afa ORACLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Fraternities promote leadership development as a benefit of membership. Researchers examined fraternal commitment and engagement of participants attending a leadership program offered by a fraternity central office. This study was designed as an outcomes assessment and included 2,065 cases, the total number of fraternity men attending in the ten-year span from 1999-2008. The following data were examined: attendance, undergraduate leadership, alumni/volunteer involvement, and donor rosters, as well as post-program survey evaluations. Descriptive statistics and significance tests revealed that (a) 63% of participants took a formal undergraduate leadership role, (b) 8% of participants took a volunteer advisory role, (c) 8% became donors, and (d) some years were more developmental for participants than others.

Leadership development is a high priority for many National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) sororities (National Panhellenic Conference, 1999) and obtaining leadership skills is a major reason why women join sororities (NPC/NIC Research Initiative, 2002). However, little research is available which summarizes leadership programs sponsored by NPC headquarters and the specific contents and effectiveness of such programs. This study examined those aspects through surveys distributed to the 26 NPC sorority headquarters. The results from the study demonstrate sorority headquarters indeed offer leadership education to undergraduate collegiate members through a wide range of programming; however, these programs may be missing critical elements associated with women's leadership theory. Recommendations for sorority professionals, including campus professionals and inter/national sorority leaders, are included.

---

[1] This article originally appeared in the *Journal of Leadership Education*, Volume 7, Issue 3, Winter 2009

2010 EDITORIAL TEAM

GENERAL INFORMATION

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors advances the study of college fraternities and sororities through a peer reviewed academic journal promoting scholarly discourse among partners invested in the college fraternal movement. The vision of *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* is to serve as the premier forum for academic discourse and scholarly inquiry regarding the college fraternity/sorority movement.

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors is published biannually. Members of the Association receive the current issue of *Oracle* as a benefit of membership; past issues of *Oracle* are available to the public on the AFA website.

Copyright:
Copyright © 2010 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, Inc. (AFA). All material contained in this publication is the property of AFA. The opinions expressed in *Oracle* do not necessarily reflect those of AFA. Requests for permission to reprint should be sent to the AFA Central Office at info@fraternityadvisors.org or 317/876-1632.

Subscriptions:
Subscriptions may be purchased by contacting the Central Office. Single issues are available for $20; a one-year subscription is $35; a two-year subscription is $50.

Submissions:
Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors accepts submissions focused on articulating research involving fraternity and sorority members at the collegiate, alumni, inter/national organization, and volunteer advisory levels. Manuscripts should be written for the student affairs generalist who has broad responsibility for educational leadership, policy, staff development, and management. Articles on specialized topics should provide the generalist with an understanding of the importance of the program to student affairs overall and fraternity/sorority advising specifically.

Research articles for *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* should stress the underlying issues or problems that stimulated the research; treat the methodology concisely; and, most importantly, offer a full discussion of results, implications, and conclusions. In the belief that AFA readers have much to learn from one another, we also encourage the submission of thoughtful, documented essays or historical perspectives.

Visit http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/Oracle.aspx for more detailed submission guidelines.

FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES SUPPORT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT! HOW DO WE KNOW?

Dan Bureau
Oracle **Guest Editor**

This issue of *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* furthers our understanding of how fraternities and sororities help students develop and nurture leadership competence. Since the journal's inception, research on the leadership experiences of members, collegiate and graduate, has been a research priority (e.g. Dugan, 2008; Harms, Wood, Roberts, Bureau, & Green, 2006; Kelley, 2008). However, the reality is that the journal-published research on fraternities and sororities and leadership development is limited (Bureau, 2007). Also, much of the literature indicates that while fraternities and sororities may be forums in which one can practice leadership, some of the most important skills necessary to lead in today's global society, such as the ability to initiate change, are not necessarily developed in the fraternity/sorority context (Dugan, 2008; Gerhardt, 2008). However, we continue to say, without sufficient evidence, that these organizations support leadership development. The articles in this journal help advance the argument that leadership development occurs in and is a priority for undergraduate fraternal organizations.

Dr. J. Patrick Biddix and Ms. Rachel Underwood present evidence that a leadership program offered by an inter/national fraternity can provide tools students perceive as necessary for leading their chapters. The authors analyzed ten years of data. They found students who participated in the leadership program were likely to move into positions such as president and pledge educator: two roles that have wide influence in chapters. This may be attributed to another finding that participants felt they had developed the tools to enact change in their organization. Such findings serve as a response to Dugan (2008) who found that navigating change was the skill with which fraternity and sorority members struggled most.

Because consciousness of self, including knowing one's values and beliefs, is an essential part of being a leader (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996), Biddix and Underwood's finding that participants will use the principles and values espoused by the organization in their leadership roles is extraordinary. At least in this context, this research helps us to know that a leadership program helped over 2000 fraternity men, over a ten-year span, develop tools for enacting change and base their leadership approach on principles.

Dr. Genevieve Evans Taylor has examined the extent to which member organizations of the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) provide leadership education. Additionally, she reviewed perceptions of how such programs support the development of essential skills identified in women's leadership development theory. Of 18 NPC organizations reporting, all provided leadership education for members. While not surprising, the unanimity of the importance of leadership education and the numerous forums in which these organizations provide such training indicates leadership development is indeed an important objective for those who administer these organizations at the national level. The additional findings that there are specific attributes of women's leadership development that these organizations emphasized and

the efficacy of training in these areas also provide interesting insight into leadership development in sororities.

From Evans Taylor's research, we now know that NPC organizations emphasize cultivating values and perceive that their training is effective. We also know that there are other areas of women's leadership development that can be strengthened to help sorority members develop well-rounded leadership competence.

Dr. Eric Atkinson, Dr. Laura Dean, and Dr. Michelle M. Espino conducted a qualitative study of how leadership development occurs within culturally based organizations. A secondary question was the extent to which the competencies developed by these students were aligned with broad learning and development objectives of the Division of Student Affairs of The University of Georgia (the site of the study). The authors found that important leadership skills such as working with diverse others, handling adversity, balancing conflict and friendships, standing up for one's beliefs, event planning, delegation, and time management were skills students learned through their involvement in these organizations. It is known from other research that social identity influences leadership identity development (Dugan, 2006). It has also been determined that membership in culturally based organizations foster an increased sense of one's ethnic and racial identity (Guardia & Evans, 2008).

These factors in mind, the work of Atkinson, Dean, and Espino helps strengthen assertions that leadership development, social identity, and fraternity and sorority membership are integrated in very powerful ways. Additionally, this research provides evidence that such organizations advance the overall goals of divisions of student affairs including fostering learning, developing leadership competence, and strengthening multicultural competence. As we advocate for fraternities and sororities as relevant and meaningful contributors to higher education, findings indicate culturally based organizations may be some of the most meaningful and relevant organizations on a college campus.

It could be easy to view the article by Dr. Patricia Witkowsky as limited. Her qualitative study examines leadership in one institutional context with two sorority members engaged in a specific leadership practice: leading potential members through an NPC recruitment process. It certainly could not inform the leadership literature broadly right? Yes and No. Qualitative studies often aim to capture the specific experiences of some population and describe those experiences not to generalize but to allow the experiences to be understood in a specific context (Creswell, 2007). The research has limitations and should be read with an understanding of the researcher's methodology and overall study objectives; however, it is a beginning of our understanding of how students perceive this one leadership experience.

Many of us who work with NPC sororities during the formal recruitment process hope our recruitment counselors are not only positively impacting potential members but also developing skills they would not develop in other leadership roles. We hold these roles up with prestige and possibility: apply to be a recruitment counselor and change the lives of potential members and your own! We make big statements, based on anecdotal beliefs that these are roles in which students learn leadership skills. This is the first research, from what I can gather, on how counselors perceived these roles and leadership development as a result of such an experience.

Witkowsky exposed how two women felt the challenge of neutrality, often wanting to be loyal to their chapters: Conflict between organizational and sorority community good presented these women with challenges. Such challenges are real tests for student leaders. Witkowsky found that leadership skills that were developed as a result of serving as a recruitment counselor include integrity, mentoring and public speaking.

Personally, I am inclined to believe serving as a recruitment counselor IS a leadership development opportunity. For others who believe and who aim to provide evidence to back such assertions, Witkowsky is your starting point. Research begets research. Get to work.

To be clear, I BELIEVE fraternities and sororities are environments in which students who have been leaders already and those who may not have been placed into leadership roles can develop leadership competence. As any good researcher, I just hope that such claims are matched with evidence. This issue of *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* adds to the empirical evidence about leadership development as a part of undergraduate fraternal experiences. This issue also presents as many questions as it does answers: we still do not know if the leadership program administered by Phi Fraternity in Biddix and Underwood would work if it was applied on a campus or by another organization. Would the same leadership program work with members of culturally based organizations or are the needs of these students distinctive from those who are members in historically White fraternities and sororities?

I continue to wonder if students who perceive themselves to be leaders and who have demonstrated leadership competence in high school organizations and teams come to us wanting to be members or if our organizations take students with low to average competence in leadership and help them improve their abilities. The environment of the fraternity/sorority community needs to be examined for the extent to which skills are developed, nurtured, improved, or even diminished (think of the challenges of integrity the women in Witkowsky's study had with sorority recruitment – if they are inclined to view the process as lacking integrity, then their previous exploration and development of this value may in fact be undermined by such leadership roles).

We close with a reprint of Don DiPaolo's (2009) article about barriers to student leaders fulfilling their promise. For those of you who have experienced Don, for example at the 2008 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Annual Meeting as the opening keynote, you will know he is anything but ordinary. His gift is to challenge people to be more. His article challenges us to be persons who help foster leadership in the fraternal movement. When you read his article, you will see he asks numerous questions that require us to think about how we tell the story of student leaders. One of the barriers he explains is that of the "hidden narrative," which is explained as how we fail to understand students' most intimate thoughts about leadership. I think the fraternal movement, to some extent, has failed itself by relying on our perceptions of students' leadership development as a result of membership. We have not captured students' distinctive and shared stories of how they come to learn how to demonstrate leadership and refine existing leadership skills in the context of these organizations. The good news for those of us invested in the fraternal movement is that this issue of *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* increases our knowledge of these thoughts.

I commend the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors and the Editorial Team of this journal for focusing the first special issue on leadership development. Five years after *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* was launched, it is wonderful to see how one research forum has made a difference within the fraternity/sorority advising profession; specifically, how understanding leadership development in fraternities and sororities has been a priority. Enjoy the readings. I hope it sparks an interest in you to advance our collective knowledge about leadership development in the fraternal movement.

References

Bureau, D. (2007, fall). Ready for research but don't know where to start? 10 fraternity/sorority related research topics. Retrieved from http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/Perspectives/Issues/2007Fall_Research_Ideas.aspx

Creswell, J.W (2007b). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

DiPaolo, D. (2009). When student leaders don't. *Journal of Leadership Education, 7*(3).

Dugan, J.P. (2006). Explorations using the social change model: Leadership development among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2), 217-225.

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.

Gerhardt, C. (2008). *The social change model of leadership development: Differences in leadership development by levels of student involvement with various university student groups.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND.

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.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

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.

Author Autobiography

Dan Bureau is a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education and Student Affairs Program at Indiana University. He has worked with fraternities and sororities for 14 years. He is the current AFA Liaison to the Council for the Advancement of Standards and among other roles has served AFA as its 2004 President and the first Associate Editor to *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*.

A TEN-YEAR STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL OUTCOMES FROM A FRATERNITY CENTRAL OFFICE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

J. Patrick Biddix and Rachel Underwood

Fraternities promote leadership development as a benefit of membership. Researchers examined fraternal commitment and engagement of participants attending a leadership program offered by a fraternity central office. This study was designed as an outcomes assessment and included 2,065 cases, the total number of fraternity men attending in the ten-year span from 1999-2008. The following data were examined: attendance, undergraduate leadership, alumni/volunteer involvement, and donor rosters, as well as post-program survey evaluations. Descriptive statistics and significance tests revealed that (a) 63% of participants took a formal undergraduate leadership role, (b) 8% of participants took a volunteer advisory role, (c) 8% became donors, and (d) some years were more developmental for participants than others.

Fraternities promote leadership development as a benefit of membership. Organizational mission and vision statements emphasize leadership training (Harms, Wood, Roberts, Bureau, & Green, 2006), and many central offices offer or sponsor programming to meet this focus. Examples of inter/national programming include Beta Theta Pi's Wooden Institute, Phi Delta Theta's Emerging Leaders, and Sigma Chi's Horizons. The impact of programming sponsored by fraternity central offices, however, is difficult to establish due to a lack of public empirical evidence. This disconnect lends support to Strayhorn and Colvin's (2006) observation that, "many offices of fraternity and sorority affairs emphatically state that they enhance the learning and development of students with little data to support such a claim" (p. 99).

Lack of justification for programs and services, coupled with scarce resources, has led to a greater call for accountability in recent years (Schuh & Upcraft, 2000). The Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors's (AFA) *Core Competencies for Excellence in the Profession* (2007) calls for professionals to be researchers, which includes assessing the impact of programs and resources on the fraternity/sorority community. Ironically, fraternity and campus-based professionals already have data (e.g., GPA, membership rosters, initiation rates, chapter and member consultations, needs-based and satisfaction surveys from programs), but fail to comprehensively report outcomes (Hesp & Biddix, 2009, September).

The purpose of this study was to examine the available evidence of leadership development resulting from attending a leadership program sponsored by a fraternity central office. Data were drawn from records normally kept by the organization, demonstrating that while data is often available, it needs to be collated, analyzed, and reported. Findings reveal after-program rates of office attainment, alumni involvement, and giving, pointing to the years in which the program was most effective in training new leaders.

Review of Literature

Hayek, Carini, O'Day, and Kuh (2002) noted, "perhaps the various programs and activities being implemented at local chapters by national organizations and campus-based personnel to enhance

the quality of Greek [sic] life are having the desired impact" (p. 658). Unfortunately, no published research was identified linking outcomes to central office leadership programming. Related research on outcomes from campus-based leadership programs offered some insight.

Outcomes Related to Fraternity Membership

In addition to small impacts on cognitive development after the first year (Pascarella, Flowers, & Whitt, 2006), research has favorably related personal/interpersonal growth, social interaction, collaborative work, and the ability to influence others, to fraternity membership. A limitation to the studies reported below is that studies conducted by Pike (2000, 2003) did not differentiate fraternity from sorority outcomes. With regard to general personal/interpersonal growth, Hayek et al. (2002) found affiliated men had higher gains than their unaffiliated counterparts. Pike (2003) reported this to be true for affiliated seniors. Both researchers found members to have better relationships with students, faculty, and administrative personnel, while Pike (2000) also reported higher levels of integration to college among first-year members.

In terms of collaborative work and commitment, Hayek et al. (2002) and Pike (2000, 2003) found members more engaged than non-members in active and collaborative learning, while Martin, Hevel, and Asel (2008) discovered positive gains in collaborate work measures. Dugan (2008) found affiliated men scored higher on commitment scales than non-members across all years of college. As for ability to influence others, Kezar and Moriarty (2000) reported significant gains among fraternity members four years after beginning college. Both Asel, Seifert, and Pascarella (2009) and Pike (2003) found this to be true among fraternity/sorority seniors.

Outcomes Related to Fraternity Leadership

Astin (1977, 1984, 1993), as well as Kuh (1995) and, more comprehensively, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991, 2005) cited positive gains in leadership skills among fraternity and sorority members. Being an officer in a campus organization significantly contributed to leadership development, decision-making skills, and feelings of personal competence (Astin, 1993; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kuh, 1995). Fraternity presidents retained high confidence in their leadership ability up to ten years after college (Kelley, 2008). With regard to peer perception, however, Harms et al. (2006) found fraternity and sorority members holding formal offices were less often recognized as effective leaders than the members with the strongest commitment to the organization.

Outcomes Related to Leadership Programming in College

Research indicates that college students can and do increase their leadership skills during the college years (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Students who participate in leadership training programs during college not only develop significant skills, but also learn to more effectively develop those skills in others (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). This can be particularly true for members of fraternities (Dugan, 2008; Harms et al., 2006; Martin et al., 2008, November). Further, time spent in student organizations such as fraternities and being elected to office, indicators of engagement and commitment, have shown the strongest correlations with personal growth (Astin, 1977, 1984, 1993).

Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (1999) summarized self-reported outcomes from leadership programming at 21 institutions, finding gains in confidence, leadership skills, and willingness to serve in a leadership role, particularly when activities were structured in cooperative ways. Kezar and Moriarty (2000) found the highest predictor for leadership skills among men was participating in a leadership class. Similarly, Dugan (2006) found students participating in formal leadership programs scored significantly higher on common purpose and citizenship.

In one of the few comprehensive (and subsequently often-cited) studies on the subject, Cress et al. (2001) explored whether programming had a direct effect on student leadership ability and personal development. Using longitudinal data from 875 students at 10 institutions, Cress et al. found that versus all other students, those participating in a leadership experience were interested in developing leadership skills in others at a significantly higher rate than those who were not, and held an elected or appointed office at significantly higher rates.

Summary and Research Question

The research reviewed indicated significant positive affects with regard to personal, collaborative, and general leadership skills among fraternity members. In many cases, the same or similar outcomes were reported for members of other types of campus groups, making it difficult to determine whether outcomes were a result of campus programming or partially attributed to opportunities afforded to members by campus- or organization-based fraternity/sorority professionals.

The purpose of this study was to address the lack of research on leadership programming outcomes offered by a fraternity central office. A primary research question was posed: What individual outcomes occurred after attending a fraternity leadership program? Individual outcomes were evaluated as (a) fraternal commitment, measured as becoming an officer or expressing commitment to chapter and/or community development, and (b) fraternal engagement, measured as becoming a volunteer, donor, or expressing commitment to long-term fraternity (e.g., organizational level) development.

Method

This study was designed as an outcomes assessment (Schuh & Upcraft, 2000). This design was chosen for its relation to the central research question. Three criteria were established to identify a case: 1) the fraternity must have leadership programs for its undergraduate members, 2) the program must have been in existence, with only minor changes, for a minimum of five years to permit longitudinal analysis, and 3) the fraternity must be willing to provide access to data. One of the researchers had a prior relationship with a fraternity meeting all three criteria. While this helped established rapport and trust (Patton, 1990), it is notable as a potential for undue influence on the study. To moderate, a second researcher not affiliated with the fraternity joined the project.

