ABSTRACT

Title of Document:	AN EXPLORATION INTO DIFFERENCES IN CONSCIOUSNESS OF SELF AND CONGRUENCE AMONG CULTURALLY BASED FRATERNITY, SOCIAL FRATERNITY, AND NON-AFFILIATED COLLEGE MEN
	Tricia Rosalind Shalka, Master of Arts, 2008
Directed By:	Dr. Susan Jones, Associate Professor Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

This study examined differences between culturally based fraternity men, social fraternity men, and non-affiliated college men on consciousness of self and congruence. The data used in this study included 1698 undergraduate men, representing 46 different higher education institutions. Data used in this study was collected in the spring of 2006 as part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. Analysis of the data was conducted using a multivariate analysis of covariance to compare independent variable group differences across the two dependent variables, while taking quasi pre-test measures for both items into account as covariates. Significant differences among culturally based fraternity men, social fraternity men and non-affiliated men were found on the combination of dependent variables. Further analyses revealed culturally based fraternity men scored lower than social fraternity men and non-affiliated men on both consciousness of self and congruence.

AN EXPLORATION INTO DIFFERENCES IN CONSCIOUSNESS OF SELF AND
CONGRUENCE AMONG CULTURALLY BASED FRATERNITY, SOCIAL
FRATERNITY, AND NON-AFFILIATED COLLEGE MEN

By

Tricia Rosalind Shalka

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2008

Advisory Committee:
Dr. Susan R. Jones, Associate Professor, Chair
Dr. Susan R. Komives, Professor
Dr. Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, Associate Professor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Fraternal organizations were founded to enhance the missions of colleges and universities (Earley, 1998). In 1998, authors of *New Challenges for Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into Learning Communities* asked the question, "Do fraternities and sororities contribute to the institution's educational mission?" only to answer that question with a response of, "No, not right now" (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, p. 91). A decade later, much work has been done, but the question still remains as to how these organizations are providing positive contributions to the institutions with which they are connected.

Regardless, these organizations seem here to stay on college campuses. The North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC), alone, boasts its fraternity chapters are on over 800 campuses between Canada and the United States (North-American Interfraternity Conference [NIC], 2006). Additionally, there are more men in NIC fraternities today than there ever have been in the long history of fraternities since the founding of the first Greek-letter organization, Phi Beta Kappa, in 1776 (NIC). The current membership of collegiate fraternity men in Canada and the United States approximates 350,000 with a total NIC fraternity membership nearing 4,500,000 if alumni are taken into consideration (NIC).

With experiences to take advantage of like being a member of a Greek organization, students should be able to appropriately inform themselves as to the many opportunities that are at their fingertips and the potential these hold for their development. As Hayek, Carini, O'Day, and Kuh (2002) captured, "Prospective students, parents, and external authorities want and need credible, trustworthy

information about collegiate quality in general and the student experience in particular. Thus, more must be learned about the nature of the experiences of members of Greek-letter organizations relative to that of other students" (p. 644). This chapter will further develop the reasons for this need, specifically as they relate to male fraternity members.

This chapter begins by outlining the history of male fraternal organizations, so as to provide some important contextual grounding for understanding the current study. The discussion is then moved into the current era of fraternity life, in presenting important current developments in student affairs that affect aspects of work with fraternities. Among such current trends are a recent movement in the fraternal world toward values congruence, attention in higher education to the need to create and sustain self-aware leaders, and increased awareness in contemporary research about the development of male college students.

This introduction will then go on to introduce specific details of the current study, including a statement of related problems, research questions and corresponding hypotheses. The methodology in the current design will be briefly introduced. Finally, the chapter will draw connections to the significance of this study and its place in informing the experience of male fraternity members as well as their non-affiliated peers.

Background

The following will detail some of the contextual background that is pertinent to the current study. Specifically, the history of fraternities is briefly explained before

outlining important current trends in the field, including a movement towards values

congruence and increased awareness of men's issues.

Male Fraternities

     History of social fraternities. The roots of the modern social fraternity system

can be traced back to the 18th century with the formation of Phi Beta Kappa in 1776 at

the College of William and Mary (Anson & Marchesani, 1991; Whipple & Sullivan,

1998b). Phi Beta Kappa was the first society in the United States that maintained a

Greek-letter name and would provide the foundation for what is thought of as

fraternities today (Anson & Marchesani). Similarly to modern-day fraternities, Phi

Beta Kappa was founded with many of the characteristics seen today, including a

ritual, oaths, a motto, a badge for external display, a strong tie of brotherhood, and an

urge for the sharing of its values (Anson & Marchesani). Phi Beta Kappa began with

the purpose of social and literary exchanges and its membership held regular

meetings to this end (Anson & Marchesani). Phi Beta Kappa began a slow expansion

process to other campuses, but 50 years after its formation maintained only five active

chapters (Anson & Marchesani). Soon thereafter, Phi Beta Kappa became a scholarly

honor society and has existed as such since that time (Anson & Marchesani).

Remnants of this organization that remain at the cornerstone of today's Greek

organizations include rituals and symbols that affirm values and a scholarly focus that

complements the origins of what would become the first of today's social fraternities,

Kappa Alpha Society in 1825 (Whipple & Sullivan).

     Since that time, a plethora of social fraternities have emerged. The 20th

century, in particular, saw considerable growth with the number of Greek-letter

organizations formed far outnumbering those that had emerged during the years between 1776 and 1900 (Anson & Marchesani, 1991). Particularly after World War II with the GI Bill and a boom in higher education, fraternities began to flourish in numbers on college campuses (Anson & Marchesani). Today, their membership numbers are stronger than they have ever been (NIC, 2006).

The advent of culturally based male fraternities. The emergence of culturally based fraternities can be traced to the founding of the first Black Greek-letter organization, Alpha Phi Alpha, which emerged in 1906 on a predominantly White campus (Anson & Marchesani, 1991; Nuwer, 1999). Over the next several years, an additional seven Black Greek-letter organizations, both fraternities and sororities, would be founded, all of which would ultimately be a part of the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) (Anson & Marchesani). These organizations emerged as a response to the oppressive forces at the time that denied Black students many rights and freedoms that were privileged to their White peers (Anson & Marchesani). Historically, Black Greek organizations have played an important role in advocating for equality, education, and the value of serving one's community (Nuwer, 1999). In large part, these organizations found their purpose in providing brotherhood/sisterhood among members, as well as being a vehicle to coordinate plans for collective actions of social justice (Anson & Marchesani). These organizations continue to provide students with a support system, which is particularly relevant on predominantly White campuses (Nuwer, 1999).

A Call for Values Congruence

The frequent tension around the value of Greek-letter organizations as connected to the undergraduate student experience has resulted in recent calls to action in the national fraternal community; the state of fraternity and sorority life on college campuses has drawn considerable attention in terms of its need for change (Grund, 2005). The Franklin Square Group (2003) released a report outlining the need for action, particularly in the area of values congruence in the fraternal community (Franklin Square Group). This group was comprised of prominent educational leaders including college and university presidents, the presidents of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and inter/national Greek organization executive directors (Franklin Square Group). The Franklin Square Group was charged with creating an "initiative to transform the collegiate Greek environment" (p. 3).

The document that emerged from this group was *A Call for Values Congruence,* which identified the problem of a disconnect that existed between what Greek organizations claimed to be about and what they did in practice (Franklin Square Group, 2003). While mission statements of fraternal organizations stated their purpose in supporting and enhancing the educational missions of colleges and universities, Greek organizations, in practice, were plagued by behaviors that detracted from this outcome (Franklin Square Group, 2003). Among these detrimental behaviors are hazing, alcohol abuse, and poor academic performance (Danielson,

5

Taylor, & Hartford, 2001; Eberhardt, Rice & Smith, 2003; Nuwer, 1999; Pascarella, Flowers & Whitt, 2001). Thus, *A Call for Values Congruence* outlined strategies for higher education institutions to hold Greek-letter chapters accountable to their espoused values (Franklin Square Group). This movement towards values congruence, then, would presumably promote positive student outcomes as a result of fraternity or sorority membership (Franklin Square Group).

Following the release of *A Call for Value Congruence*, leadership in fraternal advising began working to understand their role in the implementation of what this document outlined. Beginning with meetings in conjunction with the Association of Fraternity Advisors 2003 Annual Meeting and a later National Greek Summit in February of 2004, leaders in fraternity and sorority advising discussed the implications of the document written by the Franklin Square Group (Bureau, Schendel, & Veldkamp, 2006). Additional discussions to this end occurred in March 2004 at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Annual Conference and action towards implementing values congruence in fraternal organizations commenced shortly thereafter (Bureau et al.). A movement towards alignment between ideals and actions is not a new concept in higher education, but the possibility of change occurring in the direction of values congruence for these fraternity and sorority organizations is enhanced by the pragmatic reality that the notice of presidents means increased attention and commitment from multiple stakeholders (Heida, 2006).

The Need for Self-Aware Leaders

A value that is a key aspect of fraternal organizations is that of leadership development, as Greek-letter organizations frequently identify leadership as not only a prerequisite for joining, but also as a desired outcome of membership (Harms et al., 2006). As captured in Anson and Marchesani (1991) "fraternities and sororities offer today's students opportunities for personal development unmatched in most campus organizations" (p. ix). One such area where such personal development can occur is that of leadership.

The attention to leadership in fraternal organizations can be connected to current trends in concerns for leadership development on a broader stage. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (1999) acknowledged the publicly perceived crisis in leadership in America and the need for the leadership potential of students to be developed in confronting this crisis. The world that students enter is one of globalization and interconnectivity that requires leadership that is process and context centered (Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). An important component of the development of leadership is an individual's development of self-awareness (Astin, 1996; Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development suggests a framework of leadership as a relational process towards social change, and fundamental to this model is an individual's self-awareness (HERI). A cornerstone value of the model is that of self-awareness, as the realization of the other components of the model depend on this foundation (Astin, 1996). Among the dimensions of this model that connect to

7

an individual's understanding of self are consciousness of self (the ability to identify one's beliefs and values) and congruence (the ability to act consistently with one's beliefs and values) (HERI).

Calls for leadership in higher education organizations have been frequent in recent times (Kezar et al., 2006). However, it is not simply at the institutional level that leadership has been an important focal point within the area of higher learning. At the micro level of Greek-letter organizations "an essential component of the culture and stated purpose of fraternities and sororities is their commitment to leadership" (Harms et al., 2006, p. 81). The challenge today, especially in terms of values congruence, is helping to ensure that individual members of fraternal organizations are given the opportunity to develop congruence with their stated organizational purposes, including leadership.

Leadership is increasingly viewed in higher education as that of a relationship (Allen & Cherrey, 2000; Kezar et al., 2006; Komives et al., 2007). In a report issued by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the assertion is made that "leadership needs to be thought of as a collaborative process for effective, positive social change" (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999, p. i). Although leadership can be understood through its relational terms, what remains in all of these interactions are individuals. Some contend that central to learning leadership is an individual's self-awareness and personal development (Komives et al.). It is from this place of being self-aware that students are able to, then, effectively interact in groups and the communities of which they are a part (Komives et al.).

In a grounded theory study to investigate the nature of student leadership development Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005) discovered that an important component of leadership identity is the development of self. One aspect of this was that of "deepening self-awareness" (Komives et al, 2007, p. 394). In this study, leadership development followed a process by which the individual came to a deeper understanding of self through their interactions with groups (Komives et al., 2005). This then followed with the individual adopting a new sense of their self in relation to others, which led to a broadened view of leadership and progression in leadership development (Komives et al., 2005).

Students, including fraternity members, are expected to leave college prepared with the internal capacities to tackle the complexities of the real world. In part, this preparedness for the real world should include students' abilities to understand their sense of self and how that affects the ways that they interact with their surroundings. Baxter Magolda (1998) captured this reality through her longitudinal study of college students and their capacity for self-authorship. As her study suggested, "Adult life requires the capacity for self-authorship – the ability to collect, interpret and analyze information and reflect on one's own beliefs in order to form judgments" (p. 143). At the foundational level of existing in the world beyond college, students require an ability to analyze their surroundings and respond from a place of personal congruence as a way to effectively manage imperfect situations. As Komives et al. (2007) suggested to student leaders "Even when things are not what they ought to be, each of us can practice a personal philosophy of being the kind of person, leader, or participant we value" (p. 31). This tool is derived through a student's sense of self.

