co-curriculum is measured by the amount of time devoted to an activity. As noted by Winston and Massaro, the quality of involvement includes aspects of physical presence, public affirmation of affiliation, degree of psychological investment in success of the organization, and contributions to goal accomplishments" (Beeny, 2003, p. 7).

Involvement: "Based on the work of Astin (1984), involvement is defined as the amount of physical and psychological energy a student devotes to an experience. Physical energy in the co-curriculum includes actions such as attending organization meetings and volunteering for committee work. Psychological energy involves behaviors such as thinking about the organization outside of meetings and talking to peer**s** about the organization" (Beeny, 2003, p. 7).

Leadership: enhanced skills and competencies in any of the 48 areas indicated on the *Leadership Competencies Skills Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003).

Leadership Competencies Skills Questionnaire: The *Leadership Competencies Skills Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003) is an instrument designed to measure student leadership and skill development. This instrument was originally modified from the *Leadership Competencies Skills Questionnaire for Leadership Educators* (Badal, 2000).

Leadership Development: "Involves self-awareness; direct and honest communication; respect for others; building trust; visualization of group purpose and desired outcomes; teamwork; risk taking; role modeling/mentoring; commitment to civic responsibility; initiation of change for the common good; responsibility and accountability" (University of Georgia Division of Student Affairs, n.d.).

Learning Objectives: "Changes or consequences that occur as a result of enrollment in a particular educational institution and involvement in its courses and programs. What a student is able to know, demonstrate, analyze, and synthesize following course and program instruction" (University of Georgia Division of Student Affairs, n.d.).

National or Fraternal Organization/Headquarters: the governing body of a fraternity or sorority that creates guidelines and rules for campus chapters.

Neophyte: a new member; what a member is typically called during their first year of membership in a CBFS.

Relational Leadership Model: a college student leadership model focused on "relationships that are the building blocks in working with others to make a difference and accomplish change" **(**Komives et al., 2007, p. *xiii*)

Student Affairs Professionals: college or university administrators who advise or work with Greek letter organizations.

Limitations of Study

The researcher studied students' leadership development, a subset of co-curricular learning, as a result of involvement and expectations with CBFSs. This type of co-curricular activity occurred in non-formal environments. CBFSs do not traditionally provide an intentional leadership curriculum for student members. The first limitation was that each student participant

entered into this study with his or her own unique definition and perspective of leadership development. Numerous leadership definitions and concepts have been accepted in higher education. Leadership in fraternities and sororities has been defined in a number of ways, which proves to be a limitation to this study.

Second, the research instrument was distributed to some student members who participated in or had prior knowledge of a previous qualitative study that explored leadership development and learning objectives with the researcher (Atkinson, Dean, & Espino, n.d.). These students were knowledgeable of the themes that emerged from the study.

Third, the research was intended to be conducted at three large, research intensive, predominantly White institutions (PWIs) in the Southeast, limiting the applications of the findings to other types of campus environments. The final study was conducted on just two of the intended campuses, limiting the institutional differences even further. The CBFSs on these campuses included Asian, Latina/o, South Asian, and multicultural interest groups. Native American interest fraternities and sororities were not found on these campuses and therefore were not included.

A final limitation was the large size of the universities and the varying resources allocated to fraternity and sorority life through professional staff and programs, specifically for CBFSs, which may have affected the depth and breadth of leadership development at these institutions.

Significance of Study

Fraternities and sororities create goals and objectives that identify student learning outcomes such as leadership development (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006). Student affairs professionals strive to foster environments that enhance learning, including developing leaders.

The Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007) provides a theoretical framework exploring student leadership through the creation of positive and rewarding relationships with other members of the student organization, ultimately working toward a goal of social change for the common good. The research may have a significant impact on the development and delivery of fraternity and sorority life programs for culture-based Greek letter organizations. CBFSs are often an invisible group in higher education, particularly at PWIs (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Research is important for both students and student affairs professionals to know the leadership competencies and skills developed through CBFS participation. This information will allow them to be more deliberate and intentional in the services and programs they offer student members. Educators need to understand the intensity of involvement and the expectations placed upon these students to assume leadership roles and responsibilities once they become neophytes. Specific attention can be focused on preparing student members for the pressures they will encounter when assuming leadership responsibilities and supporting them as they cope with that pressure. In addition, the study sought to determine which perceived leadership skills and competencies were important, relevant and attributable to involvement in a CBFS. The findings can inform students and professionals seeking to document leadership development as a subset of co-curricular learning through CBFS involvement in the 21st century.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a foundation for understanding the evolution of culture-based Greek letter organizations and how involvement and expectations support and contribute to leadership development. First is an examination of the concept of leadership (theories and paradigms), of co-curricular student leadership development research, and of recent fraternity/sorority leadership studies. Next, student involvement and expectations research is traced through co-curricular experiences in higher education settings and its impact on the intellectual life of campus. Last is an extensive review of the evolution of Greek letter organizations and outcomes of Greek involvement. Specific attention was focused on the founding and operations of CBFSs.

Leadership

Leadership related to college students has been debated, explored, facilitated and taught among scholars and practitioners since the 1600's (Jones, 1938). One of the reasons that this topic has been so thoroughly questioned is, "leadership is one of the most widely talked about subjects and at the same time one of the most elusive and puzzling" (Cronin, 1984, p. 22). Leadership development has long been a desired outcome and positive value of the higher education experience for undergraduate students (Astin & Astin, 2000; Boatman, 1999). Astin (1985; 1993) supports the notion that leadership engagement contributes positively to students' college experience. The American College Personnel Association (ACPA) Commission IV began what we know to be the student leadership development

movement in higher education in 1976. A task force entitled *Students, Their Activities and Their Community*, was created to focus on the development and implementation of student leadership programs (Roberts, 1981). Since this important work, an advancement of student leadership program models and evaluative methods has examined undergraduate students, student activities and student organizations in higher education. Student leadership development is an important element of the fraternity and sorority experience (Harms et al., 2006). However, student leadership development as an outcome of CBFSs has not been an area thoroughly studied.

A History of Leadership Theories and Paradigms

The first leadership theory, the Great Man approach, operated from the belief that great men inherited their leadership qualities (Bass, 1990). The following is an overview of the theories that followed Bass's "hereditary genius" belief. Trait theory was first explored in the early 1900s by Kohs and Irkle (1920), who theorized that leaders possessed certain traits that allowed them to serve as natural leaders. This belief was refuted by researchers such as Stogdill (1984), whose research revealed that situations and leaders were intertwined in a reciprocal experience that produced the type of leader that would ultimately emerge depending on the circumstances. Fiedler (1967) developed the Contingency Model, a form of situational leadership, that measured behavior based on the leader's leadership style and the situation. The Hersey and Blanchard (1969) model added that leaders adjust their style according to situational conditions and/or to meet the needs of their supporters. Behavioral leadership, which theorized that leadership was associated with the way an individual behaved or acted in a particular situation, was thoroughly explored in the 1950s and 1960s (Fleishman, Harris, & Burtt, 1995). Theory X and Theory Y further explained how human

beings are motivated in the workplace and provided leaders with strategies to maximize their employees' potential (McGregor, 1960). These theories described behaviors and attitudes and explored how conditions and opportunities motivated individuals.

Conventional and alternative perceptions of leadership have provided a framework for how leadership has been viewed over the past fifty years. Rogers (1996) offered three conventional themes: (a) leadership occurs through one person, (b) leadership is connected to organizations and formal groups in an organizational hierarchy that places one person at the top, (c) the concepts of management and leadership are different, yet connected. A limitation of this view is that only one person can serve as the leader. Conversely, servant leadership and transformational leadership represent popular alternative leadership paradigms. Servant leadership's foundation promotes civic responsibility embracing a more service-oriented approach to leading. Greenleaf (1970) stated that in servant leadership, "the great leader is seen as servant first" (p.2). Burns (1978) introduced transformational leadership and stated that leaders' and followers' purposes become joined as people engage each other in a way that raises their level of motivation and morality. Transformational leadership has been described as essential to creating a positive organizational culture. Post-industrial perspectives view leadership as reciprocal relationships between the leaders and followers. This paradigm moved away from hierarchy, top-down power, competition, and passive participants (Zohar, 1997). Rost (1991) defined this type of leadership as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p.102).

The theories and paradigms reviewed provide a lens for how leadership has been viewed in society and higher education. The first decade of the 21st century has been one of extraordinary change and uncertainty. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United

States, wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the world-wide economic recession, and the election of Barack Obama as the 44th President of the United States will undoubtedly impact how leadership is explored moving forward. Critics of higher education charge colleges and universities with the responsibility to prepare the country's next generation of leaders for a global society (Wingspread, 2003; Acker, 2007). Creating a nation of educated leaders can be accomplished if higher education focuses on comprehensive, holistic, and transformative learning (NASPA & ACPA, 2004). Documenting leadership development as a subset of co-curricular learning is one way for CBFSs to be an example of enhancing higher education's learning environment.

Co-curricular Leadership Development

Astin & Astin (2000) reported that college campuses provide countless opportunities for leadership skill development. Co-curricular activities and organizations facilitate the most common form of leadership experiences available to students on college campuses (Badal, 2000). Student organizations provide opportunities for students to focus on self-awareness, improve communication skills, develop respect for others, build trust, develop organization goals and desired outcomes, build teamwork skills, take risks, serve as role models and mentors, exercise civic responsibility, initiate change, and become responsible and accountable for their actions (Division of Student Affairs, n.d.). Garner (1990) affirmed that co-curricular learning includes leadership development and provides students with unique opportunities to learn group skills like shared responsibility.

Leadership development has been clearly documented as an outcome of college involvement experiences (Pascarella & Terrenzini, 2005). Co-curricular experiences have provided opportunities for leadership development since the latter half of the nineteenth

century through literary societies, debate clubs, student government, and Greek letter organizations (Badal, 2000). Leadership can be learned by students through co-curricular involvement in organizations like fraternities and sororities (Pascarella & Terrenzini). In these types of organizations, leadership education takes place through official positions, conferences, retreats, workshops, seminars, mentor programs, philanthropies, service learning opportunities, step/stroll competitions, and organizational training. Assessing these leadership development outcomes guides the efforts of higher education professionals who work with student organizations:

> Indicators of leadership development include the ability to articulate a leadership philosophy or style, serve in a leadership position in a student organization, comprehend the dynamics of a group, exhibit democratic principles as a leader, and exhibit the ability to visualize a group purpose and desired outcomes. (Strayhorn, 2006, p. 93)

Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (2007) created the Relational Leadership Model to help undergraduate students better understand leadership and how students can work toward a goal of social change for the common good. The model focuses on the idea that leadership effectiveness depends on the ability of the student leader to create positive and rewarding relationships with other members of the student organization. "The model emphasizes the importance of relationships among participants in the process of purposeful change" (p. 115). The model was influenced by David Kolb (1981) whose previous work explored experiential learning (how learning occurs). Kolb's Experiential Learning Model suggested that people come to new information through a learning cycle. People learn by either doing something (concrete experience) or by thinking about something (abstract conceptualization) and people

process that information either by reflection (reflective observation) or by application (active experimentation) (Komives et al., 2007). Kolb summarized that leadership is learned through real, concrete experiences of being involved in groups who share a common purpose, like fraternities and sororities. Leadership on a college campus is a complex process where undergraduates can build on their own personal leadership philosophy through reflection and application. The Relational Leadership Model is presented in *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*. Komives et al. (2007) contended that leadership has everything to do with relationships, particularly for undergraduate students involved in student organizations and/or teams. "Leadership is inherently, a relational, communal process" (p. 74) and the model is based on the philosophy that "leadership is a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change" (p. 74).

The Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007) is a framework connecting five key elements emphasizing the nature of relationships: being purposeful, being inclusive, empowering, being ethical and moral, and process oriented.

- Being purposeful: student organizations, like fraternities and sororities, share common goals, values and activities. Group members can articulate a stated purpose and collaborate together to facilitate positive change. Positive change "improves the human condition" and "does not intentionally harm others" (p.83).
- Being inclusive: involves both self and others. The student organization believes every member can contribute and make a difference, is welcome and open to multiple perspectives (differences), and values equity among all members. "Being inclusive

embraces having the skills to develop the talent of members so they can be readily involved" (p. 86).

- Empowering: creating an environment in which all members participate in meaningful involvement and expect personal and organizational success. Each member claims ownership and feels a part of the organizational process. Sources and measures of power, understanding the ramifications of power, self-empowerment, mattering and marginality, and empowering group and organization environments are all key components.
- Ethics: organizational leadership is driven by values, ideals and standards which emphasize "leadership that is good-moral-in nature" (p. 97). Leading by example is just one way to advance the ethics and morals of an organization. Leadership involves maintaining and promoting high standards of ethical behavior and conduct. Fraternities and sororities perform rituals and hold members accountable that espouse their stated values, ideals and standards for membership.
- Process: "refers to how the group goes about being a group, remaining a group, and accomplishing a group's purposes" (p. 103). Process also refers to the recruitment of new members, expectations for involvement, how decisions are made and communicated, and activities/events associated with the organization's mission and vision. Cooperation and collaboration, meaning making, and reflection and contemplation are important tenets of organizational process.

Many of the student leadership models developed are not based on verifiable research but simply present a framework that offers an approach to learning. *Frameworks for Assessing Learning and Development Outcomes* (FALDOs) (Strayhorn, 2006), a resource published by the

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), provided examples of student learning and development outcomes. CAS has created standards of good practice since 1979, and currently has standards for 40 functional areas in student affairs, including fraternity and sorority life. CAS has identified learning and development domains, including leadership development, for each functional area to incorporate as potential outcomes (Strayhorn). In addition, the Social Change Model of Leadership Development created by Astin and Astin in 1996 was specifically integrated into the theoretical leadership context developed by CAS (Strayhorn). *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (2009) called for fraternity and sorority life professionals to provide education and experience in leadership development and to regularly assess and evaluate student learning and development effectiveness. Strayhorn and Colvin (2006) further stressed the importance of assessment and how it relates to fraternity and sorority advising. Assessment can demonstrate the impact of fraternity/sorority involvement on student leadership development.

Fraternities and Sororities

As it relates to fraternity and sorority membership, research has shown that Black and White Greek students are more likely than their non-Greek classmates to volunteer in the community, to remain active in civic issues throughout life, and to be involved in numerous student organizations (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). Fraternities and sororities create strong relationships between chapter members, allow numerous opportunities for leadership development, afford self-governing opportunities, and create expectations for community service (Earley, 1998). Hayek et. al supported previous Greek membership findings related to active learning, community service, and personal development gains (2002). DiChiara's

(2009) recent research explored the different individual styles of leadership found in fraternal organizations.

Like their White counterparts, Black fraternities and sororities positively influence members' leadership development (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). "At PWI's, the leadership development opportunities afforded to African American students by NPHC organizations are especially essential for their persistence, satisfaction, and academic performance" (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005, p. 404). Data also suggests that many of the most celebrated and successful African American national leaders are members of NPHC organizations (Brown et al.). As students assume leadership roles within their individual chapters, they cultivate their leadership skills, allowing for further accomplishments in their communities and post-collegiate experiences (Brown et al.). In addition, leadership skill development is enhanced the longer a student has been involved in a Greek letter organization (Pascarella & Terenzini). Earley (1998) agreed that in order to have a significant effect, aggressive leadership training must be promoted for Greek students throughout their undergraduate career. Aside from intentional leadership programs sponsored by the institution, leadership skill development may be more likely general than specific (Pascarella & Terenzini). Furthermore, development growth may be the result of students' peer interaction. Astin (1993) validated this study for Greek students and reported that the strongest effect on leadership development was peer interaction. In fact, "the student's peer group is the single most potent source of influence on growth and development in the undergraduate years" (Astin, 1993, p. 398). Participation in ethnic-racial student organizations contributes directly to student leadership development, particularly after four years of involvement (Pascarella & Terenzini). This research does not include CBFS student experiences.

Additional studies have shown that faculty and staff interaction has a significant impact on student leadership development (Pascarella & Terrenzini, 2005; Hayek et al., 2002). Chapter advisors and student affairs professionals have the opportunity to contribute to this development by paying strict attention to students' values and actions and by challenging negative behavior (Astin & Astin, 2000). Administrators and Greek governing councils create and require educational programming for members that focuses on a host of topics including values clarification, confrontation strategies, character development, and leadership. This education can help student leaders make difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions. Advisors play a critical role in creating an environment for students to apply leadership concepts which includes initiating and implementing change and taking action when appropriate (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998).