Case

Not unlike other social fraternities, Phi (pseudonym) has faced significant obstacles during its 150 years of existence. In the 1990s, the Fraternity searched for a permanent resolution to negative trends of declining membership and an increasing number of risk management issues. To address these concerns, a task force of alumni and undergraduate members, non-member organization and campus-based fraternity/sorority professionals, and non-member advisors met in 1997 to create a change initiative intended to reemphasize Phi's founding principles, shaping men to "live their ritual" in all aspects of their lives.

This initiative expanded quickly to include, among other things, the concept of creating a leadership development program to foster the ideals of the movement. In 1997, Phi's central office staff members introduced the model for a new leadership training program, based in part on the Undergraduate Interfraternity Institute (UIFI) model. Phi's Leadership Program (hereafter, Program) included a curriculum based on leadership practices rooted in Kouzes and Posner's (1987) work, collaboration, service to the community, and the importance of ritual. The format included a five-day experience facilitated by fraternity alumni, non-member advisors, and campus-based professionals.

The first session of the Program took place in the summer of 1999 at Phi's central office, with 44 men attending. Positive reactions from the initial group prompted the fraternity to add additional sessions in 2000 and 2001. Presently, the Program holds three to four sessions per summer with over 300 undergraduate members attending from chapters across the U.S. and Canada. Attendee demographics have varied by year, but participants are most often sophomores, a large contingent of juniors, and a few seniors. By percentage, attendance in the ten-year span grew steadily from less than 1% of all undergraduate members in 1999 to 2.5% by 2002, and beyond 5% by 2008.

Procedure

In summer 2009, the researchers contacted Phi to discuss options for the study, including available data, support, and permission. After determining which data would best meet the needs of the central research question, the researchers sought and received IRB approval for the study. The following program data were requested for the ten-year span (1999-2008) of the study: attendance rosters from the Program, survey instruments used for the Program, undergraduate leadership rosters (i.e., president, vice president), alumni/volunteer involvement rosters, and donor rosters with giving information. All data relatable to program outcomes were quantitative.

Since data were stored in different databases, the first step was to move all different forms into a common spreadsheet, with tabs for each data source. Step two was to screen data for missing cases. Step three was to collate and match rosters for attendance, offices held, volunteer positions, and donor information, then to recode the cases so that identifiable information was kept confidential in the database used for this study. Each office held was counted individually to account for attendees who held multiple offices.

Step four involved an examination of the survey instruments to determine which questions would be beneficial in addressing the primary research question. Only five questions did not involve

satisfaction data and were consistent over several years (2001-2007). Since these responses were anonymous, this file was stored in a separate tab, not merged with the master database.

Once the master database was completed, step five was to calculate initial descriptive statistics and scan for inconsistencies (e.g., outliers). Fifty-two members attended the program more than once; therefore, the dataset was revised a final time so that cases would not be counted twice. Attendees were only counted their first time. The final dataset contained 2,065 cases, the total population of Program attendees for the ten-year span minus second-time attendees.

Analysis
Analytic methods used in this study included descriptive calculations and significance tests using techniques appropriate for different types of data computed with SPSS 17.0. Chi-square (χ^2) tests were used when the outcome variable was dichotomous (e.g., becoming an officer, volunteer, or donor). Kruskal-Wallis tests (*H*) were used when the outcome variable was nominal (e.g., survey data). Mann-Whitney tests were used to test independence for pairwise comparison (e.g., survey year data). Outcomes were assessed on the total population of attendees in all years and differentiated by year attended. The latter permitted an evaluation of the Program, by year, to determine if some years were more significant than others on specific outcomes.

To address the central research question (What individual outcomes occurred after attending a fraternity leadership program?), the following sub questions were assessed:

1. Fraternal Engagement (Immediate Outcomes)
   a. What fraternity offices did attendees attain following the Program?
   b. What commitment/s did attendees make to chapter and/or community development following the Program?
2. Fraternal Commitment (Long-Term Outcomes)
   a. What volunteer positions did attendees attain following the Program?
   b. What was the donor rate of attendees following the Program?
   c. What commitment/s did attendees express to long-term personal and/or fraternity development following the Program?

Results

Fraternal Engagement
Fraternal engagement was assessed using officer rosters and survey results from 1999-2008. The first sub question concerned the number of offices and rate of attainment among attendees. Table 1 displays the aggregate descriptive statistics on involvement, by involvement type, from 1999-2008.

Table 1
Total Offices and Volunteer Positions Attained by Attendees (1999-2008)

Involvement Type (*n*=2065)[1]	*n*
Executive Offices	
Chapter President	270
Vice President	203
Treasurer	123
Secretary	115
Recruitment Chair	156
Risk Manager	123
Pledge Educator	205
Scholarship Chair	103
Non-Executive/Cabinet Offices	
Alumni Relations	137
Chorister	74
Historian	10
House Manager	85
IFC Representative	10
Intramural Chair	9
Leadership Development	18
Philanthropy Chair	117
Public Relations Chair	100
Ritual Chair	40
Sergeant-at-Arms	10
Social Chair	31
Tech Chair	8
Total Offices	1947
Volunteer Positions (Advisory Team)	
Alumni Relations Advisor	7
Chapter Counselor	25
Faculty Advisor	1
Financial Advisor	16
Pledge Education Advisor	46
Recruitment Advisor	44
Risk Management Advisor	25
Ritual Advisor	9
Scholarship Advisor	8
Vice President Advisor	2
Volunteer Positions (District/Regional Advisory Team)	
Assistant District/Regional Advisor	23
District/Regional Advisor	23
Total Volunteer Positions	229
Total Offices and Volunteer Positions	2176

[1] 52 members attended twice. Each time this occurred, data for the second year attended was removed.

Becoming an officer. To assess office attainment following the Program, attendee and involvement rosters were merged. It was not possible to calculate a percentage of officers produced by the Program versus non-attendees over ten-years; therefore, only raw counts could be displayed. Among all offices, chapter president (270), pledge educator (205), and vice president (203) were most frequently attained. While there was significant variation among non-executive/cabinet offices, alumni relations (137), philanthropy chair (117), and public relations chair (100) were mostly frequently attained.

Table 2 shows office type (executive, non-executive/cabinet, all) by attending year. Each cell displays the number and percentage (in parentheses) of attendees who attained an office. Unlike the previous question, percentages could be calculated by dividing the number of offices attained by attendees. Members holding more than one office were only counted once to permit overall outcome measures in the All Offices and All Involved total columns. All Offices refers to the total number of participants who took executive and/or non-executive positions. All Involved refers to the total number of participants who took any type of position following attendance.

Table 2
Attendees (%) Attaining One or More Positions, by Year (1999-2008)

Year	N	Executive	Non-Executive	All Offices	All Volunteers	All Involved
1999	45	12(26.7)	8(17.8)	16(35.6)	13(28.9)	22(48.9)
2000	100	58(58.0)	22(22.0)	66(66.0)	22(22.0)	77(77.0)
2001	152	87(57.2)	38(25.0)	100(65.8)	25(16.5)	105(69.1)
2002	194	99(51.0)	60(30.9)	127(65.5)	27(13.9)	132(68.0)
2003	201	87(43.3)	58(28.9)	116(57.7)	29(14.4)	126(62.7)
2004	231	120(52.0)	49(21.2)	141(61.0)	20(8.7)	161(69.7)
2005	276	126(45.7)	66(23.9)	157(56.9)	19(6.9)	166(60.1)
2006	268	118(44.0)	70(26.1)	149(55.6)	9(3.4)	158(59.0)
2007	304	138(45.4)	86(28.3)	181(59.5)	3(1.0)	180(59.2)
2008	293	115(39.3)	76(25.9)	168(57.3)	0(0.0)	168(57.3)
Total	2065	960(46.5)	533(25.8)	1221(59.1)	167(8.1)	1295(62.7)

Over a ten-year span (1999-2008), nearly 47% of attendees held a future executive office and nearly 26% held a non-executive office. Controlling for office type and holding more than one office, 59% of all attendees held at least one leadership position.

Chi-square (χ^2) tests of independence evaluated whether involvement was independent of year attended. Analysis revealed no statistically significant difference among executive or non-executive offices. A significant difference was identified among all offices, χ^2 (9, $N = 1221$) = 21.20, $p < .001$.

In other words, Program year did not influence future executive or non-executive office attainment. When type of office and holding multiple offices were controlled, however, some Program years seem more promising than others in terms of becoming a chapter officer. Statistically, it was not viable to assess which specific years were significantly different.

Commitment to chapter/community development. Survey results were assessed to evaluate future commitment to chapter and/or community development following the program. Table 3 displays descriptive statistics on the survey questions asked over multiple years. Questions 1 and 2 are relevant to fraternal engagement:

1. I have acquired tools to influence positive change in my chapter and my Greek community. (Tools)
2. As a result of this experience, I have acquired additional leadership skills that will transfer to my chapter. (Skills)

Table 3
Responses to Survey Questions, by Year (2001-2007)[a]

| | | Fraternal Commitment | | Fraternal Engagement | | |
| | | Tools | Skills | Principles | Appreciation | Friendships |
Year	*n*	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)
2001	47	4.77 (.43)	4.81 (.40)	4.74 (.44)	4.91 (.28)	4.87 (.40)
2002	166	4.59 (.60)	4.64 (.54)	4.70 (.54)	4.87 (.43)	4.83 (.40)
2003	188	4.47 (.70)	4.45 (.73)	4.48 (.63)	4.82 (.41)	4.60 (.64)
2004	131	4.58 (.59)	4.47 (.71)	4.47 (.72)	4.73 (.62)	4.61 (.60)
2005	–	4.5 (*N/A*)	4.5 (*N/A*)	4.5 (*N/A*)	4.5 (*N/A*)	4.5 (*N/A*)
2006	150	4.62 (.55)	4.63 (.57)	4.60 (.54)	4.77 (.52)	4.55 (.64)
2007	119	4.36 (.83)	4.33 (.85)	4.41 (.81)	4.80 (.42)	4.50 (.64)
Total	883	4.55 (.65)	4.52 (.68)	4.54 (.65)	4.80 (.49)	4.64 (.59)

[a] Only *M* was available for 2005, therefore *n* and *SD* are not reported or calculated in analysis.

For the six years responses were available, attendees consistently noted they acquired tools to affect positive change. An average of 4.5 (on a 1-5 scale) with a .6 standard deviation for both outcomes points to fairly consistent high ratings for individual commitment to chapter and community.

Kruskal-Wallis tests (*H*) determined whether differences existed among the six years attended (2001-2007). Results were significant for both question 1 (Tools) $H(5, N = 883) = 15.38$, $p < 0.01$ and question 2 (Skills) $H(5, N = 883) = 25.86$, $p < .0.01$. Mann-Whitney tests identified which years were specifically different for these outcomes. For question 1 (Tools), 2007 was significantly different when compared against all other years but 2003, $p < .05$. For question 2 (Skills), 2001 was significantly different when compared against all but 2002, $p < .05$.

In other words, 2007 produced a different score when compared against other years on acquiring tools to influence positive chapter and community change. In this case, the score was the lowest ($m = 4.36$) with the highest variance ($sd = .83$), suggesting whatever affected the score did so negatively when compared to other years. Something also produced a different score in 2001 when compared against other years on acquiring additional leadership skills to transfer to the chapter. In this case, the score was the highest ($m = 4.81$) with the lowest variance ($sd = .40$), suggesting whatever affected the score did so positively when compared to other years.

Fraternal Commitment
Fraternal commitment was assessed using donor rosters and survey results from 1999-2008. The first sub question concerned number of volunteers and rate of attainment among attendees. Table 1 displayed the aggregate descriptive statistics on volunteer involvement, by involvement type, from 1999-2008.

Becoming a volunteer. To assess volunteer involvement following the Program, attendee and volunteer rosters were merged. It was not possible to calculate a percentage of volunteers produced by the Program versus non-attendees over ten-years; therefore, only raw counts could be displayed. Among all volunteers, pledge education advisor (46), recruitment advisor (44), chapter counselor (25), risk management advisor (25), and assistant district/regional advisor (23), and district/regional advisor (23) were most frequently attained.

Table 2 showed data for all volunteers by attending year. Each cell displayed the number and percentage (in parentheses) of attendees who attained an office. Unlike the previous question, percentages could be calculated by dividing the number of offices attained by attendees. Members holding more than one position were only counted once to permit overall outcome measures (All Volunteers).

Over a ten-year span (1999-2008), just over 8% of attendees held a future volunteer position. Low cell counts prevented an evaluation of all volunteers by office.

Becoming an officer or volunteer. Accounting for all offices and volunteer positions, and controlling for office type and holding more than one office, nearly 63% of all attendees took a formal leadership position in the Fraternity after attending the Program. Chi-square (χ^2) tests of independence evaluated whether involvement was independent of year attended. Analysis revealed a significant difference among all members involved as officers or as volunteers, χ^2 (9, N = 1295) = 29.84, $p < .001$.

In other words, some Program years seem more promising than others in terms of participants becoming a future officer or volunteer. Statistically, it was not viable to assess which specific years were significantly different.

Becoming a donor. To assess donor rate following the Program, attendee and donor rosters were merged. Table 4 displays years, donor raw counts and percentages, donor levels, and mean (sd) donor rates. Donor levels were created by the researcher for display purposes.

Table 4
Attendees Becoming Future Donors, by Donor Rate and Program Year (1999-2008)

Year	N	Donor	Donor Level				Donor Rate *m(sd)*
			$0-99	$100-249	$250-499	$500+	
1999	45	3(6.7)	1(2.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(4.4)	*$1226.20(1521.5)*
2000	100	6(6.0)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)	*$647.80(1010.4)*
2001	152	14(9.2)	1(0.7)	5(3.3)	6(3.9)	2(1.3)	*$973.10(878.6)*
2002	195	16(8.2)	4(2.1)	5(2.6)	2(1.0)	5(2.6)	*$1335.70(4050.10)*
2003	201	16(8.0)	5(2.5)	2(1.0)	6(3.0)	3(1.5)	*$392.30(479.0)*
2004	233	20(8.6)	3(1.3)	4(1.7)	7(3.0)	6(2.6)	*$752.00(1164.0)*
2005	273	25(9.2)	6(2.2)	7(2.6)	7(2.6)	5(1.8)	*$154.70(129.5)*
2006	268	22(8.2)	6(2.2)	2(0.7)	4(1.5)	10(3.7)	*$1468.80(3476.2)*
2007	304	20(6.6)	8(1.6)	5(1.6)	5(1.6)	2(0.7)	*$74.50(86.7)*
2008	294	18(6.1)	5(1.7)	2(0.7)	6(2.0)	5(1.7)	*$98.10(121.7)*
Total	2065	160(7.7)	41(2.0)	33(1.6)	45(2.2)	41(2.0)	*$712.32(1291.7)*

Attendees from 2001-2006 had the most consistent giving rate as compared to all other groups (8.6%), though 7.7% was a fairly consistent rate for all years. In terms of consistency, 2005 was the most consistent year, with donations nearly equally falling in all donor levels, and a low average to variance ratio ($m = $154.70, $sd = $129.50). In terms of large donations, 2006 was the most productive year, with 10 attendees giving over $500.00 each.

Chi-square tests (χ^2) of independence evaluated whether becoming a donor was independent of year attended. Analysis revealed no significant differences among attendees becoming donors. Low cell counts for donor levels prevented further analysis, leaving interpretation of donor rates following attendance as merely descriptive.

Commitment to Fraternity. Survey results were assessed to evaluate future engagement to the Fraternity following the Program. Table 3 displayed descriptive statistics on the same survey questions asked over multiple years. Questions 3, 4, and 5 are relevant to Fraternal commitment:
 3. I will utilize the principles upon which our Fraternity is founded in my daily life. (Principles)
 4. I have a strong appreciation of the Fraternity as an organization. (Appreciation)
 5. Through this experience I have established strong friendships with Phi brothers. (Friendships)

For the six years responses were available, attendees consistently committed to utilizing the ritual, appreciating the Fraternity, and maintaining strong friendships with brothers. Average scores of 4.5 or better with moderate standard deviation (.5 to .6) for all three outcomes points to fairly consistent high ratings for individual commitment to Fraternity.

Kruskal-Wallis tests (*H*) evaluated whether differences existed among six years attended (2001-2007) and survey results from each year. Results were significant for question 3 (Principles) *H* (5, $N = 883$) = 21.99, $p < .01$ and question 5 (Friendships) $H(5, N = 883) = 36.83$, $p < .01$. Results for question 4 (Appreciation) were not significant. Mann-Whitney tests identified which years were specifically different for these outcomes. For question 3 (Principles), 2002 was

significantly different when compared against all other years but 2001, *p* < .05. For question 5 (Friendships), 2002 was significantly different when compared against 2004, 2006, and 2007, *p* < .05.

In other words, 2002 produced a different score when compared against other years on two measures of Fraternal commitment. With regard to Principles, the score for 2002 was the second highest (*m* = 4.70) with the second lowest variance, suggesting whatever affected the score did so positively when compared to other years. Something also produced a different score in 2002 when compared against other years on establishing strong friendships with Phi brothers. In this case, the score was again second highest (*m* = 4.83) with the second lowest variance (*sd* = .40), suggesting whatever affected the score did so positively when compared to other years.

Leadership attainment was relatively consistent across all years. In the ten-year span of this study, nearly 63% of Program attendees from 1999-2008 took a formal leadership role in the fraternity following the Program. Pledge education was the most consistent area of involvement among both undergraduates and volunteers. In that same span, nearly 8% of attendees became donors.

Fraternal engagement and Fraternal commitment were relatively consistent across all years. On survey measures of fraternal engagement, 2007 was the lowest reported year attendees noted they acquired tools to influence positive change and additional leadership skills, while 2001 was the highest. For Fraternal commitment, 2002 was the most consistent year when compared against all others, with attendees indicating an intention to use founding principles in daily life, a strong appreciation of the Fraternity, and recognition of strong friendships with Fraternity brothers. A discussion of implications from these findings follows.

Discussion

Results from this study were supported by the research linking campus-based leadership programs to development. Discussion is presented in statements, offering observations informed by present findings and grounded in previous literature.

Nearly Two Thirds of Program Attendees Took Formal Involvement Roles
As demonstrated in Table 2, 62.7% of attendees became officers or volunteers following the Program. This statistic accounted for multiple offices, so that each attendee was only counted once. Almost two decades of research on outcomes related to fraternity leadership (Astin, 1993; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kuh, 1995) as well as leadership programming in general (Cress et al., 2001) conceptually supported this finding. What is unique to this study, other than the focus on a central office leadership program, is the high and consistent rate of participation.