Our abilities in student affairs to respond to this need and ensure students gain the capacity for this skill is fundamental to our work as educators.

Increased Awareness in Men's Development

While the world of fraternal advising has been asking organizations to hold themselves accountable to higher standards of values congruence (Franklin Square Group, 2003), another emergent movement that affects efforts of change with fraternities has developed. This movement is that of increased awareness in the development of men. For some time, researchers and others have maintained the faulty assumption that the historical canon of research in human development was already about men (Davis, 2002). As a result of this frame, research to examine men through a gendered lens has been slow to start, especially when compared to research about women's development as it relates to gender (Davis). As Davis explained, "Although researchers have begun to investigate how gender affects women's identity development, there has been relatively little written about such impact on the psychosocial development of college men" (p. 508).

A key competency for any helping professions that work with fraternity men in particular is an understanding of the complexities of the experiences of men (Liu, 2005). Effective work with men must include an understanding of masculine cultural values and social expectations to uphold them (Liu). Unfortunately, faulty past logic has often concluded that research is already based on the male experience, and, thus, has contributed to limited investigation into the male experience (Davis, 2002; Liu). As Liu concluded, "Gender issues in multicultural competencies do not generally include the study of men and masculinity" (p. 685). Regardless, teasing out the

subtleties of men and masculinity are key in a full sense of multicultural competency for practitioners working with men (Liu).

The need for increased understanding of the male experience is evident, and this is especially true of men in fraternities. As Davis (2006) boldly stated, "Men are in crisis and fraternities have men" (p. 1). There are many aspects of fraternity culture that have the potential to negatively impact fraternity men, including fear of rejection by peers, secrecy, a deep sense of loyalty that can impede proper judgment, and a history of perpetuation of traditions that can take away from a man's ability to think independently (Davis). The root of addressing such problems, in the estimation of Davis, rests in understanding and challenging masculinity, as opposed to "simplistic anti-hazing, alcohol abuse, sexual assault prevention programs" (p. 1).

In the last few decades, we have seen more and more emphasis and attention drawn to the need for research about the gendered experience of men, particularly in terms of understanding masculinity, and the experiences of males (Edwards, 2007; Wade, 1998). There remains work to be done. As Davis (2002) encouraged, "we need to facilitate men learning about themselves as men" (p. 519). Ultimately, the ability of student affairs practitioners to work more effectively with men rests upon continued research and investigation into the developmental issues men face and their experiences as gendered beings, both of which are beginning to gain attention in the literature (Davis, 2006).

<div align="center">Problem Statement</div>

Research exists looking at both the positive and negative outcomes of student membership in Greek-letter organizations (Eberhardt et al., 2003; Hayek et al., 2002;

<div align="center">11</div>

Pascarella et al., 2001; Terenzini, Pascarella & Blimling, 1996). That said, studies

that explore the impact of Greek membership frequently do not recognize social

fraternities and culturally based fraternities as different types of Greek experiences.

The predominant research base of outcomes of Greek-letter membership has looked

at predominantly White, or social, organizations as opposed to parsing out culturally

based organizations as a separate entity (Kimbrough, 1995; McClure, 2006). While

men's development is an emerging research area, connections between male

fraternity membership and self-awareness need continued attention (Davis, 2002;

Davis, 2006). No studies to date have looked at congruence and consciousness of self,

and differences between men who are part of Greek organizations and those who are

not. This study will attempt to address these gaps in the current research.

<div align="center">Research Question and Hypotheses</div>

The purpose of this research is to examine if there are differences on the

congruence and consciousness of self dimensions of the social change model of

leadership development among men who are affiliated with a social fraternity, men

who are affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not affiliated

with a fraternity. Much past research has noted significant differences that exist

between students affiliated with a Greek-letter organization and their non-affiliated

peers (DeBard, Lake and Binder, 2006; Eberhardt, Rice and Smith, 2003; Hayek et

al., 2002; Kimbrough and Hutcheson, 1998; Pascarella et al., 2001; Sutton and

Kimbrough, 2001; Terenzini et al., 1996).

Based on the stated research purpose and prior research, the following alternative hypotheses are stated:

1) There exists a difference between male social fraternity members, male culturally based fraternity members, and non-Greek affiliated males on consciousness of self.

2) There exists a difference between male social fraternity members, male culturally based fraternity members, and non-Greek affiliated males on congruence.

Overview of Methodology

The current study explored possible differences between men affiliated with a social fraternity, men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity and men not affiliated with a fraternity on congruence and consciousness of self. Data was used from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) in an *ex post facto* design to investigate the above mentioned research questions. The theoretical grounding of MSL was the social change model of leadership development (SCM), developed between 1993 and 1996 through the Higher Education Research Institute (Wagner, 2006). The social change model of leadership development is a values-based model, including consciousness of self and congruence, the two dependent variables in the current study. The conceptual model of MSL is a quasi-I-E-O framework (Astin, 1993). Thus, data is cross-sectional as opposed to longitudinal.

The primary scales that were used to study the research questions in the current study were the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales that were used in the MSL survey instrument. These scales are part of a revised version of the

13

Socially Responsible Leadership Scale, originally developed by Tyree (1998). Both dimensions were measured in the MSL using a 5-point Likert-type scale.

Due to the correlation potential of the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales, a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was used for data analysis. Covariates were used to account for differences that may inherently exist between the three independent variable groups due to their self-selecting nature. The MANCOVA was used to explore possible differences across the combination of dependent variables between the three independent variable groups: men affiliated with a social fraternity, men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, and men not affiliated with a fraternity. Significance of the MANCOVA test was further investigated using univariate level ANCOVA tests to ascertain specific between group differences on each dependent variable. Post-hoc analyses using a Bonferroni test were used to understand significance of pairwise comparisons.

<div align="center">Significance of the Study</div>

The potential for transformative personal development in fraternities exists, but the key is in ensuring it occurs in practice. Grund (2005) articulated, "Student affairs must recognize and be sure that the Greek experience helps all members to grow and to be productive" (p. 10). In the recent past, though, Greek membership has frequently not been connected to such desired positive developmental outcomes (Hayek et al., 2002).

Although rhetoric furthers the notion that membership in a Greek-letter organization has positive outcomes for those involved, little research-based evidence exists to support these claims (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006). A faculty member in

Strayhorn and Colvin's qualitative study captured this reality in stating, "while I intuitively 'know' that Greek affairs makes a difference in student outcomes, I am not aware of specific research that details that difference by focusing on just the contribution of Greek involvement separately from other influences on student outcomes" (p. 101). As this faculty member suggests, empirical data supporting the positive outcomes of fraternity and sorority membership is scant (Strayhorn & Colvin).

What remains, however, is the negative prevailing stereotype of fraternities doing more harm to members than good. A plethora of studies outline the unfavorable outcomes that seem associated with fraternity membership. Men in fraternities are frequently associated with heavy and binge drinking patterns (Danielson, Taylor, & Hartford, 2001; Eberhardt et al., 2003; Hennessy & Huson, 1998; Riordan & Dana, 1998). Similarly, research has connected males' association with Greek-letter organizations with negative impacts on their academics (DeBard, Lake & Binder, 2006; Pascarella, et al., 2001). Perhaps paramount are the dangers of hazing, which continue in the cultures that exist within these fraternal organizations (Hennessy & Huson, 1998; Nuwer, 1999; Sweet, 1999). As the results of these studies suggest, this negative stereotype is not simply a stereotype but founded in some truth of reality.

The significance of the current study was that of further investigating the potential of some of the positive outcomes that those who work with fraternities claim exist (Strayhorn & Colvin, 2006). In particular, the current study sought to understand aspects of male self-awareness, an ostensibly positive outcome for college students, and the way that fraternity membership may interplay in this development. Research

continues to be needed to confirm or deny such positive outcomes of fraternity membership (Strayhorn & Colvin).

Additionally, Greek-letter organizations frequently espouse their desire to produce leaders (Harms, Woods, Roberts, Bureau, & Green, 2006), the development of which includes dimensions of self-awareness (Astin, 1996; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The current study will also contribute an understanding to whether or not membership in a Greek-letter organization is rising to meet its stated purpose in the form of creating and sustaining self-aware leaders. If Greek-affiliated men are doing poorly in this area, it is an opportunity for educators to think more critically about what can be done to help Greek membership become a formative experience for undergraduates to further develop their sense of self. This study will contribute to an understanding of the ways fraternity membership affects the individual and his self-awareness.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarity for the reader, several key terms used throughout this study are defined below:

Greek-letter Organizations

This term is used to denote individual organizations that are either fraternities or sororities, such as a chapter of a particular national fraternity or sorority organization (Nuwer, 1999). The term is used interchangeably in this study with the terms Greek organizations and Greek chapters.

16

Fraternity

For the purpose of this research the word "fraternity" is used to define Greek-letter organizations that are composed of male membership. Though the colloquial name for Greek-letter organizations of female membership is sorority, some female Greek-letter organizations are known as fraternities (Anson & Marchesani, 1991).

Sorority

This term refers to a Greek-letter organization composed of female membership (Anson & Marchesani, 1991).

Culturally Based Fraternities

This term was used in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) to define fraternal organizations that historically have a cultural or racial foundation. Organizations in this category include those that are governed by the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) and the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO), among others (Anson & Marchesani, 1991; Nuwer, 1999). For the purpose of this study and due to the nature of the MSL data set used, this term is used to describe members of fraternal organizations who indicated that their experience in a fraternity was culturally based and may or may not have included a social aspect.

Social Fraternities

This term was used in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) to define historically White fraternal organizations that have traditionally maintained a social focus. Such organizations include those that are governed by the North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) (Nuwer, 1999). For the purpose of this

study only participants who indicated on the MSL that they were members of a social fraternity but were not members of a culturally based fraternity are part of this category.

Social Change Model of Leadership Development

The social change model of leadership development defines leadership as a relational process towards positive social change that includes seven Cs (Consciousness of Self, Congruence, Commitment, Collaboration, Common Purpose, Controversy with Civility, and Citizenship) plus change (HERI, 1996).

Consciousness of Self

Consciousness of self is a component of the social change model of leadership development as one of the individual values of that model. Consciousness of self is a dimension that relates to a person's understanding of self, including values, beliefs, and preferences (HERI, 1996).

Congruence

Congruence is also a component of the social change model of leadership as one of the individual values of that model. Congruence builds upon consciousness of self in that it has to do with the individual's capacity to act in accordance with his or her identified beliefs and values. In other words, it is the integration of thoughts and actions (HERI, 1996).

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an introduction to some of the important concepts connected to the purpose of the current study. The chapter opened with the frequently asked question of what value Greek-letter organizations provide and illuminated the

importance of continued research in understanding the nature of differences between Greek-affiliated students and students who do not join a fraternity. Following this, an explanation of relevant happenings in the student affairs and fraternity advising areas were given. This included an overview of the movement towards values congruence in fraternity advising as well as the increased attention in student affairs to issues in men's development. After outlining the research purpose and corresponding hypotheses of the current study, an overview of methodology was provided. Next, information was provided about the need for research to better understand outcomes of the fraternity experience. Fraternities frequently cite leadership as an outcome of membership. Thus, this chapter also drew a connection to the importance of self-awareness as part of the process of leadership. The current study will further investigate the differences that may exist between men who are affiliated with a fraternity, either social or culturally based, and their non-affiliated peers in terms of their sense of self.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Many aspects of the environment come into play for college men as connected to their path in self-concept formation and self-awareness. This chapter will explain the range of such environmental components that influence male self-awareness, from the macro components of social influence on identity development to the micro influences of specific group affiliation. First, the chapter addresses the macro societal influences on male self-awareness through the lens of masculinity and male identity development. Next, self-awareness is defined through the frame of the two dependent variables in the current study, consciousness of self and congruence. Self-awareness is further expanded to include the ways in which groups interplay with an individual's understanding of self. Finally, a review of research related to evaluated differences between Greek-affiliated students and their non-affiliated peers is explored to address the micro level of environmental experiences specifically connected to Greek-letter affiliation. The chapter concludes delving into the researched importance of culturally based organizations and the roles they play for undergraduates' development as a particular type of Greek-letter affiliation that is different from the social fraternity experience.