Torbenson and Parks (2009) chronicled emerging scholarship on CBFSs in their seminal work, *Brothers and Sisters: Diversity in College Fraternities and Sororities.* They report that National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO) continues to provide leadership for Latina/o fraternities and sororities by helping create educational foundations and alumni associations. These entities "are increasing in numbers and provide leadership development and professional growth" (Torbenson & Parks, 2009, p. 117). Similarly, Sigma Omicron Epsilon, Inc., a Native American Greek letter organization, espouses traditional Native American values that promote personal growth and leadership through pledging practices. Another Native American Greek letter organization, Phi Sigma Nu, promotes the quality of leadership through brotherhood. Overall, CBFSs strive to build leadership skills through participation in philanthropic activities and community service projects (Torbenson & Parks).

Recent fraternity and sorority student leadership studies have only tangentially included CBFS involvement. Harms, Woods, Roberts, Bureau, and Green (2006) examined the perceptions of leadership in fraternal organizations with over 90 percent of participants who identified as Caucasian. This research focused on the relationship between personality and leadership in Greek organizations at one large state university in the Midwest. The survey included the *Big Five Personality Traits* and leadership measures of Trait Dominance, Power Motive, Leadership Identity, Social Influence, Transformational Leadership, and Organization Offices. Results indicated that there are a number of ways to conceptualize leadership including the objective, subjective and positive approaches. "This study reflects the attention needed to nurture the personality traits of leaders and identify ways to assist in the development of skills by other members" (Harms et al., 2006, p. 87). Kelley (2008) studied the self-perceived impact that serving as a fraternity president had on leadership development. The participants completed the *Leadership Acquisitions Form* and the *Leadership Practices Inventory*. His research focused on the relationship to career success ten years after serving as chapter president, and his sample was drawn from three international fraternities. Results showed that this experience did have a positive impact on participants' leadership skills (Kelley). DiChiara (2009), using the *Student Leadership Practices Inventory*, studied the differences in leadership practices among members of fraternities and sororities belonging to four governing councils at a large public land-grant institution located in the mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. One of the councils, the United Council of Fraternities & Sororities (UCFS), included nine multicultural and special-interest Greek letter organizations. The results of the study indicated no significant differences between members of the four councils. No one category of leadership practices of members in the various councils was demonstrated more than any other (DiChiara). Dugan (2008) explored the relationship

between fraternity and sorority membership and socially responsible leadership. He reported that Greek members scored highest on the leadership value of commitment and lowest on the leadership value to navigate change. The study also reported statistically significant differences on most of the leadership measures between fraternity and sorority participants. The core of the instrument consisted of the *Socially Responsible Leadership Scale*. A limitation of Dugan's research was that the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership did not differentiate between outcomes based on membership in historically White, NPHC, or CBFS organizations. Dugan (2008) stated, "Future research should examine whether membership in these [multicultural] organizations produces different influences on student leadership development" (p. 22). A limitation of these studies was the lack of racially/culturally diverse student participants. Few of these leadership studies included students involved in CBFSs. The researcher was not able to locate a CBFS study that utilized the Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007), the leadership basis for the study. The research has helped to fill this gap in the literature.

Student Involvement and Expectations

The first known student organizations, which dated back to the early 1700s, had religious orientations allowing students to pray together under the supervision of faculty (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Between 1760 and 1860, students were afforded numerous opportunities for involvement in a variety of clubs and organizations such as literary societies, debate clubs, fraternities and sororities, social clubs, athletics, student government, and campus newspapers (Rudolph, 1990). Co-curricular activities remained fashionable and continued to expand on campuses in the early part of the twentieth century. Colleges and universities first officially recognized student organizations as student life prospered between 1920 and 1960 (Horowitz, 1987). As *in loco parentis* changed the "parental" relationship between colleges and students in

the late 1960s, the importance of student co-curricular participation and involvement also evolved. In addition to the aforementioned student organizations, students became active in many of the social issues of the times. Students assumed leadership roles and participated in campus demonstrations with the civil rights movement, women's movement, and Vietnam War (Horowitz). Student activism in the first decade of the 21st century centered on environmental, employment/living wages, all forms of diversity, and cost of higher education issues. In 2009, literally hundreds of student organizations thrive on college campuses in a broad range of self identified categories such as academic, advocacy, arts, cultural/international, honor, media, political, professional, programming/activities, religious, representative council, service, special interest, and sports/recreation (University of Georgia Center for Student Organizations).

Greek letter organizations continue to be trendy co-curricular organizations for student involvement (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Today, over 200 international social fraternities and sororities exists for student participation (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005). Phi Beta Kappa is recognized as the first honorary fraternity, founded in 1776 at the College of William and Mary (Kimbrough, 2003). Kappa Alpha Society, founded in 1812 at Union College, is considered the first Greek letter social fraternity (Kimbrough). Fraternities were first founded as literary societies and debate clubs and were considered the most popular student organizations on campuses between 1760 and 1860 (Brown, Parks, & Phillips). They later evolved into "social" organizations to fill the social void of student life on many campuses (Kimbrough). Women began enrolling in higher education in the early part of the 19th century, and by the mid-1800s, sororities were established as involvement opportunities to meet bonding and relationship needs (Torbenson & Parks).

Participation with student organizations is the most common form of co-curricular involvement (Badal, 2000). This type of involvement facilitates student development, offers educational programs and services that stimulate the learning process, and promotes an environment conducive to leadership discovery. Involvement and leadership skills developed through co-curricular activities increase the student's ability and likelihood to impact the campus community and society after graduation (Astin, 1993). Co-curricular involvement provides active learning opportunities for students that cultivate noticeable behavioral qualities and characteristics enhancing academic and/or cognitive learning (Astin, 1984, 1993; Blimling, Whitt, & Associates, 1994; Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005; Study Group, 1984; Terenzini, Pascarella, & Blimling, 1996). Co-curricular activities provide opportunities for students to become involved and engaged in nontraditional forms of learning outside the classroom. Participation in co-curricular activities is enhanced by campus cultures that value student involvement, leading to student learning and personal development (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991). Campuses enhance the overall learning environment by providing opportunities both inside and outside classrooms that expand on academic programs (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005).

Alexander Astin conducted the most conclusive research on student involvement as it relates to student development. Astin's work provides a base upon which the work of student affairs practice is predicated. His studies signify the importance of undergraduate student involvement related to learning and inform higher education professionals that students learn by becoming involved. Astin's *Theory of Involvement* (1984) is the seminal study of primary influence. This theory, which is behavioral in nature, concerns itself with what students are doing and how involvement processes work to facilitate learning. Astin's (1984) model states

five postulates and propositions to student involvement. The postulates maintain that involvement: is the investment of physical and psychological energy in different objects; occurs along a continuum as different students exert/invest different amounts of energy at different times; and includes both qualitative and quantitative components. The propositions assert that the amount of learning and personal development is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of involvement and that the effectiveness of any educational practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase involvement. Astin (1984) goes on to state, "The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement with that program" (p.298).

In summary, Astin's involvement theory states that the greater a student is involved, the more a student will learn. Astin (1996) showed that learning and development are directly proportional to the quality and quantity of time associated with a particular involvement experience. Involvement is measured by a student's physical and psychological investment in an academic experience, as well as the amount of quality and quantity of energy exerted towards that object. Quantity refers to the amount of time an individual spends on a certain task. Quality refers to the effort or nature of the involvement with that task. The extent to which students achieve development goals is directly related to the time and effort they devote to activities (Astin).

Astin conducted and participated in a number of research studies over his career that yielded the following findings related to student involvement in co-curriculum activities:

- Student learning is influenced by involvement in the co-curriculum (1975, 1977, 1984, 1985, 1993, 1996, & 2000).

- Lack of involvement is a primary reason for a student not persisting in college. Both lack of time and/or lack of interest are reasons for students not being actively involved in their undergraduate experience (1975).
- *Four Critical Years* was the result of a ten year longitudinal study collected from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). This study revealed a number of interesting findings with regard to both student and institutional characteristics that enhanced and influenced student experiences and learning, which ultimately affected their decision to pursue graduate education (1977).
- Campus involvement enhanced the overall effects of attending college: strengthening competence, self-esteem, artistic interests, liberalism, religious apostasy (abandoning faith), and as weakening business interests (1977).
- *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of Higher Education* stated that improving the quality of education was dependent on involvement, expectations, and assessment and feedback (Study Group, 1984). *The Study Group* also defined involvement as the amount of "time, energy, and effort students devote to the learning process" (p. 17).
- The more intensely students engage in their own education, the more substantial findings are reported in growth, achievement, satisfaction and persistence (1984).
- Student time should be viewed as the greatest institutional resource (1984).
- The primary purpose of any institution of higher education is to develop the talents of its faculty and students to maximize their full potential (1985).
- Undergraduate student involvement, in areas such as instruction, student activities, assessment and feedback, and public policy, is critical to the talent development of

undergraduate students. Astin: "stated simply: students learn by becoming involved" (1985, p. 133).

- The three most beneficial forms of undergraduate involvement are academic involvement, involvement with faculty, and involvement with peer groups (1993).
- Students become more involved when they can identify with their college environment. The campus environment plays a critical role in what it provides students and what opportunities are presented to interact with other ideas and people (1996).
- Greek organizations require a significant amount of time, and through involvement with Greek letter organizations, students better identify with other students and campus resources (1996).
- Negative effects of non-involvement include isolation from peers and separation from the physical campus (1999).
- Peer groups are the single most influential factor on the cognitive and affective development of students (1999). Astin reported, "…the greater the interaction with peers, the more favorable the outcome" (p. 590).
- Peer groups are powerful because of their ability to involve students more intensely in the intellectual life of the campus than other sources of development. Involvement is significantly affected by peer influence and can be a powerful attribute, leading to satisfaction and the development of close interpersonal relationships. Peers serve as the most important factor affecting the educational and personal development of college students. Students' educational development is enhanced when peer groups place high value on altruism and social activism (1999). Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) supported Astin's findings by reporting that peer interaction was more influential than interactions

with staff and faculty members. Their study *How College Affects Students* also reported that Greek members experience greater gains in interpersonal skills than nonmembers (2005).

Similarly, Tinto's (1993) research demonstrated that co-curricular involvement in organizations and activities promoted retention. His studies focused on traditional, residential students and concluded that student departure or persistence is a longitudinal process that occurs as a result of the meanings students ascribe to their interactions in a college setting (1993). Academic and social integration are key components leading to sufficient adjustment of the collegiate life. Tinto found that developing positive interactions with peers led to increased feelings of comfort with and adjustment to college. Conversely, negative interactions with peers affected departure. Tinto developed 13 propositions to explain how different components interacted together to provide a pathway to departure or persistence. One proposition stated that student entry characteristics affected the initial level of commitment to the institution as well as the likelihood of persistence toward graduation. Another proposition revealed that the greater the level of student academic and social integration, the greater the level of commitment to the goal of graduation from the institution (Tinto).

Encouraging students to get involved in co-curricular activities has proven to ensure student engagement and promote retention. Astin, Pascarella and Terenzini, and Tinto's extensive research on student involvement concludes that involvement in co-curricular activities has a significant impact on student development. However, the applicability of these findings to CBFSs is a glaring gap in the literature.

Involvement Expectations

Organization and peer expectations through involvement provide students with powerful knowledge about formal and informal membership requirements and standards. "Organization expectations are an example of such variables because of their ability (1) to influence the amount of interaction students have with peers and (2) to influence the nature of interactions that peers have with one another" (Beeny, 2003, p. 26). Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991) revealed the impact of high expectations on involving students. They reported that student involvement was enhanced as a result of ambitious and clearly articulated expectations. This study only examined institutions' expectations and did not explore student organization or peer expectations. Kuh (1999) reported that expectations should be both realistic and appropriate in order for students to deliver positive results. How expectations are conveyed is also a critical factor. Environmental pressures, such as a student organization's mission, purpose, practices and policies, are important in establishing student-campus environment congruence, like the concept of membership expectations (Strange & Banning, 2001). Although high expectations have been promoted as a solution to improving the learning environment (Study Group, 1984; Wingspread, 1993), little research has explored the relationship between CBFS involvement expectations and leadership development.

Involvement in Heritage or Culture-Based Groups at PWIs

Numerous research studies have documented the critical relationship between campus environment and the development of undergraduate students (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 1993; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Strange & Banning, 2001). PWIs can be especially problematic for multicultural students as culture at these institutions conveys messages of exclusion and devaluation (Gonzalez, 2003). Literature espouses multicultural students'

perceptions of belonging and support as essential factors leading to academic achievement, retention, satisfaction, and development (Castro, 2004; Mina, L., Cabrales, J.A., Juarez, C.M., & Rodriguez-Vasquez, F., 2004). Tinto (1993) stated that colleges are made up of several communities, or "subcultures." Fraternities, sororities, and multicultural student communities are central to this research proposal. At PWIs, multicultural students need to identify with at least one smaller community, like CBFSs, in which to seek membership and support in order to persist towards graduation. Tinto (1993) further described the importance of inclusive and supportive communities for students of color who experience difficult transition issues at PWIs. Kuh and Love (2000) supported the notion that institutional subcultures are important for multicultural students to overcome barriers and find membership at PWIs. Implications for cultural student organizations primarily focus on social identity and a sense of inclusion in campus life (Sidanius, Van Laar, Levin, & Sinclair, 2004). For example, ethnic identity was found to be the most important factor relating to a student's decision to join minority ethnic organizations (Sidanius et al.).

A small and growing body of research notes that multicultural students at PWIs select co-curricular involvement, such as cultural student organizations, as a primary venue for campus life involvement (Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001). Museus (2008) studied the role of ethnic organizations in fostering cultural adjustment and membership at PWIs for African American and Asian American students. This research concluded that ethnic student organizations provided important venues of cultural familiarity, opportunities for cultural expression and advocacy, and sources of cultural validation. This social involvement enhanced both students' cultural adjustment and membership at PWIs (Museus).

Maramba (2008) studied Filipina/o student experiences at a large research institution. This research explored the campus climate and one's sense of belonging at a PWI. The study concluded that student affairs professionals and services positively impacted Filipina/o experiences and provided a supportive environment. Additionally, participants identified closely with Filipina/o student organizations. Involvement, both on and off campus, for these students included social, community, and religious organizations. Maramba affirmed that students involved in Filipina/o and/or Asian student organizations provided rich detail of their participation. Aside from these studies, little research on co-curricular involvement in culture-based student organizations has been conducted.

An Evolution of Culture-Based Fraternities and Sororities

Students of color faced many challenges at PWIs in the first part of the 20th century. Schools in the South were still segregated, and a hostile climate existed on many campuses in the North. Historically, White organizations prohibited integration through their criteria for membership (Kimbrough, 2003). Issues of race and culture were a limiting factor for numerous social opportunities including membership in fraternities and sororities. From 1885 to 1929, some colleges diversified to include ethnic and religious minorities, admitting among others African Americans and Jews, resulting in the creation of many different types of Greek letter organizations (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005). The early part of the 20th century is considered the foundational period of Black fraternities and sororities as students desired a direct connection to their African ancestry (Brown et al.). Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. formed as the first Black Greek letter organization on a college campus at Cornell University in 1906 and was the beginning of the Black Greek movement in higher education (Ross, 2000). Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. quickly followed, forming in 1908 at Howard University as the first Black Greek

letter sorority (Ross). Today, nine traditionally African American fraternities and sororities with national organization affiliations can be found on college campuses. Historically, these organizations claim to seek students who are academically accomplished and interested in leadership initiatives (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). These Greek letter organizations are housed under a national umbrella organization called the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), which furthers the collective interests of African American fraternities and sororities. This group is referred to as the *Divine Nine* (Ross).

American college campuses have witnessed a dramatic increase in the racial and ethnic diversity of students over the past several decades. Part of that increase has been with the number of Latinas/os enrolling over the past 40 years (Gonzalez, Jovel, & Stoner, 2004). Higher education first documented Latina/o enrollment records in the 1960s and 1970s, and this student population multiplied threefold by the 1990s (Gonzalez et al.). Latina/o students sought similar ways to bond as their White and Black peers by creating Latina/o-based fraternities and sororities (Montelongo & Ortiz, 2001). Because of the difficulty adjusting at PWIs, Latina/o students yearned for the opportunity to form close relationships through organizations and to feel a sense of security in the campus community (Montelongo & Ortiz). These desires were the impetus for creating Latina/o-based Greek letter organizations as students sought a safe atmosphere resembling home. The first reported Latino Greek founding was Phi Iota Alpha in 1931 at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (Phi Iota Alpha Fraternity, Inc., n.d.).