Another perspective is to consider those 37.3% of members who either did not become or have not yet become formal leaders. How did attending the Program, which focused on deepening attendees' understanding of ritual and leadership through ritual, influence these members? What impact did they later have on their chapter and community? Both Komives, Lucas, and McMahon's (2007) and Dugan's (2006, 2008) research has shown that contemporary models emphasizing relational (e.g., commitment to shared leadership where anyone in the organization

can contribute) over positional leadership may be more reflective of today's students leadership approach.

Shertzer and Schuh (2004) recommended educators work to shift learning environments to value initiative and collaborative action over hierarchical decision-making. While this may be difficult in an organization as structured as a fraternity chapter, leadership programs can emphasize the value of every member contributing, particularly in a fraternity chapter where members report significant gains on ability to influence others over the course of their involvement (Asel et al., 2009; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Pike, 2003) This concept is supported in Harms et al.'s (2006) finding that fraternity members recognized those members more committed to the organization than those holding positional roles as more effective leaders.

Nearly Half of Program Attendees Took Executive Board Leadership Roles
The finding that 46.5% of attendees became executive officers was similarly not surprising for many of the same reasons previously discussed. What is notable about this finding is the remarkable consistency among all years. With the exception of the inaugural year of the program in 1999, attendees have returned to their chapters and been elected to office. This statistic might even be higher if data for 2009 or 2010 were available, which would allow those who attended in 2008 to appear on the officer rosters.

Taken together with the previous findings, and considering an additional 25.8% of members take a non-executive position, it would seem that either the Fraternity structure, the leadership Program, or perhaps both, whether intentionally or not, emphasizes formal leadership as the path to create change. This consideration echoes the notion previously mentioned that leadership is equated with position, and is perhaps emphasized in the Program through the use of Kouzes and Posner's (1987) model, which has been criticized as valuing positional role attainment over values-based outcomes grounded in collaboration (Dugan, 2006, 2008). A discussion of alternative models for leadership development is discussed later as a recommendation.

Program Attendees Most Often Became Chapter President
Program attendees most often became chapter president. Following Dugan's (2006, 2008) criticism of Kouzes and Posner's (1987) model, it may be that attendees returned hoping to affect change and perceived the most viable means of doing so was being elected to the highest positional office. It could be the opposite – that peers recognized their leadership potential and elected them, or somewhere in between. Available data did not make it possible to discern intention, so motivation for seeking office can only be speculated.

Members holding formal offices are less often recognized as effective leaders than the members with the strongest commitment to the organization (Harms et al., 2006). Chapter president is the most visible positional leader and therefore, members attaining the position may find it difficult to affect the change they had hoped to see. In other words, members who had a transformative experience at the Program may be frustrated when others do not share their vision for the chapter, no matter how altruistic, simply because they hold office. This suggests that the Program should incorporate additional work on building and sustaining relationships for change – emphasis areas covered by two of Kouzes and Posner's (1987) Five Practices for Exemplary Leadership®: Inspiring a Shared Vision and Enabling Others to Act.

Many Program Attendees Took Leadership Responsibility for Pledge Education

While it was not possible to determine the rate of program attendees taking an office or advisory role working with pledge education versus those members who did not attend the Program, both offices showed high numbers for those who did. Considering the emphasis of the Program on ritual and member education, this is perhaps not as surprising. Again, without baseline and outcomes-based survey data, this is purely conjecture. However, it seems reasonable that a member hoping to create organizational change would see new members as the opportunity to do so. This further suggests that the Program's emphasis on change as related to committing to founding Principles seems to have taken hold with many attendees, whose choice to work with new members seems an indicator of their desire to create a long-term change in the organization. It could also be that as a result of the curricular focus, participants learned the new members program was the area most in need of change.

Few Program Attendees Seldom Became Ritual Chairman

Perhaps surprising was that attendees did not assume leadership roles as ritual chairmen following the Program, given the emphasis on ritual. Leadership in the highest offices (president and vice president) and in one of the most influential (pledge education), along with survey results focusing on intention to create change, support the idea that attendees desired to positively influence their experiences. A speculative reason attendees did not become ritual chairs may be that the office is not considered authoritative enough to influence other members. This assumes a formal leadership paradigm valuing hierarchy over commitment. Perhaps a more plausible explanation is that ritual chair, formally or not, is perceived more as a logistics officer (e.g., purchasing equipment, setting ceremony dates) than an educational one.

Nearly Eight Percent of Program Attendees Donated to the Fraternity

Similar to the caveat on rate of officer attainment, this statistic is likely to rise each year it is re-calculated. What the number currently indicates is that a good representation (over 8%) of attendees become donors. Given that most are undergraduates, coupled with the fact that the oldest donors in this group are likely in their early thirties at most (e.g., a 22-year-old attending in 1999), this seemingly low rate becomes significant. Like all findings from the study, attending the Program is not the only influence on later actions; however, the consistent rate is perhaps an indicator of a link. If donating is an indicator of satisfaction with or belief in an organization, perhaps the Program is enhancing members' connection to the Fraternity. The notable aspect about giving is that rates can only stabilize or rise, especially as members grow older and presumably reach higher income brackets. Instead of targeting members and reminding them of their experiences in the Fraternity, development officers can remind members of their experience with the Program and emphasize how giving can contribute to other members' connection.

Program Attendees Expressed High Engagement to Chapter/Community Development

In addition to rates of office attainment following the Program, two survey questions were used as indicators of immediate chapter/community engagement. As with other outcomes used in this study, survey results were fairly consistent across all years, indicating a constant Program organizers can perhaps rely on – in this case, with no change, attendees continued to perceive they have been provided the tools and skills to create change.

Two questions dealt with the perception of acquiring tools and additional leadership skills to affect positive chapter and fraternal community change. Attendees overwhelmingly indicated the Program had provided tools necessary to influence change. These values are congruent with Dugan's (2006) findings linking formal leadership roles to similar outcomes (i.e., commitment, collaboration, common purpose). This emphasis would seem to increase organizational engagement and perhaps is further supported by the high rate of attendee involvement following the Program. In short, the curriculum provided attendees with tools to create change and the confidence to do so, though there is no way of determining how this intention translated to action.

As noted in results, follow-up tests revealed that 2007 (for Tools) and 2001 (for Skills) were significant years for producing member engagement, as measured by these questions. While it is not possible to pinpoint what exactly might have caused these years to be more important than others, some other observations about those years can be made from the data. The year 2007 had the lowest scores for the Tools measure and was also was in the lower tier for executive office attainment, though nearly the highest for non-executive office. Given that this question related to acquiring tools to influence positive change, one can speculate that attendees in 2007 did not leave with the same levels of self-confidence in their ability, as did those of other years. This later may have translated to fewer members running for executive offices and instead serving in less positional, non-executive offices.

The year 2001 had the highest scores for the Skills measure and was also among the highest for executive office attainment and lowest for non-executive officers. Given that this question related to acquiring additional leadership skills for use in the chapter, it is perhaps no surprise that more members from this year went on to attain the highest offices. Again, this seems to enforce an emphasis on formal leadership being the best route to creating change, at least at the chapter level.

Program Attendees Expressed High Commitment to Personal/Fraternity Development
In addition to volunteering and donor rates following the Program, three survey questions were used as indicators of long-term personal/Fraternity commitment. As with other outcomes used in this study, survey results were fairly consistent across all years, indicating a constant Program organizers can perhaps rely on – in this case, with no change, attendees continued to commit to living the ritual (Principles), recognizing the value of the Fraternity (Appreciation), and establishing strong friendships with members outside of the chapter level (Friendships).

Three questions dealt with commitment to aspects of the larger Fraternity – its principles, the organization, and non-chapter members. These measures are reflective of Harms et al.'s (2006) and Dugan's (2008) findings on organizational commitment as an outcome of fraternal membership. Such commitments may be linked to collaborative learning and work measures, noted by several researchers (Martin et al., 2008; Hayek et al., 2002; Pike 2000, 2003) as positively associated with membership.

With regard to statistical significance only Principles and Friendships permitted a look at specific years to determine difference. In both cases, 2002 was important when compared to others. In both cases, the values for those years was second highest with the second lowest variance,

indicating that attendees, as a group, committed to similar levels of utilizing principles and establishing strong friendships outside of their respective chapters. As for volunteering or donor rates, both measures were fairly consistent, if not lower, for those years than previous or subsequent years. Given that taking a volunteer role or donating is not restricted to a four-year window as undergraduate offices are, perhaps these outcomes may take longer to manifest and link directly to Fraternal commitment.

Recommendations

Research on leadership programs and fraternal affiliation, results from the present study of Phi's Program, and barriers the researchers encountered while conducting the study resulted in the following recommendations, perhaps transferable to other central office leadership programs. This study revealed two major obstacles and one limitation to completing a contemporary outcomes assessment of Phi's Program.

1. ***Create a Master Tracking Database for Members***
   A primary obstacle the researchers encountered was the assortment of databases Phi maintained on membership activities. For example, the membership database was separate from the officer and volunteer database, as well as from the donor database. Program attendees were similarly kept in a different database, as were survey responses and other outcomes-based data. None had consistent fields that could easily be linked or merged for data analysis. As a result, finding and piecing together all of the necessary data was a major undertaking. Given how often each of these disparate databases are accessed by the central office staff, it would seem beneficial to create a master database to promote effective data entry, query, and reporting.

   Using a data-tracking system, such as Microsoft Access, at the central office level would allow for data mining on specific programs, chapters, and individuals to be more easily tracked and linked, as well as more readily available for comparative analysis. A case file for a member could be created when he joins as a pledge, updated on initiation, and then continually built upon as he progressed through collegiate and alumni membership status. Each time a member did something within the fraternity (e.g., became an officer, volunteer, attended a program, etc.), that information would get added to his file by a series of linking spreadsheets and could be easily found when needed. Currently, Phi uses online forms for data reporting which could seemingly be linked to this data-tracking system.

   In addition to keeping track of individual member information, implementing a master system would facilitate assessment efforts at various levels. For example, a query on Phi members at the University of Tennessee might show that only 3% of members have attended any leadership program in the past three years. Another example might be a query of Program attendees, requesting how many members became officers, volunteers, or donors following attendance. Currently, as demonstrated by this study, this type of assessment is not possible without considerable effort. Overall, the creation of such an instrument would serve as a useful tool in recording, tracking, and assessing member information for Phi.

An important consideration would be the need for security measures to safeguard sensitive information. One option would be requiring a separate password to access confidential sections of records, such as donor information.

2. *Develop or Adopt an Outcomes-Based Assessment Instrument*
For the past 10 years, Phi's assessment efforts on the program have been primarily satisfaction surveys conducted post-event (e.g., please rate the speaker, food, etc). A few notable exceptions were the five questions consistently given during the middle years of the Program. Even then, however, it was not possible to directly link responses to other experiences. In this case, it might be worth exchanging anonymity for a way to accurately link member experiences to subsequent outcomes. This revision would be the easiest, whereby Phi would keep the five consistent questions and request names, noting that the results are only used for assessment data. This comes with risks inherit in non-anonymous survey data, such as possible lower response rate and/or inaccurate answers (i.e., members rate items high because their answers are linked to their name). However, as demonstrated above, the gain would outweigh the loss of data as a more accurate link between self-rated outcomes and later measures of engagement and commitment.

A second option would be to internally develop an instrument based partly on Phi's values, the goals for the Program, and perhaps a set of developmental outcomes that might be impacted by the Program. Other sample questions might involve intent to become an officer or volunteer or desire to lead in any capacity. Questions should be tied directly to the mission of the Program and Fraternity though should be kept to no more than a page to promote participation. A group similar to the original founders of the Program could draft a list of questions, which could then be piloted with fraternity members to build validity and enhance reliability.

Once the instrument was piloted, administration could begin for the subsequent summer Program sessions. A logistics plan would involve a pre/post design. To promote participation, participants could fill out an online version of the instrument when registering and then fill out a paper version of the same at the end of the program on site. If confidentiality was more important than linking future actions to these responses, the new instrument could be blinded by assigning code numbers at the beginning and end, allowing Phi to link the pre/post data. Descriptive statistics, t-tests, and correlation measures (all easily calculable in Excel or using online calculators) could provide data answers immediately following the program.

A third option would be to utilize an existing instrument intended to measure outcomes from leadership programming. An instrument commonly given to college students to measure student development would link Phi's programming to extant efforts on college campuses, permitting cross-comparisons. Other advantages of this approach would be that the instrument would be valid and reliable, at least among college-aged men. Some survey developers even offer data analysis and reporting as part of the service. Disadvantages might be the cost (most instruments involve a fee) and that the instrument would not be tied directly to Program goals, unless an instrument was selected that would allow an additional few questions. An example instrument is the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS), an

instrument designed to evaluate values associated with the social change model (Tyree, 1998). A discussion of this instrument and its underlying theory follows.

3. ***Consider Realigning Curriculum with Contemporary Leadership Theory***
Perhaps the biggest limitation of this study was the available data used to evaluate outcomes. In most cases, data involved formal office attainment. This approach, while consistent with the curricular focus of many leadership programs in higher education in the 1990s and early 2000s has recently been reconsidered.

Rost (1993) is frequently cited as among the first to advocate a postindustrial leadership paradigm, centered on shared responsibility, the opportunity to create change, and inclusivity. This is in contrast to a traditional industrial paradigm, which views leadership as individualistic, formal, and synonymous with management (Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Posner, 2004; Posner & Brodsky, 1992). Dugan (2006, 2008) has been critical of leadership theory that takes a hierarchical leader-centric approach – valuing positional role attainment over values-based outcomes grounded in collaboration. Recently, researchers (Dugan, 2006, 2008; Martin et al., 2008) have demonstrated positive outcomes and areas for improvement linking fraternity membership to the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996).

The central tenets of the Social Change Model (HERI, 1996) involve social responsibility and change as benefiting the common good. Eight core values are aimed at enhancing level of self-awareness and ability to work with others: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, common purpose, collaboration, controversy with civility, and citizenship. These values function at the individual (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment), group (common purpose, collaboration, and controversy with civility), and societal (citizenship) levels. Interaction across and among all values contributes to social change for the common good, the eighth value in the model (HERI).

A benefit of linking a leadership program's curriculum to focus areas from the model is that it includes a statistically valid instrument (Tyree, 1998) that can be used to assess outcomes, the SRLS. Dugan (2008) found commitment as the highest value and change as lowest among fraternity and sorority members across all years in college. Sorority members scored significantly higher than fraternity men on congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility. Martin et al. (2008) found fraternity members scored high on the congruence, commitment, and collaboration scales, using the same instrument on a sample of first-year students, though their evaluation positioned fraternity men versus those who were not members.

Using this model and instrument, or a similar one internally developed and validated, would provide Phi valuable insight as to how the Program outcomes align with larger developmental gains. Phi might even choose to administer the instrument to all members at the beginning and ends of their collegiate careers to ascertain how fraternity experience might more specifically relate to overall collegiate outcomes. If data could be linked to code numbers, Phi could compare the experiences of those who attended leadership training, such as the Program, to those who did not attend. Overall, this could be a powerful investment in

data relating the value of fraternal involvement to future members, alumni, parents, institutional representatives, and the larger community.

Limitations and Future Research

Outcomes related to attendance dates should be interpreted with caution given the finite timeframe of the study. For example, it is not possible to track donors beyond present, so any attendees giving from 2009 and on will not appear as donors in this study. The same is true of involvement for those attendees in later years, which may not yet have attained office.

The lack of baseline data on measures such as member aspirations of becoming officers before attending makes it difficult to establish causation. In other words, were vast majority of attendees intending to become leaders regardless (see Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), or did the Program influence their decisions to run for office (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006)? What may be attributed to the Program, however, is the influence it had on leadership values, or the type of office an attendee might later take. For example, the Program's focus on ritual and member education may more likely produce members interested in taking offices related to pledge education or ritual.

Future research should incorporate multi-fraternal, multi-campus, and multi-leadership theory designs to provide a more comprehensive look at the value of leadership programs offered to fraternity and sorority members. Efforts to assess chapter and Fraternal-level outcomes, such as program effects on recruitment, retention, and risk management would also significantly add to our understanding of the value of sponsored leadership programming. Such data would be useful not only for benchmarking and program justification, but also for campus expansion efforts and central office advancement.

References

Association of Fraternity Advisors. (2007). Core competencies for excellence in the profession. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/Business/CoreCompetencies.aspx

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/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 1-15.

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

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

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

Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(1), 15-27.

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

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.

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

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

Hesp, G. H., & Biddix, J. P. (2009, September). *Researcher.* Webinar presented for the First 90 Days Program of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, Carmel, IN.

Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

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.

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

Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S., Owen, J. E., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 401-420.

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

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(2), 123-155.

Martin, G. L., Hevel, M. S., & Asel, A. M. (2008, November). *New evidence on the effects of fraternity and sorority affiliation: It's more complicated than you might think.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL.

Pascarella, E. T., Flowers, L., & Whitt, E. J. (2006). Research revisited: Cognitive effects of Greek affiliation in college: Additional evidence. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(2), 117-132.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pike, G. R. (2000). The influence of fraternity or sorority membership on students' college experiences and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education, 41*(1), 117-139.

Pike, G. R. (2003). Membership in a fraternity or sorority, student engagement, and educational outcomes at AAU public research universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(3), 369-382.

Posner, B. Z. (2004). A leadership development instrument for college students: Updated. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 443-456.

Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(3), 231-237.

Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*(1), 91-110.

Schuh, J. H., & Upcraft, M. L. (2000). *Assessment practice in student affairs: An applications manual*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shertzer, J. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering others and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal, 42*(1), 111-131.

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.

Tyree, T. M. (1998). Designing an instrument to measure socially responsible leadership using the social change model of leadership development. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(06), (AAT 9836493).

Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). *Leadership in the making: Impact and insights from leadership development programs in U.S. colleges and universities*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Author Autobiography

Dr. J. Patrick Biddix is Associate Professor of Higher Education and Research Methods at Valdosta State University.

Rachel Underwood is a graduate research assistant for the Higher Education Program at Valdosta State University.

AN ANALYSIS OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAMMING SPONSORED BY MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE NATIONAL PANHELLENIC CONFERENCE

Genevieve Evans Taylor

Leadership development is a high priority for many National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) sororities (National Panhellenic Conference, 1999) and obtaining leadership skills is a major reason why women join sororities (NPC/NIC Research Initiative, 2002). However, little research is available which summarizes leadership programs sponsored by NPC headquarters and the specific contents and effectiveness of such programs. This study examined those aspects through surveys distributed to the 26 NPC sorority headquarters. The results from the study demonstrate sorority headquarters indeed offer leadership education to undergraduate collegiate members through a wide range of programming; however, these programs may be missing critical elements associated with women's leadership theory. Recommendations for sorority professionals, including campus professionals and inter/national sorority leaders, are included.