Constructions of Masculinity

The current study is specifically focused on male students and their sense of self-awareness as affiliated or not affiliated with a Greek-letter organization. As a result, the following section illustrates how being male is conceptualized for college students and delineates some of the challenges that occur from such constructions.

The socialization of men is connected to aspects of self-awareness, which relate to

two dependent variables in the current study, consciousness of self and congruence.

Social constructions

There are a number of factors that contribute to how gender is conceived, but

environment and socialization certainly play an important role among these (Connell,

2002). Men are enculturated early on about definitions of being male and these

ideologies are reinforced throughout childhood for young males (Kaufman, 2001). As

Jackson (1991) wrote, "Gender identities are formed from birth as children are

moulded into socially-approved patterns of masculinity and femininity" (p. 201).

These socially defined patterns of masculinity, though, are frequently narrowly

constructed. The results of socialization of gender roles can lead to rigid or restrictive

definitions of being male (O'Neil, 1981). Of particular note to the current study is the

reality that fraternities frequently promote the enactment of such narrow definitions

of masculinity (Rhoads, 1995).

Masculinity begins when action meets environment. Until there is a forum for

social interaction and performance to occur, masculinities do not yet exist (Connell,

2001). When thinking of how the male gender role is constructed it is important to

acknowledge its contextual nature. In whatever contexts they arise, masculinities are

heavily influences by their surroundings and the prescribed rules of that environment

for what masculinity should look like (Connell). As Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku (1993)

suggested, male gender roles develop within cultural contexts. Rather than men

enacting their male gender role due to biological nature, their behavior is informed by

how they have internalized cultural messages for what it means to be a man in that

particular context (Pleck et al.). In the case of certain fraternal environments, the context conveys the message that masculinity is to be enacted in a way that demonstrates dominance and prowess (Rhoads, 1995).

In many cases, this process of socialization sets up negative consequences for men and those around them. In part, male socialization can be attributed to the continued remnants of personal and institutionalized sexism that exists in society (O'Neil, 1981). This institutionalized sexism presents challenges for all those who interact within such a framework, especially for the men who are unable to measure up to the standards of masculinity they have perceived within their social context (O'Neil).

It must also be noted that theoretical conceptions of masculinity across racial lines are heavily understood through a White majority lens. As Marable (2001) explained, "the essential tragedy of being Black and male is our inability, as men and as people of African descent, to define ourselves without the stereotypes the larger society imposes upon us, and through various institutional means perpetuates and permeates within our entire culture" (p. 17). This extends to other male racial groups, also. Espiritu (2001) outlined a related challenge for Asian men who face "the exclusion…from Eurocentric notions of the masculine" (p. 33). Not only have dominant expressions of masculinity acted as a force to silence and oppress women, but they have also done so to men of color (Espiritu). As Espiritu advocated, "The task for feminist scholars, then, is to develop paradigms that articulate the complicity among these categories of oppression, that strengthen the alliance between gender and

22

ethnic studies, and that reach out not only to women, but also to men, of color" (p. 39).

 To truly understand the construction of the masculine gender, though, requires an examination of the intersections of gender and race, also (Connell, 1995). Gender serves as a means of organizing social practice, and, thus, it is inextricably linked with other social structures, such as race (Connell). For example, the masculinity of White men is not simply dichotomized as something different than femininity, but also something different from the masculinity of Black men in terms of social constructions (Connell).

Masculinities

 In considering what it means to be male, it is important to conceive of this notion in its plural form. Masculinity is not a fixed concept, but rather something that is constructed in different ways in different social contexts (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). As many ways as there are for societies and cultures to make sense of and organize their worlds, so, too, are there multiple understandings of masculinity that are influenced by the cultural and historical contexts in which they are found (Connell, 2001). The idea of masculinity is one that is constantly interpreted through a variety of cultural, historical and geographical lenses (Beynon, 2002).

 Frequently, masculinity is defined by what it is not. One way that this occurs is that masculinity is dichotomized as something different from femininity (Beynon, 2002). Part of this differentiation from femininity may include detachment and independence, which are considered to be emotions and behaviors that are not

feminine (Bird, 1996). In other words, being masculine means that one is not feminine. This interpretation proves difficult, especially given current understandings of gender as a construct that is more continuous than the dichotomy of male and female (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). That said, being male is often understood in a social context through the lens of being absent of what are deemed feminine qualities (Beynon).

A qualitative study of 10 undergraduate men by Davis (2002) revealed the tensions many college men experience around the socially constructed definitions of masculinity that include a fear of femininity. In particular, the participants in this study expressed frustration with the narrow expectations of how their interactions with other men were supposed to occur (Davis). This frustration was rooted in a fear of being perceived as feminine or opposite to conceptions of being a man (Davis).

In addition to definitions of maleness as something separate from femininity, there is also a tendency toward the exclusion of other forms of gender expression and identity. In their study regarding men's attitudes of race and gender equity, Wade and Brittan-Powell (2001) found that men who were dependent on a reference group for their gender role self-concept tended to maintain negative attitudes about equity by race or gender. As they concluded, "masculinity or male identity may partially be constructed around the exclusion of others" (p. 47).

Masculinity defined through the lens of what it is not is especially visible in many male fraternity cultures. In an ethnographic study of fraternity culture, Rhoads (1995) found that fraternities tend to uphold limited definitions of masculinity that, in particular, oppress women and gay males. In the fraternity Rhoads studied,

masculinity was enacted as macho behavior, such as an emphasis on physical prowess and aggressiveness. Indeed, many rituals embedded in fraternity culture serve to further the existence of environments that view women and gay males as inferior (Rhoads).

One form of such masculinity described above is that of hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is inextricably connected to power, as it represents the behaviors and codes of being by which male dominance over women is maintained (Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). In the case of hegemonic masculinity, there exist both explicit and implicit frameworks for what it means to be a man (Beynon, 2002). As Donaldson (1993) explained, "The ability to impose a definition of the situation, to set the terms in which events are understood and issues discussed, to formulate ideals and define morality is an essential part of this process" (p. 645). Although hegemonic masculinity is, presumably, enacted by only a minority of men, it exists as a normative benchmark by which men compare themselves (Connell & Messerschmidt). While this creates a state of tension for the many men who do not enact hegemonic masculinity, there remain enough models in society to uphold this form of masculinity as an exemplar (Connell, 2001). As Connell and Messerschmidt further explained, "hegemony works in part through the production of exemplars of masculinity, symbols that have authority despite the fact that most men and boys do not fully live up to them (p. 846).

The challenge of hegemonic masculinity is that despite the fact that it does not account for many of the experiences men actually encounter (Connell, 1995), it continues to be upheld through existing structures. A study by Bird (1996) focused on

how hegemonic masculinity is maintained with the unfortunate conclusion reached that systems continue to perpetuate this from of masculinity. As Bird explained, "Hegemonic masculinity is consistently and continually recreated despite individual conceptualizations that contradict hegemonic meanings. Violations of the norms of hegemonic masculinity typically fail to produce alterations in the gender order; instead, they result in penalties to violators" (p. 130).

Hegemonic masculinity is connected to "the cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life" (Connell, 1995, p. 77). In the case of hegemonic masculinity, that dominant group is heterosexual men in contrast to women and in contrast to homosexual men (Connell). In this context of dominance there are additionally different forces that interplay between heterosexual masculinities, such as race (Connell). Hegemonic masculinity enacted by White men serves to sustain institutional oppression, which, in turn, frames the way dominant masculinity is enacted in marginalized male racial groups as a reaction to such systems of power (Connell). In the case of men of color, there is constant tension to find ways for their identity as males to be self-defined as opposed being defined by a system of White racial domination (hooks, 2004).

Male Gender Role Expectations

O'Neil (1981) discussed the masculine mystique and value system as "a complex set of values and beliefs that define optimal masculinity in society" (p. 205). These assumptions about the ideal male role are learned early in life through a process of socialization (O'Neil). Collectively, they uphold gender stereotypes about

masculinity in the United States (O'Neil). O'Neil summarized the masculine

mystique and value system into the following assumptions:

1. Men are biologically superior to women, and therefore men have greater
   human potential than women.

2. Masculinity, rather than femininity, is the superior, dominant, more valued
   form of gender identity.

3. Masculine power, dominance, competition, and control are essential to
   proving one's masculinity.

4. Vulnerabilities, feelings, and emotions in men are signs of femininity and
   to be avoided.

5. Interpersonal communication that emphasizes human emotions, feelings,
   intuitions, and physical contact are considered feminine and to be avoided.
   Rational-logical thought rather than intuitive and emotional expressions is
   the superior form of communication.

6. Sex is a primary means to prove one's masculinity. Affectionate, sensual,
   and intimate behavior are considered feminine and less valued.

7. Vulnerability and intimacy with other men are to be avoided because (a) a
   man can not be vulnerable and intimate with a male competitor because he
   may be taken advantage of, and (b) intimacy with other men may imply
   homosexuality or effeminacy.

8. Men's work and career success are measures of their masculinity.

9. Men are vastly different and superior to women in career abilities;

   therefore men's primary role is that of breadwinner or economic provider;

   women's primary role is that of caretaker of home and children. (p. 205)

As evidenced above, components of the masculine mystique serve to preserve aspects of hegemonic masculinity. Men are socialized to compare themselves to these standards at an early age (O'Neil, 1981). Such narrow expectations of masculinity can certainly add to the strain a man may experience in comparing himself to gender expectations.

Through his qualitative study of 10 undergraduate, heterosexual, Caucasian men, Davis (2002) sought to understand the ways the social expectations of gender roles affect college men. Data was evaluated using a framework of hermeneutic phenomenology, and from this analysis, five themes emerged (Davis). These included the importance of self-expression, codes of communication caveats, fear of femininity, confusion about and distancing from masculinity, and a sense of challenge without support (Davis). A common thread in many of these themes is that of challenges for men in terms of sense of self.

Across many of the themes that emerged in the Davis (2002) study are difficulties that men face in balancing their internal world with the external expectations that have been imposed upon them. The men in this study felt that communication and self-expression were important, though the ability to express themselves to others was a reality with which they had only recently learned to be comfortable, as it did not fit within the traditional boundaries of masculinity (Davis).

This is consistent with the work of O'Neil (1981) around male gender role conflict, which will be discussed in more depth in what follows.

Participants were also asked about their experiences being a male on campus (Davis, 2002). This proved to be a question that was difficult for the participants to answer and they expressed they had previously given very little thought to this aspect of their identity (Davis). Regardless, the men in this study delineated themselves as different from other men, in that the participants felt uneasy about expressions of hyper-masculinity (Davis). The common sentiment was that masculinity was a bad thing and something the individuals did not want to identify with even though they were not able to articulate what it meant to be male (Davis). This theme is particularly relevant when considering the challenges men face in connection to self-awareness. From the above findings, it is clear that many men do not take the opportunity to reflect on what such an identity means to their individual self-concept.

Although Davis (2002) does much to further our understanding of the complexities of expectations of male gender roles, there are some notable limitations to this research. Perhaps most importantly, the men who were interviewed for this study are all Caucasian and all heterosexual (Davis). As a result, it is difficult to make statements beyond this study as to the applicability of the findings, particular across lines of race and sexual orientation. There may certainly be components of these findings that would be different with members of another racial or sexual orientation group.