The Latina/o fraternity and sorority movement would not gain momentum until the mid-1970s, but since the founding of Lambda Theta Alpha Sorority, Inc. and Lambda Theta Phi Fraternity, Inc. at Kean College in 1975, over 75 Latina/o Greek letter organizations have been created on college campuses (Kimbrough, 2003). Unlike most White and Black Greek

organizations, numerous Latina/o Greek letter organizations had not been recognized or affiliated with a larger national umbrella council (Kimbrough). In 1998, the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO) formed to serve as a council representing the interests of both Latina/o Greek fraternities and sororities (NALFO, n.d.). As the governing council, NALFO (n.d.) recently passed new minimum standards that they believe promote student learning. As of January 1, 2008, chapters were no longer allowed to induct first term/quarter/semester freshmen, and students were required to have earned a 2.5 GPA prior to being considered for membership. NALFO's mission statement, which is highlighted on their website, included the goal of promoting and fostering leadership development (NALFO, n.d.). NALFO also stated that campus multicultural councils are expected to "sponsor monthly leadership programs which promote personal development and encourage implementation of best business practices" (NALFO, n.d.).

CBFSs appear to have a history of leadership development programs and activities. As the landscape of campuses continued to diversify, other culture-based Greek organizations were formed. Pi Alpha Phi Fraternity, Inc. was founded as the first Asian fraternity in 1926 at the University of California Berkeley followed by Chi Alpha Delta Sorority, Inc., the first Asian sorority, in 1928 at the University of California Los Angeles (Castro, 2004). These Greek letter organizations were formed solely to promote the interests of Asian students. The first multicultural fraternity and sorority, reflecting multiple cultural values, were founded in 1986 at California State University Sacramento with a focus on diversity and devotion to cultural awareness (National Multicultural Greek Council, n.d.). Native American Greek letter organizations are the newest culture-based group to form fraternities and sororities. Phi Sigma Nu Fraternity, Inc. and Alpha Pi Omega Sorority, Inc. were founded in the mid 1990s to provide

support and opportunities for Native American students (Castro). Similar to NALFO, the National Multicultural Greek Council (NMGC) was formed to serve in an advisory capacity for groups who have a multicultural focus (NMGC, n.d.).

Many fraternities and sororities still use labels such as African American, Asian, Latina/o, and Hispanic, as distinct from multicultural interest groups, as students traditionally self-identify with organizations related to their races and cultures (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Students from different ethnic populations tend to remain relatively segregated and isolated from one another on campus and in the Greek community (Villalpando, 2004). Tradition, culture, and peer pressure often prohibit groups from recruiting students who are deemed different (Kimbrough, 2003). Another factor includes the institution's historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of various racial/ethnic student populations. Students of color know they may be labeled "sellout" by joining a different fraternity or sorority not consistent with their race or culture (Kimbrough).

CBFS traditionally operate independently of campus Interfraternity Council (IFC), Panhellenic Council, and NPHC groups. Because of their small student numbers and perceived similarities, CBFS and NPHC organizations may be housed or advised together on some college campuses. More recently, Hispanic, Latina/o, and Asian-based Greek letter organizations are found in umbrella Greek councils, which reflect the increasing diversity of fraternities and sororities (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). No one common name or type of council for CBFSs is consistent throughout college campuses.

Culture-Based Fraternities and Sororities

Many multicultural students are first-generation college students and come to campus less prepared to succeed, especially at PWIs (Mina, Cabrales, Juarez, & Rodriguez-Vasquez,

2004). Family plays a critical role in the lives of students of color as tension arises over parent concerns about support groups found in the collegiate environment (Mina et al.). CBFS provide unity and a sense of belonging on campus. Latina/o and Asian American Greek letter organizations have emerged as alternatives to the historically White and Black fraternities and sororities. Greek students report feeling they have a better chance to excel academically from this support (Mina et al.). CBFSs also focus on campus and community service in addition to volunteering as expectations of membership in these organizations (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). An emphasis is placed on giving back to the Latina/o and Asian communities as students are expected to serve as mentors and role models. CBFS membership helps students feel like an integral part of the institution and "reinforces pride in their heritage and cultural values" (Mina et al., 2004, p. 84).

Scholarly research has for the most part ignored the role or effect of CBFSs in higher education (Montelongo & Ortiz, 2001). Articles tend to focus on perceptions of behavior instead of research results. Many Latina/o Greek letter organizations have taken on practices consistent with NPHC organizations, including pledging exercises, brandings and tattoos, calls, stepping, performances, programs and rituals (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005). These groups "have called upon their heritage to provide a twist to Greek Life" (Kimbrough, 2003, p. 181). Latina/o student populations significantly increased in higher education during the 1990s (Gonzalez, Jovel, & Stoner, 2004). Due to anticipated rising enrollments, CBFSs have the ability to expand, increasing their stature on college campuses and in student activities (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

Little research has focused on learning outcomes of CBFS membership. Detractors contend that Latina/o fraternities and sororities are no more than social and community service organizations (Heidenreich, 2006). Heidenreich, in particular, was concerned about the rise and

emergence of these organizations that lack social awareness and activism and more closely resemble historically White Greek letter organizations. This researcher asserted that higher education should be concerned that Hispanic students are choosing Greek affiliation over other types of organizations found in campus life. Castro (as cited in Sidanius, Van Laar, Levin, & Sinclair, 2004), on the other hand, believed that culture-based fraternal groups provide their members with opportunities for leadership growth and development. Although CBFSs, like Phi Iota Alpha (n.d.), claim to "develop leaders" on their websites and in publications, further research is needed to confirm this assertion.

Historically, research efforts have focused on White Greek letter organizations (AFA, 2009; NIC, 2009; Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Asel, Seifert, & Pascarella (2009) studied the effects of fraternity and sorority membership on college experiences and outcomes. This study was conducted at a large Midwestern public research, university with members involved in the Interfraternity Council, Panhellenic Council and National Pan-Hellenic Council. The authors stated that the research results are generalizable only to historically White Greek letter organizations and did not include participants in CBFSs (Asel et al.). Other recent studies have been conducted on historically Black fraternities and sororities and contain almost no specific references to other culture-based Greek letter groups (Kimbrough, 2003). Layzer (2000) studied identity construction among Latina college students who joined a Latina sorority at a PWI. Layzer termed this process "strategic sisterhood" and denoted key themes of affiliation, recognition, solidarity and selection. Participants cited power through sisterhood and power through community as reasons for joining. Layzer also contended that this type of community is constantly evolving (2000). Torbenson and Parks (2009) examined the history and variety of

cultural-interest fraternities and sororities, but this literature does not provide further evidence of leadership development. Their work was intended to be a catalyst for future research on CBFSs.

Chapter Summary

Co-curricular experiences are enhanced by student organizations, like fraternities and sororities, that value student involvement (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991). Greek letter organizations market their ability to develop leadership skills through participation in organizational leadership roles (Harms et al., 2006). Through this involvement, Greek organizations provide tangible avenues for students to enhance leadership skills and competencies. Higher education strives to prepare students to be leaders and informed citizens (Kelley, 2008), and CBFSs provide students with opportunities for leadership development, academic support and achievement, and campus/community involvement (Castro, 2004). Greek leaders reported that they also held significant leadership positions in other areas of campus life and continued assuming leadership roles in their communities after college (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). Greek organizations often recognize famous alumni and highlight their accomplishments through quotes and statements attributing their professional success to Greek involvement and the organizations' legacy of leadership (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005). Many Greek letter organizations state leadership development as one of their public values and goals (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

A review of the literature provided a context for the importance of researching student leadership development as a result of involvement and expectations with CBFSs. The Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007) presents one framework in which to view student leadership development. Leadership development outcomes are limited in CBFS higher education research studies. Themes of involvement, expectations, and leadership skill

development as a direct benefit of membership in a CBFS required further research. Therefore, documenting the presence of leadership development outcomes resulting from a student's involvement experience and expectations with a CBFS is an area that needed further exploration.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a basic overview of survey research principles and explains the process and presents descriptions of methods that were used to conduct the study. This section further describes participant selection, data collection, instrumentation, data analysis, and research questions for this research.

Survey Research Principles

A quantitative method for a research study was selected as the researcher sought to examine a "social or human problem, based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analyzed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalizations of the theory hold true" (Creswell, 1994, p. 2). The researcher chose survey data collection due to the economy of the design and the rapid turnaround in data collection using an instrument. Creswell identified a standard format of five steps for survey research: the survey design, population and sampling, instrumentation, variables in the study, and data analysis. "A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of some fraction of the population - the sample - through the data collection process of asking questions of people" (Creswell, 1994, p. 117). The design starts with a review of the purpose and rationale of the study. The researcher describes the characteristics of the population to be studied and the sampling design. The design should include a description of the population, identify how participants will be selected, and identify the number of people in the sample. The design names the instrument to be used, describes its major content sections, and confidence (validity and

reliability) of instrument items and scales. In the next component, the research introduces the variables and explains how the variables relate to the instrument. The last section contains the data analysis. Creswell recommended presenting this section as a series of steps: describing how the information will be reported, how bias will be eliminated/minimized, providing a descriptive analysis of all variables, presenting how reliability and validity of scales will be tested to ensure internal consistency, and "identify the statistics to be used to compare groups or related variables and answer the research questions or objectives of the study" (p. 124).

Process

The purpose of this study was to examine how CBFSs support and contribute to leadership development, a subset of co-curricular learning, as a function of intensity of involvement and expectations. Specifically, what leadership skills and competencies were developed and enhanced through membership in CBFSs? The researcher administered a questionnaire to student members of CBFSs at two research institutions in the Southeast. The intended outcome of this study was to inform CBFSs and student affairs practitioners who work with these student groups, so they can be more intentional when advising active student members. The study was designed to evaluate CBFS members' perceptions of involvement and expectations in order to establish a foundation for future studies.

In addition, the researcher conducted a preliminary qualitative study of leadership outcomes based on membership in CBFSs that supported the broader quantitative study (Atkinson, Dean, & Espino, n.d.). The themes of leadership development as a result of involvement, membership and organization expectations, and enhanced skill development led the researcher to select the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (*Appendix A*)

(Beeny, 2003). The researcher received the author's approval to use the instrument (*Appendix B*).

Participants

The population studied was active student members of CBFSs at two large, research institutions in a single state and within a state system, in the Southeast: Institution One and Institution Two. A convenience sample of the entire population was measured. The study focused on CBFSs that were recognized members of multicultural Greek councils advised out of the fraternity and sorority life office on each respective campus. The CBFS at the two institutions included Asian, Latina/o, South Asian and Multicultural based interest groups.

Institutions were selected based on the following criteria. First, the fraternity and sorority life offices at these universities employed full-time student affairs professionals and graduate assistants to work with university registered fraternities and sororities, including CBFSs. Second, a multicultural Greek council served as the governing body of registered or recognized CBFSs. A third institution was contacted but did not participate due to logistical reasons. Table 1 reports the prevalence of CBFSs by cultural interest group and notes approximate total student membership in CBFSs at each institution.

Table 1

Culture-Based Fraternity and Sorority Prevalence and Membership by Institution

	Number of Organizations	
Area of Interest	Institution One	Institution Two
Asian	2	2
Latina	1	1
Latino	1	2
Multicultural	1	2
South-Asian	2	1
Total Membership	81	104

At Institution One, the Multicultural Greek Council reported seven active CBFS chapters comprising approximately 81 members (Georgia Institute of Technology Multicultural Greek Council, 2010). Those CBFSs included Alpha Iota Omicron Fraternity, Inc., a South Asian-interest fraternity; Delta Phi Lambda Sorority, Inc., an Asian-interest sorority; Lambda Theta Alpha Sorority, Inc., a Latina-interest sorority; Lambda Upsilon Lambda Fraternity, Inc., a Latino-interest fraternity; Sigma Beta Rho Fraternity, Inc., a South Asian based multicultural-interest fraternity; Sigma Sigma Rho Sorority, Inc., a South Asian-interest sorority; and Xi Kappa Fraternity, Inc., an Asian-interest fraternity.

At Institution Two, the Multicultural Greek Council reported the following eight active CBFSs: Sigma Beta Rho Fraternity Inc., a South Asian based multicultural fraternity; Lambda Phi Epsilon Fraternity, Inc., an Asian-interest fraternity; Lambda Sigma Upsilon Fraternity, Inc., a Latino-interest fraternity; Lambda Theta Phi Fraternity, Inc., a Latin-based fraternity; Delta Phi Lambda Sorority, Inc., an Asian-interest sorority; Sigma Sigma Rho Sorority, Inc., a South

Asian-interest sorority; Lambda Theta Alpha Latin Sorority, Inc., a Latina-interest sorority; and Gamma Eta Sorority, Inc., a multicultural-interest sorority. The council reported 104 active members of CBFSs for Spring semester 2010 (University of Georgia Multicultural Greek Council, 2010).

Data Collection

The researcher initially contacted student affairs professionals and the executive members of the multicultural Greek councils at the two institutions to request permission to conduct the study at each host institution. The researcher gained approval from the host study site's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Upon approval from the study sites' IRB, the researcher contacted both Greek Life Offices and multicultural Greek councils. The researcher then e-mailed each CBFS's individual chapter president for permission to attend an upcoming weekly scheduled chapter meeting in January and February 2010 to administer and collect the surveys. Data collection occurred through convenience sampling – simply selecting the group of members who were present at the chapter meetings and who completed the questionnaire when the researcher administered the instrument (Huck, 2000). The survey design was cross-sectional and information from each participant was only collected at one point in time (during the chapter meeting) (Creswell, 1984). All CBFS participants received two copies of the consent form, one labeled "Researcher's Copy" and one labeled "Participant's Copy" (*Appendix C*), and one copy of the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire*. The researcher first read the interview protocol (Appendix D), and then distributed and reviewed the consent forms with the participants, stressing that participation was voluntary. The participants were informed that they had a choice to participate and that there were not be any negative outcomes for not participating. Participants could elect not to answer any question without having to explain why.

No discomforts or stresses were anticipated. The researcher further explained that foreseeable risks were minimized as no individually-identifiable information about the participant was collected or shared with others. Prior to students receiving the instrument, the researcher asked each participant to sign and return the consent form labeled "Researcher's Copy" and to keep the consent form labeled "Participant's Copy" for their individual records. The researcher asked the chapter president to collect and return all other materials immediately following the meeting. The researcher then distributed the instrument to the students and instructed them to complete the questionnaire and return the completed survey directly to the chapter president. Finally, the researcher physically left the meeting location to ensure minimal discomfort or pressure. The researcher received the completed surveys from the chapter presidents immediately following the chapter meetings.

Instrumentation

The researcher previously conducted a basic, qualitative study of leadership outcomes based on membership in CBFSs at the host institution (Atkinson, Dean, & Espino, n.d.). An overview of the findings of this particular study highlighted significant leadership outcomes from culture-based Greek letter involvement, served as the outgrowth of the current research study, and provided rationale for the selection of the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire*. Participants in the qualitative study shared that they were expected to assume leadership roles within their organizations soon after joining. The small chapter sizes of CBFSs, as compared to other Greek letter organizations, required each participant to assume multiple leadership roles. This leadership expectation was described as pressure directed from older active members and alumni. The participants had all held numerous formal leadership positions with their CBFS and stated learning a wide variety of leadership skill development. The

participants felt a strong sense of responsibility to lead and enhance their CBFS. Although the researcher expected that some level of leadership growth would be validated through participant interviews, the volume of experiences shared through interviews by the students was extensive and served as motivation for further study (Atkinson, Dean, & Espino, n.d.). The research themes of involvement, expectations, and leadership skill development as a direct benefit of membership in a CBFS informed this research study.

The research study themes were similar to a dissertation titled *Perceptions of Learning in the Co-curriculum: A Study of Involvement and Expectations* (Beeny, 2003), therefore the same instrument was an appropriate choice for this study as well. The *Co-curricular Involvement and Experience Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003) is an instrument designed to measure perceptions of student leadership and skill development and is comprised of questions from Badal (2000), Beeny (2003), and Winston and Massaro (1987). This instrument was originally modified from the *Leadership Competencies Skills Questionnaire for Leadership Educators* (Badal, 2000). The instrument also includes involvement related questions from Winston and Massaro (1987). The questionnaire is a 4-sided instrument containing 74 questions. The instrument includes "questions in the following areas: (a) perceptions of student learning in the co-curriculum, (b) intensity of student involvement in the organization, (c) perceptions of organizational expectations and the practices surrounding those expectations, and (d) demographic information" (Beeny, p. 36, 2003). Participants selected appropriate responses on Likert scales, indicating a level of agreement or disagreement with the statements (Hull, 2000). The questionnaire includes the following instrument measures: the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory (Winston & Massaro, 1987), Leadership Competencies and Skills Questionnaire for Leadership Educators

(Badal, 2000), and an expectations section Beeny (2003) created based on the work of Kuh (1999) and Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991).