Leadership development is a predominant focus within sororities. National Panhellenic Conference- (NPC) affiliated sororities offer a wide range of leadership programs for undergraduate women including leadership institutes, inter/national conferences and conventions, regional meetings, workshops and trainings, mandated programs, optional programs, and traveling consultant presentations. To symbolize the importance of leadership within sororities, the NPC shield includes a lamp, which denotes leadership, scholarship and enlightenment (NPC, 1999).

Many sorority public documents note leadership as an important aspect of sorority life. As stated in the NPC's *Manual of Information*, one of the reasons sororities exist is to "develop the individual's potential through leadership opportunities and group effort" (1999, p. 4). In addition, 20 of the 26 sororities note the term "leadership" on the main homepage of their Web sites, indicating its importance; and 16 of the 26 sororities note the term "leadership" within their creed, mission, vision, or purpose statement. Leadership is also a major reason why women join sororities. Through a study conducted by the Center for Advanced Social Research, 82% of NPC sorority members indicated they joined a sorority because of the opportunities for leadership training (NPC/NIC Research Initiative, 2002).

The purpose of this study was to provide an overview and critical evaluation of NPC sororities' programming efforts. Specifically, the research questions involved determining what leadership programs were offered, what expectations sorority leadership had for program learning outcomes, their perceptions of how effective programming was in achieving stated objectives, and the extent to which programs addressed specific needs of women's leadership development.

Drawing from a sample of NPC headquarters respondents ($n = 28$; 18 of 26 NPC groups), the researcher sought to first determine the types of programs being offered and then evaluated programmatic foci through a framework of reviewed literature on women's leadership development. A review of literature, shared in the next section, revealed several frames for

evaluation including empowerment, experiential learning, finding voice, listening, relationship building, self-confidence, information sharing, vision, and the sororities' founding values.

The researcher also asked participants to evaluate the importance and effectiveness of each key leadership component in their leadership programming and differentiated perceptions by demographics related to position within the organizations (i.e., inter/national president, executive director, or individual responsible for the collegiate leadership programming) and length of service.

Review of Literature

Many leadership studies can be grouped into four thematic areas: trait theory, behavior theory, situational or contingency theory, and values-based transformational theory. Trait theories examine the great leaders and the psychological, personality, physical, and social traits they exhibit (Bass, 1990; Chemers, 1995; Wiggam, 1931). Behavior theories focus on the actual action of a leader. Theories in this category go beyond looking at the internal characteristics of the leader and examine what leaders actually do (Hersey & Blanchard, 1995a; McGregor, 2001; Ouchi, 2001). Situational or contingency leadership theory goes beyond the traits of leaders and their behavior and includes the environment in which leadership needs to be displayed. This category of leadership theory notes how a leader will act in certain situations and suggests the environment affects how leaders display leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1995b; Nye, 2008). The most recent additions to leadership theory include those that focus on the values of the individuals and the organizations, particularly among college students. These theories go beyond the traits, behavior, and situation. These theories indicate there is a relationship between the leader and the follower and examine leadership through a holistic approach (Burns, 1995; Fairholm, 1991; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). These also are more inclusive theories based on samples including women and people of color (Torres, Jones, & Renn, 2009). As a result, the past few decades have resulted in an increase of research in the area of women's leadership development and in the creation of leadership programs specifically for women. Danowitz, Sagaria, & Johnsrud (1988) found "the most helpful programs for developing women's leadership seem to be those intended primarily or exclusively for women… [because they] focus on supporting and affirming women's identity, aspirations, and accomplishments" (p. 9).

A review that included both the aforementioned general leadership research and women's leadership research resulted in a number of common components. Developing and maintaining relationships was a frequent theme, especially in values-based theory. Sharing information, listening, and empowerment were also prominent. Additionally, the cultivating of a values set was consistently found. Table 1 includes a listing of these and other shared elements common to both general leadership and women's leadership research.

Table 1
Leadership Components and their General and/or Women's Leadership Theorists

Leadership Component	General Leadership Theorists	Women's Leadership Theorists
Creating Experiential Learning		Astin & Leland (1991); Danowitz, Sagaria, & Johnsrud (1988); Micas (1991); Peters & Lutovsky (2001); Semersheim (1996); Whitt (1993)
Cultivating Values	Burns (1995); Ciulla (1995); M. Fairholm (2004); Gandhi (1995); Gardner (1990); Hesselbein (2002); Wheatley (1999)	McDade et al. (2008)
Defining Vision	M. Fairholm (2004); Greenleaf (1998); Hesselbein (2002); Kotter (1996); Kouzes & Posner (2003); Nye (2008)	
Developing and Maintaining Relationships	Burns (1995); G. Fairholm (1991); M. Fairholm (2004); Hesselbein (2002); Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy (1995); Komives, Lucas ,& McMahon (2007); Ouchi (2001); Vroom (1995); Wheatley (1999)	Astin & Leland (1991); Belenky et al. (1986); Danowitz, Sagaria, & Johnsrud (1988); Follett (2001); Gilligan (1993); Helgesen (1990); Komives (1991); McDade et al. (2008); Whitt (1993)
Developing Self-Confidence		Astin & Leland (1991); Danowitz, Sagaria, & Johnsrud (1988); Micas (1991)
Empowering	Komives, Lucas, & McMahon (2007)	Astin & Leland (1991); Danowitz, Sagaria, & Johnsrud (1988); McDade et al. (2008)
Finding Voice		Baxter Magolda (1992); Belenky et al.(1986); Gilligan (1993); Helgesen (1990); Micas (1991); Whitt (1993)
Listening	Covey (1990); G. Fairholm (1991); M. Fairholm (2004); Hesselbein (2002); Komives, Lucas, & McMahon (2007); Kouzes & Posner (2003); Wheatley (1999)	McDade et al. (2008)
Sharing Information	M. Fairholm (2004); Von Bertalanffy (1968); Wheatley (1999)	Danowitz, Sagaria, & Johnsrud (1988); Helgesen (1990); Rosner (1990)

The nine key leadership components are initially defined below:

- *Creating Experiential Learning* deals with giving individuals the opportunity to practice leadership skills that encourage independence.
- *Cultivating Values* deals with the core principles and beliefs that serve as the foundation for the sorority.
- *Defining Vision* includes the notion of embodying the core purpose and setting direction for decision-making.
- *Developing and Maintaining Relationships* involves intentionally creating opportunities for individuals to connect with one another in a personal and meaningful way.
- *Developing Self-Confidence* involves having a good sense and image of oneself.

- *Empowering* is the process of giving information and power to another individual for the purpose of enabling, teaching, and further enhancing the other's success.
- *Finding Voice* is the ability to discover and articulate internal beliefs.
- *Listening* involves the act of truly hearing and understanding what another individual is saying.
- *Sharing Information* is informing individuals that the act of sharing information leads to empowerment and allows for the individual/organization to maximize success.

These concepts are further described in the discussion section as they relate to specific survey responses. This allows analysis to be framed through the lens of extant research using language specifically emerging from the literature. The methods used to collect and evaluate data for analysis follow.

Method

This study examined the perceptions about leadership education of individuals working at or volunteering for a inter/national sorority headquarters. A researcher-developed survey, created based on leadership components detailed in the review of literature, was distributed to each of the 26 NPC sorority headquarters, with the request the individual responsible for leadership programming, the inter/national president, and the executive director complete the survey. A total of 28/78 surveys, or 36% were returned. The survey was structured in a Likert scale format, prompting participants to rate their organization's programming based on the emphasis, importance, and effectiveness of the program in addressing each of the nine leadership components.

Participants included 12/26 staff members responsible for leadership programming, 11/26 inter/national presidents, and 5/26 executive directors. Of the 26 total NPC groups, 18 (69%) sororities participated through at least one of their participants (inter/national president, executive director, or staff member) completing the survey. All respondents were female, and the average length of service in their current role was three years. The methods used to analyze data were based on the research questions and purposes of the study. SPSS was used as the statistical software to analyze the data. Mean, percentage, and standard deviation were calculated and reported.

Two primary limitations are acknowledged that affect generalizabiltiy. First, the response rate of this study ($n = 78$) was low; however, 18 of the 26, or 69%, of the NPC groups were represented. Great efforts were made to increase participation in this study. The struggles the researcher faced in data access further demonstrate the continuing challenges associated with the study of sororities. This consideration is discussed further in the recommendations. Secondly, the sample of this study was only drawn from NPC organizations. The author recognizes this as a limitation of the study, as sororities from the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations, Inc.; National Pan-Hellenic Council, Inc.; National Multicultural Greek Council, Inc.; National APIA Panhellenic Association, Inc.; Native American sororities; and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender sororities are not included. . This study introduces the opportunity for future study on how diverse sororities provide leadership education to members.

Results

All 18 participating sororities offered leadership programming through leadership institutes, inter/national conferences and conventions, workshops and trainings, mandated programs, optional programs, and traveling consultants. Of these groups, 88.9% offered leadership programming through regional meetings. Programming for leadership occurred most within leadership institutes and through traveling consultant presentations. Leadership institutes and regional meetings were perceived as more effective in achieving leadership outcomes. Table 2 summarizes mean and standard deviation for each leadership component based on perceived emphasis, importance, and effectiveness.

Table 2
Leadership Components and Composite Means (1-5 M scale[1])

	Emphasis	Importance	Effectiveness
Creating Experiential Learning	3.82 (.58)	3.94 (.72)	3.65 (.67)
Cultivating Values	4.42 (.77)	4.59 (.71)	4.03 (.85)
Defining Vision	4.04 (.71)	4.12 (.62)	3.81 (.70)
Developing and Maintaining Relationships	4.24 (.64)	4.31 (.65)	3.93 (.68)
Developing Self-Confidence	3.74 (.50)	3.80 (.60)	3.44 (.55)
Empowering	3.88 (.54)	4.20 (.61)	3.67 (.73)
Finding Voice	3.57 (.75)	3.60 (.71)	3.40 (.55)
Listening	3.45 (.75)	3.55 (.83)	3.26 (.74)
Sharing Information	3.95 (.95)	3.99 (.92)	3.58 (.92)

[1] 1 = not at all, 3 = somewhat, 5 = heavy

The most emphasized leadership components, based on headquarters staff perceptions, were cultivating values (*m* = 4.42), developing and maintaining relationships (*m* = 4.24), and defining vision (*m* = 4.04). Listening (*m* = 3.45) and finding voice (*m* = 3.57) were the bottom two components. Standard deviation measures demonstrated a moderate variability among responses: developing self-confidence (*sd* = .50), empowering (*sd* = .54), and creating experiential learning (*sd* = .58) were fairly consistent, while the most variable was sharing information (*sd* = .95).

The most important leadership components, based on headquarters staff perceptions, were cultivating values (*m* = 4.59), developing and maintaining relationships (*m* = 4.31), and empowering (*m* = 4.20). Listening (*m* = 3.55) and finding voice (*m* = 3.60) were the bottom two components. Standard deviation measures demonstrated a moderate variability among responses: developing self-confidence (*sd* = .60), empowering (*sd* = .61), and defining vision (*sd* = .62) were fairly consistent, while the most variable was sharing information (*sd* = .92).

The most effective leadership component, based on headquarters staff perceptions, was cultivating values (*m* = 4.03), which was the only component to average over 4. Listening (*m* = 3.26), finding voice (*m* = 3.40), and developing self-confidence (*m* = 3.44) were the bottom three components. Standard deviation measures demonstrated a higher variability among responses

than the other categories: developing self-confidence (*sd* = .55) and finding voice (*sd* = .55) were fairly consistent, while the most variable was sharing information (*sd* = .92).

Discussion

Sororities offer a wide range of programming which promotes members' leadership development. Sorority leaders consistently noted their programs emphasized cultivating organizational values and developing and maintaining relationships, which are critical aspects for women entering the work force and global community. While participants also listed other leadership components as important or effective, two were consistently missing from programming – developing self-confidence and finding voice, both individual leadership values. A discussion of these four components, related to the previously reviewed literature, follows. Each subheading is labeled according to whether it was "supported" or "not supported" by the findings of this research.

Cultivating Values (Supported)

This study found cultivating values was rated highest of the nine leadership components for emphasis, importance, and effectiveness. Cultivating values was identified as curriculum and/or programming geared toward strengthening the core principles and beliefs serving as the foundation for a sorority. Values-based leadership is consistently referenced in literature related to fraternity/sorority organizations, programs, communities, and professional associations. Theorists who support values-based, transformational leadership note the importance of leaders having a set of core values. Wheatley (1999) stated that values strengthen organizations, provide clarity, and serve as a guide when chaos occurs. Fairholm (2004) added that organizational and individual values dictate behavior.

This continued emphasis on values-based leadership would serve sorority members well as they enter the professional setting. Today's world is filled with complex issues, and values-based leaders are needed to navigate toward a peaceful, productive, and prosperous society. For sorority professionals, including campus professionals and inter/national sorority leaders, it is important to support values-based leadership education through intentional discussions with undergraduate sorority leaders. Campus professionals and inter/national leaders should work intentionally with sorority leaders on programming aimed at cultivating values, focusing efforts on how values assist in the organizational decision-making process. These discussions will further support the leadership development of students, and it will assist in holding sorority members accountable to their publicly stated values.

Developing and Maintaining Relationships (Supported)

The findings in this study showed relationship building was a high priority for leadership education within NPC sororities, as evidenced by this leadership component ranking second for emphasis, importance, and effectiveness. Developing and maintaining relationships was identified as curriculum and/or programming intentionally creating opportunities for individuals to connect with one another in a personal and meaningful way. As early as the 1920s, Follett (2001) asserted creating positive relationships is critical if one wishes to maintain a healthy and productive working organization. Similar to values-based leadership, relationship building will serve the women well as they enter today's complex society. In order to effectively lead, women

must know how to create, nurture, and maintain relationships to affect positive change (Komives et al., 2007).

Developing Self-Confidence (Not Supported)

Developing self-confidence was emphasized within the women's leadership literature, yet this current study notes this component consistently ranked seven or eight (of nine) in terms of emphasis, importance, and effectiveness. Developing self-confidence was identified as curriculum and/or programming intended to help women develop a good sense and image of self. To create and maintain healthy, productive, and empowering relationships, one must first have a high self-confidence level. In a frequently cited study, Astin and Leland (1991) found women who were successful leaders were aware of and felt good about their leadership talents and educational capabilities.

Developing self-confidence adds authenticity to leadership. Followers want to be led by leaders who feel good about themselves, who feel confident in their leadership, and who have a good sense of self. This promotes genuine and meaningful interactions. Since developing self-confidence is emphasized within the literature, it is recommended sororities place greater emphasis on this leadership component.

Finding Voice (Not Supported)

Finding voice was also emphasized within the women's leadership literature, yet this current study notes this component consistently ranked seven or eight (of nine) in terms of emphasis, importance, and effectiveness. Finding voice was identified as curriculum and/or programming strengthening the ability of women to discover and articulate internal beliefs. Helgesen (1990) noted being truthful to oneself was the key to finding one's voice. Baxter Magolda (1992) mirrored this assertion by stating, "voice is a mode of manifesting internal truth" (p. 230).

If sororities wish to strengthen their members' leadership development capabilities, finding voice must be further emphasized in sorority leadership programming. As organizations that place great emphasis on leadership, it is critical sorority women learn, implement, and promote self-reflection, an activity that helps facilitate by understanding and finding voice. Sorority professionals, including campus professionals and inter/national sorority leaders, may want to examine current programs aimed specifically at women's leadership development to determine if this component, seemingly missing from inter/national programming, might be included in campus-based programming.

Recommendations

Develop an Assessment Plan

Accountability and assessment are highly emphasized within the current educational environment, as evidenced by the 2006 Spellings Report regarding the future of higher education (US Department of Education). If sororities indicate leadership is a priority, they must be able to quantify and qualify it through research (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006). In addition, if sororities wish to progress they must conduct assessments to determine if their programming is meeting the needs of their members and if the programming is meeting its intended objectives. Beyond internal research, sororities must also embrace research by external entities to ensure objectivity and gain credibility.

Unfortunately, as demonstrated by the low response rate for this study, gaining access to data on NPC-affiliated organization leadership programming is a challenge. Knowing research is highly restricted within this population, the author actively sought out allies within the NPC population for support of this research. In addition, the author contacted the NPC Research Committee Chair to gain approval for the study and was informed the survey did not need committee approval as it did not ask undergraduates for participation. This information was clearly communicated to the participants in the cover letter, yet some still noted it was against their organization's policy. Despite these efforts by the researcher, this study yielded a small response rate, thus showing the study of sororities for further understanding continues to be a challenge.

Make Assessment Data Available
Leadership is stated as a high priority for NPC sororities. Sororities display this priority through their organizations' Web sites, creeds, mission, vision, and purpose statements. If leadership development is truly a priority, programming efforts must go beyond these written statements. Sororities should record and publish statistics regarding the number of women who actually participate in leadership development programs. Many of the leadership programs are focused on specific officer positions rather than targeting the entire membership. Since 82% of the women who join sororities indicate they do so because of leadership opportunities (NPC/NIC Research Initiative, 2002), it is critical that sororities meet this need or they will quickly find themselves irrelevant.

Sororities could benefit from publicly available and easy to access assessment data that examines the effectiveness of the leadership programming. This information could be shared between the 26 NPC groups to see which groups are excelling at leadership programming, and then groups could share best practices. Ultimately, effective leadership programming is essential in preparing women to be active and contributing citizens of society. NPC groups have the potential to be a powerful and predominant force in the dissemination of leadership education to women if they choose to make it a priority, if they conduct and share assessment results, and if they share their effective programs with one another.

Expand Leadership Institutes
The respondents of this survey perceived leadership institutes as a primary way of effectively teaching leadership to sorority women. Based on this finding, sororities should continue delivering leadership education experiences to members by expanding institutes to include more participants. Leadership institutes can be very expensive to implement and only involve a small percentage of sorority women; however, sorority foundations could solicit donations to create an endowment for the expansion of leadership institutes. Further, campus-based partnerships with the administration, local chapter, or alumnae may be viable ways to financially support women's attendance to such institutes.