Male Gender Role Conflict

O'Neil (1981) brought attention to the negative and harmful aspects of male socialization. While the 1970s identified societal oppression against women through the women's movement, O'Neil suggested that the late 1970s and early 1980s marked the beginning of understanding the oppressive nature of male gender role socialization and the larger impact this has on both men and women.

Gender role conflict is a byproduct of socialized gender roles. As defined by O'Neil (1981) "gender role conflict and strain occur when rigid or restrictive gender roles learned during socialization prohibit a person from using one's human potential" (p. 204). In essence, gender role conflict hinders personal growth, as it is a psychological response to narrow expectations of gender roles. In many cases, these narrow definitions of gender role, such as hegemonic masculinity, are those that most males cannot actually uphold (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). The results are harmful consequences to a man's sense of self and his ability to act congruently with his own definition of self. Davis (2002) found evidence of fear of femininity, a key component of O'Neil's model, acting to restrict a man's ability to communicate what he actually feels. When this type of situation is present, both males and females experience negative consequences of their socialized role expectations (O'Neil).

When restrictive gender role expectations are present, two scenarios result. First, an individual may uphold the gender role and reinforce its adherence in his or herself as well as in others (O'Neil, 1981). At the extreme, individuals who fall into this category may go so far as punishing and devaluing those who do not prescribe to the narrowly defined gender norms (O'Neil). This is also one of the ways that sexism

is expressed in our society (O'Neil). The second reaction to restrictive gender role expectations is to not be confined by them and react spontaneously in a way that is an authentic expression of self (O'Neil). This outcome is more difficult to maintain, because there are few positive rewards, though much more pronounced negative feedback from those who devalue those who do not uphold traditional definitions of gender roles (O'Neil). Additionally, those who do not adhere to gender roles may also accumulate anger towards those who continue to uphold such systems of oppression (O'Neil). Regardless of whether an individual is restricted by gender roles or the one upholding the restrictions, gender role conflict and strain may ensue, which ultimately creates incongruity between the male's self-concept and what he feels he needs to enact (O'Neil).

Male Identity Development

The following section provides various points of view as to how a man comes to an understanding of self. Specifically, two different conceptions of male identity development will be outlined. Both of these connect to male self-awareness in providing a richer understanding of the external and internal influences at play in male college students coming to understand aspects of their identity as men.

College Men's Gender Identity Development

Edwards (2007) developed a grounded theory of men's gender identity development. Central to the study was the desire to understand "the process by which college men come to understand themselves as men" (p. 179). Through a qualitative study of 10 college men at an East Coast research university, Edwards proposed an emerging theory of college men's gender identity development.

The men in Edwards' (2007) study were constantly negotiating their gender

identity in relation to society's expectations. As a result, men embarked on a process

of feeling like they were wearing a mask that portrayed being a man as society

expected it and hid whatever the men perceived as their own flaws that did not

measure up to that expectation (Edwards). Regardless, upholding this mask proved a

constant struggle for the men in the study and one from which they wished they could

break free (Edwards). Aspects of this situation are reminiscent of struggles described

by O'Neil's (1981) conception of male gender role conflict.

Edwards' (2007) grounded theory of college men's gender identity

development begins with the social context. Men come to an awareness of the

external expectations of what being a man is supposed to look like (Edwards). This

process of socialization occurs at the level of dominant society, but also at the micro

level of specific group expectations (Edwards).

Once these expectations have been internalized, men move into a three-phase

process of performing masculinity by way of putting on a mask (Edwards). In phase

1, the man feels a need to put on a mask to meet the external expectations that exist of

being a man (Edwards). Often this occurs in conjunction with the man feeling as

though he does not currently measure up to these expectations, hence the need for a

mask that portrays them (Edwards). In phase 2, the man is fully into wearing a mask,

which often occurred in the party scene for college men, as they performed a role they

felt they were supposed to (Edwards). In phase 3, the man begins to understand that

there exist consequences for wearing this mask of external masculinity (Edwards).

The man in this phase may become aware of the effects this mask has on demeaning

women, limiting relationships with other men, and resulting in individual loss of authenticity (Edwards).

Following phase 3, men begin to move beyond external expectations, though the college men in Edwards (2007) were only embarking on this journey and not fully into it. As this process to "transcend external expectations" (Edwards, p. 175) occurs, men start to recognize the incongruence between their mask and internal world. Central to this recognition, are critical incidents that incite awareness of this reality (Edwards). Ultimately, the transcendence of external expectations of masculinity requires a degree of self-awareness on the part of the male, as evidenced above.

Male Reference Group Identity Dependence

The above theory provided insight into how men construct a self-concept in their formation of gender identity. Of particular interest to the current study, though, is the interplay of a group, such as a fraternal organization. Previous theories of traditional masculinity delineate some of the relationships this social construct has with a man's psychological approach to his world (Wade, 1998). Where the research is sparser is in its explanatory power of individual variability as it relates to conformity to ideologies of masculinity (Wade). Wade proposed a theory of male reference group identity dependence as a means of further understanding this gap, which addresses how a man's interactions with others connect to his self-concept and identity formation.

Wade (1998) defined male reference group identity dependence as "the extent to which males are dependent on a reference group for their gender role self-concept" (p. 352). Male reference group identity dependence is separated into three distinct

33

statuses. These three statuses include: no reference group, reference group dependent and reference group nondependent (Wade, 1998). Each of these groups is further developed through the lens of four postulates, listed below.

Wade (1998) explained male reference group identity dependence through four postulates. The first of these is that "males identify with other males to the extent that they feel a psychological relatedness to a particular group of males or to all males" (p. 364). A continuum exists that can be roughly divided into three groups: A man may, 1) not feel psychologically related to other males, 2) feel a sense of psychological relatedness to a particular group of males, or, 3) feel a sense of psychological relatedness to all men (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000). The second postulate in this theory stated that the "three levels of ego identity are associated with three levels of psychological relatedness to other males" (Wade, 1998, p. 366). If a man maintains an unintegrated ego identity, his experience in relation to other men will be that of not feeling a psychological connection to them, while a man with a conformist ego identity feels a sense of psychological relatedness to only a particular group (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000). Men who possess an integrated ego identity will also possess a sense of psychological relatedness with all males (Wade & Brittan-Powell). The third postulate to Wade's theory is that of "feelings of psychological relatedness to other males are associated with how males use reference groups for their gender role self-concept" (p. 366). Finally, the fourth postulate stated that "how males use reference groups for their gender role self-concept is related to their gender-related attitudes and the quality of their gender role experiences" (Wade, 1998, p. 367).

The existence of a healthy integration of reference group as a source of identity for men can produce certain favorable outcomes. In fact, men who are categorized in the no reference group status experience considerable strain (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000). This status has been found to be connected to a diffused sense of ego identity, low self-esteem, social anxiety, depressive symptoms, and a sense of self as lacking masculine characteristics (Wade & Brittan-Powell). Meanwhile, men who fall into the reference group dependent status were found to prescribe to a stereotyped sense of masculinity, experience gender role conflict, and maintain attitudes that do not support a sense of gender and racial equality (Wade & Brittan-Powell). In such cases, these reference groups become exclusionary in nature and severely restrict the potential for positive growth in individuals who identify with them.

Establishing a sense of connectedness to others is an important progression for males in college, and the concept of a healthy reference group for men, as seen in the reference group nondependent status can certainly provide this. At their strongest, male reference groups carry the potential to forge connections between males through positive embodiments of masculinity (Wade, 1998). The college years for any student are often a time to search for meaning and identity and male reference groups can be a source of "a sense of meaning, direction, identity, and belongingness" (Wade, p. 370). All of these attributes hold positive potential for a man's overall wellbeing and sense of self. Those men who achieve reference group nondependent status demonstrate evidence of integrated ego identity, endorsing nontraditional masculinity

ideology, not experiencing gender role conflict, and maintaining a sense of high self-esteem (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000).

The idea of male reference group identity dependence makes theoretical and logical sense in terms of the ways individual men can draw a sense of self-concept through the ways in which they identify and relate to groups they are associated with. This theory has been tested through quantitative measures (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000; Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2001). Unfortunately, both of these studies have had rather small sample sizes, 172 male undergraduates and 142 male undergraduates, respectively (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000, Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2001). Additionally, one of these studies occurred at a singular institution on the east coast of the United States (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000), while the other was conducted at two universities in the eastern United States (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2001). Thus, it is clear that more research on this construct is necessary, particularly to assess the generalizability and broad applicability of this theory for male college students across the country. The concept of male reference group identity dependence is particularly interesting when thinking of male fraternities, so additional research that examined male reference group identity dependence in the context of this student group affiliation would be particularly valuable.

Self-Awareness Through Consciousness of Self and Congruence

The following section will outline dimensions of self-awareness as they relate to two constructs used as dependent variables in this study, consciousness of self and congruence. Consciousness of self and congruence are terms expanded upon as values in the social change model of leadership development (HERI, 1996). These constructs

36

are conceptualized below through the lens of the social change model in addition to related concepts that help inform an understanding of these variables for the purpose of the current research.

The social change model of leadership development was developed by a team of leadership specialists and student affairs professionals who began work on the model in 1993 (HERI, 1996; Wagner, 2006). The Working Ensemble, as they called themselves, sought to develop a leadership development model for college students (Wagner). After several working meetings to discuss the skills, values, and knowledge students needed for effective leadership, the social change model of leadership development was born (Wagner).

A key assumption of the social change model is that leadership is a values-based pursuit (Wagner, 2006). In order for collaborative action to occur, individuals and groups must have a clear sense of their values and act consistently in concert with these (Wagner). This identification of values and action upon them represents elements of self-awareness that are fundamental to leadership as identified through the social change model of leadership development (Astin, 1996).

Consciousness of Self

The Working Ensemble conceptualized consciousness of self as "being aware of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action" (HERI, 1996, p. 22). In other words, consciousness of self as defined by the social change model of leadership includes self-knowledge or self-awareness (Astin, 1996). Consciousness of self extends to encompass not only an individual's self-concept, but also his or her capacity to accurately observe his or her behaviors and thoughts in

concert with others (Astin). Consciousness of self represents a cornerstone value of the social change model, as the realization of the other values of the model (congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change) rest upon the individual's understanding of self (Astin).

In a descriptive study exploring differences between male and female undergraduates on the social change model of leadership, Dugan (2006a) found several differences according to gender. Of the eight values of the social change model of leadership (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change), men's scores were significantly lower than those of women on six of the eight constructs (Dugan). One of these values in which men scored lower than their female counterparts was that of consciousness of self (Dugan).

Research conducted by Dugan (2006a) occurred at a single institution, so caution must be made to generalizing beyond this campus. In total, 912 students participated in the study, with 859 of those responses determined usable (Dugan). The survey for this study was administered to 60 randomly selected undergraduate course sections, but it is not clear as to how attention was drawn to ensure there was no overlap of respondents between classes (Dugan). Despite these limitations, this study does provide some basis for further research to understand why a statistically significant result in a negative direction occurred for men when compared to their female peers on the consciousness of self dimension. As Dugan suggested, "colleges should work towards closing the performance gap between men and women" (p.

223). Further research can help inform the extent to which this is needed and how it might occur.

Congruence

Another dimension of self-awareness is the ability to act consistently with one's beliefs and values. This active part of self-awareness is congruence. The Working Ensemble conceptualized congruence as "thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty towards others. Congruent persons are those whose actions are consistent with their most deeply-held beliefs and convictions" (HERI, 1996, p. 22). Congruence is closely connected to the consciousness of self value in the social change model of leadership, as it represents the individual's ability to put action to their identified values and beliefs (Astin, 1996).

Congruence is an aspect of self-awareness that is closely connected to effective leadership. As Komives et al. (2007) articulated, "Exemplary leadership includes a congruency between values and actions" (p. 101). The process of finding congruency between personal actions and values is a courageous and difficult one, but it provides the power behind purposeful leadership (Komives et al.).