Measures

Section I - Involvement Index

The *Extracurricular Involvement Inventory (EII)* (Winston & Massaro, 1987) was used to measure the physical and psychological energy of a student's involvement with a CBFS. Winston and Massaro (1987) conducted two studies to develop reliability and validity for the instrument. The studies consisted of 3 sample groups (Group A, Group B, and Group C) and a sub-sample group (Subsample Group D). The sub-sample group completed the EII and the *Club's and Organization's Scale* (Pace, 1984) on different occasions over a two-week time period and the Pearson correlation coefficient was reported as 0.97 (a value of minus 1.0 indicates a perfect inverse linear relationship between two variables). "When using a chi-square to do the analysis using the number of activities in which a student is involved, the response is x2 = 20, *df* = 2, showing no statistical difference. Reliability tests indicate that the EII is stable over time" (Winston & Massaro, 1987, p.173) and a consistent measure of a given behavior. Similarly, validity for the EII was tested to ensure that the instrument actually measures what it intends to measure. This was estimated by conducting a correlation analysis with the *Clubs and Organizations Scale* (Pace, 1984) and by contrasting groups.

> "The correlational analysis was found to be .45 with Group C (*n* = 75) and 0.55 with Groups A & B combined (*n* = 79). Both groups were significant at p<.001. An analysis of covariance was conducted by dividing a sample into three groups based on intensity of involvement and by using the Clubs and Organizations scale as the dependent variable. Means and standard deviations were as follows: (*M* = 18.07, *SD*

> = 3.69); (*M* = 26.30, *SD* = 6.23); (*M* = 29.80, *SD* = 8.50). Scheffe's post hoc test revealed statistical significance between Group 1 and Groups 2 and 3, but no difference between Group 2 and 3. The researchers concluded that the EII might be more sensitive than the Clubs and Organizations Scale in measuring higher levels of involvement." (Beeny, 2003, p.41)

The EII is a series of Involvement Indexes (INIX) that measure: (a) approximate number of total hours spent in involvement with the CBFS over the previous four weeks; (b) official offices or positions held; (c) and the quality of a student's participation with a CBFS. In order to determine the intensity score for an INIX question, the responses to the five items assessing the dimensions of quality are totaled: (a) Very Often (3 points awarded), (b) Often (2 points awarded), (c) Occasionally (1 point awarded), (d) Never (0 points awarded), (e) and other statements attributable to no meeting requirements or duties/responsibilities (0 points awarded). Scores range from 1-15 for the quality dimension section.

> The researcher then multiplies scores from the quality measure by the score for the quantity measure. To determine the quantity measure the researcher converts hours of participation using the following scale: 0 hours = 0; 1-8 hours = 1; 9-16 hours = 2, and so on at 8-hour intervals. The intensity score is the product of the quality measure and the quantity measure (Beeny, p. 40, 2003).

For the purpose of this study, the researcher modified how hours were converted to account for large hour number participant responses. The following scale was used: 0 hours = 0; 1-25 hours = 1; 26-50 hours = 2, 51-75 hours = 3, 75-100 hours = 4, 101 or more hours = 5.

Section II - Leadership Skills and Competencies

Beeny (2003) adapted the leadership skills and competencies section from Badal's *Leadership Competencies and Skills Questionnaire for Leadership Educators* (2000). Badal originally designed this scale, which includes 48 leadership items, to measure leadership education. The items are collapsed into four leadership subscales titled: The Concept of Leadership, Personal Skill Development, Leadership in Organizations, and Other Competencies and Skills. Three sources were utilized in the creation of the leadership items included in the scale. The primary source was the comprehensive student leadership curriculum outlined in the *Student Leadership Program Model* (Roberts & Ullom, 1990). The first three leadership subscales were directly taken from this curriculum (Badal). Badal also used the "Quantum Model" found in *Rewiring the Corporate Brain* (Zohar, 1997) which addressed work place leadership competencies and skills. Finally, Badal asked eight leadership educators to critique the scales. Beeny (2003) tested the *Leadership Skills and Competencies Questionnaire* for reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The statistical test has yielded measures ranging from 0.8772 to 0.9459. Values above .70 are considered strong thus allowing the researcher to be confident in the reliability of the instrument (Huck, 2000). Similarly, the researcher ran a Cronbach's alpha test on the *Leadership Competencies and Skills Questionnaire* as a method to assess internal consistency.

Participants were asked to complete the 48 questions related to perceived leadership development (skills and competencies) with CBFSs. This part of the instrument includes a Likert scale, with numbers ranging from 1 – 5 (1 = No Growth, 2 = Minimal Growth, 3 = Moderate Growth, 4 = Strong Growth, and 5 = Very Strong Growth). One additional

question asks participants, “What other skills and competencies not mentioned about have you learned from being involved in the student organization?” (Beeny, 2003).

Section III - Expectations

This section includes eleven questions designed to rate student perceptions about the expectations of the organization (CBFS) or membership requirements and standards established by the organization (CBFS). The instrument defines expectations as “those membership requirements and standards established by the organization” (*Appendix A*). Beeny (2003) created the questions “based on three sources, the primary source being “Setting the Bar High” (Kuh, 1999), a chapter from the book *Good Practices in Student Affairs: Principles to Foster Student Learning* (Blimling, Whitt, & Associates, 1999)” (p.41). The other source used was *Involving Colleges* (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates, 1991). Beeny reviewed and solicited feedback for these eleven questions with select faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students. A Likert scale is used to rate 10 of the 11 questions, and the scale ranges from 1-5 (1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). For question number 11, participants are given the prompt, “I learned about the organization’s expectations through:” and are asked to choose from 9 different answers, checking all that apply (Beeny, 2003).

Section VI - Satisfaction

The satisfaction variables include participants’ satisfaction with their experiences in the organization, whether the participants would return to the CBFS as an active member for another year, and whether the organization has been worth the participant’s time. This section is scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 – 5, (1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Somewhat

Agree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree) (Beeny, 2003).

Section V - Demographics

Demographic variables included sex, class standing, type of CBFS, total number of people in the CBFS, and the total number of student organizations a participant was involved with on campus. Tenure with the CBFS was also assessed and scored on the following criteria: 6 months or less, 7 months to 1 year, 1-2 years, or more than 2 years (Beeny, 2003).

Data Analysis

Responses from the questionnaire were statistically analyzed using correlation analysis and regression analysis, as the researcher explored the degree to which a CBFS student's perceived leadership development was related to the intensity of the student's involvement and to the fraternity's or sorority's expectations. The following research questions guided the study:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between the CBFS student's evaluation of membership expectations and perceived co-curricular leadership development in the organization? This question examined the relationship between the CBFS's expectations and the students' perceptions of their leadership development as an active member. Each of the expectation variables were investigated using the Pearson's correlation coefficient with the four leadership subscales. Pearson correlations are "designed for the situation where (1) each of the two variables is quantitative in nature and (2) each variable is measured so as to produce raw scores" (Huck, 2000, p. 70). The statistical analysis is considered to be bivariate in character. The Pearson correlation coefficient "is a measure of the degree of linear relationship between two variables that are measured on an interval scale" (Jaeger, 1983, p. 330).

RQ2: Is there a relationship between intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and perceived leadership development? This question examined the relationship between the intensity of the student's involvement in the CBFS and the student's perception of their leadership development while involved as an active member. Each of the four leadership subscales was investigated using the Pearson's correlation coefficient.

RQ3: To what extent is a student's perceived co-curricular leadership development explained by intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and expectation variables together? A multiple regression analysis was conducted to explain perceptions of leadership development (dependent variable), on the four leadership subscales, looking at intensity of involvement and the ten expectation variables together (independent variables). Multiple regression was "used to predict the value of one variable (called a dependent variable) from the values of at least two other variables (called independent variables)" (Jaeger, 1983, p. 334).

RQ4: What variables appear to be most important in explaining perceived CBFS student co-curricular leadership development? This multiple regression question examined intensity of involvement along with the ten expectation variables (independent variables) that appeared to be most important in explaining perceived leadership development on the four leadership subscales (dependent variable).

RQ5: To what extent is the intensity of a CBFS student's involvement (both physical and psychological) explained by leadership development and expectation variables together? A multiple regression analysis was conducted to explain intensity of involvement (dependent variable), looking at perceptions of leadership development as measured by the four leadership subscales and the ten expectation variables together (independent variables).

RQ6: What are the competency and skill items most and least often cited as being developed through involvement with a CBFS? The means (a simple frequency distribution) of participant responses to the 48 leadership skills and competencies were ranked in descending order from those skills and competencies for which students indicated they had grown the most to those skills and competencies for which students indicated they had grown the least.

RQ7: What are the differences in the rating of items among CBFS students based on type of CBFS by cultural group? An ANOVA was originally proposed to examine this research question. Jaeger (1983) defined an analysis of variance (ANOVA) as "an inferential statistical procedure used to test the null hypothesis that the means of three or more populations are equal to each other" (p. 329). A power analysis was determined using Cohen's D table with power of .80 and a medium effect size. The analysis determined that a minimum of 50 participants per cultural group would be necessary in an effort not to commit type II error. The study did not yield the required participant number needed. Therefore, a multiple regression was run using the leadership subscales and the different types of CBFS (Asian, Latina, Latino, Multicultural, and South Asian) to determine if there were any statistically significant differences due to a particular culture.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine how CBFSs support and contribute to leadership development, a subset of co-curricular learning, as a function of intensity of involvement and expectations. This chapter presents the results from the statistical data analysis while addressing each research question separately. The following research questions guided the study:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between the CBFS student's evaluation of membership expectations and perceived co-curricular leadership development in the organization?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and perceived leadership development?

RQ3: To what extent is a student's perceived co-curricular leadership development explained by intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and expectation variables together?

RQ4: What variables appear to be most important in explaining perceived CBFS student co-curricular leadership development?

RQ5: To what extent is the intensity of a CBFS student's involvement (both physical and psychological) explained by leadership development and expectation variables together?

RQ6: What are the competency and skill items most and least often cited as being developed through involvement with a CBFS?

RQ7: What are the differences in the rating of items among CBFS students based on type of CBFS by cultural group?

Questionnaire

Data were collected using the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire*. This instrument is a questionnaire (*Appendix A*) created by Beeny (2003), based on the work of Badal (2000) and Winston and Massaro (1987). The researcher entered the data from this study into Perseus, a survey software system using a word processing format, and then converted for use in Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS), 16th edition. Data analysis was conducted on each of the three constructs: leadership, intensity, and expectations. The instrument focused on 48 leadership skills and competencies and five intensity of involvement items (*Appendix A*) which were compressed into five different subscales: Concept of Leadership (CONC), Personal Skill Development (PERS), Leadership in Organizations (Org), Other Competencies and Skills (OTHER), and Intensity of Involvement. The four leadership subscales were calculated using a composite score from the four categories which appear in the *Leadership Skills and Competencies Questionnaire* (Badal). An Intensity of Involvement score was calculated for each CBFS participant. This score was the product of the quantity measure (the total number of hours each CBFS participant reported during the four week period prior to data collection) and the quantity measure (Involvement Index) (Winston and Massaro). To derive the involvement score, the researcher multiplied the number of reported hours with the weighted response based on the information reported in the Involvement Index, which yielded an indication of Intensity of Involvement

Record of CBFSs Completing the Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire

In total, 115 out of a possible 185 students (62% response rate) participated in the study. Forty-one participants were from Institution One, and 74 participants were from Institution Two. See Table 2.

Table 2

Number of Participants per Culture-Based Fraternity and Sorority

Name of CBFS	*n*	Total N	Percentage
Institution One Multicultural Greek Council			
Alpha Fraternity, Inc.	0	24	0%
Beta Sorority, Inc.	8	9	89%
Gamma Sorority, Inc.	0	2	0%
Delta Fraternity, Inc.	0	4	0%
Epsilon Fraternity, Inc.	22	23	96%
Zeta Sorority, Inc.	0	6	0%
Eta Fraternity, Inc.	11	13	85%
Institution Two Multicultural Greek Council			
Theta Sorority, Inc.	23	39	79%
Iota Sorority, Inc.	2	2	100%
Kappa Fraternity, Inc.	9	12	75%
Lambda Fraternity, Inc.	2	6	33%
Mu Sorority, Inc.	8	11	73%
Nu Fraternity, Inc.	4	4	100%
Xi Fraternity, Inc.	14	16	88%
Omicron Sorority, Inc.	13	15	87%

Analysis of Scales

The *Leadership Skills and Competencies Questionnaire* (Badal, 2000) contains 48 items designed to address leadership. To prepare for the analysis, the researcher collapsed the 48 items into four subscales based on the questionnaire's design (Beeny, 2003): Concept of Leadership (CONC), Personal Skill Development (PERS), Leadership in Organizations (ORG), and Other Competencies and Skills (OTHER). Each of the four subscales was tested with Cronbach's alpha and proved to be reliable. Alpha scores ranged from 0.803 from the Personal Skill Development subscale (PERS) to 0.899 for the Other Competencies and Skills subscale (OTHER). Complete Cronbach's alpha results are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Reliability Analysis for the Four Leadership Skills and Competencies Subscales (Alpha)

Scale	Subscale Abbreviation	*N* of cases	*N* of Items	Alpha
Concept of Leadership	CONC	111	9	.877
Personal Skill Development	PERS	112	12	.803
Leadership in Organizations	ORG	115	7	.819
Other Competencies and Skills	OTHER	107	23	.899

Results of Data Analysis

Demographics

CBFS respondents varied in terms of gender, type of CBFS, leadership positions held within the group, number of hours involved with the CBFS, class standing, tenure with

organization, and the number of organizations involved with on campus. Demographic information is included in Table 4. Sixty (52%) of the CBFS participants reported male and 55 (48%) reported female. Fifty-one (44%) participants were involved in an Asian culture-based fraternity and sorority, 14 (12%) Latina/o, 38 (33%) Multicultural, and 12 (11%) South Asian. Participants ranged from first-year students to graduate students. Five (13%) participants were first year students, 39 (34%) second year, 33 (29%) third year, 25 (22%) fourth year, and 3 (2%) graduate students. Twenty-nine (26%) participants reported 6 months or less tenure with the organization, 15 (13%) reported 7 months to 1 year, 32 (28%) reported 1 to 2 years, and 37 (33%) reported more than two years. The number of hours that respondents were involved in the organization in the four weeks prior to completing the questionnaire ranged from 3 to 542 hours. Seventy-seven (69%) CBFS students were involved in the organization for 50 hours or less over the four week period, 46 (41%) for 1-25 hours, 31 (28%) for 26-50 hours, 6 (5%) for 51-75 hours, 19 (17%) for 76-100 hours, and 10 (9%) for 101 plus hours. The number of other student organizations with which a CBFS student was involved ranged from one to ten. The majority of participants (62%) reported the total number of organizations involved with on campus between two and three student organizations: 12 (10%) with one organization; 32 (28%) with two organizations; 36 (31%) with three organizations; 14 (12%) with four organizations; 12 (10%) with five organizations, 2 (2%) with six organizations; and 1 (.9%) reported involvement with seven student organizations. In terms of leadership positions held, 100 (87%) respondents reported holding some type of office in the CBFS during the four week period prior to data collection. See Table 4.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample – CBFS Students

Variable	*n*	Percent
Gender		
Male	60	52.2
Female	55	47.8
Type of CBFS		
Asian	51	44.3
Latina	8	7.0
Latino	6	5.2
Multicultural	38	33
South Asian	12	10.4
Leadership Positions Held within Organization		
President	18	15.7
Treasurer	9	7.8
Vice President/Vice Chairperson	16	13.9
Committee/Task Force/Project Chairperson	32	27.8
Secretary	8	7.0
Held no office or leadership position	15	13
Other	38	33
Number of Hours Involved in CBFS in the Past Four Weeks		
1-25	46	41.1
26-50	31	27.7
51-75	6	5.4
76-100	19	17.0
101 or more	10	8.9

[Table 4 continues]

Table 4 continued

Variable	*n*	Percent
Tenure with Organization		
6 Months or Less	29	25.7
7 Months – 1 Year	15	13.3
1-2 Years	32	28.3
More than 2 Years	37	32.7
Class Standing		
First Year	15	13.0
Second Year	39	33.9
Third Year	33	28.7
Fourth Year	25	21.7
Graduate Student	3	2.6
Number of Student Organizations Involved with on Campus		
1	12	10.9
2	32	29.1
3	36	32.7
4	14	12.7
5	12	10.9
6	2	1.8
7	1	0.9

The researcher analyzed the following demographic variables with the four leadership subscales: gender; leadership positions held within the organization; and tenure with the organization.