Include Campus Professionals
It is important that campus professionals be familiar with the leadership programs offered to sorority women. Through this knowledge, professionals can talk with sorority women about these leadership programs and encourage participation. In addition, if sororities provide campus professionals with assessment data noting the effectiveness of their leadership programs, these

same professionals can make strong arguments for campus financial support. Professionals can also take more advantage of traveling consultant visits. Consultants' traveling schedules are often set months in advance, thus allowing professionals the opportunity to contact the consultant prior to arrival. Consultants could lead a session on a leadership topic for an individual student organization, a joint fraternity/sorority educational program, or a presentation to the general student body. Consultants also could co-lead with a campus professional furthering the learning and collaboration of all involved.

Future Research
A survey with collegiate women could show if leadership programs are effective and meeting the objectives of the program. If sororities continue to place less emphasis on the components studied in women's leadership research, their members will be lacking the complete skills necessarily for effective leadership. A future study examining why these aspects are absent in leadership programming could prove to be beneficial to leadership educators.

Conclusion

Areas for growth include increasing access and participation in research by external entities, which will assist in gaining research credibility and will evaluate effectiveness of current programming. In addition, sororities must look for ways to increase the number of women who participate in their leadership programs. Finally, sororities need to examine current leadership programming to determine if they are including the key leadership components detailed in this study. Inclusion of these key leadership components will provide the collegiate women with a comprehensive leadership development experience, which will ultimately best prepare them for leadership roles after leaving campus.

References

Astin, H., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1992). *Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in students' intellectual development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Burns, J. M. (1995). Transactional and transforming leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 100-101). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Chemers, M. M. (1995). Contemporary leadership theory. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 83-99). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Ciulla, J. B. (1995). Messages from the environment: The influence of policies and practices on employee responsibility. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 492-499). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Fireside.

Danowitz, Sagaria, M.A., & Johnsrud, L. K. (1988). Generative leadership. *New Directions for Student Services, 44*, 13-26.

Fairholm, G. W. (1991). *Values leadership: Toward a new philosophy of leadership*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Fairholm, M. R. (2004). *Values, vision, vector, voice: Distinguishing authentic leadership perspectives.* Paper presented at the UNL Gallup Leadership Institute Inaugural Summit, Omaha, NE. Retrieved September 13, 2010, from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/aspa/unpan018801.pdf

Follett, M. P. (2001). The giving of orders. In J. M. Shafritz, & J. S. Ott (Eds). *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 152-157), Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group.

Gandhi, M. (1995). Satyagraha. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 72-80). New York, NY: The Free Press.

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

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler.

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership.* New York, New York, NY: Doubleday Currency.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1995a). Behavioral theories of leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 144-148). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1995b). Situational leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 207-211). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Hesselbein, F. (2002). *Hesselbein on leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1995). Power, influence, and influence tactics. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 339-351). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Komives, S. R. (1991). Gender differences in the relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership and achieving styles. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*(2), 155-165.

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

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *The leadership challenge*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McDade, S. A., King, P. J., Chuang, Y., Morahan, P. S., Nooks, K. A., Sloma-Williams, L., & Richman, R. C. (2008). A window into the culture of leadership within higher education through the leadership definitions of women faculty: A case study of ELAM women faculty alumnae. *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education, 1*, 74-102.

McGregor, D. M. (2001). The human side of enterprise. In Shafritz, J. M. & Ott, J. S. (Eds), *Classics of Organization Theory* (pp. 179-184). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group.

Micas, S. S. (1991). The WILL program: An undergraduate leadership program for women. *Initiatives, 53*(4), 19-24.

National Panhellenic Conference. (1999). *Manual of information* (13th ed.). Indianapolis, IN.

NPC/NIC Research Initiative. (2002). *2002 Report of research results*. [Brochure]. Indianapolis, IN.

Nye, J. S. (2008). *The powers to lead.* USA: Oxford University Press.

Ouchi, W. G. (2001). The z organization. In J. M. Shafritz, & J. S. Ott (Eds), *Classics of Organization Theory* (pp. 434-445). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group.

Peters, C., & Lutovsky, B. (2001). Fostering learning outcomes in fraternity and sorority involvement. *Campus Activities Programming.* 73-75.

Rosner, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review 68*(6), 119-125.

Semersheim, K. L. (1996). Undergraduate Greek leadership experiences: A proven method for gaining career related and life-long skills. *Campus Activities Programming, 29*(3), 56-60.

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.

Torres, V., Jones, S. R., & Renn, K. A. (2009). Identity development theories in student affairs: Origins, current status, and new approaches. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 577-596.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education.* Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/pre-pub-report.pdf

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York, NY: Braziller.

Vroom, V. H. (1995). Decision-making and the leadership process. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 418-427). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Wiggam, A. E. (1931). The biology of leadership. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *Business Leadership* (pp. 13-32). New York, NY: Pitman.

Whitt, E. J. (1993, November). *I can be anything! Student leadership in three women's colleges.* Paper presented at the ASHE Annual Meeting, Pittsburgh, PA.

Author Autobiography

Dr. Genevieve Evans Taylor is executive director of Associated Students Inc. at California State University Channel Islands.

LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES BASED ON MEMBERSHIP IN MULTICULTURAL GREEK COUNCIL (MGC) ORGANIZATIONS

Eric Atkinson, Laura A. Dean, and Michelle M. Espino

This study explored how involvement in Multicultural Greek Council (MGC) organizations promoted leadership development for five undergraduate students at the University of Georgia, a predominately White, research-extensive institution in the Southeast. Findings highlight significant leadership outcomes from involvement such as an increased sense of belonging to the campus community, opportunities for leadership development, interpersonal relationships influenced by organizational culture and peer expectations, and specific leadership skills development. Implications for practice are included.

Membership in fraternities and sororities has served as a springboard for leadership, fellowship, and service on college/university campuses for nearly two centuries. Thus, fraternities and sororities can serve as powerful learning environments that foster personal growth and development (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Despite the opportunities afforded through membership in these organizations, historically White fraternities and sororities are often marked as exclusionary, particularly in recruiting students of color (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005; Kimbrough, 2003). Organizations representing Latina/o, Asian, and Native American membership have recently expanded, as have distinct multicultural interest groups (Brown et al., 2005; Castro, 2004; Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

Larger national umbrella councils, such as the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO) and the National Multicultural Greek Council (NMGC) formed to represent the interests of these organizations. Campus affiliates of these groups traditionally operate independently of campus Interfraternity Councils, Panhellenic Councils, and National Pan-Hellenic Councils. This study explored the experiences of students involved in groups affiliated with the National Multicultural Greek Council (NMGC), a national governing council currently comprised of 11 groups whose mission is to "act as an alliance to unite all multicultural and multiethnic, Greek-letter Fraternities and Sororities under one national entity" (NMGC, 2010). The local affiliate at the site of this study is the Multicultural Greek Council (MGC).

The mixed effects of involvement on members of historically White and historically Black fraternities and sororities are well established, especially with regard to alcohol and other drug abuse, retention, satisfaction with the college experience, service, philanthropy, academics, leadership, involvement, and hazing (Asel, Seifert, & Pascarella, 2009; Martin, Hevel, & Asel, 2008; see also Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). A limited amount of this research has focused on experiences of students within MGC organizations, namely examining the factors that affect ethnic identity development and the leadership experiences of MGC organization members at predominately White institutions (Guardia, 2006; Guardia & Evans, 2008; Layzer, 2000; Montelongo & Ortiz, 2001; Reis, 2004).

Literature on other fraternal organizations and literature pertaining to participation in cultural student organizations and leadership development relating to MGC organization membership

is reviewed below. The objective of this qualitative exploration of leadership development among fraternity/sorority members was to understand the extent to which members perceived their involvement in MGC organizations affected leadership development.

Literature Review

In their most recent review of literature on involvement, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) reported membership in fraternities and sororities can provide opportunities for peer interaction, academic support, campus involvement, community service, and leadership development. Actively involved fraternity/sorority members are more likely to assume positional leadership roles, make a difference in the campus life and the local community, remain active in civic issues after college, and be engaged in numerous student organizations, aspects that point to leadership development (Astin & Astin, 2000).

Based on findings pertaining to the impact on students of membership in ethnic and cultural student organizations, MGC member organizations have the potential to facilitate ethnic/racial identity development and enhance a sense of belonging for students of color (Castro, 2004; Guardia & Evans, 2008; Mina, Cabrales, Juarez, & Rodriguez-Vasquez, 2004; Sidanius, Van Laar, Levin, & Sinclair, 2004). Ethnic or culturally based student organizations influence academic success through social support, access to faculty of color, and an increased level of self-efficacy that can lead to a stronger academic identity (Baker, 2008; Negy & Lunt, 2008). These factors can enhance satisfaction with the university, improve overall persistence, and solidify a commitment to serving communities of color and society after college (Brown et al., 2005).

Since MGC organizations focus on culture, members are generally expected to give back to their communities and serve as mentors and role models (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). MGC organizations provide unity and a sense of belonging on campus, particularly at predominantly White institutions (PWI). This form of cultural involvement helps students of color feel connected to the institution by serving as a support mechanism (Chavous, 2000; Sidanius et al., 2004). Specifically, Mina et al. (2004) found that sources of support "reinforce pride in their heritage and cultural values" (p. 84). Culturally based student organizations help students gain cultural familiarity with others; serve as conduits for cultural expression and advocacy; and validate students' lived experiences on campus (Museus, 2008).

The purpose of the present study is to document leadership development outcomes among MGC members. Strayhorn (2006) provided a definition of leadership development that guided the present inquiry:

> 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 (p. 93).

Conceptual Framework

The student affairs division at the University of Georgia, where the study was conducted, developed a definition of leadership that was also used to interpret the data as every day practice. It is reflective of specific outcomes stemming from the *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). The Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Astin & Astin, 2000) was specifically integrated into the theoretical leadership context developed by CAS (Strayhorn, 2006). The Division of Student Affairs spent a year creating development and learning objectives for functional areas based on the FALDOs. The *Student Affairs Learning and Development Objectives* (SALDOs) were the result of this initiative (Campus Division of Student Affairs, n.d.).

For the purpose of this study, the operational definition of 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" (Campus Division of Student Affairs, n.d.). By including this operational definition in the analysis, the authors were able to determine the extent to which leadership development was fostered among MGC members.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative approach to understand the relationship between leadership development and participant involvement with MGC fraternities and sororities. Because the focus of the study was on participants' lived experiences within a particular cultural context (i.e., a culturally based fraternity/sorority), an inductive strategy was essential (Creswell, 2007). Context is an important aspect of sharing narratives, because it involves the "historical moment of the telling; the race, class, and gender systems the [participants] manipulate to survive and within which their talk has to be interpreted" (Riessman, 1993, p. 21). As a result, the authors searched for meaning making as it pertained to the leadership stories shared by members of MGC groups at a PWI using narrative analysis (Riessman, 1993).

Institutional Profile
The site for the study was the University of Georgia (UGA), a predominantly White, research-extensive, institution in the Southeast. According to an official University publication, the undergraduate population totaled 25,335 in 2007 with an enrollment of 82% White students and 14% students of color (Campus College Portrait).

A total of 59 fraternities and sororities were registered as student organizations at the institution at the time of the study. Each chapter belonged to one of four governing councils advised through the Greek Life Office: the Interfraternity Council (IFC), MGC, National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), and Panhellenic Council (NPC). Each of these groups is the local collegiate council that centralizes the campus efforts and activities of its member chapters. After only 10 years of existence at UGA, the eight MGC chapters, representing Asian, South Asian, and Latina/o cultures, comprised 12% of the total fraternity/sorority membership on campus. With

NPHC groups representing another 8% of fraternity/sorority membership, the proportion of students of color across the fraternity/sorority community was higher than the proportion in the undergraduate student body. The UGA MGC groups have provided students from various cultural backgrounds with opportunities to participate in fraternal organizations while also developing relationships based on shared cultural identities.

Participants

Following IRB approval for the study, a purposeful sample of five undergraduate students, two males and three females, were selected. Participants were recruited based on their active involvement (defined for the study as a dues-paying member of a MGC-affiliated chapter who was in good standing with the organization); each had at least one year of experience as an initiated member, and two of them played a role in the formation of their specific chapter or the MGC itself. Students were not chosen based on having leadership roles; however, the interviews revealed that holding a leadership position is the norm for students involved in MGC. Brief profiles of the participants are reflected in Table 1.

Table 1
Participant Demographics (pseudonyms chosen by participants)

Pseudonym	Year	Organization type	Affiliation Year
Sara	4th year	Asian interest sorority	1st semester freshman
Hanna	2nd year	Asian interest sorority	1st semester freshman; Legacy
Sally	3rd year	Latina interest sorority	1st semester freshman
Zach	3rd year	South Asian, multicultural fraternity	1st semester freshman
John	4th year	Latino interest fraternity	2nd year; founding member

[1] A legacy is an individual who has a family member who joined the same fraternity or sorority.

Trustworthiness and Researcher Role

The primary researcher was a student affairs professional who supervised the Greek Life area, and all three authors are members of a fraternity or sorority. The authors acknowledge ethical considerations and potential biases inherent in being supporters of fraternity and sorority communities (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Participants could have perceived the primary researcher as an authority figure with power over the Greek Life area, MGC, and/or individual organizations. Therefore, the primary researcher, who interviewed the participants, worked to ensure a safe atmosphere based on a strong rapport and sense of trust with the council.

The researcher first attended a council meeting, explained the study, answered questions and concerns, and asked for volunteers. Prior to the interviews, the researcher reviewed the consent form with each participant, stressing that participation was voluntary. The participants were also informed that there were no 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 primary researcher further explained that foreseeable risks would be minimized, as no identifiable information about the participant would be collected or shared with others. All participants were asked to choose pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality, and chapters were described by cultural identity.

Data Collection and Analysis
Data were collected through individual, semi-structured interviews conducted over a three-week period during the fall 2008 semester. The interview protocol consisted of eight questions focusing on participant level of involvement in their chapters, leadership development (as defined by the participants themselves to avoid constraining their conceptualization of leadership), and moments when leadership was demonstrated. Transcribed interviews were analyzed using the constant comparative method (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This form of analysis is intended to result in the recognition of recurring patterns, which is a process of meaning making drawn from rich descriptions ultimately leading to the creation of underlying themes. Participants drew on their experiences, which were then compared with emerging categories of leadership development as defined by the site institution's Division of Student Affairs.

Findings and Discussion

Participants in this qualitative study of leadership development initially sought membership in MGC fraternities and sororities to find and develop close friendships. Equally important was the avenue to celebrate one's devotion to cultural awareness. Opportunities fostering the development of leadership skills were readily and, at times, immediately available for newly initiated members. As a result, their stories of leadership development also included the pressure to be a leader as an underlying theme.

Friendship and Cultural Awareness as Organizational Purpose
Participants reported experiencing a difficult time fitting into undergraduate university life, and joining a MGC group helped them establish close friendships based on sisterhood and brotherhood. Sara (Asian-interest sorority member) shared, "there might be a lot of [other] organizations, however, just being from a small town and also being from a minority group, those were not an option for me." Other participants also noted that the institution, and the nature of the mainstream fraternity/sorority community in particular, were not welcoming places. Sally (Latina-interest sorority member) indicated that she did not "relate to other students on campus," and John (Latino-interest fraternity member) believed that establishing a new fraternity would help him feel "truly welcomed" in the institution. MGC organizations publicly emphasize principles of sisterhood/brotherhood. Students clearly stated MGC groups allowed them to form close relationships that led to a sense of security on campus.

Participants believed the mission and purpose of MGC organizations was to develop close sisterhood/brotherhood bonds and to increase and sustain cultural awareness. Sara stated, "our main mission is to spread Asian awareness, and through this sorority I have gained more confidence in being Asian American on campus. We always say [the sorority is a] home-away-from-home." John stated a similar conviction, "[our mission is] cultural awareness and being role models to our [Latino] community. To provide a family away from home." Sally believed that giving back to the Latino/a community was an important part of her sorority's responsibility, stating "The mission of our sorority is to provide sisterhood…and being role models for others that are not in college, younger people." The participants' social lives often revolved around activities that promoted or celebrated cultural awareness. These activities included sponsoring

philanthropic events that improved an aspect or quality of life affecting the population of a particular culture and mentoring high school students, both in the local campus community and at home, who shared the same cultural identity.

Leadership as a Benefit of Involvement

The participants believed leadership development was a direct benefit of involvement in MGC organizations. Participants shared examples of being involved (at high levels) as opposed to just being a member listed on the chapter's role. This involvement could be characterized as active participation:

> Leadership is definitely a part of what we do and who we try to become as sisters…. [It is one of the] benefits of becoming a sister or being a part of the organization, you do gain that leadership experience. I feel that everybody who has come into our sisterhood has grown as a leader in some way (Hanna, Asian-interest sorority member).

According to participants, members tend to stay actively involved in positions of leadership during their entire undergraduate careers, thus creating a "leadership ladder" of opportunity. Participants explained how they first started in smaller leadership positions, which ultimately led to more responsibility over time. Many of the participants held positions as chapter president or vice president.

Participants' membership in an MGC-affiliated chapter allowed these students to identify personal leadership styles and philosophies. Sara said, "You can be a different type of president or different type of leader without doing the same things as long as you find your own way to make things work." Chapter members looked for leadership potential as they sought new members. Sara confided, "I think sometimes what other people don't know is when we rush girls, one of the things we look for is leadership [potential]." Although not always publicly stated on MGC or chapter Web sites (Campus Multicultural Greek Council, n.d.), as reflected in the quotations above, these groups looked for leadership qualities in new members to advance the organization.

Expectations of Leadership

Participants eagerly described involvement with their respective organizations. Most of them believed that all active members were expected to assume some type of leadership role(s) within the chapter. The small chapter size (approximately 13 members per MGC group as compared to the average chapter size of 9 with NPHC groups, 83 with IFC groups, and 203 with NPC groups) afforded members the opportunity to hold numerous leadership positions. John stated, "As a small organization we each must take up a leadership role. Sometimes you have to pick up the slack because we have so few members." Zach (South Asian-interest, multicultural fraternity member) reflected on a brother who exhibited leadership within the chapter without holding a formal title. He indicated this was possible due to the size of the chapter and the need for someone to get the job done. "He [a member] got to that point where he was a leader not because of position title but because he bonded with so many different people – the fraternity does provide people with a bond of leadership."

Older members conveyed an expectation of leadership to new members through both encouragement and pressure. All participants passionately expressed the feeling of

"responsibility" to assume their chapter's legacy. Sara said, "When I crossed [was initiated] it was more about survival on our campus…. There was a lot of need to step up and carry on the legacy of what we built." Sara also shared the expectations for leadership that older members placed on her:

> [They] told me they could see me as president. There was tremendous pressure from the founding line or the founder or older sisters to say our job is not done even though we are founded, we have other goals. I would like to call it encouragement, but sometimes it's a lot of pressure.