Congruence was a theme that also emerged in Baxter Magolda's (2002) longitudinal study assessing self-authorship. When participants entered life beyond college, in particular, their surroundings made it even more difficult to function without the capacity for self-authorship (Baxter Magolda). At this point, conflicts that emerged between external influences and internal values were pronounced. Career choices or relationships that were externally driven and incongruent with an

individual's internal value set led to difficult crossroads experiences (Baxter Magolda). As a participant was able to move through these experiences towards self-authorship his or her capacity for mature relationships was increased (Baxter Magolda). From the above, it is notable that the ability to act congruently with personal values was a behavior that needed to develop, but resulted positive development for individuals.

Self-authorship was frequently not achieved during the college years among the participants of Baxter Magolda's (2002) study. This can be attributed to the way college education is structured. Students do not receive messages through their college education that emphasize their need to develop an internal sense of self (Baxter Magolda). Once college students graduate, though, there is a premium placed in their personal and professional lives on their ability to evaluate information according to their own internal values (Baxter Magolda). In other words, individuals ultimately are demanded to find ways to understand self and integrate it consistently with external drives, which is the work of congruence.

A study by Dugan (2006a), as previously mentioned, found differences between male and female undergraduates on values of the social change model of leadership. The congruence dimension also showed a statistically significant difference between men and women in this study, with men scoring lower than women (Dugan). As with the difference noted on consciousness of self, the discrepancy between men and women on the congruence dimension begs further research to determine the nature of this finding.

Dugan (2006a) suggested the need for an increase in values-based leadership education for male undergraduates. As evidenced by the lower scores that men maintained on the consciousness of self and congruence dimensions, in addition to others, it would seem that something is preventing male students from attaining their full potential in terms of self-awareness. There is an emerging need for colleges to seek active ways to engage men in probing more deeply into their own self-awareness (Dugan).

<div align="center">Understanding Self Through Groups</div>

The current study seeks to understand differences of self-awareness that exist between males who are affiliated with a Greek-letter organization, social or culturally based, and those males who are not affiliated with a Greek-letter organization. To that end, some commentary must be made on the ways an individual might understand his or herself in the context of a group and relationships with others. The following section will review literature that relates to this aim.

Self-Awareness in Groups

Komives et al. (2005) sought to understand the processes an individual goes through in their development of a leadership identity. This research used a grounded theory methodology and identified five categories connected to the development of a leadership identity, which included: developmental influences, developing self, group influences, students' changing view of self with others, and students' broadening view of leadership (Komives et al., 2005). These five dimensions operated along continuums, with each contributing to progress on the six-stage developmental

process that is identified as the leadership identity development (LID) model (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006).

Although the LID model is grounded in "leadership as a collaborative, relational process" an important dimension of the development of a leadership identity occurs at the level of self-awareness (Komives et al., 2005, p. 593). The process of leadership identity development occurs in relationship with the ways an individual's relationship with others changes over time (Komives et al., 2006). Central to this process is that of the constant deepening of self-awareness for the student and the attainment of ways to develop self-efficacy (Komives et al., 2006).

Among the five categories that influence leadership identity development is that of developing self (Komives et al., 2005). This category can be further divided into several properties. Dimensions that contribute to developing self include deepening self-awareness, building self-confidence, establishing interpersonal efficacy, applying new skills, and expanding motivations (Komives et al., 2005). As evidenced in the list above, the "developing self" category has considerable overlap with the individual in connection with others. Group influences were an important interaction with the development of self and contributed to a student's changing view of him or herself in relation to others (Komives et al., 2005).

Group influences were an important part of the cycle of leadership identity development, especially in terms of their effect on the individual. Students were frequently drawn to a group for the purpose of belonging and these organizations were frequently tied to their sense of self-image (Komives et al., 2005). Ultimately, the students in this grounded theory study maintained many social identities and the

aspects that contributed to their development of self worked in tandem to the development of leadership identity (Komives et al., 2005).

The Komives et al. (2005) research did much to further our understanding of leadership identity development, as well as the importance of the individual's understanding of self in relation to others as part of the process. The study drew on a diverse group of students in terms of demographic and experiential backgrounds (Komives et al., 2005). A significant limitation of the study, however, is that all participants were chosen through a process of purposeful sampling for their demonstrated ability as leaders who practiced a collaborative and relational form of leadership (Komives et al., 2005). Thus, it would be interesting to see how the process of leadership identity development may look different if further informed by students who are in earlier stages of leadership development, including those who have yet to show themselves as visible enough leaders to be recognized for such a study. The impact of the group on such individuals would be of particular interest.

Sutton and Kimbrough (2001) conducted a study to explore trends in Black student involvement. One noteworthy finding that emerged from this research was that Black students who participated in the study tended to identify themselves as leaders regardless of whether or not they held a formal leadership position (Sutton & Kimbrough). A similar finding occurred in a Kimbrough and Hutcheson (1998) study that showed over 80% of both Black Greek affiliated and Black non-Greek affiliated students identifying as leaders, regardless of positional roles. This finding is interesting to consider in connection to the LID model, in which a student is considered to be at level four (leadership differentiated) or beyond in their leadership

identity development once they are able to see leadership beyond positional roles (Komives et al., 2006). This would suggest that the individuals in the Sutton and Kimbrough study are at a fairly developed level in the LID model, which may mean they are in a position of greater understanding of self in relation to others or that leadership identity development follows a different path for these African American students than is suggested by the LID model.

In a model of intercultural maturity, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) highlight the importance of self-awareness that is needed to effectively interact in diverse groups. This model includes an intrapersonal dimension, which accounts for how an individual views him or herself and arrives at a sense of identity and understanding of self (King & Baxter Magolda). As the complexity of self-awareness moves along the continuum from a sense of self that is externally defined to a sense of self that is internally defined, an individual is increasingly able to engage in diverse groups without feeling threatened by differences (King & Baxter Magolda). The importance of self-awareness as part of the process of interaction in diverse groups underscores the interplay between self and others in the process of self-concept.

Differences Between Greek Affiliated and Non-Greek Affiliated Students

The current study seeks to assess possible differences between men who identify as being affiliated with a Greek-letter organization, either a social fraternity or a culturally based fraternity, and those men who are unaffiliated with such an organization. As a result, this section will review previous research that notes differences that do exist between Greek-affiliated male students and their non-

affiliated male peers. Such differences provide further rationale as to why the current study seeks to understand differences among these male Greek-affiliated and non-affiliated groups and recognize that the possibility does exist for differences to be present.

Differences in Cognitive Outcomes

Terenzini et al. (1996) conducted an extensive literature review to identify what previous research concluded about the nature of various out of classroom experiences on intellectual outcomes for students. In terms of the experience of Greek affiliated students, fraternity or sorority membership was generally found to have a negative, albeit not strong, effect on cognitive outcomes (Terenzini et al.). A student's first year of college represented somewhat of a critical period. For white males, Greek affiliation during their first year of college was connected to negative outcomes on reading, math, and critical thinking skills in addition to a measure of composite achievement (Terenzini et al.). This played out differently for men of color who affiliated with a Greek organization during their first year of college and experienced slightly positive outcomes on all of these measures when compared to non-Greek affiliated students (Terenzini et al.).

Similar results to this latter conclusion were supported by findings in a quantitative study by Sutton and Kimbrough (2001) that looked at trends in Black student involvement. Of the student who participated in this study, 47.3% were members of a historically Black Greek organization. Of the African American students in this study who attended predominantly White institutions, those who were members of a historically Black Greek organization maintained a higher overall GPA

than their peers who were not affiliated with a historically Black Greek organization (Sutton & Kimbrough).

Additional recent primary research supports many of the other claims that were outlined in the Terenzini et al. (1996) review of studies relating to fraternity or sorority membership and cognitive outcomes. In their study, Pascarella et al. (2001) looked at five areas of cognitive outcomes among participants, which include: writing skills, science reasoning, gains in understanding the arts and humanities, gains in understanding science, and gains in writing and thinking skills. Although the general gap between Greek affiliated students and non-Greek affiliated students was less in this study than in previous research by Pascarella, Edison, Whitt, Nora, Hagedorn, and Terenzini (1996), which also noted decreased cognitive outcomes for Greek-affiliated students, differences between these two groups continued to exist (Pascarella et al., 2001).

Whereas Greek affiliated women experienced minor gains over non-Greek affiliated women in their second year of college, male Greek affiliated students did not fair as well (Pascarella et al., 2001). Controlling for confounding variables, Pascarella et al. noted that fraternity membership coincided with negative effects on all five of the cognitive measures during the student's sophomore year. The magnitude of these effects, though, was small enough that it could not be assumed that they were not due to chance (Pascarella et al.).

During the third year of college, Greek affiliation continued to play some role in cognitive outcomes among students in this study. Male Greek affiliated members continued to show some evidence of negative cognitive results as compared to their

non-Greek affiliated male peers (Pascarella et al., 2001). Fraternity members in their third year of college showed statistically significant negative effects in the reading comprehension and understanding the arts and humanities cognitive measures (Pascarella et al.).

Although a negative trend for fraternity membership in the second and third year of college and cognitive outcomes existed, there are positive results with this data. Compared to their previous study looking at cognitive impacts of Greek membership during the first year of college, Pascarella et al. (2001) noted that the magnitude of cognitive deficits of fraternity membership were smaller in the second and third year of college. Thus, although male Greek affiliation seemed to negatively impact a students experience in terms of certain cognitive outcomes, the magnitude of that impact is significantly reduced after the student's first year of college, which may suggest something critical about the first year experience and Greek membership for male students.

The sample used for Pascarella et al. (2001) proves helpful in making generalizations. The study was composed of 18 institutions that were represented in 15 different states (Pascarella et al.). Attention was made to select a group of institutions that would represent institutional diversity (Pascarella et al.). Additionally, student participants in this study were part of a follow-up study of the National Study of Student Learning (NSSL), which meant that longitudinal data could be obtained and commented on (Pascarella et al.).

DeBard, Lake and Binder (2006) found similar differences when looking at Greek affiliated students as compared to their non-Greek affiliated peers. The

researchers reviewed institutional records for over 3,000 students at a Midwestern university to see how students performed academically in relation to their predicted grade point averages based on performances measures for the incoming freshman class (DeBard et al.). Looking at all student groups, as separated by gender and affiliation status, Greek affiliated men were found to perform lower than their predicted GPAs (DeBard et al.).

Data concerning the Greek affiliated men was particularly notable. Overall, predicted GPAs were lower for fraternity men than non-fraternity affiliated men (DeBard et al., 2006). That said, fraternity members still underperformed compared to their predicted GPAs for their first year (DeBard et al.). Non-Greek affiliated men achieved higher than their predicted GPAs by the end of their freshman year (DeBard et al.).

Differences in Behavioral Outcomes

Fraternity and sorority membership is connected to a number of other behaviors of concern that are less pronounced in the non-Greek affiliated student body. Eberhardt, Rice and Smith (2003) noted a variety of these distinctions as they relate to alcohol abuse, risky sexual behavior, and academic integrity. Consistent with previous research, students affiliated with a fraternity or sorority reported higher rates of alcohol consumption and frequency of use, resulting in more negative consequences, than their non-Greek affiliated peers (Eberhardt et al.). Astin (1993) found evidence of a positive correlation with alcohol consumption and membership in a Greek-letter organization. Greek affiliated men show the highest instances of alcohol abuse, even more than Greek affiliated women (Eberhardt et al.).

The risky sexual behavior dimension did not produce any notable differences between Greek students and non-Greek affiliated students with the exception of fraternity and sorority members more frequently engaging in unprotected sex (Eberhardt et al., 2003). Greek affiliated students were also very similar with non-affiliated peers in terms of academic integrity. A notable difference, however, regarded Greek affiliation and attitudes towards cheating. Greek organization members tended to have stricter views around cheating than their non-affiliated peers (Eberhardt et al.). Students who were not affiliated with a Greek organization were much more likely to view reporting a class member for cheating as a worse offense than the actual act of cheating (Eberhardt et al.).