A point-biserial correlation was calculated measuring the strength of the relationship between gender (dichotomous variable) and the 4 leadership subscales (continuous variables). Gender showed a moderate correlation with two subscales based on the Pearson correlation coefficient at the 0.05 level. Positive correlations were reported for the Leadership in Organization subscale ($r = .214$, $p < .05$) and Other Competencies and Skills subscale ($r = .215$, $p < .05$). The positive correlation indicates that the values on the two variables move in the same direction. The researcher also ran an independent sample t-test which did not reveal statistically significant differences between male and female respondents on the four leadership subscales.

Neither the type of leadership position(s) held nor the participants' length in tenure with the organization showed a statistically significant correlation with the four leadership subscales. The results regarding leadership position(s) held within the organization may have been the result of very low numbers. Tenure with the organization (0-1 year vs. more than 1 year) may have been the consequence of respondents being predisposed to other types of leadership experiences.

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between the CBFS student's evaluation of membership expectations and perceived co-curricular leadership development in the organization? This question examined the relationship between the CBFS's expectations and the students' perceptions of their leadership development as an active member. Each of the expectation variables were investigated using the Pearson's correlation coefficient with the four leadership subscales. Below are the results for each of the four leadership subscales listed in Table 5.

Table 5

Correlations between Organization Expectations and Perceived Leadership According to the Subscales

	Concept of Leadership	Personal Skill Development	Leadership in Organizations	Other Competencies and Skills
Clearly stated	.112	.185	**.366***	.169
Consistent with other orgs.	.082	.178	**.189***	**.210***
Expectations are high	**.204***	**.235***	**.222***	**.417****
Expectations are low	.074	-.81	**-.206***	**-.202***
Expectations are attainable	**.197***	**.190***	**.202***	**.254****
Have necessary resources to meet expectations	.175	**.201***	**.240***	**.284****
Expectations are consistently reinforced	.112	.111	**.281****	**.284****
Members held accountable for expectations	.180	.142	**.374****	**.224***
I have received consistent and clear feedback	**.217***	.173	**.338****	**.401****
I joined the org. expecting to learn	.102	.114	.108	.195

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Concept of leadership. The expectation variables *expectations are high, expectations are attainable, and received clear and consistent feedback* show a moderate positive relationship at the 0.05 level. There was no statistical significance for the variables *clearly stated, consistent with other organizations, expectations are low, have necessary resources to meet expectations, consistently reinforced, members are held accountable for expectations, and joined the*

organization expecting to learn something. The lack of significant relationships between membership expectations and the leadership variables suggests that CBFS students do not have a strong overall concept of leadership paradigms such as historical perspectives, theoretical foundations, and evaluation and research concepts.

Personal skill development. CBFS students who have strong personal skill development reflect perceiving lofty expectations that are attainable through available resources. The expectation variables *expectations are high, expectations are attainable, and have necessary resources to meet expectations* indicate moderate positive relationships at the 0.05 level. There was no statistical significance for the variables *clearly stated, consistent with other organizations, expectations are low, consistently reinforced, members are held accountable for expectations, received clear and consistent feedback, and joined the organization expecting to learn something.*

Leadership in organizations. The expectation variables *clearly stated, consistent with other organizations, expectations are high, expectations are low, expectations are attainable, and have necessary resources to meet expectations* all show low to moderate positive relationships at the 0.05 level. The expectation variables *consistently reinforced, members are held accountable for expectations, and received clear and consistent feedback* indicate significant positive relationships at the 0.01 level. The relationship between membership expectations and the leadership variables in this subscale suggests that CBFS students have a strong grasp of leadership within organizations such as understanding group dynamics, teambuilding, motivating others, task/resource management, and handling crisis. There was no statistical significance for the variable *joined the organization expecting to learn something.*

Other competencies and skills. The expectation variables *consistent with other organizations, expectations are low, and members are held accountable for expectations* show low to moderate positive relationships at the 0.05 level. The expectation variables *expectations are high, expectations are attainable, have necessary resources to meet expectations, consistently reinforced, and received clear and consistent feedback* indicate significant positive relationships at the 0.01 level. The relationship between expectations and the majority of leadership items stated in this subscale signifies that CBFS students developed a variety of leadership skills and competencies due to lofty expectations. There was no statistical significance for the variables *expectations are clearly stated and joined the organization expecting to learn something.*

Research Question 2

Is there a relationship between intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and perceived leadership development? This question examined the relationship between the intensity of the student's involvement in the CBFS and the student's perception of their leadership development while involved as an active member. Each of the four leadership subscales was investigated using the Pearson's correlation coefficient. Ratings regarding intensity of involvement correlated with the leadership subscales Personal Skill Development - *PERS* ($r = .212$, $p < .05$) and Leadership in Organizations - *ORG* ($r = .204$, $p < .05$), indicating moderate positive relationships between intensity of student involvement and perceived leadership skill development in the CBFS. See Table 6.

Table 6

Correlations between Intensity of Involvement and Perceived Leadership According to Subscales

Subscales	*n*	Intensity of Involvement
Concept of leadership	108	.031
Personal skill development	109	**.212***
Leadership in organizations	112	**.204***
Other competencies and skills	104	.178

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Research Question 3

To what extent is a student's perceived co-curricular leadership development explained by intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and expectation variables together? A multiple regression analysis was conducted to explain the impact of involvement and expectations together (independent variables) on perceptions of leadership development (dependent variable). The results of this analysis yielded significant analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for the following subscales: Personal Skill Development (PERS) subscale ($R2 = .209$, $F(11, 88) = 2.118$, $p < .05$); Leadership in Organizations (ORG) subscale ($R2 = .334$, $F(11, 90) = 4.097$, $p < .05$); and the Other Competencies and Skills (OTHER) subscale ($R2 = .353$, $F(11, 84) = 4.173$, $p < .05$). The findings indicate that the regression models used for these subscales resulted in a good degree of prediction of the outcome variables. On the other hand, the ANOVA test for the model in which the Concept of Leadership (CONC) subscale was set as the dependent variable did not yield a statistically significant result (*R2* =

.114, $F(11, 86) = 1.010$, $p > .05$), indicating that this regression model did not predict the outcome variable effectively.

Research Question 4

What variables appear to be most important in explaining perceived CBFS student co-curricular leadership development? This multiple regression question examined intensity of involvement along with the ten expectation variables (independent variables) that appeared to be most important in explaining perceived leadership development on the four leadership subscales (dependent variable). None of the relationships were statistically significant. The four leadership subscales are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

Significance of Expectation Variables on Perceived Leadership

Scale	df	t	*p*	R2
Concept of Leadership				**.114**
Intensity of Involvement	86	-.101	.920	-
Expectations are clearly stated	86	-.040	.968	-
Expectations consistent with other organizations	86	.123	.902	-
Expectations are high	86	1.389	.169	-
Expectations are low	86	.951	.344	-
Expectations are attainable	86	.489	.626	-
I am given necessary resources to meet expectations	86	1.046	.298	-
Expectations are consistently reinforced	86	-.645	.521	-

[Table 7 continues]

Table 7 continued

Scale	df	t	*p*	R2
Held accountable for expectations	86	.627	.532	-
Received consistent and clear feedback	86	.960	.340	-
Expected to learn something	86	.435	.665	-
Personal Skill Development				**2.09**
Intensity of Involvement	88	1.953	.054	-
Expectations are clearly stated	88	.559	.577	-
Expectations consistent with other orgs.	88	.538	.592	-
Expectations are high	88	2.790	.006	-
Expectations are low	88	.318	.751	-
Expectations are attainable	88	.604	.547	-
I am given necessary resources to meet expectations	88	1.405	.164	-
Expectations are consistently reinforced	88	-1.344	.182	-
Held accountable for expectations	88	.121	.904	-
Received consistent and clear feedback	88	.423	.674	-
Expected to learn something	88	.403	.688	-
Leadership in Organizations				**.334**
Intensity of Involvement	90	3.128	.002	-
Expectations are clearly stated	90	1.930	.057	-
Expectations consistent with other orgs.	90	.061	.952	-
Expectations are high	90	1.438	.154	-
Expectations are low	90	-1.636	.105	-
Expectations are attainable	90	-.177	.860	-
I am given necessary resources to meet organization expectations	90	-.090	.928	-

[Table 7 continues]

Table 7 continued

Scale	df	t	*p*	R2
Expectations are consistently reinforced	90	-.199	.843	-
Held accountable for expectations	90	1.832	.070	-
Received consistent and clear feedback	90	1.523	.131	-
Expected to learn something	90	.427	.670	-
Other Competencies and Skills				**.353**
Intensity of Involvement	84	1.397	.166	-
Expectations are clearly stated	84	-.533	.595	-
Expectations consistent with other orgs.	84	.979	.330	-
Expectations are high	84	2.310	.023	-
Expectations are low	84	-.660	.511	-
Expectations are attainable	84	1.121	.265	-
I am given necessary resources to meet organization expectations	84	1.589	.116	-
Expectations are consistently reinforced	84	-.050	.961	-
Held accountable for expectations	84	-.131	.896	-
Received consistent and clear feedback	84	1.879	.064	-
Expected to learn something	84	1.121	.266	-

Research Question 5

To what extent is the intensity of a CBFS student's involvement (both physical and psychological) explained by leadership development and expectation variables together? A multiple regression analysis was conducted to explain intensity of involvement (dependent variable), looking at perceptions of leadership development as measured by the four leadership subscales and the ten expectation variables together (independent variables). The results of this

analysis indicated that perceived leadership and expectations together did not account for significant variability in the intensity of involvement score, $R2 = .139$, $F = .868$, $p > .05$. Participant scores on intensity of involvement did not seem to be related on their perceptions of leadership and expectation variables together. Intensity of involvement is not explained by perceptions of leadership development and expectation variables together.

Research Question 6

What are the competency and skill items most and least often cited as being developed through involvement with a CBFS? The means (a simple frequency distribution) of participant responses to the 48 leadership skills and competencies are ranked in descending order, from those skills and competencies for which students indicated they had grown the most to those skills and competencies for which students indicated they had grown the least (see Table 8). Each of the 48 leadership skills and competencies is reported individually (not collapsed into subscales). A review of answers to the open-ended question "What other skills and competencies not mentioned above have you learned from being involved in the CBFS?" reflected that the responses reiterated items stated in the skills and competencies section. The top ten ranked items represented skills and competencies from three of the four leadership subscales, excluding the Concept of Leadership Subscale.

Table 8

Ranking of Means for Student Responses to Skills and Competencies Questionnaire

Item	*n*	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personal management issues	114	4.57	.678
Sensitivity to cultural and ethnic diversity	114	4.55	.777
Taking initiative	115	4.55	.639

[Table 8 continues]

Table 8 continued

Item	*n*	Mean	Std. Deviation
Motivating others	115	4.55	.652
Understanding leadership styles	115	4.53	.612
Self-assessment and personal goal setting	115	4.51	.640
Responsibility and accountability for one's actions	114	4.50	.732
Teambuilding	115	4.49	.654
Understanding organizational structures and functions	115	4.49	.640
Cooperation	115	4.47	.753
Creating a vision for the organization	115	4.47	.705
Developing integrity	115	4.45	.775
Running effective meetings	115	4.43	.739
Exploration of personal leadership approaches	115	4.41	.724
Understanding group dynamics	115	4.39	.684
Decision making skills	115	4.37	.729
Understanding the role of power	115	4.36	.678
Knowledge of self	115	4.32	.695
Oral communication skills	114	4.32	.756
Task and resource management	115	4.31	.754
Ethics	115	4.29	.915
Understanding conflict management	115	4.28	.790
Knowing how to delegate	115	4.27	.798
Assertiveness skills	115	4.26	.796
Empowering others	115	4.25	.857
Critical thinking and reflection	115	4.25	.836

[Table 8 continues]

Table 8 continued

Item	*n*	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cultural variations of leadership	114	4.25	1.027
Public speaking skills	114	4.23	.810
Listening skills	114	4.19	.808
Handling negotiations	114	4.18	.875
Handling crisis management	115	4.17	.888
Creativity development	115	4.17	.847
Problem solving	115	4.16	.812
Civic responsibility	115	4.16	.979
Followership	114	4.06	.834
Flexibility and openness to change	115	4.04	.921
Societal problems	114	3.96	.999
Global leadership	114	3.92	1.082
Innovations	115	3.90	.810
Risk taking	115	3.82	1.014
Historical perspective	115	3.81	.990
Responsive and flexible structures	115	3.81	.936
Written communication skills	115	3.80	.938
Evaluation and research assessing leadership concepts and behaviors	113	3.74	1.124
Embracing ambiguity and uncertainty	115	3.66	.963
Sensitivity to gender	114	3.59	1.218
Theoretical foundations and concepts	115	3.58	1.068
Non-hierarchical networks	112	3.41	1.095

Research Question 7

What are the differences in the rating of items among CBFS students based on type of CBFS by cultural group? A multiple regression analysis was run using the four leadership subscales and the different types of CBFSs (Asian, Latina, Latino, Multicultural, and South Asian) to determine if there were any significant differences due to a particular culture. The researcher combined the Latino and Latina groups and removed this variable from the regression model to avoid multicollinearity, two variables measuring the same construct. The Latino and Latina variable served as the reference group for this analysis. In regard to the Concept of Leadership subscale, Personal Skill Development subscale, Leadership in Organizations subscale and Other Competencies and Skills subscale, none of the independent variables were statistically significant. Therefore, there were no statistically significant differences among culture-based fraternities and sororities on the leadership subscales. The multiple regression model also included the variable Intensity of Involvement to hold this aspect of student experience constant.

Chapter Summary

Data were collected in person through the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003) at weekly scheduled CBFS chapter meetings at two institutions. The overall response rate for the questionnaire was 62%. The researcher utilized correlation analysis and regression analysis to examine and answer seven research questions. This chapter highlighted the psychometric properties of the questionnaire and showed that it was a reliable instrument based on high Cronbach's alpha scaled scores. Several significant results at both the 0.05 and 0.01 alpha levels were identified with regard to leadership, involvement, and CBFS expectations of student members.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the research study, a discussion of the important findings from the results, additional limitations, and implications for culture-based fraternity and sorority (CBFS) student members and student affairs professionals. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future CBFS research studies.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how CBFSs support and contribute to members' self-perceived leadership development, a subset of co-curricular learning, as a function of intensity of involvement and expectations. Specifically, what leadership skills and competencies were developed and enhanced through membership in CBFSs? The intended outcome of this study was to inform CBFSs and student affairs practitioners who work with these student groups, so they can be more intentional when advising active student members and organizations. The study was designed to evaluate CBFS members' perceptions of involvement and expectations in order to establish a foundation for future studies. Seven research questions were developed to examine the purpose and intended outcomes of the study.

This study sought to contribute to fraternity and sorority leadership development literature, with specific regard to culture-based organizations, by providing research that could make a significant impact upon the development and delivery of CBFS programs and services. This research explored an important outcome of participation by examining the leadership skills and competencies CBFS members develop through active membership. Intensity of involvement

along with organization and peer expectations were analyzed to verify leadership development as an outcome of membership. Student affairs professionals can utilize the results of this study and related research to plan more intentional programs and services to help CBFS students succeed as they join organizations and assume leadership positions.

In this study, student leadership development was primarily viewed through the Relational Leadership Model (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007), a theoretical framework presented in *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*. Komives et al. help undergraduate students better understand leadership and how they can work toward a goal of social change for the common good. The Relational Leadership Model focuses on students and their relationships with others. Astin's (1984) Theory of Student Involvement was also central to this study. His research informs higher education that participation in co-curricular activities has an impact on the collegiate experience and student development. Astin found that the more physical and psychological energy a student devotes to a co-curricular activity, the more he or she will learn from that experience.

To determine CBFS members' perceptions of their leadership development as a function of intensity of involvement and expectations, the researcher used the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* developed by Beeny (2003). The instrument was designed to measure perceptions of student leadership and skill development and is comprised of questions created from Badal (2000), Beeny (2003), and Winston and Massaro (1987). The instrument includes the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory (Winston and Massaro), the Skills and Competencies Questionnaire (Badal), forty-eight skill and competency items, and a section regarding expectations placed on active members by the student organization (Beeny).

Participants were asked to respond to questions on the instrument, the majority of which were rated on Likert scales. The questionnaire also included demographic questions.

In January and February 2010, the researcher attended one regular weekly chapter meeting for each participating CBFS at Institution One and Institution Two and asked active members to participate in the study by completing the *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003). One hundred and fifteen out of a possible 185 students participated in the study (62% of the eligible student population studied). Forty-one participants were from Institution One, and 74 participants were from Institution Two. The overwhelming majority of students (87%) reported holding an office or other official position within the organization. CBFSs included Asian, Latina/o, Multicultural, and South Asian interest groups. Participants were active members of their CBFS, which were recognized organizations within the institution's Multicultural Greek Council, an umbrella governing body of culture-based Greek organizations.