Hanna shared a similar experience.

> I know as a neo [newly initiated member], I was always encouraged to take on leadership positions. As you transition between leadership positions…the older people who are already in that leadership position will tell you their experiences and teach you how to do things and how to get things together.

All participants held multiple leadership titles and roles within their respective organizations. The multiple leadership roles were the direct result of small organizational size. Each member was expected to assume numerous responsibilities to ensure that the chapter was operating at its maximum potential.

Leadership Skill Development
The participants shared personal examples of times when they or a member of their organizations exhibited leadership. Through these stories, participants demonstrated how they believed leadership skills were learned and mastered through involvement in an MGC organization. Specifically, themes emerged that highlighted initiative and the ability to hold others accountable.

MGC organizations have great dependence on the initiative of of student leaders to advance the organization. MGC chapters are not as institutionalized as other student organizations or other fraternities/sororities with alumni/ae advisors and decades of involvement on campus. The participants described leadership experiences planning and coordinating retreats, meetings, stroll competitions, service projects, and conventions, with little guidance from external groups such as alumni/ae boards or inter/national leadership staff. For example, Sara proudly shared her experience coordinating a national convention that included hosting 10 chapters from Illinois and Ohio and alumnae from New York, and involved over 100 active members and alumni/ae.

Participants also gained valuable leadership skills through positive and negative experiences and the execution of chapter initiatives. Sara stated, "Leadership is something you have to acquire through experience." Hanna believed that, "Leadership is the ability to make things happen. Whatever that may be, collaborating with others, listening to others, keeping things moving as well as being able to stop and assess what is going on." Zach shared a personal story about a leader in his chapter whom he admired:

> Our external president stepped up and put himself on the line to face criticism. Got up in front of everybody in the chapter and said "Look, we are not going to go anywhere if we keep doing this. We need to do what we promised to do when we first started this [chapter]."

Membership in MGC organization allows for a wide variety of leadership skills development. Participants learned through leadership roles how to work with others and collaborate. As chapter president, Sara shared, "It was tough working with different people. I really had to think about how I presented myself. That was something that grounded me and something I do not think I would have acquired without being in my sorority." Hanna admired a chapter officer's leadership who reflected "a willingness to listen" in order to incorporate the ideas and beliefs of all members. Others learned how to be problem solvers. Zach felt like a leader because he "inspired others to do something that they wanted to do but maybe didn't have the right tools or resources at the time. So, I provided the tools and resources to help them along."

Participants identified delegation, time management, and flexibility as skills learned through leadership positions. John was the most vocal participant describing his experience as chapter president. He developed "organizational skills as well, like running the meeting and coordinating events, planning the agenda and calendar, and financing. Public speaking as well. [I also learned] multi-tasking." He believed that being a fraternity member "has definitely been a great opportunity to work in my development of leadership skills. You have to be able to affect people's lives to be a leader. Essentially motivate them into action."

Holding other members accountable provided the participants an opportunity to demonstrate a learned skill. Although this was difficult at times, it was a necessary action for the success of the fraternities and sororities. Zach shared his view on holding fraternity brothers accountable:

> You are my brother and I love you but look, you can't make this mistake again. Learn from your mistakes, don't do this again. That is an important part of any organization. If you can't hold people accountable, you will not get anywhere.

Some MGC participants shared that holding members accountable was not practiced in non-culturally based student groups to which they belonged on campus. John articulated this theme clearly:

> It goes back to the expectation. Whatever you are trying to make happen, your level of accountability is higher in a Greek chapter than in a club. By being one of those people making things happen, you allow yourself to develop leadership skills. Greek Life [sic] has been very beneficial [in that area]. You have to risk that friendship to make sure that things are being done. You might have to say something that is not being received warmly, but it needs to be said and people need to know. You have to stand for what you want to accomplish in the wake of being everybody's best friend.

Through holding others accountable, participants recognized the difference between friendship and brotherhood/sisterhood when confronting individual behavior. Sara described the dual role conflicts involved in being a leader and being a friend.

> [As a leader], you really have to split business from personal. They can still be your friend, but [they] did not do what [they] were supposed to do, so you must draw the line and not take advantage of people just because they are your friends.

John thought that holding others accountable had a broader implication affecting the entire academic community> "[A leader] has to be willing to call somebody out and setting that example not just for the chapter but for the campus."

Summary
An overview of the findings highlights significant leadership outcomes from involvement in MGC organizations. First, the participants sought membership in MGC fraternities and sororities to find and develop close friendships. As minority students at a PWI, the participants initially did not feel a part of the campus community. They were drawn to the visible mission and purpose of MGC organizations, which included forming close bonds of friendship and spreading cultural awareness. Second, the MGC groups provided participants with a true sense of belonging at UGA. Soon after joining, participants were expected to assume leadership roles within their organizations. This expectation was directed from older active members and alumni/ae. Third, the small size of the chapters required each participant to assume multiple leadership roles. The participants felt a strong sense of responsibility to lead and enhance the organization, but the leadership expectations were also experienced as a form of pressure

Fourth, leadership development and personal growth was described as a direct outcome of these opportunities. The participants held numerous formal leadership positions and could easily describe leadership experiences and outcomes. They stated that learning leadership skills was a direct benefit of membership in an MGC organization. Fifth, a wide variety of leadership skills development occurred. Participants specifically highlighted taking initiative and holding others accountable as learned traits. Although it was expected that some level of leadership growth would be validated through participant interviews, the volume of leadership experiences shared by the students was surprising. The individual chapters and the governing council both served as a laboratory for growth and development.

Relation to Division of Student Affairs Learning and Development Objectives
One lens through which to view leadership development is through the intended outcomes of the campus Student Affairs Learning and Development Objectives (SALDOs). According to this framework, leadership development is characterized by "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" (Campus Division of Student Affairs, n.d.). Using this leadership objective to interpret the data, the findings indicate that involvement in MGC organizations further developed participants' leadership skills.

The research themes identified directly connect with the division's definition of leadership. The theme of friendship and cultural awareness as an organizational purpose related to leadership objectives of self-awareness, building trust, commitment to civic responsibility, and visualization of group purpose and desired outcomes. Leadership as a benefit of involvement allowed for self-awareness as students identified personal leadership styles and philosophies. Peers who served as role models and mentors shared expectations of leadership involvement. Initiative and accountability involved risk taking and the initiation of change for the common good of the organization by holding others responsible and accountable for their actions.

By incorporating this operational definition in the analysis, the researchers were able to assess the extent to which leadership development, so defined, was fostered within the MGC organizations. Students clearly and passionately described their beliefs through descriptions and

examples confirmed through the interviews. Participants were able to articulate, demonstrate, analyze, and synthesize leadership development as defined by the division. Thus, there appears to be a strong relationship between student leadership growth and participants' involvement with their MGC organizations.

This study was unique in that the nature of leadership was explored in the context of cultural expression. Latina/o and Asian cultural contexts affected the way that the participants expressed leadership elements. Cultural affiliation specifically enhanced the meaning of their leadership experience and development. Students stated feeling a different kind of obligation and accountability towards their cultural identities and communities of color. Unlike some other student organizations found in campus life, the cultural component of MGC groups made it personal to each participant (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

Implications for Practice

The results of this study reveal that students gain a variety of leadership skills through involvement in MGC. Advisors including campus advisors, local advisors, and inter/national fraternity/sorority leaders can have a significant impact on their leadership development. Several implications for professional practice emerged that can direct the design and delivery of leadership education programs and services.

Student affairs administrators and advisors need to better understand campus organizations such as the MGC organizations as the demographics of the United States population and of those coming to college continue to change. Professionals are instrumental in developing purposeful plans to impact student learning within this unique community. Fraternities and sororities have the capacity to grow in record numbers, and professionals need to be prepared to help shape tomorrow's leaders by working more intentionally with these important student groups and their members.

Leadership development is a compelling value; the leadership skills developed through involvement in MGC organizations should be supported and documented. Leadership outcomes should be determined and measured by the individual MGC chapter in conjunction with its respective inter/national organization and the campus fraternity/sorority life office. Perhaps, in this manner, inter/national organizations will consider including leadership skills as part of their espoused values. Sharing significant leadership accomplishments and opportunities may be a beneficial outcome that can demonstrate contributions of MGC organizations to the campus learning environment and attract potential members during fraternity and sorority recruitment.

Although participants were forthcoming about their knowledge and understanding of leadership, fraternity/sorority professionals, when available to work with these groups, could have a significant impact on this learning. They can challenge members to more clearly define and articulate personal leadership philosophies and styles, especially as they relate to a unique culture. Fraternity/Sorority professionals can help students reflect on their experiences, process the learning that occurs, and apply this new knowledge for future use. It appears that students are currently only processing this leadership self-assessment on their own or with their peer groups.

Culturally aware fraternity/sorority advisors, including campus advisors, local advisors, and inter/national fraternity/sorority leaders, have the opportunity to help students reflect on their leadership experiences within the students' cultural contexts. In terms of leadership involvement, it is important for advisors to comprehend the tensions these students feel in leading their organizations. A major finding in this study indicated that participants openly shared the anxiety they felt when they immediately assumed a leadership role(s) as active members. Advisors could help new student leaders incorporate time management skills, exercise moderation, set priorities, and manage stress.

Finally, healthy behavior is a potential concern for those who work directly with these student leaders. Campus advisors, local advisors, and inter/national fraternity/sorority leaders could intentionally infuse strategies aimed at enhancing personal wellness and balance. A needs-assessment could identify what specific leadership education programs, activities, and interventions are needed to help new MGC fraternity/sorority members succeed. Advisors could also help students use peer influence for positive change and productivity; assist students in identifying and setting measurable, manageable, and meaningful personal and organizational goals; and improve these organizations by further inspiring and developing students committed to leading with integrity and core ethical values. A published statement of leadership benefits may also be used to bring about enhanced skill development and should be documented in student affairs annual reports and specific leadership program funding proposals to stakeholders.

Limitations and Further Research

This qualitative study was based on only one PWI and the experiences of five undergraduate students. There was no intent at generalizablity, though professionals working with students in similar organizations may find many parallels. Further, participants knew the topic of the interview prior to the researcher's interaction and may have tailored some of their responses based on that knowledge to elicit positive self-perceptions and presentations of their fraternity/sorority involvement. A final limiting factor is that the data were collected solely through self-report. There were no objective measures or corroborating perceptions of reported leadership skills or development.

Future research should include studies of other learning and development outcomes of involvement in MGC organizations, as well as research using objective measures of such outcomes. Based on findings such as those, targeted interventions can be developed to yield more intentional outcomes, and the effectiveness of those interventions can be assessed.

Conclusion

Member involvement in MGC fraternities and sororities was found to promote leadership development, particularly given the expectation members have of holding a variety of leadership positions. It is clear that leadership, one of the UGA Student Affairs Learning and Development Objectives, was an outcome of involvement in these groups. Membership in an MGC organization increased members' sense of belonging to the campus community, offered leadership development opportunities, involved the expectation that members assume

leadership roles, and developed specific leadership skills including initiative and accountability.

References

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/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 1-15.

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

Baker, C. N. (2008). Under-represented college students and extracurricular involvement: The effects of various student organizations on academic performance. *Social Psychology of Education, 11*, 273-298.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

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.

Campus College Portrait. (2007). Retrieved July 29, 2008, from Admissions Web site: http://www.oir.uga.edu/external/College_Portrait_UGA.pdf

Campus Division of Student Affairs. (n.d.). Retrieved August 11, 2010, from Division of Student Affairs Web site: http://www.uga.edu/studentaffairs/about/learning.htm

Castro, M. (2004, April). *The growth of multicultural organizations.* Paper presented at the meeting of Association of Fraternity Advisors. Hollywood, CA.

Chavous, T. M. (2000). The relationships among racial identity, perceived ethnic fit, and organizational environment for African American students at a predominately White university. *Journal of Black Psychology, 26*(1), 79-100.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Guardia, J. R. (2006). Nuestra identidad y experiencias (our identity and experiences): Ethnic identity development of Latino fraternity members at a Hispanic-serving institution (Proquest Dissertations And Theses, Iowa State University, 2006). *Section 0097, Part 0745 211 pages*: *Publication Number: AAT 3229078*.

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.

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

Layzer, C. (2000, April). *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.

Martin, G. L., Hevel, M. S., & Asel, A. M. (2008, November). *New evidence on the effects of fraternity and sorority affiliation: It's more complicated than you might think.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL.

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, CA: 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. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

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

National Multicultural Greek Council, Inc.. (2010). *About: Constitution*. Retrieved August 25, 2010 from http://nationalmgc.org/about/constitution/

Negy, C., & Lunt, R. A. (2008). What college students really think about ethnic student organizations. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(3), 176-192.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pike, G. R. (2000). The influence of fraternity or sorority membership on students' college experiences and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education, 41*(1), 117-139.

Reis, M. L. (2004). Latina college student success (Proquest Dissertations And Theses, Arizona State University, 2004). *Section 0010, Part 0745 156 pages: Publication Number: AAT 315244.*

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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.

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

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

Author Autobiography

Dr. Eric Atkinson serves as the Associate Dean in the Department of Campus Life at the University of Georgia. He is a member of Sigma Chi Fraternity.

Dr. Laura A. Dean serves as an Assistant Professor for the College Student Affairs Administration Program at the University of Georgia. She is a member of Kappa Delta sorority.

Dr. Michelle M. Espino serves as an Assistant Professor for the College Student Affairs Administration Program at the University of Georgia. She is a member of Sigma Lambda Gamma National Sorority, Inc.

SISTERS LEADING TOGETHER: THE EXPERIENCE OF RECRUITMENT COUNSELORS DURING SORORITY RECRUITMENT

Patricia Witkowsky

The purpose of this constructivist, ethnographic case study was to describe the experience of sorority recruitment counselors during formal recruitment at a mid-size university in the western United States. The findings of this study include the recruitment counselors' desire to give back to the fraternity/sorority community and their campus, challenges experienced during disaffiliation, their struggle between neutrality during the recruitment process and loyalty to their chapter, their perception of recruitment's "Disney World effect" (popularity of chapters due to decorations, costumes, etc.), and the development of their leadership skills. Finally, implications for fraternity/sorority professionals and researchers are presented.

The presence of sororities on college campuses began before 1902, but the organizations joined together that year under the umbrella of the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC). In 2009, more than four million women across the world were members of a sorority within the NPC. With almost 3,000 chapters on over 650 campuses across the United States and Canada and over 250,000 undergraduate and graduate members, sorority life in higher education plays an important part in the lives of many female college students (NPC, 2009). Despite the overwhelmingly negative images of sorority life portrayed in the media and literature, such as excessive alcohol use and body image issues, sororities continue to thrive as more than 90,000 undergraduate women joined a sorority during the 2008-2009 academic year (NPC).

The fraternal values of leadership, scholarship, and service provide opportunities for undergraduate women to pursue many of the intended learning outcomes of a college education (NPC, 2009). One of the many opportunities for increased involvement and leadership in sororities occurs during the recruitment of new members, when sorority women represent their chapters by serving as recruitment counselors. Recruitment counselors typically disaffiliate from their chapters to guide potential new members (PNMs) through the recruitment process and attempt to be unbiased when providing information about each of the chapters PNMs are considering. Although researchers have not yet explored the leadership experience of recruitment counselors and the challenges they face while serving as mentors to PNMs, this experience remains an important avenue for increasing involvement and leadership development in sorority women.

Therefore, the purpose of this constructivist, ethnographic case study is to describe the experience of sorority recruitment counselors during formal recruitment at a mid-size university in the western U.S. The primary research questions are:
1. What is the experience of recruitment counselors during sorority recruitment?
2. What are recruitment counselors' perspectives of the recruitment process for potential new members?

Review of Literature

A great deal of published literature in higher education around the fraternity/sorority experience explores alcohol, hazing, and body image issues - further promoting negative views of the experience. Fraternity/sorority members have been studied regarding issues including alcohol use (Alva, 1998; Caron, Moskey, & Hovey, 2004; Elias et al., 1996; Hutching, Lac, & LaBrie, 2008; LaBrie et al., 2007; Miley & Frank, 2006), eating disorders (Basow, Foran, & Bookwala, 2007; Cashel, Cunningham, Landeros, Cokley, & Muhammad, 2003; Kashubeck, Marchand-Martella, Neal, & Larsen, 1997), hazing (Spaulding, 1995), health behaviors (Dinger, 1999a; Miller, Statten, Rayens, & Noland, 2005; Shulken & Pinciaro, 1997), academic dishonesty (Williams & Janosik, 2007), sexual activity (Dinger, 1999b), and dating violence (Anderson & Danis, 2007).

Research on sororities specifically is limited, and even less literature exists on understanding the recruitment process, particularly the experiences of students involved. The available research concerning recruitment explores the impact of recruitment on academic success (Nelson, Halperin, Wasserman, Smith, & Graham, 2006; Santovec, 2004), the effects of recruitment on self-esteem (Chapman, Hirt, & Spruill, 2008), and the psychosocial effects of recruitment on students (Atlas & Morier, 1994). Participation in sororities and fraternities remains strong in higher education and the positive aspects of the experience are frequently noted by its members and fraternity/sorority professionals.

Student involvement and integration to academic and social aspects of student life have been linked to retention, academic achievement, social integration, appreciation and understanding of diversity, and a more positive college experience overall (Tinto, 1975). Astin (1999) stated that "student involvement refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 518). A major component of Astin's involvement theory holds that "the amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program" (p. 519). Sorority members are well-known for devoting a large amount of time to chapter activities, as well as developing high quality connections within their sisterhood. In a study conducted by Astin (1975) focusing on students who did not persist in college, he found that sorority participation was positively correlated with student retention. This alternative perspective of sorority involvement calls for further exploration into the experiences of sorority women and the positive contributions to its members' learning and development.

Methods

Ethnographic case study was chosen as the methodology to guide the exploration of sorority recruitment counselor culture during formal recruitment. Ethnography, commonly cited as the "hallmark of qualitative research" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 95), seeks to describe the culture of a group, including their beliefs, behaviors, and values (Goetz & LeCompte, 1993; Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Spradley & McCurdy, 1988; Wolcott, 1995). Using methods such as participant observation, document analysis, and interviews, the researcher strives to develop a written account of the culture from the insider perspective (Spradley & McCurdy, 1988). Both field notes from my observations (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995), as well as interview data using

participants' words (Merriam, 1998), are presented to understand the data gathered through the ethnographic research process.