Differences in Involvement and Engagement Outcomes

Favorable differences exist, as well. Kimbrough and Hutcheson (1998) evaluated historically Black Greek organization membership and patterns of involvement and leadership. In this study, those students who were members of a historically Black Greek organization were found to be much more involved in campus organizations and activities than were their African American peer group who were unaffiliated (Kimbrough & Hutcheson). Additionally, this involvement also extended to holding leadership positions in one or more of those activities, which may have accounted for the finding that the Greek affiliated students in this study showed greater leadership self-efficacy than did their non-affiliated peers (Kimbrough & Hutcheson).

Additional positive outcomes for Greek-affiliated students emerged from Hayek et al. (2002) in a quantitative analysis of data collected from the National

Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) during the spring of 2000. Specifically, this analysis of the NSSE data was intended to assess possible differences between Greek-affiliated students and non-Greek affiliated students (Hayek et al.). The sample used in this particular study included 42,182 undergraduate students representing 192 different institutions, all of which maintained a recognized Greek system at the time of data collection (Hayek et al.). Within this sample group, 6,560 undergraduates identified as members of a Greek-letter organization (Hayek et al.). The purpose of this study was to assess levels of engagement on various educationally effective practices, which are tied to student learning and personal development, among Greek-letter members and non-affiliated students (Hayek et al.).

Levels of engagement were broken down into several categories. These categories accounted for 13 variables: academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, supportive campus environment, personal-social gains, general education gains, practical competence gains, community service, diversity, satisfaction, co-curricular, class preparation, and relaxing and socializing (Hayek et al., 2002). An unstandardized Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) procedure revealed Greek-affiliated students showed statistically significant and positive effects for 11 of the 13 measures of engagement (Hayek et al.). After taking controls into account, Greek-affiliation continued to show statistically significant and positive effects in 9 of the 13 measures (active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, supportive campus environment, personal-social gains, general educational gains, practical competence gains, community service, satisfaction, and co-curricular) (Hayek et al.). Broadly, these results indicate that Greek-affiliated

students fare better than their non-affiliated peers on several indicators of academic engagement.

Hayek et al. (2002) also assessed the possibility of institutional influence on these results. Similar results occurred such that even after controlling for various institutional differences effects for Greek-affiliated students remained comparable for the seven engagements variables tested (Hayek et al.). Further analysis was completed to test institutional types, which indicated that the differentials between Greek-affiliated students and their non-affiliated peers were greater at large, public institutions as compared to private institutions on the community service, co-curricular activities, and class preparation variables (Hayek et al.). Greek-affiliation effects were similar among males and females, as well as freshman and seniors (Hayek et al.).

Several pieces of important information emerged from this study related to some of the apparent positive effects of Greek-letter membership. Greek-affiliated students showed positive effects on key components of academic engagement from student-faculty interaction to personal-social gains to satisfaction (Hayek et al., 2002). Additionally, these positive effects of engagement broadly applied across the Greek-affiliated population regardless of gender or class standing (Hayek et al.). However, one critique is in regards to the findings by class standing. Due to the way NSSE data is collected, from a random sample of only first year students and seniors, it is possible that the inclusion of sophomores and juniors in the sample could inform the findings in different ways (Hayek et al.). Regardless, the multi-institutional

nature of this study in addition to the large sample size gives additional confidence in some of these findings.

Importance of Culturally Based Organizations

Harper and Quaye (2007) sought to supplement previous research on the experience of Black male leaders by studying how involvement behavior is related to outcomes in identity expression and development. In this qualitative study of 32 Black male student leaders from six large, public research institutions in the Midwest, two important themes emerged related to the stated research purpose (Harper & Quaye). These two themes included the impetus for involvement in both predominantly Black and majority White campus organizations and the opportunity for cross-cultural communication. Findings from the Harper and Quaye study provide some important implications as to the value of culturally based student organizations in providing students with the opportunity for growth in aspects of identity development. Participant observations revealed that predominantly Black student organizations constituted the main spaces for Black males engagement on the six campuses that were represented in the study, even though many participants held some level of involvement in predominantly White organizations, as well (Harper & Quaye). As Harper and Quaye concluded of these predominantly Black organizations, "Without them, some of the participants may not have found a place for the expression and development of their Black identities." It is suggested in these findings that culturally based organizations are an important milieu for self-understanding and growth in terms of identity development.

Kimbrough (1995) studied the perceptions African American students hold of Black Greek-letter organizations and their function in leadership development. The quantitative study evaluated the impressions of 61 students, 27 students were members of a Black Greek-letter organization and 34 were not, at a predominantly White institution in a rural Midwestern setting (Kimbrough). Membership in a Black Greek-letter organization provided earlier and more opportunities for leadership development than these students received in predominantly White organizations (Kimbrough). Despite some of these positive attributes of Black Greek-letter organizations, Kimbrough's study raised further questions about the role these organizations play in uniting or dividing the African American community. In particular, members of Black Greek-letter organizations overwhelmingly connected the experience to leadership development, while non-members were ambivalent about that connection (Kimbrough). A limitation of the current study is that it assessed student perceptions at a singular predominantly White institution. A similar study at an historically Black institution would be a fascinating juxtaposition.

In a study looking at involvement and leadership development and the impact of Black Greek-letter organizations Kimbrough and Hutcheson (1998) found that students affiliated with a Black Greek-letter organization were more involved on the campus and had greater confidence in their leadership abilities than did their non-affiliated peers. Kimbrough and Hutcheson gathered information from participants at 12 institutions in their research, both predominantly White institutions and Historically Black institutions. Students who were affiliated with a Black Greek-letter organization at an HBCU significantly outperformed their peers in terms of

involvement, leadership confidence, and leadership ability development (Kimbrough & Hutcheson). Kimbrough and Hutcheson expected that the supportive environment of an HBCU for Black students would have resulted in more comparable scores between the Greek-affiliated and non-affiliated students.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an overview of previous literature and research related to the current study. First, male identity was explored through a variety of lenses including masculinities, gender role expectations, and gender role conflict. Next the chapter outlined several theories of male identity development that help to inform the ways in which men come to understand their sense of self. Because the focus of the current study is that of understanding dimensions of male self-awareness, this chapter also outlined constructions of consciousness of self and congruence. Finally, this chapter concluded by looking at various research that has made the case for differences that exists between Greek-affiliated students and their non-affiliated peers.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the methods used in this quantitative study. First, the research purpose is restated with corresponding hypotheses. Next is an explanation of the research design, which moves into a discussion of instruments and measures along with the validity and reliability of these. Following this, information will be given regarding the sampling strategy for the current study and then an explanation of data collection and analysis. Finally, this chapter concludes by outlining limitations of the study that pertain specifically to the methodology.

Research Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of this research was to examine if there are differences on the congruence and consciousness of self dimensions of the social change model of leadership development among men who are affiliated with a social fraternity, men who are affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not affiliated with a fraternity. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed:

1) Is there a difference between men who are members of a social fraternity, men who are members of a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not members of a fraternity on the consciousness of self construct of the social change model of leadership?

2) Is there a difference between men who are members of a social fraternity, men who are members of a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not members of a fraternity on the congruence construct of the social change model of leadership?

Ample research notes significant differences that exist between men affiliated with a fraternal organization and those who are not (DeBard, Lake & Binder, 2006; Eberhardt, Rice & Smith, 2003; Hayek et al., 2002; Kimbrough & Hutcheson, 1998; Pascarella et al., 2001; Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001; Terenzini et al., 1996). Based on this body of research along with the abovementioned research questions, the following alternative hypotheses were stated:

1) There exists a difference between male social fraternity members, male culturally based fraternity members, and non-Greek affiliated males in consciousness of self.

2) There exists a difference between male social fraternity members, male culturally based fraternity members, and non-Greek affiliated males in congruence.

<div align="center">Research Design</div>

The current study was a non-experimental *ex post facto* design based on data collected as part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). The MSL was theoretically grounded in the social change model of leadership development (SCM), which was developed by leadership and student affairs specialists through the Higher Education Research Institute between 1993 and 1996 (Wagner, 2006). SCM defines leadership as a collaborative, values-based process to effect positive social change (HERI, 1996).

The conceptual model of the MSL was Astin's (1993) I-E-O (Inputs-Environment-Outcomes) model, though the MSL utilized a quasi-I-E-O framework. Thus, data for the MSL is cross-sectional as opposed to longitudinal and were

collected at one point in time. To accommodate for information that would be required for the input dimension of the I-E-O model, certain questions on the MSL survey required students to reflect on past thoughts and experiences.

In addition to being an *ex post facto* study, the current research design was also causal comparative, based on pre-existing groups as opposed to experimental manipulation (Krathwohl, 1998). Participants in the current study fell into one of three categories: male affiliated with a social fraternity only, male affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, or male non-affiliated with a fraternity. All of these group designations were determined from circumstances that existed prior to the collection of the MSL data. Respondents indicated their membership affiliation at the time they responded to the MSL survey. Thus, the researcher did not manipulate the affiliation groups. Rather, these pre-existing groups, as defined in the MSL, were evaluated in the current study in an attempt to describe possible differences that existed between these various circumstances of fraternity affiliation or lack thereof.

<div align="center">Instruments and Measures</div>

The current study relies on information gathered from the MSL survey instrument, which will be described below. Specific measures and variables that were used in the current study from the MSL instrument will also be discussed below.

Instruments

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) survey instrument was developed by the MSL research team and assessed a variety of inputs and outcomes surrounding students' college experiences. The MSL instrument included demographic, behavioral, and attitudinal question categories. The survey instrument

was sub-divided into numerous categories including college information, perceptions

participants held before enrolling in college, experiences participants had in college,

student group involvements, development of leadership abilities, assessment of

leadership development, reflections on self, reflections on leadership, college climate,

and background information.

Development of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale. Several scales

were included within the MSL survey instrument, but the current study was only

concerned with data gathered from the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale-

Revised 2 (SRLS-R2) (Dugan, 2006b). Tyree (1998) initially developed The Socially

Responsible Leadership Scale. Tyree's scale was broken down into eight separate

scales (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common

purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change) that measured the social

change model of leadership development. The SRLS included scales that were of

interest in the current study, specifically the scales for consciousness of self and

congruence. After conducting several pilot tests to assess the SRLS for reliability and

validity, the final SRLS was composed of 103 items. Tyree's scale items maintained

strong reliability ranging from a high of .92 for citizenship to a low of .71 for

controversy with civility.

In preparation for the MSL, the SRLS was revised to a more manageable

length, in order to increase the likelihood for participants of the MSL to complete the

full survey. Appel-Silbaugh (2005) worked to reduce the 103-item SRLS to an 83-

item version, SRLS-R, that was used for both pilot tests. Dugan (2006b) later worked

further with the original SRLS to reduce it to a 68-item scale, SRLS-R2, which was

the scale ultimately used in MSL to measure dimensions of the social change model of leadership development. Reliability of the SRLS-R2 as calculated from the MSL data ranged from a high of .83 for commitment to a low of .77 for controversy with civility and citizenship.

   Pilot tests. Prior to data collection, the MSL research team tested the MSL survey instrument for construct validity through two pilot tests in the fall of 2005. The first of these pilot tests occurred during October of 2005 with a sample of 14 undergraduate students at the University of Maryland, College Park. Following feedback from the participants, some changes were made to the initial instrument, including the re-wording of some questions and an effort to reduce the length of time required to complete the survey. The initial average time to complete the survey was 30 - 35 minutes, which students reported to be too long.

   A second pilot test occurred in December of 2005. The second pilot test was conducted to test the web-based survey format, which would ultimately be used for the MSL. Of particular note, researchers were interested in observing the points at which students quit taking the web-based survey. This second test utilized a random sample of 3,411 students at the University of Maryland, College Park. During both pilot tests, SRLS-R was the scale used to measure the dimensions of the social change model of leadership. Of the 782 students who responded to the second pilot test survey, 12% did not complete the full survey. This second pilot test took 25 – 30 minutes to complete on average, but the percentage of students who did not complete the survey was worrisome enough to cause reason for a further reduction in the number of survey items. As a result, Dugan's (2006b) SRLS-R2, a 68-item scale, was

used for the final iteration of the MSL survey without sacrificing internal consistency of the instrument, but cutting down on the time students would need to complete the survey. The final completion time of the MSL survey was approximately 20 minutes.