Seven research questions directed the study. Data analysis included descriptive statistics and ranking of means to determine the leadership skills and competencies perceived by the CBFS members. Responses from the questionnaire were further analyzed using correlation analysis and regression analysis. The following research questions guided the study:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between the CBFS student's evaluation of membership expectations and perceived co-curricular leadership development in the organization?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and perceived leadership development?

RQ3: To what extent is a student's perceived co-curricular leadership development explained by intensity of CBFS student involvement (both physical and psychological) and expectation variables together?

RQ4: What variables appear to be most important in explaining perceived CBFS student co-curricular leadership development?

RQ5: To what extent is the intensity of a CBFS student's involvement (both physical and psychological) explained by leadership development and expectation variables together?

RQ6: What are the competency and skill items most and least often cited as being developed through involvement with a CBFS?

RQ7: What are the differences in the rating of items among CBFS students based on type of CBFS by cultural group?

Additional Limitations of the Study

Limitations to the research emerged after completing the data collection and analyzing the results. These are additional limitations to those included in Chapter 1. First, the leadership subscale titled Other Competencies and Skills includes 23 total leadership items (Badal, 2000). This represents significantly more leadership items than are found in the other three leadership subscales (9 items in Concept of Leadership, 9 in Personal Skill Development, and 7 in Leadership in Organizations). Some of these items could be further categorized into another heading; their current structure may have affected the findings due to the diversity of so many items. The Other subscale appears to be a catch-all for items which did not fit the criteria of the first 3 categories. The researcher could not control for how participants defined and perceived leadership skill items when filling out the questionnaire. The broad nature of the Other subscale may have left participants with room for interpretation. One recommendation to enhance the

questionnaire is to create an additional subscale titled ethical and moral development to include those Other items that would be consistent with this Relational Leadership Model element (Komives et. al). Second, the small response size of some culture groups is another limitation. The number of Latina/o and South Asian (n = 26) respondents was disproportionate compared to larger numbers representing Asian and Multicultural (n = 89) participants. Latina/o and South Asian respondent voices may have been overshadowed in the data analysis. A final limitation was the difficulty of knowing for sure, even with self-reporting, whether the results came only from involvement in CBFSs; or whether they could have existed for these students prior to joining; or if they were partially the result of other collegiate or personal experiences.

Discussion of the Findings

The Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 2007) provided a theoretical framework for understanding the development of CBFS student leaders. The findings of this study support research from Komives et al. in asserting that student leadership development occurs as a result of relationships formed through membership in student organizations, in this case culture-based fraternities and sororities. The Relational Leadership Model focuses on the idea that leadership effectiveness depends on the ability of the student leader to create positive and rewarding relationships with other members of the student organization. The model further "emphasizes the importance of relationships among participants in the process of purposeful change" (Komives et al., 2007, p. 115). The leadership framework connects five key elements emphasizing the nature of student relationships: being purposeful, inclusive, empowering, ethical and moral, and process oriented (Komives et al.). Komives et al. state that fraternities and sororities also exhibit important relationship characteristics through sharing a common identity. This leadership theory is relevant to the findings as

CBFSs were founded on the tenets of brotherhood/sisterhood, cultural awareness, and service to the community. The members of each CBFS share a common purpose, clear goals, and an awareness of commitments (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Moreover, CBFSs support positive change through the celebration and promotion of cultural awareness. Torbenson and Parks further reported that CBFSs focus on campus and community service in addition to volunteering. Special emphasis is placed on giving back to their cultural communities as CBFS members are expected to serve as mentors and role models.

The following is a discussion of findings of culture-based Greek letter organizations and how involvement and expectations support and contribute to leadership development. First is an examination of the perceived rankings/outcomes of leadership development in CBFSs. Next, student involvement is explored and last is a review of organization expectations. The findings are based on the data analysis of the research questions.

Leadership Development in a CBFS

In examining the mean scores for the 48 leadership items (RQ 6) in the *Leadership Skills and Competencies Questionnaire* (Badal, 2000), this study's results aligned with the Relational Leadership Model's key aspects: **purposeful; inclusive; empowering; ethical and moral; and process oriented** (Komives et al., 2007). According to participant self-reported learning, the highest ranked leadership skills and competencies, in descending order, included: *personal management issues, sensitivity to cultural and ethnic diversity, taking initiative, motivating others, understanding leadership styles, self-assessment and personal goal setting, responsibility and accountability for one's actions, teambuilding, understanding organizational structures and functions, cooperation, creating a vision for the organization,* and *developing integrity*. Half of these highest ranked items are located in the Other

Competencies and Skills subscale. The Personal Skill Development subscale and Leadership in Organizations subscale each had three items in the highest ranked list. While participants emphasized leadership skills and competencies in the three previously stated subscales, it appears that only moderate growth was achieved in the Concept of Leadership subscale. Respondents did not indicate learning, as compared to the other subscales, skills that critiqued and analyzed different leadership concepts. Komives et al. stated that examining the foundational principles of leadership is a key component and basis for one's understanding of leadership development (2007). Understanding how these leadership paradigms emerged and how leadership has been socially constructed over time assists students in defining their own personal philosophy of relational leadership to work effectively with other students towards meaningful goals.

The ranking of the leadership skills and competency items are in direct alignment with the Relational Leadership Model and support the model as items like *motivating others, teambuilding,* and *cooperation* are consistent with the relational nature of fraternities and sororities (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Leadership on a college campus is a complex process where undergraduates can build on their own personal leadership philosophy through reflection and application (Komives et al., 2007). These leadership items suggest that CBFS members are **empowering**. These organizations created environments in which all members participated in meaningful involvement and expected personal and organizational success. Members claimed organizational ownership and felt as though they were a part of the organizational process. Respondents further reported sharing empowerment with other members. Members' ability to understand the role of power in the organization is another essential characteristic of the model's empowerment element. The leadership item rankings

further verified that CBFS members *understood the role of power* and how that applied to organization relationships. CBFSs shared important leadership skills of *motivating others, teambuilding, cooperation, and understanding the role of power* described by Komives et al. as factors which create organizational environments "that empower others to do and be their best" (p. 91).

Culture-based Greek organizations also publicly emphasize a commitment to cultural awareness (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). This characteristic is represented in the *sensitivity to cultural and ethnic diversity* item, which aligns with the model's being **inclusive** element. CBFSs "involve people who have different backgrounds and different views and who do not embrace the dominant cultural norms" of the predominantly white student bodies found at these two institutions (Komives et al., 2007, p. 87). As a member of a CBFS, each participant described and applied their unique perspective of culture as the organization built a shared purpose. In *creating a vision for the future,* CBFSs are student organizations that are **purposeful** by sharing common goals, values and activities. CBFS members can articulate a stated purpose and collaborate together to facilitate a positive change for these campus communities centered on a devotion to culture. Positive change "improves the human condition" and "does not intentionally harm others" (Komives et al., 2007, p.83).

CBFS participants also ranked *responsibility and accountability for one's actions* and *developing integrity* as competencies that were affected by their CBFS involvement. Being **ethical** is another key element of the Relational Leadership Model. Participants reported conforming to the high standards of their CBFS. CBFS leaders shared that they are driven by the values, ideals and principles of their organizations, which emphasize "leadership that is good - moral - in nature" (Komives et al., p. 97). Leading by example is just one way to

advance the ethics and morals of an organization. According to the model, relational leadership involves maintaining and promoting high standards of ethical behavior and conduct. CBFSs perform rituals and hold members accountable for actions and behaviors that espouse their stated values, ideals and standards for membership (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). According to the rankings, CBFS members are **inclusive** and involve both self and others through responsibility and accountability. The leadership model suggests that inclusive environments lead to student organizations who believe that every member can contribute and make a difference, are welcome and open to multiple perspectives (differences), and value equity among all members. Komives et al. further stated that "Being inclusive embraces having the skills to develop the talent of members so they can be readily involved" (p. 86). Moreover, CBFS members are involved in the shared creation of goals and rules that govern CBFS conduct. Once involved, CBFS members perceive an inclusive chapter atmosphere.

One involvement item on the questionnaire asked participants, "In the past four weeks have you held an office in this organization or a position equivalent to one of the following offices?" Approximately 87% of participants responded yes to the question. This is an important finding as most of the active chapter members held a leadership position. This may be the result of small chapter size. The largest chapter size reported was 39 active members. The size of the chapters requires most members to assume some level of leadership responsibility and position. Another skill ranked high by respondents is *personal management issues* such as stress and time management. It is a logical conclusion that CBFS members enhance these skills due to the high time and high expectation demands of their CBFS leadership positions. In order to be successful, members must be able to manage stress and time demands of leadership positions effectively and efficiently.

The five lowest ranked leadership skills and competencies items were found in the Concept of Leadership and Other Competencies and Skills subscales: *non-hierarchical networks, theoretical foundations and models, sensitivity to gender differences and leadership, embracing ambiguity and uncertainty*, and *evaluation and research assessing leadership concepts and behaviors.* This report is consistent with Beeny's (2003) research findings, in which she studied other co-curricular organizations at Institution Two. CBFS participants appeared to lack growth, as compared to the other 3 subscales, in the Concept of Leadership category. This does not insinuate that CBFS students do not perceive leadership concepts as important, particularly as items such as *civic responsibility* and *societal problems* are often associated with service opportunities for CBFS. Concept of Leadership items can be traditionally found and taught in a college leadership courses. One explanation is that the items found in Personal Skill Development, Leadership in Organizations, and some of the Other Skills and Competencies subscales might be learned and enhanced through active participation in co-curricular organizations such as CBFS (Beeny, 2003). These leadership items may also be viewed by Greek students as essential and common aspects of fraternity and sorority membership. The leadership items ranked lowest should not be overlooked and should be thoroughly explored as possible topics for education. The Concept of Leadership items were developed as potential leadership curriculum subjects based on their applicability to leadership in companies and organizations (Badal, 2000). CBFS students could potentially benefit from exposure to the items found in this category, particularly *historical perspectives, theoretical foundations* (such as the Relational Leadership Model), *ethics, cultural variations of leadership, global leadership, civic responsibility and societal problems.*

Leadership development was also explained by the combination of both intensity of involvement (both physical and psychological) and the expectation variables together on all of the leadership subscales, except the Concept of Leadership items (RQ 3). This finding supports previous research which identified involvement and expectations as elements that improve the quality of education (Study Group, 1984). Data analysis indicated that the combination of variables was a good fit for Personal Skill Development, Leadership in Organizations, and Other Competency and Skills subscale items. This finding is based on the regression models used for the subscales which resulted in a significantly good degree of prediction of the outcome variables. The participants perceived involvement and expectations variables together as important in the development of the 3 subscales. Komives et al. (2007) contended that leadership has everything to do with relationships, particularly for undergraduate students involved in student organizations and/or teams. "Leadership is inherently, a relational, communal process" (p. 74) and their model is based on the philosophy that "leadership is a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change" (p. 74). The combination of intensity of involvement and high expectations responses demonstrated that CBFS leaders are **process oriented.** The relational process: "refers to how the group goes about being a group, remaining a group, and accomplishing a group's purposes" (p. 103). Relationships formed based on the combination of intensity of involvement and expectations led to the process of how CBFS recruit new members, involve active members, make organizational decisions, communicate, and create and implement activities/events associated with the organization's mission and vision (Komives et al.). The leadership skill and competency items *cooperation and collaboration, meaning making, and*

reflection and contemplation identified through involvement and high expectations are important tenets of organizational process.

There appeared to be no difference in leadership development between the different culture-based fraternities and sororities. The differences were too small to draw any practical conclusions. This finding supports DiChiara's study (2009) which concluded no significant leadership differences between members of Greek governing councils. The leadership development demonstrated in this study by participants may simply be a direct result of the function and operations of CBFS organizations in general. It appears that all CBFS students can gain leadership skills regardless of the type of culture-based organization they decide to join.

Involvement in a CBFS

Data analysis (RQ 2) suggested that there is a relationship between intensity of student involvement and student leadership development. Moderate correlations were found between intensity of involvement and perceived leadership development on both the Personal Skills Development and Leadership in Organizations subscales. These findings support Astin's work (1994, 1996) on student involvement: students learn by being involved, Greek membership is time intensive, and peer groups have the ability to intensely involve students. Astin (1984) stated, "The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement with that program" (p.298). Astin (1996) also explained that Greek organizations require a significant amount of time, and through involvement with Greek letter organizations, students better identify with other students and campus resources. He further reported that peer groups, such as CBFSs, are powerful because of their ability to involve students in campus life more intensely than other sources of development. Peers serve as the most important factor affecting

the educational and personal development of college students (Astin, 1984, 1999). Peer influence strongly affects CBFS involvement, which is a powerful attribute leading to student satisfaction at the institution and the development of close interpersonal relationships with other members. Komives et al. (2007) contended that interpersonal relationships such as brotherhood/sisterhood produce relational leadership development.

The Personal Skill Development subscale includes the *exploration and understanding of personal leadership styles and approaches, personal goal setting, creativity development, oral and written communication skills, problem solving,* and *personal management issues.* According to the questionnaire, Leadership in Organizations involves *group dynamics, teambuilding, motivating others, task and resource management,* and *conflict and crisis management.* All the items listed above are skills and competencies that were reported to have value placed on their development through CBFS organizational involvement. This finding suggests that the more active participation students have in CBFSs, the more importance they place on the growth of personal and organizational skills. CBFS participants with higher levels of involvement experiences more often reported these items to be learned as a result of exposure, practice, and implementation of leadership skills. Astin (1984) explained that students do not simply develop by joining a student organization. Instead, development occurs as the result of the physical and psychological energy they exert toward the student organization. CBFS respondents exerted significant energy towards their fraternity/sorority's success, and the findings indicated that the more energy they exerted, the more development they reported.

Participants in this study also reported elevated hours of involvement that resulted in high *Involvement Index* scores (Winston & Massaro, 1987). The index scores, the involvement quantity measure, verified considerable involvement with CBFS organizations, activities, and

programs. Intensity of involvement is profound with CBFS members as these organizations require or demand significant involvement. Approximately 59% of respondents reported being involved in the CBFS for 26 hours or more during the four weeks prior to taking the questionnaire. This may also be attributed to their devotion and loyalty to cultural awareness or it may be just attributed to their fraternity/sorority. Another factor may be the relative youth of these organizations on the two campuses. These organizations are less than 20 years old with the majority founded in the last 10 years. These CBFS continue to establish their place in student life. One reason why members are so willing to invest significant time and energy towards the organizations' success may be the emotional ties to other members and allegiance to the organization (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Active member affiliation appears to be personal due to the relational and culture-based aspects of the organization.

Significant correlations were not found between intensity of involvement and perceived leadership development on the Other Competencies and Skills subscale. The unusually high number and diversity of items on this subscale may have created a category that was too large to indicate overall significant findings. Another reason may be that additional skill and competency items were perceived but were not included in the Other subscale. Although Badal (2000) created the 48 item instrument based on leadership curriculums, the items are not an exhaustive list of all leadership skills and competencies.

Participant scores on intensity of involvement did not relate to their perceptions of leadership development and expectation variables together (RQ 5). Although intensity of involvement was significant, this study could not draw the conclusion that these two variables together impacted involvement behaviors. Because of the lack of significant correlation, practical or meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn.

Expectations in a CBFS

Through initiation into the organization, CBFS members make a lifetime commitment to the ideals and mission of their organizations. This research also examined the relationship between the CBFS student's evaluation of membership expectations and perceived leadership development in the CBFS. This data analysis yielded significant and practical information regarding expectations for active CBFS members and student affairs professionals. *Expectations are high* and *expectations are attainable* resulted in moderate positive relationships on all four leadership subscales (RQ 1). These results indicate that CBFS students experience pressure and perhaps stress when trying to meet high leadership expectations. Even though the expectations are high, however, respondents felt that they were able to meet the lofty leadership goals, which supports Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991) findings.