Setting

The institution where the study occurred is in the western United States with a sorority/fraternity population representing approximately 600 of the 9,000 undergraduate students. At the time of the study, the fraternity/sorority community at the institution included five NPC sororities, seven North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) fraternities, and six multicultural fraternities and sororities. Sorority formal recruitment only involved the five NPC sorority chapters, because the multicultural sororities did not participate in formal recruitment due to specific processes and traditions. The study took place over the five-day formal sorority recruitment period in the middle of September.

Participants

Following IRB approval for the study, the total population of nineteen recruitment counselors, representing the five NPC sorority chapters, consented to participate in the study. The primary data collection method was observational and included several formal and informal settings. In most instances when the group was together, the Panhellenic Council's President, Vice President for Recruitment, Risk Management Chair, and the campus Coordinator of Fraternities and Sororities advisor were also present and participating; therefore, there perspectives were included in data collection. Five recruitment counselors were quoted using pseudonyms in the findings section, while the campus advisor, Ester (pseudonym) was also quoted when applicable. Two recruitment counselors who volunteered from an open call to all participants were interviewed following formal recruitment to provide additional data and/or clarification. No specific sample size is needed to justify qualitative research and the depth of the exploration with the two recruitment counselors provided strong data to support my observations of the recruitment process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Recruitment counselors were selected in the spring semester prior to fall recruitment. They underwent training throughout the summer consisting of teambuilding activities and skill-based education to gain the knowledge and expertise needed to guide the 75 PNMs through the recruitment process. Additionally, recruitment counselors were required to officially disaffiliate from their sorority chapter in May after graduation and remain disaffiliated until the day when PNMs receive their invitations to join the sororities (Bid Day).

Prior to the week of recruitment and following their training, the recruitment counselors were actively involved in recruiting undergraduate women to participate in recruitment activities. Once PNMs registered to participate, they were assigned to a small group of three to four other interested students and had two recruitment counselors available to answer their questions throughout the recruitment process. During the recruitment activities, the recruitment counselors informed PNMs of their schedules for each night. Additionally, the recruitment counselors escorted PNMs between chapter houses for the four nights of recruitment activities. Finally, the recruitment counselors spent time debriefing with their small group of PNMs each night before deciding which chapters the PNMs wanted to preference.

Gaining Access to the Field

Before beginning this study, I obtained access to the site and the participants through discussions with the fraternity/sorority professionals and Panhellenic Council Recruitment Chair. Sororities and their members value the traditions and rituals of their individual chapters and did not want to allow me access to the chapter houses where the recruitment activities occurred because of previous negative press. However, the recruitment counselors were not allowed into the sorority houses during recruitment either, so my entrance into them was not necessary to develop an understanding of the recruitment counselor culture. I was granted access to explore the experience of the recruitment counselors, thus not compromising the privacy of the sorority chapters.

Data Collection

As a participant observer, I interacted with and shadowed the recruitment counselors for 36.5 hours throughout the five-day formal recruitment process (Goetz & LeCompte, 1993). I kept a notebook and writing tool with me at all times to record observations of the settings, recruitment counselors' interactions with each other and with the PNMs, and a chronology of the events. The initial jottings from the field were expanded into full narratives of the observations and interpretations each day. As a result of the observations, theoretical notes (Richardson, 2000) also emerged as I began to make connections between what I was seeing and hearing and my knowledge of theory related to student involvement and leadership. I also maintained a researcher journal wherein I recorded my thoughts about the research process (Richardson, 2000). In addition to the observations, I was in continual dialogue with the fraternity/sorority professionals about the process and challenges. I also spoke with the recruitment counselors informally while in the field. The final step in data collection culminated in two one hour, semi-structured individual interviews with two recruitment counselors who expressed an interest in being interviewed. A sample of the interview questions developed following my time in the field and hours of reflection included:

1) Why did you want to be a recruitment counselor?
2) What did you gain from the experience of being a recruitment counselor?
3) What was the most challenging part of being a recruitment counselor?
4) How is the recruitment experience similar to and different from the rest of the sorority experience?

I completed transcriptions of the interviews and combined the interview data with the field notes during the analysis.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began the moment I started observing the recruitment counselor culture and recruitment process (Huberman & Miles, 2001; Merriam, 1998; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Stake, 1995). I continually identified themes in the journals I kept throughout the data collection process. Following the initial stages of analysis, including deciding what to notice, record, and describe (Clifford, 1990), I immersed myself in the data by reading through the journals, field notes, and interview transcripts. Next, I re-read the data and took note of emerging themes through an inductive coding process (Patton, 2002). The themes emerged as I saw "phrases, events, activities, behaviors, [and] ideas" re-occur in the data (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 46). Following the development of multiple themes, I reviewed them for similarities and combined data and themes where overlap appeared (LeCompte & Schensul).

Findings

The findings presented below emerged from field notes during 36.5 hours of participant observation during formal recruitment, as well as data from individual interviews with two recruitment counselors following their recruitment experience. The data collected bear little resemblance to the results of previous studies of sorority members. This study provides an insider perspective into the views of the recruitment process and the values and beliefs of the recruitment counselors. Findings in the areas of giving back, challenges with disaffiliation, struggling between neutrality and loyalty, the Disney World effect, and leadership skills will be presented.

Giving Back
As is a common theme among students in leadership positions, the recruitment counselors' reasons for choosing to apply and accept the position involved wanting to give back to sorority life on campus and contribute to the positive experience of PNMs. When asked about her decision to apply to be a recruitment counselor, Ella shared:

> I think just to like give back, I think would be the biggest thing. And just like help sororities and fraternities in general….I wanted to be like there to help build that and bring sororities and fraternities together instead of branching off.

The recruitment counselors saw a problem they wanted to address within the fraternity/sorority community at the university and by serving their community they were able to make an impact. Each had positive experiences once becoming sorority members, but frequently did not have the most positive experience with their recruitment counselor when they were PNMs and thus decided to change that relationship for others. Ella's experience highlighted that sentiment:

> When I went through [recruitment] as a freshman, I didn't have a good recruitment counselor that I felt comfortable with….Ever since then, I've been [sic] I want to like help freshmen and I feel like I'm a really sociable person, so when it comes to shy little freshmen, I'm like 'hi.'…I felt like to be there for them so that they could have somebody they felt comfortable with and could talk to.

Oftentimes, sororities are perceived as portraying a false image and many of the recruitment counselors were working against those stereotypes. Ava's main goal for serving as a recruitment counselor was to "be seen as a leader and positive role model. We want to do good things for this campus. We want faculty and administration to realize we are positive role models on this campus." In addition to how they are viewed as individuals, recruitment counselors, including Ava, were concerned about the images chapters portrayed to PNMs throughout recruitment:

> It was really important for me to be able to have that impact on someone else's life before I left [the university] to make sure that if nothing else, even if I wasn't able to impact a large amount of girls, even if it was just my own direct PNMs, whether it be eight or ten of them, to really make sure that they understand fully what they were getting themselves into, that they didn't have false images or ideals in their heads of what sorority life was or the [chapters] they were potentially joining, so they weren't shell shocked.

The concern for the good of all chapters and the PNMs as they chose which chapter to join was paramount in many recruitment counselors' decisions to disaffiliate and give back to the sorority community, which was a major part of their college experience. Disaffiliation required the sacrifice of chapter affiliation expression as well as sorority friendships.

Challenges with Disaffiliation

The disaffiliation process was by no means easy for the recruitment counselors. Since the social support afforded by sorority membership is one of the hallmarks of the experience, leaving their support system was challenging. As Ava shared:

> For me it was difficult because some of my close friends live out of state, so they had been gone all summer and I hadn't seen them…And so I tried to prepare them like, 'if you guys don't get back by such and such a date, I'm not going to be able to go out in public with you anymore'….It was hard being disaffiliated just because there were so many people I wanted to say hi to and have a longer conversations with. It's hard to keep reminding yourself that you can say hi, but have to keep going, especially when you run into someone who looks like they're having a bad day and you can't check up on them to see if they're ok….It's a lot harder being disaffiliated than you think it's going to be. It's lonely. It's hard when you're going to the grocery store by yourself, going to work out by yourself and just everything by yourself.

Another recruitment counselor, Linda, described her experience living in her sorority house while disaffiliated. After an informal conversation, I recorded the following field notes:

> She said she has been using the backdoor when she comes and goes and will have to move out of her house the night before recruitment begins and remain out until it ends. She said it's hard because she has paid for the food, but can't eat it, so she intends on raiding the kitchen before she leaves. She and the others who live in their houses will stay with other [recruitment counselors] who live off campus until the end of recruitment.

Struggle Between Neutrality and Loyalty

The primary factor in a recruitment counselor's effectiveness is the maintenance of neutrality in the eyes of the PNMs. As is stated in the institution's Recruitment Handbook (not cited to preserve confidentiality), recruitment counselors are "required to be completely unbiased" (p. 12). At the beginning of the summer before recruitment, the recruitment counselors were required to disaffiliate, or cease contact, with members of their chapter. They struggled between the need to be neutral in order to work with the PNMs through their decision-making process without fear of knowing which chapter their recruitment counselor belonged to and their bonds of sisterhood and previously pledged, life-long membership to their chapter. Although they were to be neutral and disaffiliated, the recruitment counselors still sought fairness in the process for their own chapter and experienced struggles being unbiased. The recruitment counselors revealed this theme both explicitly and implicitly.

While discussing the recruitment counselor selection process, Ava stated that only two women initially applied from her chapter. It was her feeling that "if only two applied…then it's my [chapter's] loss." However, if they are neutral, it would not matter if the chapters were equally represented among the recruitment counselors. There was also a great deal of discussion about

the number of PNMs assigned to the groups of recruitment counselors because then they would not be able to have as much influence over the PNMs. The first discussion I witnessed was at the recruitment counselor meeting following the recruitment orientation session, as recorded in my field notes:

> As Ester (the Coordinator of Fraternities and Sororities) and I walked to the Panorama Room, I asked her about the complaints from some recruitment counselors about having less PNMs than others. Ester said she just addressed them about it and that it was not at all personal and only reflected where PNMs lived as opposed to whether they thought certain recruitment counselors could handle it. She reiterated to them not to complain about their numbers.

Ella expressed her concern about the division of PNMs:

> I thought it was going to be like everyone has five girls or everyone has ten girls. Like when they divided up PNMs, I didn't know that it was not equal. Now some have two girls and some have 15 girls. And I think that discouraged a lot of people because I worked my butt off and I have two girls. For the longest time I had one girl. I feel like I could be helping my chapter more.

I also witnessed an exchange between two recruitment counselors epitomizing the tension over numbers of PNMs in groups and recorded it in my field notes:

> After individual meetings, the recruitment counselors sat back in the front row and waited for all the PNMs to leave. One recruitment counselor said to another after talking about a PNM, 'she was on my list.' The other said, 'you can have her if you want.' Then, the other said 'I'm just kidding, I don't care.'

There were several discussions where mistrust between recruitment counselors became clear despite their pledge of neutrality. In my field notes, I documented the following:

> I found out that even recruitment counselors are not allowed to go in the houses when the active sorority women are meeting with the PNMs. It seems that a lot of it is because of rituals and the possibility that recruitment counselors will tell their own chapters about what they saw and how another chapter does things. Even though they are disaffiliated from their chapters, the recruitment counselors are still connected to them and thus the distrust. They attempt to display disaffiliation from their chapters to the PNMs, but among themselves, they are still wary.

A new sisterhood was supposed to be created for recruitment, but there continued to be undertones of competition for PNMs, because each chapter wanted to have new members. Although the recruitment counselors were to have created a new sisterhood among themselves during recruitment, clearly, outside of their recruitment counselor roles, they were still connected emotionally to their chapters.

Another concern expressed by Ava was that the recruitment counselors wanted to represent their own chapter well to other recruitment counselors:

> I think somewhat we were all still on the level of wanting to make a good impression in front of the other [chapters] and needing to put our best face forward. So, I know I was nervous about one of our girls.

When asking what they found most difficult about the disaffiliation process, Ella said
> Definitely listening to girls say bad things. Because so many girls thought I was a [member of sorority A], they would talk bad about [sorority B]. Some of those girls are in [sorority B]. You talked all that crap and now look where you're standing.

During a closing meeting one night of recruitment, I documented the challenges recruitment counselors were facing:
> As the meeting started, they talked about how it's hard to hear negative things about your [chapter] and that tomorrow night's a big night. A recruitment counselor said a lot of PNMs don't know what to do. Ella suggested just going up to them and asking if they have questions. Lisa was worried because what if they don't want to talk to you because they're afraid of saying something bad about your chapter.

The recruitment counselors did their best to be sisters to each other during recruitment by doing things for each other that their sorority sisters would normally do, including baking cupcakes for someone's birthday, posting "happy birthday" signs for another's celebration, and giving roses to wish each other good luck during recruitment. The recruitment counselors also paid for and made each other the traditional paddles at the end of recruitment.

The difficulty of attempting to remain neutral and disconnected from their chapter culminated during bid night when the recruitment counselors' affiliations were revealed. The recruitment counselors were crying and happy to be back with the sisters in their chapters. They were also excited about bonding with the new members who were being revealed at bid night.

Disney World Effect

The recruitment counselors' main concern was that the PNMs would choose a chapter based on the theme nights and decorations as opposed to the experience they would have over the next several years. Throughout the recruitment process, the PNMs were encouraged to "look past the matching outfits and decorations and think about joining a sisterhood, not a picture" (Leslie). The two recruitment counselors interviewed for this study revealed their concern about the recruitment process as they discussed their distinction between recruitment and real life in a sorority. Ella's perspective was:
> I feel like recruitment is very superficial. Like, I had so many girls say [sorority B] members are such high maintenance, they're such Stepford Wives, but walk in there any other time of the year and everyone has sweats on. So like, I had so many girls say they're such Barbie dolls, and I'm like, no really, they're not. Like, I've lived there for the past two years and everyone wears sweats. So I think that is what is so misleading. And then a lot of PNMs say this is so intimidating because every chapter had a shopping, materialistic theme. Like Juicy Couture, Tiffany's, Off Broadway, Victoria's Secret. Really, that's not what they are. You could probably guess that the [chapter] that had the Juicy Couture theme only 5% have something Juicy… And I think that if I were to run recruitment, I would not let [chapters] do a materialistic theme. What everyone says about a [chapter] is not how they are like a month later and I tried to explain that to them. Everyone has these themes, don't look at them as who they are. They're just themes.

While Ella was concerned with the negative images being perceived by PNMs, Ava was concerned about the positive misperceptions on the part of the PNMs:

> Every [chapter] wants to give off the most positive image of itself, but I think a lot of times [chapters] give off the Disney World effect during recruitment and you know they attract wonderful girls and they get them in and they go to the first meeting and find out 'oh my gosh this is totally different than what I thought it was going to be.' Like, 'these girls don't treat each other like I thought they did' or 'this is a lot more serious than I thought it was,' or 'there's a lot more rules than I thought there was going to be,' or 'wow, I don't fit in here'...You're putting girls into real life situations and this is something that they're going to be in for four years. Because when all that glitter and balloons go away and they're in real life situations, they're going to live there, they're going to eat there, they're sleep there, they're going to do their homework there, they're going to cry there, laugh there, and that's where younger, less mature girls were having a really hard time being able to kind of take all those superficial things out of the room and be like ok well when all this goes away on Tuesday, am I still going to like this [chapter] just because I liked the themed night?

The Coordinator of Fraternities and Sororities was also concerned about the decision-making process of the PNMs based on superficial things. I noted a conversation with Ester in my field notes:

> Ester talked to me about wanting a 'No Frills' recruitment so PNMs don't get excited about a chapter because of their decorations. The importance of recruitment is to get to know the PNMs and decorations, skits, and slideshows do not fulfill that purpose.

Although the recruitment counselors are concerned about the images being portrayed by the recruitment process, they expressed frustration with not being able to alter what happens with recruitment, because all chapters must agree upon changes.

Leadership Skills
The recruitment counselors recognized and valued the leadership and job skills they developed throughout their experience in their sorority and in the recruitment process. The structure of the recruitment counselor position provides many opportunities for positive development. Many recruitment counselors noted the value of sorority membership in general and further explained the benefits of holding the recruitment counselor position. Ella appreciated the opportunities to develop communication and leadership skills:

> I think just mentoring and speaking because like obviously PNMs are shy and you have to do most of the talking. And just relating, communication, mainly because just explaining to them how you felt and how you've been in the same experience and what not. And I'd say just leadership because there are a lot of times where you have to take the lead, take the lead within the recruitment counselors, or when you're like suggesting ideas, some people are just like sitting there. Initiative. I think just like stepping up and taking the lead and making sure that things are done and done correctly.

Ava recognized how her integrity was tested during recruitment:

> Personally, I gained so many things. Just the ability to work with a lot more different people than I had anticipated....Time management definitely. I would definitely have to

say integrity. I was definitely put to the test and I had to choose between a sister and doing the right thing…So it was good [to] learn that we could be independent, and will have to do that very soon after graduation.

Leslie described the ability to be neutral and mediate conflict, as well as improved verbal communication skills and public speaking. Kara said she's "a better version of herself, a stronger woman, stronger leader, and friend." As the researcher, I saw leadership and organizational skills being displayed by the students. The recruitment counselors were able to juggle multiple responsibilities and continue their schoolwork as well. Despite the negative press sororities receive, the recruitment counselors clearly articulated how the value of leadership is embodied in their work with the PNMs, within their chapters, and in the community.

Reflections and Implications Practice

The use of ethnography as a methodology to understand student groups and processes of development is beneficial in understanding how students think, not just what they think. Participant observation, though time-consuming, provides an opportunity to understand the perspectives of students in their natural environment. Additionally, as an outsider to sorority life, I learned a great deal that I can use in my future practice in student affairs. My outsider perspective also allowed me to notice aspects of the culture that others entrenched in it may not recognize.

The findings of this study reveal potential for supporting recruitment counselors' leadership development during sorority recruitment. Many of the leadership opportunities occurring within the chapters are not closely supervised by a fraternity/sorority professional. The experience of recruitment counselors, however, provides practitioners with the opportunity to directly influence sorority members' leadership development. Although many traditions and structures are already formalized within fraternity/sorority life, professionals should seek out additional leadership development opportunities for fraternity/sorority members, such as collaborations among new members in various chapters and status-specific (e.g., first year, sophomore, junior) initiatives to improve fraternal life on their campus. Recruitment counselors viewed their role as an opportunity to give back to their campus. Professionals should further promote and formalize the generative nature of the recruitment counselor position to further develop members' citizenship and leadership.