Measures and Variables

The current study used several different variables and scales from the MSL survey instrument. Specific independent variables included student group involvement and gender, in order to create the three groups of interest in the current study, which included men affiliated with a social fraternity, men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not affiliated with a fraternity. In order to account for differences that may have been inherent to the self-selecting nature of these three groups, the quasi pre-tests for the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales were used as covariates. SRLS-R2 Scales that were used included the Consciousness of Self Scale and the Congruence Scale, which constituted the two dependent variables in the current study.

Student group involvement. The student group involvement question on the MSL was used to understand the nature of participants' involvement in groups on campus. Participants in the MSL were able to select all items that applied from a long list of possible student group involvements. A total of 21 areas of student group involvement were listed (see Appendix A). Of particular importance for the current study were two options: culturally based fraternities and sororities, and social fraternities or sororities. These two options were used to decipher a male student's affiliation either as Greek-affiliated with a social fraternity, Greek-affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, or not affiliated with a Greek-letter organization.

60

Gender. For the purpose of this study, only participants who identified as male were used. The MSL survey gave participants three options to select from in identifying their gender. These included female, male, and transgender.

Consciousness of self quasi pre-test. The consciousness of self quasi pre-test item was used to measure a participant's understanding of self prior to starting college. The quasi pre-test item for consciousness of self used a five-point Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Respondents were asked to reflect back to before they started college in responding to the degree to which they agreed with the statement "I had low self esteem."

Congruence quasi pre-test. The congruence quasi pre-test item sought to measure a participant's consistency between values and actions prior to the start of college. The quasi pre-test item for congruence was similarly constructed, also using a five-point Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Respondents were asked to reflect back to before they started college in responding to the degree to which they agreed with the statement "My behaviors reflected my beliefs."

Consciousness of self scale. Consciousness of self was measured in the MSL with the Consciousness of Self Scale, which was part of the SRLS-R2 (Dugan, 2006b). This scale assessed a participant's current understanding of self. Participants were able to rank their responses on this scale according to a five-point Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. A total of nine items constructed the scale and were assessed according to this scale to determine the participant's Consciousness of Self Scale score (see Table 3.1).

61

Reliability of the Consciousness of Self Scale of Tyree's (1998) SRLS was calculated as .82. A similar Cronbach alpha of .83 was determined for the Consciousness of Self Scale at the time of the MSL pilot. A final analysis of data collected as part of the MSL, which used the SRLS-R2 (Dugan, 2006b) produced an alpha of .79 for the Consciousness of Self Scale. Cronbach alpha results were calculated for the reliability of the Consciousness of Self Scale using the sample for the current study, which was determined to be .79.

Table 3.1: *Consciousness of Self Scale*

18. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following items by choosing the number that most closely represents your opinion about that statement.   (Circle <u>one</u> response for each.)
1 = Strongly disagree   **4 = Agree**   **2 = Disagree**   **5= Strongly Agree**   **3 = Neutral**
Q18.4: "I am able to articulate my priorities"   *Q18.6: "I have low self esteem"*   Q18.9: "I am usually self confident"   Q18.18: "The things about which I feel passionate have priority in my life"   Q18.22: "I know myself pretty well"   Q18.34: "I could describe my personality"   Q18.41: "I can describe how I am similar to other people"   *Q18.56: "Self-reflection is difficult for me"*   Q18.59: "I am comfortable expressing myself"
Note: Italics represent a negative response item that was reversed for scoring

Congruence scale. Congruence was measured in the MSL with the Congruence Scale, which was part of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale-Revised 2 (SRLS-R2) (Dugan, 2006b). This scale assessed participants' current abilities for their values and actions to be congruent with one another. Participants were able to rank their responses on this scale according to a five-point Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

A total of seven items were incorporated into the scale and assessed using this scale
to determine the participant's Congruence Scale score (see Table 3.2).

Reliability of the Congruence Scale of Tyree's (1998) SRLS was calculated as
.82. A similar Cronbach alpha of .85 was determined for the Congruence Scale at the
time of the MSL pilot. A final analysis of data collected as part of the MSL, which
used the SRLS-R2 (Dugan, 2006b) produced an alpha of .80 for the Congruence
Scale. Cronbach alpha results were calculated for the reliability of the Congruence
Scale using the sample for the current study, as well, and was determined to be. 82.

Table 3.2: *Congruence Scale*

18. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following items by choosing the number that most closely represents your opinion about that statement. (Circle <u>one</u> response for each.)
1 = Strongly disagree **4 = Agree** **2 = Disagree** **5= Strongly Agree** **3 = Neutral**
Q18.13: "My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs" Q18.27: "It is important to me to act on my beliefs" Q18.32: "My actions are consistent with my values" Q18.52: "Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me" Q18.63: "My behaviors reflect my beliefs" Q18.64: "I am genuine" Q18.68: "It is easy for me to be truthful"

Sampling Strategy

Two different sampling strategies were pertinent to the current study. First,
the method of sampling used in the MSL will be discussed below, as this comprised
the original pool from which the current study could draw participants. Second, the
specific sampling strategy used for this study will be explained. This sample is a
reduced sample from that of the MSL. In particular, the sample for the current study

does not include any participant who does not identify as male, which is not the case of the full MSL sample.

Sampling for the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership

Invitations to participate in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership were extended to institutions via three listservs that catered to professionals with an interest in leadership education. From this initial request, institutions were encouraged to complete an application, which garnered 150 interested schools. Through a process of purposive sampling, in order to attain appropriate institutional diversity for the study group, a total of 55 institutions were selected to participate in the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). The following criteria, among others, were considered in selecting the 55 institutions for diversity of type: public versus private, Carnegie classification, institutional size, geographic region, geographic location, primary student residence, and special focus (e.g. HBCU, Ivy League, religious affiliation, etc.). Of the 55 selected institutions, 52 institutions followed the study through to completion. Students participating at each campus were selected through a process of random sampling for institutions with a total student body that exceeded 4,000. In the case of institutions with a total student body that was less than 4,000 the full population represented the sample. The assumption was made that response rates of web-based surveys are approximately 30%, so campuses were oversampled by 70% in order to achieve the desired response rate.

Total responses from MSL numbered 155,716, constituting a response rate of 37%. Of these, 56,854 responses were considered usable. To enhance the quality and reliability of the data this number was further reduced through data preparation to

exclude those respondents that completed less than 90% of the core survey items. The total response number following this procedure was 50,378.

Sample for the Current Study

Before analyzing the data from the MSL, some further preparation was required to better fit the parameters of the current study. Of the 52 participating campuses, 46 had male students and maintained a recognized Greek-letter system. To arrive at this number, a review of institutional websites was conducted to confirm that an institution enrolled male students in addition to having a recognized Greek-letter system on their campus. Of these 46 institutions in the current study sample, 24 were considered large in student body size, 14 were considered medium in student body size, and 8 were considered small in student body size. Of the total 46 institutions, 19 were private and 27 were public. The data from these 46 campuses leaves an overall student sample size of 45,175.

The focus of the current study was on men, and, thus only male participants were left in the current sample, totaling a sample size of 17,973. Respondents with missing data pertinent to the current research questions and variables of interest were removed through a process of listwise deletion (n = 71), which brought the final total sample size to 17,902.

Due to the smaller number of men in the culturally based fraternity affiliation group within this sample of 17,902 the entire sample was used (n = 566). A random number generation technique was used to select a comparable number of cases for each of the other two groups, men who are affiliated with a social fraternity and men who are unaffiliated. These two groups were larger than the culturally based fraternity

men number so these random sample adjustments in the other groups ensured the number of cases in each group were the same for ease of statistical procedures, for example the increased robustness that equal groups allow for in meeting certain assumptions of the research design (Pallant, 2007). However, in order to ensure that the randomly generated groups did not dramatically alter the composition of these two groups, the social fraternity men and the non-affiliated men, demographic data for both of these groups was examined to assess that they were comparable to the larger sample group from which they were drawn. Because this study examined male students and their affiliation with a Greek-letter organization the sample was further sub-divided into those men who identified as members of a culturally based Greek-letter organization (n = 566), men who identified as members of a social Greek-letter organization, (n = 566), and men who did not identify as members of a Greek-letter organization, (n = 566).

For the purpose of this study, the culturally based fraternity men could be identified in two different ways. First, they may have selected that they were part of a culturally based fraternity, but not a social fraternity on the MSL instrument. Second, they may have selected that they were part of a culturally based fraternity and also selected being affiliated with a social fraternity on the MSL instrument. Meanwhile, social fraternity men were identified in only one way. They were only considered social fraternity men for the purpose of this study if they had selected membership in a social fraternity on the MSL instrument and not selected membership in a culturally based fraternity on the MSL instrument. Thus, these two groups, culturally based and social, are discrete in the way they have been constructed in this study. That said, the

group of men within the culturally based group who also selected a social fraternity membership as part of their experience present a group that were a surprise to the researcher. This particular group is further explained below in terms of its unique demographic characteristics in an attempt to understand why those participants may have selected both membership affiliations.

Once ineligible institutions and female or transgender respondents were removed from the data set in establishing the sample for the current study (prior to listwise deletion), a total of 569 men remained who had selected culturally based fraternities as an organization with which they were affiliated. Of these 569 supposed culturally based fraternity men, however, 309 had also selected social fraternities as an organization with which they were affiliated.

It is important to understand some of the demographic characteristics of this group of 309 cases in which there was overlap in claiming affiliation with both a culturally based and social fraternity. Within this group 96.4% of respondents were full-time students. There was a fairly even distribution of class standing, but with slightly more seniors (34.0%) and a smaller percentage of sophomores (16.8%). In terms of political views, 32.7% of this group considered themselves left of center on the political spectrum, while 27.6% considered themselves to be right of center. This group did well academically, with 26.5% of respondents scoring in the 3.50-4.00 range and only 1.6% claiming a GPA of 1.99 or less. 82.2% of respondents' parents had received at least some college level of education or greater. In terms of parental income, 16.1% of cases were $39,999 or lower, while 34.6% of cases were $100,000 or higher. Racial breakdowns produced some variance from other groups in this

study. White students accounted for 59.2% of this group of 309, African American students 8.1%, American Indian students 0.3%, Asian American students 12.6%, Latino students 7.4%, and multiracial students 7.4%. In other words, African American, American Indian, Asian American and Latino students were more represented in this group of 309 students in terms of percentages than in the social Greek group or non-affiliated group respectively. Of this group of 309 cases, 14.2% reported living in a fraternity house. Additionally demographic information was run on this group that was not run for the independent variable groups, in hopes of ascertaining whether this group was composed largely of what would be classified as social fraternities but may have a strong religious basis that students would perceive as a culturally based organization, for example Jewish fraternities such as Alpha Epsilon Pi that does fall under the umbrella of social organizations. It does not seem that that was the case. Of the 309 cases with overlap, only 10.7% reported being religiously Jewish. The largest religious affiliation for this group was Catholic at 29.1% of respondents in the overlap group.

<div align="center">Data Collection</div>

All data collection as part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership occurred between January 20, 2006 and March 8, 2006. Distribution of the survey instrument (see Appendix A) for the purpose of data collection was administered through a web-based format. This web-based survey was administered by Survey Science Group (SSG).

Every participating institution had a point person from the MSL research team to be in contact with regarding administration of the survey instrument and

corresponding administrative information that was requested from each campus. In addition to this contact, a detailed guidebook was sent to each institution in order to ensure a more uniform process from campus to campus.

Each participating campus had a specific window of time during which their version of the survey was administered. For each institution, this window constituted a three-week period of time that occurred at least two weeks after the commencement of classes, but before midterm exams. Data collection was deliberately planned for the second semester so as to give first year students and transfer students ample time to adjust to their campus environment.