Participants also reported (RQ 1) that their respective CBFS expectations are *clearly stated* to active members in the Leadership in Organizations subscale, indicating that CBFS effectively communicate stated organizational expectations. Students reported that expectations of CBFS groups are *consistent with other organizations on campus*. This finding contradicted the researcher's expectation that participants would disagree with this item based on the findings of a previous qualitative study (Atkinson, Dean, and Espino, n.d.) where CBFS students shared their perceptions of how expectations were lower in other campus organizations. Participants also overwhelmingly felt they had the *necessary resources to meet the organizations expectations*. This may be the direct result of relational support found in the leadership skill and competency rankings section (RQ 6), which was reflected in items such as *time and stress management, motivation, teambuilding,* and *collaboration.*

Organization expectations were reported (RQ 1) to be *consistently reinforced,* and students indicated that they *receive consistent and clear feedback* on their ability to meet group expectations. Additionally, students reported *members being held accountable for stated expectations* in the Leadership in Organizations subscale but not the Personal Skill Development category. Even though participants reported *clear, consistent, reinforced,* and *high expectations,* along with the learned skill of *motivating others,* members did not ultimately feel that they were *held accountable* for personal development. This too contradicted the researcher's expectation that participants would agree with this item based on the skill rankings (RQ 6) and findings from previous researcher interviews, as compared to this study of a larger, more general CBFS population (Atkinson, Dean, and Espino, n.d.). This discovery may imply that further work needs to be done with CBFS students exploring personal responsibility and accountability expectations. One example could be the exploration or enhancement of the *understanding of conflict management* leadership item. The Relational Leadership Model identifies conflict resolution as a critical leadership characteristic and encourages relational processes to handle conflict moving the group and individuals to resolution (Komives et. al). The model encourages individuals to take responsibility as compared to placing blame or avoiding the conflict to maintain group harmony. Addressing accountability and responsibility from an individual and chapter point of view may help members make meaning of their stated mission and standards. Students did not report receiving *consistent reinforcement or feedback* on their personal skill development. This may be attributed to the overall importance of the fraternity and sorority success above individual accomplishments. An explanation may be that it is easier for CBFS members to confront their respective organization's failures than specific individual leadership shortcomings. One additional reason might be the lack of traditional organization advisors who

would likely be giving important feedback on personal skill development. Another unexpected result was that students did not join the CBFS expecting to learn leadership skills. It appears that students were initially interested in making new friends, developing personal relationships and bonds, and celebrating their unique culture through these organization memberships. Komives et al. contend that creating a culture of learning expectations through the personal exploration of leadership potential would help students better understand themselves and others. The Relational Leadership Model approach strives to create organizations that are lead with integrity and moral purpose (2007).

Implications for Practice

The results of this study have major implications for the daily operations of CBFS and for the design and delivery of CBFS student leadership services and programs. The findings reveal that leadership development occurred for these participants as a result of CBFS involvement and expectations. More specifically, a relationship existed between students' evaluation of membership expectations and perceived leadership development. Another relationship was verified between intensity of involvement and perceived leadership growth. Therefore, it should not be surprising that the combination of involvement and expectation variables together resulted in perceived leadership development. Specific learned leadership skills and competencies were identified. Moreover, if these individual CBFS organizations, multicultural Greek councils, and student affairs professionals are interested in developing leadership education programs, this study can inform a best practices approach in designing such programs. For example, intentional time could be set aside (as an agenda item) at every council and chapter meeting to introduce leadership topics that would directly impact students' preparation for office or leadership position(s). Since CBFSs serve as learning laboratories, CBFS leadership

education programs/workshops could be linked with formal leadership education classes taught at the institution to help inform students of leadership subjects that could be directly applied to the daily operations of these organizations. Student affairs professionals and faculty members could collaborate on the teaching of leadership concepts, skills and competencies, and expectations that lead to healthy and productive chapter environments. Further attention should be devoted to the creation and implementation of internal chapter standards boards to assist with personal accountability and responsibility principles. CBFS students should be encouraged to attend different speaker series sponsored by academic departments across campus that introduce leadership concepts needed in a global society.

The findings of this study can help define a leadership curriculum for active CBFS members to address issues highlighted in this study. While some leadership items were ranked highly by most respondents, indicating that they believed that involvement led to development of those skills, others were not ranked as high. Some of the leadership items to be further examined as major components for possible educational programs are: *ethics, handling negotiations, handling crisis management, problem solving, understanding conflict management,* and *embracing ambiguity and uncertainty.* All of these leadership items were ranked moderate and low on the extent to which involvement contributed to skill development and provide educational opportunities for student affairs professionals who are interested in directly impacting students' preparation to serve in a leadership position. Additionally, students reported that they did not expect to learn anything by joining the CBFS. This finding is interesting as students did not anticipate enhancing their leadership development. The results of this study may have been quite different if new members expected to learn leadership skills and competencies through

membership. CBFSs should strive to show results of how participation contributes and enhances the institutions' learning environment.

Individual CBFS organizations, multicultural Greek councils, and student affairs professionals could better impact or enhance a student's experience by sharing these results. Multicultural Greek councils, which serve as the governing body of culture-based chapters, could take the lead in examining their role and potential impact in promoting and enhancing leadership skills and competencies. Together, more experienced CBFS members and student affairs professionals could collaborate on the teaching of leadership skills and competencies that were not identified as being items that were learned at as high a level in this study. Greek life units could offer a series of workshops for new CBFS members to more intentionally infuse leadership curriculum into their interactions. Individual chapters could hold meetings to convey leadership expectations and host neophyte workshops solely devoted to leadership building concepts. Finally, related CBFS (inter)national organizations could offer, if they do not currently, summer leadership academies to better prepare chapter officers for job responsibilities. A number of these (inter)national organizations are relatively new, and this study could serve as an impetus for intentional education initiatives. One area of particular interest could be bystander behavior education to assist in the development of personal responsibility and accountability. Komives et al. shared that student leadership development is greatly enhanced when students understand the importance of relationships and how that applies to conflict resolution. Responsibility involves accepting responsibility for one's actions and that of the organization and "being conscious of the moral and ethical implications of deciding not to act" (Komives et al., 2007, p. 134). Through this type of education, members would better understand how group dynamics

(organization expectations) can prevent students from taking action to stop dangerous or unhealthy behaviors discussed in the literature review of previous fraternity/sorority research.

In addition, potential members could be educated about the time commitments and expectations placed on active members. For example, a multicultural Greek council could sponsor or host an information session for interested CBFS students prior to recruitment periods. The individual organizations and councils could better inform potential members of the intensity of involvement and expectations before students decide to join an organization. Potential students should understand that leadership action is an expectation of membership. CBFS groups could articulate leadership development as a benefit, along with friendship and celebration of cultural awareness, during recruitment and selection processes. Knowing both the stated mission/values and implied involvement and expectation realities of membership will help new initiates better prepare to explore their potential for leadership and ability to work with others.

Student affairs professionals can further assess the leadership skills and competencies of CBFS student members through formal and informal methods. A series of leadership workshops could be offered for members to develop and enhance topics through a new member education format. As an additional suggestion, such educational efforts could use intended learning outcomes based on this research, or based on other assessments of CBFS student needs. Leadership educators and presenters could be identified based on their expertise. Student affairs professionals could also provide feedback regarding students' leadership action and performance, both individually and for the organization. Professionals could be more intentional in the way they interact with all student members, not just the chapter president. Professionals often interact with the designated leadership of the chapter due to the nature of these positions, but this research sheds light on the importance of interacting and providing feedback to general

chapter members, particularly in light of approximately 87% of respondents holding some type of recognized office.

The Relational Leadership Model could be used more intentionally as a learning tool to enhance CBFS leadership education, since this model was designed to assist college students in accomplishing change, making a difference in the campus community, and working with others (Komives et. al, 2007). The relational perspective helps students use personal experiences as the frame in which to understand their leadership development. Student affairs professionals could utilize this model as a resource to work with CBFS chapters and individual students. Student affairs professionals could also help identify additional leadership resources, theories, exercises, and on-line modules.

Many of the organizations who participated in the study did not have an identified chapter/faculty advisor to serve in this important mentorship role (Astin, 1993). Additional faculty and alumni volunteers could be recruited to serve as chapter advisors, mentors, and leadership coaches. This research informs student affairs professionals with necessary information to identify and prepare CBFS chapter advisors more effectively. Chapter advisors could be identified, recruited, and trained in the areas of leadership and student development theory. A specific chapter advisor training curriculum could be developed to educate advisors on the realities of working everyday with CBFS students and CBFS student organizations. This recommendation is supported by Astin's research which identified that one of the most beneficial forms of undergraduate involvement is involvement with faculty (1993). Astin (1985) showed that this interaction would lead to students maximizing their fullest potential. Advisor training could be assessed annually and adapted to meet the changing needs of CBFS students.

Although CBFS groups primarily espouse the tenets of friendship, devotion to culture, and service, leadership has now been proven to be a compelling outcome of membership. The leadership skills and competencies emphasized in this study reflect personal and organizational growth through relationships. These findings reveal that CBFS members gain leadership development. The Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al.) fits well with the nature of CBFS organizations which create unique communities where members feel an "immediate kinship" through social interactions leading to brotherhood/sisterhood (p.287). This research also supports CBFS involvement as a co-curricular activity that enhances and supports higher education's mission of developing leaders and preparing students for a global society (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006; Long, 2002; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998; Wingspread, 1993). Therefore, this study should be shared with CBFS related (inter)national organizations, and leadership should be considered for inclusion in CBFS mission statements and action plans.

Recommendations for Future Research

Leadership development research on CBFS members can be extended in future research studies. A limitation of this research was that only two research institutions located in a single state in the Southeast were studied. A larger study could be conducted involving other types of institutions, in other areas of the country, which may have greater numbers of CBFSs and/or have a longer history of existence than the groups examined on these campuses. It may also be interesting and beneficial to conduct this study on smaller campuses that do not have official multicultural Greek councils or full-time staff members solely devoted to advising Greek letter organizations to measure environmental influences on and differences in CBFS member development.

The majority of students who participated in this study reported affiliation with an Asian or multicultural group. This high number of participants can be attributed to the larger percentage of Asian students, as compared to other cultures and ethnicities, enrolled at the two institutions. Conversely, a distinctly smaller percentage of Latina/o students are enrolled at these two institutions. This study included small Latina/o and South Asian participant numbers and did not include any Native American Greek letter organizations or participants. Future studies should insure more involvement from Latina/o, South Asian, and Native American culture-based participants.

Last, it would be interesting to explore other student leadership development models related to culture-based fraternity and sorority membership. Further research studies could explore leadership through different student leadership theoretical frameworks other than the Relational Leadership Model. CBFS leadership related studies could examine student leadership differences between types of culture-based groups and between other Greek letter organizations; leadership development differences between types of official CBFS leadership positions or offices; intensity of involvement coupled with high expectations promoting healthy behaviors; and direct leadership development benefits and outcomes resulting from having a chapter advisor. Future researchers might also consider conducting qualitative studies to further explore specific leadership actions and behaviors in CBFSs. A final recommendation is to study CBFS outcomes in developmental areas other than leadership such as cognitive development, self-esteem, healthy behaviors, and social responsibility.

Chapter Summary

The *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (*Appendix A*) produced significant results for CBFS students demonstrating perceived leadership development as a

function of intensity of involvement and CBFS expectations. Leadership development was found to be significantly related to perceived growth on a number of leadership skills and competencies, the level of participants' physical and psychological involvement in the CBFS, and students' perceptions of high expectations established by the CBFS organization guidelines and peer members. Although participants identified specific learned leadership skills and competencies, a number of items were not reported as being skills that were learned at as high a level and need further examination. Based on these findings, leadership education programs and services could be developed to enhance student learning and preparedness for CBFS leadership positions. Further research needs to be conducted to determine whether the intentional teaching of leadership skills and competencies would benefit or enhance a student's CBFS experience. This study should be only the beginning of understanding the nature and leadership outcomes from membership in culture-based fraternities and sororities.

REFERENCES

Acker, D. (2007). The world awaits: Globalizing U.S. education. *About Campus, 12*, 30-32.

American Association of Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (1998). *Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2005). *A call for values congruence.* American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

American College Personnel Association. (1996). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view*. American Council on Education Studies, ser. 1, vol. 1, no. 3. Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (1949). *The student personnel point of view*. American Council on Education Studies, ser. 6, vol. 8, no. 13. Washington, DC: Author.

Asel, A.M., Seifert, T.A., & Pascarella, E.T. (2009). The effects of fraternity/sorority membership on college experiences and outcomes: A portrait of complexity. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 4*(2), 1-15.

Association of Fraternity Advisors. (2009). Retrieved February 12, 2009, from AFA Web site: http://www.fraternityadvisors.org

Astin, A.W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*, 297-307.

Astin, A.W. (1985). Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 123-134.

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

Atkinson, E., Dean, L.A., Barham, J.D., & Espino, M.E. (in review). *Leadership outcomes based on membership in culture-based fraternities and sororities*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Badal, A.A. (2000). Leadership education: A study of leadership educators and employers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(09).

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Beeny, C.K. (2003). *Perceptions of learning on the co-curriculum: A study of involvement and expectations* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 2003). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. **beeny_claudia_k_200305_phd.pdf**

Blimling, G.S., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (1999). *Good practices in student affairs: Principles to foster student learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boatman, S.A. (1999). The leadership audit: A process to enhance the development of student leadership. *NASPA Journal, 37,* 325-336.

Brown, T.L., Parks, G.S., & Phillips, C.M. (2005). *African American fraternities and sororities: The legacy and the vision*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Castro, M. M. (2004, April). *The growth of multicultural organizations*. Paper presented at the meeting of Association of Fraternity Advisors Professional Development Committee, Hollywood, CA. Retrieved from http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/pdf/prof_dev/2005_04_pd.pdf

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

Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cronin, T.E. (1984). Thinking and learning about leadership. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 14*(1), 22-34.

DiChiara, A.N. (2009). Fraternal leadership: Differences in leadership practice among four governing councils. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 4*(2), 16-29.

Dugan, J.P. (2008). Exploring relationships between fraternity and sorority membership and socially responsible leadership. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 3*(2), 16-25.

Earley, C. (1998). Influencing ethical development in Greek letter organizations. In E.G. Whipple (Ed.), *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: Transforming fraternities*

and sororities into learning communities (pp. 39-49). New Directions for Student Services, No. 81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fleishman, E.A., Harris, E.F., & Burtt, H.E. (1955). *Leadership and supervision in industry*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Gardner, J.W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: The Free Press.

Gehrke, S.J. (2008). Leadership through meaning-making: An empirical exploration of spirituality and leadership in college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(4), 351-359.

Gonzalez, K.P. (2003). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education, 37*(2), 193-218.

Gonzalez, K.P., Jovel, J.E., & Stoner, C. (2004). *Latinas: The new Latino majority in college* (pp.17-27). New Directions for Student Services, No. 105. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Newton Center, MA: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Georgia Institute of Technology Multicultural Greek Council. (2010). Retrieved October 21, 2009, from Georgia Institute of Technology, Office of Greek Affairs Web site: http://www.gatechmgc.com/index.html

Guardia, J.R., & Evans, N.J. (2008). Factors influencing the ethnic identity development of Latino fraternity members at a Hispanic serving institution. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(3), 163-181.

Harms, P.D., Woods, D., Roberts, B., Bureau, D., & Green, A.M. (2006). Perceptions of leadership in undergraduate fraternal organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(2), 81-94.

Harper, S.R., & Quaye, S.J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for Black identity expression and development among African American male student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development, 48,* 127-144.

Hayek, J.C., Carini, R.M., O'Day, P.T., & Kuh, G.D. (2002). Triumph or tragedy: Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter organizations and other students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(5), 643-663.

Heidenreich, L. (2006). Against the grain: Confronting Hispanic service organizations in times of increasing inequalities, 1930 and 2005. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 5*(2), 123-137.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Horowitz, H.L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Huck, S.W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Jaeger, R.M. (1983). *Statistics: A spectator sport*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Jones, A.J. (1938). *The education of youth for leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelley, D.R. (2008). Leadership development through the fraternity experience and the relationship to career success after graduation. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 3*(1), 1-12.

Kimbrough, W.M. (2003). Black Greek 101: The culture, customs, and challenges of Black fraternities and sororities. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Kohs, S.C., & Irkle, K.W. (1920). Prophesying army promotion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 3-4*, 73-87.

Kolb, D.A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In A.W. Chickering & Associates (Eds.), *The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society* (pp. 232-255). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S.R., Casper, J.O., Longerbeam, S., Mainella, F.C., & Osteen, L. (2004, March). *Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory*. Handout from presentation at National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Annual Conference: Denver, CO.

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

Kuh, G.D. (1993). *Cultural perspectives in student affairs work*. Lanham, MD: American College Personnel Association.

Kuh, G.D. (1999). Setting the bar high to promote student learning. In Blimling & Whitt (Eds.) *Good practice in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G.D., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges: Encouraging student learning and personal development through out-of-class experiences.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G.D., & Whitt, E.J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no. 1. Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Layzer, C. (2000). *Strategic sisterhood in a Latina sorority: Affiliation, recognition, and solidarity*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Long, S. (2002). *The new student politics: The Wingspread statement on student civic engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Maramba, D.C. (2008). Understanding campus climate through the voices of Filipina/o American college students. *College Student Journal, 42*(4), 1045-1060.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mina, L., Cabrales, J.A., Juarez, C.M., & Rodriguez-Vasquez, F. (2004). Student programs that work. In A.M. Ortiz (Ed.), *Addressing the unique needs of Latino American students* (pp. 79-88). New Directions for Student Services, No. 105. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Montelongo, R., & Ortiz, D. (2001). *Comprehending cultural factors that impact success: Emerging views of the Latina/o experience at predominantly White institutions*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sixth Annual National Conference, People of Color in Predominantly White Institutions, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Museus, S.D. (2008). The role of ethnic student organizations in fostering African American and Asian American students' cultural adjustment and membership at predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(6), 568-586.