The expectation of neutrality on the part of recruitment counselors ensures they may fall short, as they will never be able to truly rid themselves of their connection and loyalty to their chapter during recruitment. Another struggle for recruitment counselors included mentoring and guiding PNMs who expressed negative statements about their chapters. During the selection and training of recruitment counselors, the issue of neutrality should be further explored in a realistic manner to include the importance of appearing unbiased to the PNMs. However, recruitment counselors and fraternity/sorority professionals should also accept that recruitment counselors will never be value- or opinion-free during their exchanges with PNMs and other recruitment counselors. Throughout the training and community-building of the recruitment counselors, trust should be emphasized to avoid issues of competition during recruitment. Additionally, sorority members have strong feelings about their chapters, and thus recruitment counselors' maturity and ability to

address negative statements about their chapters should be assessed in the selection process. During recruitment, despite the already long days, time should be built into the schedule for recruitment counselors to reflect on their experience each day to process their feelings about such challenges.

The participants valued their experience despite the sacrifices associated with disaffiliation. Fraternity/sorority practitioners can continue to tap into the leadership development opportunity available during recruitment and use the recruitment counselors' positive energy and desire to give back to continually improve their institution's fraternity/sorority community.

Although sororities are often seen in a negative light on campus, given my experience in numerous areas in higher education and student affairs, I witnessed several similarities between sorority recruitment and other aspects of higher education. For example, sororities are often criticized for presenting a false front, or the Disney World effect as described by Ava. I see the presentation of the positive aspects as what occurs during campus tours and orientation activities for parents and students. Campuses strive to highlight the best aspects of the institution in order to recruit new students, just as the sororities seek to increase membership in their chapters by promoting the best they have to offer. The negative energy recruitment counselors are constantly working against from the media, students, and campus administrators may be taking time away from further leadership development and their ability to create positive change on their campus. Professionals should take the perspectives of recruitment counselors into account when revising and improving their recruitment processes because of their unique insight from both within and outside of their chapters.

Limitations and Future Research

As an ethnographic study, the experience of recruitment counselors was explored in-depth at a single institution. Thus, reader must determine the transferability of the findings and implications to the unique environment of their institution (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The structure of recruitment, including the amount of time recruitment counselors spent with the PNMs, recruitment counselor selection and training, and disaffiliation practices, vary by institution and should be considered by the reader when seeking insight from the experiences of this study's participants.

The experience of the recruitment counselors began prior to my introduction to them in the fall as they were selected and trained during the previous academic year. My inability to observe the entirety of their experience is a limitation of this study. Although the number of hours of observation may seem limited (36.5 hours), the majority of the observation hours occurred over a four-day period, meaning I was deeply entrenched in the recruitment counselor experience as it occurred. Future research of the recruitment counselor culture should begin with the recruitment of sorority members for the position and continue through recruitment process. Additionally, ensuring the availability of all recruitment counselors for interviews following the experience will further enhance research of the recruitment counselor culture.

In regard to future research, although access to the sorority houses at the institution posed a challenge to the study, expanding the study of recruitment counselors to the perspectives of the

sisters in the chapters who welcome the PNMs would provide a fuller understanding of the recruitment counselor culture. Little discussion was held around issues of backlash from the active members in the chapters or how the chapters' leaders' absence influenced the recruitment process.

References

Anderson, K. M., & Danis, F. S. (2007). Collegiate sororities and dating violence: An exploratory study of informal and formal helping strategies. *Violence Against Women, 13*(1), 87-100.

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

Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518-529.

Alva, S. A. (1998). Self-reported alcohol use of college fraternity and sorority members. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 3-10.

Atlas, G., & Morier, D. (1994). The sorority rush process: Self-selection, acceptance criteria, and the effect of rejection. *Journal of College Student Development, 35,* 346-353.

Basow, S. A., Foran, K. A., & Bookwala, J. (2007). Body objectification, social pressure, and disordered eating behavior in college women: The role of sorority membership. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 394-400.

Caron, S. L., Moskey, E. G., & Hovey, C. A. (2004). Alcohol use among fraternity and sorority members: Looking at change over time. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 47*(3), 51-66.

Cashel, M. L., Cunningham, D., Landeros, C., Cokley, K., & Muhammad, G. (2003). Sociocultural attitudes and symptoms of bulimia: Evaluating the SATAQ with diverse college groups. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(3), 287-296.

Chapman, L., Hirt, J. B., & Spruill, N. R. (2008). The effects of sorority recruitment on self-esteem. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 3*(2), 38-51.

Clifford, J. (1990). Notes on (field) notes. In R. Sanjek (Ed.), *Fieldnotes: The making of anthropology* (pp. 47-71). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dinger, M. K. (1999a). Physical activity and dietary intake among college students. *American Journal of Health Studies, 15*(3), 139-148.

Dinger, M. K. (1999b). Sexual activity among college students living in residence halls and fraternity or sorority housing. *Journal of Health Education, 30*(4), 242-246.

Elias, J. W., Bell, R. W., Eade, R., Underwood, T., Winsky, K., Shonrock, M. D., Treland, J. E., & Fiel, R. (1996). 'Alcohol myopia,' expectations, social interests, and sorority pledge status. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 42,* 78-90.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (2001). Data management and analysis methods. In C. F. Conrad, J. G. Haworth, & Lattuca, L. R. (Eds.), *Qualitative research in higher education: Expanding perspectives* (2nd ed.) (pp. 553-571). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Hutching, K., Lac, A., & LaBrie, J. W. (2008). An application of the theory of planned behavior to sorority alcohol consumption. *Addictive Behaviors, 33,* 538-551.

Kashubeck, S., Marchand-Martella, N., Neal, C., & Larsen, C. (1997). Sorority membership, campus pressures, and bulimic symptomatology in college women: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*, 40-48.

LaBrie, J. W., Hutching, K., Pederson, E. R., Hummer, J. F., Shelesky, K., & Tawalbeh, S. (2007). Female college drinking and the social learning theory: An examination of the developmental transition period from high school to college. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(3), 344-356.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing & interpreting ethnographic data.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miley, W. M., & Frank, M. (2006). Binge and non-binge college students' perceptions of other students' drinking habits. *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 259-262.

Miller, K., Statten, R. R., Rayens, M. K., & Noland, M. (2005). Levels and characteristics of physical activities among a college student cohort. *American Journal of Health Education, 36*(4), 215-220.

National Panhellenic Conference (2009). *NPC Statistical Information June 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.npcwomen.org/resources/pdf/2009%20Stats_Final.pdf

Nelson, S. M., Halperin, S., Wasserman, T. H., Smith, C., & Graham, P. (2006). Effects of fraternity/sorority membership and recruitment semester on GPA and retention. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(1), 61-73.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 923-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Santovec, M. L. (2004). Greek rush delay doesn't affect academic success. *National On-Campus Report, 32*(17), 1-2.

Shulken, E. D., & Pinciaro, P. J. (1997). Sorority women's body size perceptions and their weight-related attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of American College Health, 46,* 69-74.

Spaulding, D. J. (1995). Fraternity & sorority hazing violence: Elements of a comprehensive plan to combat this campus scourge. *College Student Journal, 29,* 368-373.

Spradley, J. P., & McCurdy, D. W. (1988). The cultural experience: Ethnography in complex society. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, *45*, 89-125.

Williams, A. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2007). An examination of academic dishonesty among sorority and nonsorority women. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(6), 706-714.

Wolcott, H. F. (1995). *The art of fieldwork.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Author Autobiography

Patricia Witkowsky, Ph.D., is Student Affairs Program Manager at Colorado State University-Pueblo.

RESEARCH REVISITED:
WHEN STUDENT LEADERS DON'T[2]

Donald G. DiPaolo, Ph.D.

This introspective and reflective idea brief explores the nature of the gap between what leadership educators hope to accomplish in the lives of students and what actually happens. The author draws upon thirty years of leadership education and a wealth of interactions with leadership educators and student leaders across North America. Five latent barriers to successful leadership education are presented for further discussion, debate and application. The reader is encouraged to engage in supportive dialogue with colleagues to address difficult questions and cultural obstacles to our work.

I have been in the fortunate position of working with tens of thousands of student leaders across North America. They have taught me a great deal. I have also learned from hundreds of student life professionals, extension coordinators, coaches, deans, and faculty members who are committed to leadership education and who spend their lives in an attempt to serve students.

There are inspiring stories from the field: challenges overcome, moments of enlightenment, organizations and campus cultures improved, exemplary service to others, an issue of social justice advanced.

Underneath these examples of success, in which justified pride should be felt, there are often scores of examples where, despite the best efforts of leadership educators, a student disappoints, fails, flounders. Oftentimes, leadership educators with great intentions become disheartened and have their effectiveness questioned and programs challenged because students in leadership positions…don't. I have commiserated with them.

What follows are five broad notions from the field on why student leaders fail. I offer this idea brief in an effort to spark discussion and reflective dialogue among leadership educators and in the hopes that we continue to come together and ask tough questions. At the most recent Association of Leadership Education (ALE) conference in Spokane, there were calls for more qualitative methods and honest dialogue in an attempt to uncover what is really going on in campus leadership development (Boyd & Edgar, 2008). Perhaps that effort can be aided by a consideration of the more hidden and difficult impediments to students leading on campus.

Barrier One - The Hidden Narrative

Students come to us with powerful mind maps of how humans relate in the world. As research has shown, family dynamics and socialization have a great deal to do with shaping the leaders that arrive on campus (Hartman & Harris, 1992). When our students experience a crisis or crucible of leadership, I have found that an unresolved personal or characterlogical struggle is often at play (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Student leaders that struggle often display symptoms of personal dysfunction. They are not usually able to see on their own that these have underlying

---

[2] This article originally appeared in the *Journal of Leadership Education*, Volume 7, Issue 3, Winter 2009

causes that, unless resolved, will continue to be problematic throughout their lives. We tell students to lead from their core, but student leaders that stumble often have unresolved conflicts in their core (DiPaolo, 2008). In essence, many of them need healing in their core.

Our students come to us as full, complex human beings. The realities of human personality and characterlogical make-up are invited and uninvited guests at every leadership class and retreat (Kets de Vries, 1993). Every leadership educator has experienced moments when the overwhelming deeper needs of a student dominate and even negate our best efforts.

- Would we be more effective referring some of our student leaders to campus counseling rather than leadership activities?
- Are schools prepared to handle the onslaught of students seeking their assistance?
- How do we treat the ethical dilemma inherent in this dynamic?
- Beyond leadership development, how far do we go with personal development?
- Are we trained to make this call? If we do not make the call, who will do so and after how much damage to the life of the student and the community?

Barrier Two - Time For A Different Style

I have found that many student leaders have been rewarded with positions of leadership in college based on a style that worked for them in junior high and high school. However, this style is not necessarily effective once they are in college (Endress, 2000; Fleishman, Zaccaro, & Mumford, 1991; Yammarino & Bass, 1991). Quite often this involves an alpha female or alpha male discovering that they really cannot do it alone in college—that their personal charisma, particular area of talent, or strong will is no longer enough. People assume that a president or captain in high school is just going to carry on in college. I once had an Olympic medalist tell me, "Just because I have an Olympic medal, people think I know how to lead. I have no idea how to lead!"

Many of our student leaders have been wearing the label of "leader" without any real understanding of what that means. This may work for a while, but the enormity or added complexity of the organization at the college level becomes problematic. The cracks in the armor begin to show. Student leaders find out they are on teams or in student organizations that have many other successful leaders and they do not know how to really share leadership or adapt to a different or more collaborative style. For others, it may be time to *not* lead and learn what it means to be a successful follower (Vecchio, 2002).

- Should leadership educators, coaches, orientation leaders and other campus personnel build leadership style assessment into the first experiences students have on campus?
- How do we let student leaders know that what they bring as leaders might not work anymore, or even more difficult, that perhaps it is time to just follow first and learn?
- What mental models and paradigms of leadership education can be refocused to highlight this need?
- How can we challenge students to evaluate, and maybe even change, their current leadership paradigm when they feel they have already been strongly rewarded?
- What is the compelling case for change prior to experienced failure?

Barrier Three - Student Leader Collapse

Another dynamic that leadership educators face is the utter burnout of our student leaders. Many of our student leaders (and their educators) are exhausted physically, intellectually, and emotionally. We keep telling students to "get involved," and they have followed our advice. Perhaps our first advice should be to encourage them to discover what matters most to them and then be very selective in their involvement. Is this an opportunity to introduce the concept of "less is more" rather than "more is better?"

I have seen many student leaders turning to any number of ways to cope with the competing demands on their time and the enormous expectations that they feel—whether these demands originate internally or externally. Once we pull back the veil—if students allow us to see their vulnerability—it can a bit shocking to the student and to the leadership educator.

We talk about mind-body-spirit balance, yet we often do not model this as leadership educators and we lavish awards on students who do not maintain this balance, either. I have been frequently surprised at the number of complex coping mechanisms students employ, just to get through the school year. Students often "self-medicate" through the use of common stimulants, binge drinking episodes, or the growing prescription drug network. Sometimes, they simply break down.

- How do we help student leaders learn healthier lifestyles when campus culture seems to reward those who do not live them?
- What are we, as leadership educators, modeling for students?
- What theoretical or practical models of student leadership can we highlight in our programs to prevent the toll on stressed students?
- Is there a place for an intentional "less is more" message in our leadership curricula?

Barrier Four - The Attached Umbilical Cord

A common chorus I hear from those in the field is the growing presence of domineering parents. Gone are the early days of American higher education where the parental role was limited after the bus or train or stagecoach left the station. The modern parent, of helicopter fame, is much more involved in campus life. This presents all kinds of psychological, social and legal challenges to leadership educators (McEwan, 2005; Wong Briggs, 2007). This dynamic can be an unexpected source of exasperation and frustration for colleagues and students alike.

I recently had a leadership educator report to me that he sat with a new student who was stunned and saddened by the sudden realization that *nothing* he had done in his life, up to that point, was his own decision. This student was Class President, Captain of the Track Team, a Merit Scholar, and led a host of other organizations. He saw that he had ended up at the college of his parent's choice in a major in which he had no interest.

If student leadership education has self-efficacy and personal empowerment as core psychological underpinnings, are we facing a crisis in the power of students to evolve as thinking, emoting, and separate beings (Bandura, 1997)?

- Are we getting a generation of student leaders who are performing for authority rather than leading from a place of purpose and strength?
- How do we help students claim the intellectual and interpersonal freedom that is necessary to be an authentic leader—an author of one's life?
- How do we encourage a type of separation from parents while respecting their contributions?
- Is there a familial trend that requires us to first exhort our student leaders to "know thyself" before we ask them to lead anything?

Barrier Five - The Price of Leadership

The most common complaint I hear from university presidents, deans of students, campus life professional and faculty members is the lack of accountability and responsibility exemplified by student leaders. Many campus professionals feel a sense of personal betrayal when students, in whom much has been invested, do not come through.

Despite our best efforts, many of our prized student leaders are just unable to pay the price of leadership. When it comes down to drawing a line in the sand on any number of social or ethical issues, our exemplars are often unable to hold their peers accountable. The price is very high, of course, because students who demonstrate this kind of courage are often quickly rebuked and risk harmony in relationships. College students are vulnerable in their status with peers and it takes courage and strength of character to be a principled leader, especially regarding the need to belong and the risk involved in not complying with peer-group dynamics.

The difficult truth is that we feel good about the students who have gone through our classes, retreats, and programs, yet too many are willing to accept the perks of a leadership status without really earning them. The whole point and purpose of our educational efforts is lost if, during a moment of truth, our students repeatedly back down from the challenge.

A related dynamic is the expectation of other students that the leaders are supposed to do all the work. Students will often grant other students the title and position of leadership, but then place unrealistic demands on what that means for an organization. Somehow, being a student leader has come to mean that the leader is supposed to do all the work.

- What can we do to embolden student leaders to do the right thing during crucible moments?
- How can we best create early networks on campus that may serve as supports of principled student leadership?
- As leadership educators, are we modeling accountability for our students?
- How do we help students see the value of principled leadership in a culture where there are so many examples of failed leadership?

- How do we help student leaders promote a sense of shared responsibility in organizations?

Next Steps

I offer these broad notions humbly and introspectively in an attempt to promote courageous dialogue and honest discussion among those of us who care about student leadership development. It is critical that we create the space in our professional lives to come together and ponder these phenomena. This effort could unlock some of the mysteries in the lives of the students we serve and reveal a hidden curriculum on campus that we should take into account when we design our programs and create our courses.

Perhaps it is time for leadership educators to engage each other, and these challenges we face, in a different way?

References

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bennis, W. G., & Thomas, R. J. (2002). *Geeks and Geezers: How era, values and defining moments shape leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Boyd, B., Edgar, L.E. (2008). *Research themes, authors, and methodologies in the journal of leadership education: A five year look.* Paper presented at the Association of Leadership Educators Annual Conference, Spokane, WA.

DiPaolo, D. G. (2008). *Leadership education at American universities: A longitudinal study of six cases*. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Endress, W. L. (2000). *An exploratory study of college student self-efficacy for relational Leadership: The influence of leadership education, cocurricular involvement, and on-campus employment.* University of Maryland, College Park.

Fleishman, E. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Mumford, M. D. (1991). Individual differences and leadership: An overview. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(4), 237-243.

Hartman, S. J., & Harris, O. J. (1992). the role of parental influence on leadership. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*(2), 153-167.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1993). *Leaders, fools, and imposters: Essays on the psychology of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

McEwan, E. (2005). *How to deal with parents who are angry, troubled, afraid, or just plain crazy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Vecchio, R. P. (2002). Leadership and gender advantage. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(6), 643-671.

Wong Briggs, T. (2007). Helicopter parents' role up in the air. *USA Today*.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Person and situation views of leadership: A multiple levels of analysis approach. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(2), 121-139.

Author Autobiography

Dr. Donald G. DiPaolo is Associate Professor in the Education Department at the University of Detroit Mercy in Detroit, Michigan. He is a leading, national voice in the area of leadership education and has presented to tens of thousands of college student leaders across the United States and Canada. Dr. DiPaolo is the author of *Leadership Education at American Universities: A Longitudinal Study of Six Cases* (Mellen Press). He also serves on the Editorial Review Board of the *Journal of Leadership Education* and has received numerous honors for his contribution to the lives of college students.