National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations, Inc. (n.d.). Retrieved September 16, 2007, from NALFO Web site: http://www.nalfo.org

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Multicultural Greek Council. (2007). Retrieved September 16, 2007, from NMGC Web site: http://nationalmgc.org

North-American Interfraternity Conference. (2009). Retrieved February 12, 2009, from NIC Web site: http://www.nicindy.org

Pace, C.R. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experience.* Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, The University of California.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Phi Iota Alpha Fraternity, Inc. (n.d.). Retrieved November 16, 2007, from Phi Iota Alpha, Inc. Web site: http://www.phiota.org

Roberts, D.C. (Ed.). (1981). *Student leadership programs in higher education*. Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association Press.

Roberts, D.C., & Ullom, C. (1990). *Student leadership program model*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Rogers, J.L. (1996). Leadership. In S. Komives & D. Woodward (Eds.), *Student Services* (3rd ed., pp. 299-319). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ross, L.C., Jr. (2000). *The divine nine: The history of African American fraternities and sororities.* New York: Kensington Publishing Corp.

Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic enclaves and the dynamics of social identity on the college campus: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(1), 96-110.

Sigma Chi Fraternity. (2009). Retrieved November 2, 2009, from Sigma Chi Fraternity Web site: http://www.sigmachi.org

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Strange, C., & Banning, J.H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strayhorn, T.L. (2006). *Frameworks for assessing learning and development outcomes.* Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

Strayhorn, T.L., & Colvin, A.J. (2006). Assessing student learning and development in fraternity and sorority affairs. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(2), 95-107.

Study Group on Conditions of Excellence in Higher Education. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Sutton, E.M., & Kimbrough, W.M. (2001). Trends in Black student involvement. *NASPA Journal, 39*(1), 30-40.

Terenzini, P.T., Pasceralla, E.T., & Blimling, G.S. (1996). Student's out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 149-162.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Torbenson, C.L., & Parks, G. (2009). *Brothers and sisters: Diversity in college fraternities and sororities*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

University of Georgia Center for Student Organizations. (2009). Retrieved September 27, 2009, from University of Georgia, Center for Student Organizations Web site: http://www.uga.edu/stuorgs/index.html

University of Georgia Division of Student Affairs Learning and Development Objectives. (n.d.). Retrieved September 16, 2007, from University of Georgia, Student Affairs Web site: http://www.uga.edu/studentaffairs/

University of Georgia Multicultural Greek Council. (2010). Retrieved October 21, 2009, from University of Georgia, Greek Life Office Web site: http://www.uga.edu/mgcouncil/

Villalpando, O. (2004). Practical considerations of critical race theory and Latino critical theory for Latino college students. In A.M. Ortiz (Ed.), *Addressing the unique needs of Latino*

American students (pp.41-50). New Directions for Student Services, No. 105. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whipple, E.G., & Sullivan E.G. (1998). Greek letter organizations: Communities of learners? In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: Transforming fraternities and sororities into learning communities* (pp.7-19). New Directions for Student Services, No. 81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993). *An American imperative: Higher expectations for higher education.* Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation.

Winston, R.B., Jr., & Massaro, A.V. (1987). Extracurricular involvement inventory: An instrument for assessing intensity of student involvement. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28,* 169-175.

Zohar, D. (1997). *Rewiring the corporate brain: Using the new science to rethink how we structure and lead organizations*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

APPENDIX A

Co-Curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire

Section I – Involvement Index

Please indicate in the questions below: (1) the approximate number of hours you have been involved (for example, attending meetings, working on projects, or playing games with this group or organization in the last four weeks, and (2) leadership position held, if any. Then answer questions 1 through 5.

1. In the last four weeks, for approximately how many hours have you been involved with this group or organization and its activities or programs?

_____ hours

2. In the last four weeks have you held an office in this organization or a position equivalent to one of the following offices? (Check one)
( ) President/Chairperson/Team captain/Editor
( ) Treasurer
( ) Vice-President/Vice Chairperson
( ) Committee/Task Force/Project Chairperson
( ) Secretary
( ) I held no office or leadership position
( ) Other leadership position, please specify:

_____

Researcher's Notes

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____

Please respond to the following statements about your involvement in the previously mentioned student organization or group. Check the **ONE** best response for each statement.

DURING THE PAST FOUR WEEKS …

1. When I attended meetings, I expressed my opinion and/or took part in the discussions.
( ) Very Often
( ) Often
( ) Occasionally
( ) Never
( ) I attended no meetings in the past four weeks.
( ) The group/organization held no meetings in the past four weeks.

2. When I was away from members of the group/organization, I talked with others about the organization and its activities, or wore a pin, jersey, etc. to let others know about my membership.
( ) Very Often
( ) Often
( ) Occasionally
( ) Never

3. When the group/organization sponsored a program or activity, I made an effort to encourage other students and/or members to attend.
( ) Very Often
( ) Often
( ) Occasionally
( ) Never
( ) This organization had no program or activity during the past four weeks.

4. I volunteered or was assigned responsibility to work on something that the group/organization needed to have done.
( ) Very Often
( ) Often
( ) Occasionally
( ) Never

5. I fulfilled my assigned responsibilities to the group/organization on time.
( ) Very Often
( ) Often
( ) Occasionally
( ) Never
( ) I had no duties or responsibilities except to attend meetings.

Section II – Skills and Competencies

Each of the following items could be elements of a leadership development curriculum. Please indicate the amount of growth, attributable to this organization, that you have experienced on the following competencies and skills. Use the following rating scale. If you do not understand an item, or think that it is not applicable, please circle 1 – no growth.

1-No growth 2-Minimal growth 3-Moderate growth 4-Strong growth 5-Very strong growth

	No Growth		Moderate		Very Strong
The Concept of Leadership					
1. Historical perspectives on leadership	1	2	3	4	5
2. Theoretical foundations and models	1	2	3	4	5
3. Ethics	1	2	3	4	5
4. Cultural variations of leadership	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sensitivity to gender differences and leadership	1	2	3	4	5
6. Global leadership	1	2	3	4	5
7. Civic responsibility	1	2	3	4	5
8. Societal problems	1	2	3	4	5
9. Evaluation and research assessing leadership concepts and behaviors	1	2	3	4	5
Personal Skill Development					
10. Exploration of personal leadership approaches	1	2	3	4	5
11. Understanding leadership styles	1	2	3	4	5
12. Self-assessment and personal goal setting	1	2	3	4	5
13. Creativity development	1	2	3	4	5
14. Oral communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
15. Written communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
16. Public speaking skills	1	2	3	4	5
17. Problem solving	1	2	3	4	5
18. Personal management issues (time, stress)	1	2	3	4	5
Leadership in Organizations					
19. Understanding group dynamics	1	2	3	4	5
20. Teambuilding	1	2	3	4	5
21. Motivating others	1	2	3	4	5
22. Understanding organizational structures and functions	1	2	3	4	5
23. Task and resource management	1	2	3	4	5
24. Understanding conflict management	1	2	3	4	5
25. Handling crisis management	1	2	3	4	5

Section II – Skills and Competencies (continued)

1-No growth 2-Minimal growth 3-Moderate growth 4-Strong growth 5-Very strong growth

	No Growth		Moderate		Very Strong
Other Competencies and Skills					
26. Knowledge of self	1	2	3	4	5
27. Followership (the act of following leader/s)	1	2	3	4	5
28. Innovation	1	2	3	4	5
29. Listening skills	1	2	3	4	5
30. Assertiveness skills	1	2	3	4	5
31. Decision making skills	1	2	3	4	5
32. Risk taking	1	2	3	4	5
33. Critical thinking and reflection	1	2	3	4	5
34. Responsibility and accountability for one's actions	1	2	3	4	5
35. Developing integrity	1	2	3	4	5
36. Taking initiative	1	2	3	4	5
37. Flexibility and openness to change	1	2	3	4	5
38. Embracing ambiguity and uncertainty	1	2	3	4	5
39. Non-hierarchical networks	1	2	3	4	5
40. Responsive and flexible structures	1	2	3	4	5
41. Cooperation	1	2	3	4	5
42. Running effective meetings	1	2	3	4	5
43. Empowering others	1	2	3	4	5
44. Creating a vision for the organization	1	2	3	4	5
45. Understanding the role of power	1	2	3	4	5
46. Handling negotiations	1	2	3	4	5
47. Knowing how to delegate	1	2	3	4	5
48. Sensitivity to cultural and ethnic diversity	1	2	3	4	5

What other skills and competencies not mentioned about have you learned from being involved in the student organization? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section III – Expectations

Below are questions pertaining to external expectations. Expectations are defined as those membership requirements and standards established by the organization.

1-Strongly disagree 2-Somewhat disagree 3-Neither agree or disagree 4-Somewhat agree 5-Strongly agree

	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. This organization's expectations are clearly stated.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Expectations of this organization are consistent with other organizations on this campus.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The expectations of me in this organization are high.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The expectations of me in this organization are low.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The expectations of this organization are attainable.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am given the resources necessary to meet expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Expectations are consistently reinforced.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Members are held accountable for the stated expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have received consistent and clear feedback regarding meeting my group expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I joined this organization expecting to learn something.	1	2	3	4	5

11. I learned about this organization's expectations through:
(check all that apply)

( ) I don't know the expectations
( ) interview
( ) executive member
( ) word of mouth
( ) organization advisor
( ) membership application
( ) weekly meetings
( ) during retreat
( ) organizational brochure/website

Section IV – Satisfaction

1-Strongly disagree 2-Somewhat disagree 3-Neither agree or disagree 4-Somewhat agree 5-Strongly agree

	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. I am satisfied with my experience in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5
2. If able, I would return to this organization as an active member for another year.	1	2	3	4	5
3. This organization has been worth my time.	1	2	3	4	5

Section V – Demographics

1. Total number of people in fraternity/sorority: _____

2. Type of culture based fraternity/sorority (choose only one):

Asian Latina Latino Multicultural South Asian

3. Tenure with organization: 6 months or less 7 months-1 year 1-2 years More than 2 years

4. Class standing: First year Second year Third year Fourth year Grad student

5. Number of organizations involved with on campus: _____

6. Sex: Male Female

APPENDIX B

AUTHOR'S PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT

Eric,

So good to hear from you. Amy and I still speak and she mentioned last time we spoke that you were working on your doctoral degree. Congratulations to you. I know it must feel good to be nearing the finish line.

Yes, you can certainly use the questionnaire I developed for my dissertation. Your topic sounds interesting and I would be curious to learn of your findings. I have been contacted over the years about use of my dissertation, but to be honest I have not kept track of people or institutions.

Please let me know if I can be of additional help.

Claudia

From: Eric Atkinson [mailto:atkinson@uga.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2009 12:55 PM
To: Beeny, Claudia
Subject: Greetings from Athens!

Hi Dr. Beeny:

Hello from Athens! I am still working at UGA and have been pursuing my terminal degree part-time in the CSAA program. It is finally time to start that "little" report and I am writing to ask your permission to use the survey you created, the *Co-curriculum Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire,* for my dissertation. I am exploring the possibility of replicating your study with culture-based fraternities and sororities. May I have your permission to use this survey? Also, what other research studies have used your instrument?

I hope all is well with you and your family.

All the best,
~Eric

Eric Atkinson
Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Georgia

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Dear Participant:

I agree to participate in a research project titled, *Leadership Development in Culture-Based Fraternities and Sororities: A Study of Student Involvement and Expectations*, which is being conducted by Eric Atkinson, a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, who can be reached at 706-369-5417 or via e-mail at atkinson@uga.edu. The research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Laura A. Dean, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, who may be reached at 706-542-6551 or via e-mail at ladean@uga.edu.

I do not have to take part in this study. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that participating in this project could result in research that might be published.

Purpose
The purpose of the research is to gather information concerning the experiences of undergraduate students who are involved in culture-based fraternities and sororities.

Benefits
I understand that the research proposed can have a significant impact on the development and delivery of fraternity and sorority life programs for culture-based Greek letter organizations. Information garnered through this study will benefit participants by giving them an understanding of how culture-based fraternity and sorority experiences impact and enhance the institutions' learning environment, specifically in the area of leadership development.

Procedures
1. I will read and sign the consent form. (Be sure to ask questions if you have any.)
2. I will complete a short questionnaire taking approximately 15 minutes to fill out. Please respond to the questions based only on your involvement in a culture-based fraternity or sorority (just this one student organization). The questionnaire is titled *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003).
3. I understand that I may elect not to answer any question without having to explain why.
4. In order to assure that my responses are kept anonymous, I will not be asked to place my name on the questionnaire.

Privacy
The data resulting from my participation will be treated anonymously and secured in the researcher's home. There are no identity links on the survey. Federal regulations for IRB record-keeping require that all research records be kept for at least three (3) years after completion of the study. I understand that the surveys will be destroyed in Summer 2013.

Discomfort/Risks
No discomfort or stresses are anticipated. Likewise no risks are expected.

Further Questions
I understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time should I become uncomfortable. The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached at the contact information listed in paragraph one.

_____
My signature below indicates that the researcher has satisfactorily answered my questions and that I consent to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Signature of Researcher/Date: _____

Signature of Participant/Date: _____

_____
Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu.

RESEARCHER'S COPY OF CONSENT FORM

Dear Participant:

I agree to participate in a research project titled, *Leadership Development in Culture-Based Fraternities and Sororities: A Study of Student Involvement and Expectations*, which is being conducted by Eric Atkinson, a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, who can be reached at 706-369-5417 or via e-mail at atkinson@uga.edu. The research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Laura A. Dean, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, who may be reached at 706-542-6551 or via e-mail at ladean@uga.edu.

I do not have to take part in this study. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that participating in this project could result in research that might be published.

Purpose
The purpose of the research is to gather information concerning the experiences of undergraduate students who are involved in culture-based fraternities and sororities.

Benefits
I understand that the research proposed can have a significant impact on the development and delivery of fraternity and sorority life programs for culture-based Greek letter organizations. Information garnered through this study will benefit participants by giving them an understanding of how culture-based fraternity and sorority experiences impact and enhance the institutions' learning environment, specifically in the area of leadership development.

Procedures
1. I will read and sign the consent form. (Be sure to ask questions if you have any.)
2. I will complete a short questionnaire taking approximately 15 minutes to fill out. Please respond to the questions based only on your involvement in a culture-based fraternity or sorority (just this one student organization). The questionnaire is titled *Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire* (Beeny, 2003).
3. I understand that I may elect not to answer any question without having to explain why.
4. In order to assure that my responses are kept anonymous, I will not be asked to place my name on the questionnaire.

Privacy
The data resulting from my participation will be treated anonymously and secured in the researcher's home. There are no identity links on the survey. Federal regulations for IRB record-keeping require that all research records be kept for at least three (3) years after completion of the study. I understand that the surveys will be destroyed in Summer 2013.

Discomfort/Risks
No discomfort or stresses are anticipated. Likewise no risks are expected.

Further Questions
I understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time should I become uncomfortable. The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached at the contact information listed in paragraph one.

_____
My signature below indicates that the researcher has satisfactorily answered my questions and that I consent to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Signature of Researcher/Date: _____

Signature of Participant/Date: _____

_____
Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu.

APPENDIX D

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT/INSTRUCTIONS

Script for Researcher (to be read aloud to all subjects):

Good evening. My name is Eric Atkinson and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia. I am conducting a research project titled, Leadership Development in Culture-Based Fraternities and Sororities: A Study of Student Involvement and Expectations. Specifically, I am studying active student members of culture-based fraternities and sororities at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University and University of Georgia. I have received the appropriate approval from your institution to conduct this research.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. For those of you interested in participating, I will ask you to complete a short questionnaire taking approximately 15 minutes to fill out. Please respond to the questions based only on your involvement in a culture-based fraternity or sorority. The questionnaire is titled Co-curricular Involvement and Experiences Questionnaire.

At this time, I will distribute the consent form and questionnaire. I will read aloud the consent form and entertain any questions or concerns you may have about the research.

In order to ensure minimal discomfort or pressure, I will physically leave the room and ask you to return the completed questionnaire to the chapter president. I will collect the questionnaires from the chapter president following the meeting.

The researcher will then distribute the consent form and questionnaire. The researcher will read aloud the consent form to all subjects and address questions and concerns before physically leaving the meeting.