Students were invited to take the survey through an initial e-mail invitation (see Appendix B). Depending on the timeframe during which the student completed the survey, up to three e-mail reminders could have been sent during that three-week period. Once the student completed the survey, they received no further e-mails.

Several incentives were included as part of the sampling strategy. Both national incentives were offered, as well as individual incentives at the institutional level. All participants in the MSL were entered into a draw for the national incentives and a chance to win one of six prizes. These included four i-Pod Nanos, a free registration for the LeaderShape Institute, and a $50 gift card to Old Navy. Beyond these national incentives, some individual participating institutions chose to offer their own incentives to the participants from their respective campus.

Data Analysis

Data analysis for the current study was conducted to explore the information in multiple ways. The following will outline the descriptive analyses that were

conducted as well as tests that were performed to assess whether assumptions for the research design were met. Additionally, the MANCOVA design used in this study is explained below.

Descriptive Analyses

Descriptive analyses of the data were used to further explain the nature of the three independent variable groups. Percentages to indicate the breakdown by race, class standing, living situation, grades, income level of parents, and education of parents were generated. Such demographic information provided a richer understanding of each independent variable group.

For the purpose of this study, race was assessed using a collapsed variable that grouped respondents into seven different categories. These included: White, African American/Black, American Indian, Asian American, Latino, Multiracial, or not included (presumably, if the respondent did not feel they identified with any of the aforementioned categories). Within the parameters of this study, participants could fall into one of five categories for class standing. Respondents could identify as first years/freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, or other. Only undergraduates were included in the current sample. In terms of the "other" category, this may include participants who were fifth-year seniors, for example, among other possibilities. The place of residence variable gave students six options in identifying their living situation. These included: parent/guardian or other relative home, other private home/apartment or room, college/university residence hall, other campus student housing, fraternity or sorority house, other. Grades were broken down into five different categories, 3.5-4.0, 3.0-3.49, 2.5-2.99, 2.0-2.49, and 1.99 or less. Income

level of parents was divided into several categories for respondents to choose from that ranged from incomes less than $12, 500 to $200,000 and over, in addition to giving participants the option of selecting that they did not know their parents income level or did not wish to say. Participants had a range of options in selecting their parents' highest levels of education obtained. These choices included: don't know, less than high school diploma or GED, high school diploma or GED, some college, associates degree, bachelors degree, masters degree, and doctorate or professional degree.

Analyses of Assumptions and Conditions for Multivariate Analysis of Covariance

The rationale for multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) in the case of the current study was based on the expectation that the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales were correlated and that covariates were required to account for differences that may have been due to the self-selecting nature of the independent variable groups. To confirm this expectation of correlation in order to proceed with MANCOVA, Pearson correlations were conducted. The significance and level of relationship determined from this analysis informed justification for MANCOVA.

Statistical and graphical analyses were performed on the data to evaluate whether or not it met the assumptions of MANCOVA. Assumptions of MANCOVA that were tested included sample size, normality, outliers, linearity, homogeneity of regression, multicollinearity, and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. All of these assumptions will be further discussed in chapter four.

Multivariate Analysis of Covariance and Post-hoc Analyses

Once the assumptions of MANCOVA were satisfied, MANCOVA was run to look at difference of means between the independent variable groups (male – social fraternity affiliated, male – culturally based fraternity affiliated, male – non-Greek affiliated) and outcomes of the two dependent variables (the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales); the quasi pre-tests for both the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales were used as the covariates. The MANCOVA test results were examined and interpreted for significance at an alpha level of .05.

For a significant MANCOVA result, post-hoc analyses were performed to ascertain specific between group differences. Univariate ANCOVA tests aided in looking at potential differences between groups by individual dependent variable. A Bonferroni adjustment was used to test significant results.

Limitations of Methodology

There are some inherent limitations in this study due to its nature as an *ex post facto* design. Indeed, the study was confined by an already existing sample and data set. Participants were chosen through the lens of an investigation into leadership outcomes as opposed to a specific interest in the outcomes of Greek-letter affiliation or male development. The types and wording of questions as they appeared on the MSL survey instrument were determined prior to the commencement of this study. The current study did not inform these original factors and, thus, is working within these already defined parameters.

An additional methodological limitation is in defining the three independent variable groups. The not affiliated group was composed solely of men who did not

identify as members of either a social fraternity or a culturally based fraternity. Men

in the social fraternity group were strictly those who identified as members of a social

fraternity, but not as members of a culturally based fraternity. The complexity arrives

with the culturally based fraternity group. Of those men in the overall student sample

used for this study (i.e., once ineligible institutions and female respondents were

removed), 566 men identified as members of a culturally based fraternity. Of these,

however, 309 also indicated that they identified with a social fraternity. Although the

MSL instrument was deliberate in putting the culturally based fraternity group option

before the social fraternity option for respondents to choose from, it seems that these

two categories were not as discrete in the minds of participants as they were for those

who created the instrument, as men would, in practice, not belong to both groups.

Additionally, even if a man selected the culturally based fraternity item, but realized

upon seeing the social fraternity option that that was more accurate, he would have

had the option on the web-based survey to change this response. Thus, it seems that

those respondents who selected the culturally based fraternity group, even if they also

selected the social fraternity option, had some reason for viewing the salience of their

fraternity experience as both cultural and social. For the purpose of this study, then,

the culturally based fraternity group was defined to include any man who identified

himself as a member of a culturally based fraternity, even if he also selected a social

element to that experience. Social fraternity men were defined only if they selected

the social fraternity affiliation, but did not select a culturally based affiliation. Further

information about the nature of this group will be discussed in chapters four and five.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology for the current study. After outlining the research purpose and corresponding alternative hypotheses, the *ex post facto* research design was explained. The current study used variables and instruments that were part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. Of particular note are the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales, which constituted the dependent variables of this study. Due to the likelihood of correlation between the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales and the possibility of men choosing affiliation based on inherent differences, MANCOVA was used to analyze the data. Chapter four will present findings from this analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this research was to examine if there were differences on the congruence and consciousness of self dimensions of the social change model of leadership among men who are affiliated with a social fraternity, men who are affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not affiliated with a fraternity. In order to account for pre-existing differences that may be present due to the self-selecting nature of these three independent variable groups, this study also used quasi pre-test measures for the two dependent variables, consciousness of self and congruence, as covariates. Two hypotheses were stated related to this research purpose. The first hypothesis was that there would be a difference among these three groups on the Consciousness of Self Scale. The second research hypothesis stated that there would be a difference among these three groups on the Congruence Scale. This chapter will outline results from statistical analyses to examine these hypotheses.

Demographic Description of Independent Variable Groups

Race

Some noticeable differences appeared between the three independent variables groups (culturally based fraternity men, social fraternity men, and non-Greek affiliated men) on this demographic variable (see Table 4.1). The not affiliated group had 71.4% of respondents who identified as White. The culturally based and social fraternity men groups showed considerable difference in percentage of White male membership. 51.6% of men in the culturally based group identified as White, while 84.1% of men in the social fraternity group indicated their racial affiliation as White. Notable differences were evident between these two groups across other racial

75

categories, as well (see Table 4.1). In summary, the culturally based fraternity men group was composed of 44.3% men of color, the non-affiliated group was comprised of 27.0% men of color, and the social fraternity group maintained a membership of 14.0% men of color. It should be noted that 4.1% of respondents in the culturally based group, 1.8% of respondents in the social group, and 1.6% of respondents in the not affiliated group indicated that their race was not included in the options from which they could select. Additionally, one respondent in both the social fraternity group and not affiliated group, respectively, did not respond to this question, and, thus, percentages do not total 100% in all groups for this question.

Table 4.1

Race by Independent Variable Groups

	Cultural Greek (n=)	Social Greek (n=)	Not Affiliated (n=)	Chi-square
White	51.6	84.1	71.4	$\chi^2 = 185.463$, df = 14, p< .05
African American/Black	13.6	1.6	4.1	
American Indian	0.5	0.2	0.4	
Asian American	13.4	3.9	11.0	
Latino	8.3	2.3	2.8	
Multiracial	8.5	6.0	8.7	
Not Included	4.1	1.8	1.6	

Class Standing

Results across the three independent variable groups in this study maintained similar representations of these class standing categories (see Table 4.2). There were slightly more sophomores (28.6%) in the social fraternity sample than in either the culturally based fraternity group (18.9%) or in the not affiliated group (20.8%), which when assessed with a crosstabulation showed as a significant difference.

Table 4.2

Class Standing by Independent Variable Groups

	Cultural Greek (n=)	Social Greek (n=)	Not Affiliated (n=)	Chi-square
First year/ Freshman	21.9	18.7	23.3	$\chi^2 = 22.027$, df $= 8$, p< .05
Sophomore	18.9	28.6	20.8	
Junior	26.0	21.6	26.3	
Senior	32.0	30.2	27.9	

Place of Residence

The social fraternity men group differed from the other independent variable groups (culturally based men and non-affiliated men) particularly in terms of living with relatives or living in a fraternity house (see Table 4.3). Only 4.2% of social fraternity men in this sample reported living with a relative, while 11.3% and 13.3% of culturally based and non-affiliated men, respectively, reported living with relatives. A similar difference existed for the potential of living in a fraternity house, where

25.4% of social fraternity men, 10.1% of culturally based men, and 0.2% of non-affiliated men maintained this living environment.

Table 4.3

Place of Residence by Independent Variable Groups

	Cultural Greek (n=)	Social Greek (n=)	Not Affiliated (n=)	Chi-square
Parent/Guardian Or other relative home	11.3	4.2	13.3	$\chi^2 = 196.612,\ df = 10,$ $p< .05$
Other private home, apartment, or room	33.7	28.4	36.6	
College/ University residence hall	35.2	35.3	41.2	
Other campus student housing	6.0	5.3	6.2	
Fraternity or sorority house	10.1	25.4	0.2	
Other	3.5	1.2	2.7	

Grades

The breakdowns by grade categories were comparable across the independent variable groups, with the exception that the not affiliated group maintained a higher percentage of men in the 3.50-4.00 range, at 32.5% (see Table 4.4), which proved to be statistically significant when examining the results of a crosstabulation. The culturally based fraternity group had 26.3% of members in this category, while 24.7% of social fraternity men fell in this range.

Table 4.4

College Grades by Independent Variable Groups

	Cultural Greek (n=)	Social Greek (n=)	Not Affiliated (n=)	Chi-square
3.50-4.00	26.3	24.7	32.5	$\chi^2 = 17.383,\ df = 10,\ p> .05$
3.00-3.49	38.2	38.9	36.4	
2.50-2.99	27.2	26.3	24.0	
2.00-2.49	6.0	8.7	5.7	
1.99 or less	1.4	1.4	1.1	

Income Level of Parents

Some pronounced disparity emerged on this demographic variable between the independent variable groups (see Table 4.5). For parents whose income level was below $39,999, 17.8% of the culturally based group and 16.1% of the non-affiliated group fell into this category. Only 9.3% of the social fraternity men reported their parents' earnings at $39,999 or below. At the other end of the spectrum, 45.1% of the social fraternity men reported parental incomes exceeding $100,000, whereas only 32.1% and 29.9% of the culturally based and non-affiliated groups, respectively, reported the same.

Table 4.5

Parental Income by Independent Variable Groups

	Cultural Greek (n=)	Social Greek (n=)	Not Affiliated (n=)	Chi-square
Less than $12,500	3.5	1.9	5.5	$\chi^2 = 82.432,\ df = 20,\ p<$ .05
$12,500 - $24,999	7.1	3.5	3.5	
$25,000 - $39,999	7.2	3.9	7.1	
$40,000 - $54,999	8.1	5.7	11.0	
$55,000 - $74,999	14.7	9.5	11.7	
$75,000 - $99,999	11.8	14.3	13.4	
$100,000 - $149,000	13.1	17.3	15.4	
$150,000 - $199,999	8.0	9.4	6.5	
$200,000 and over	11.0	18.4	8.0	
Don't know	8.5	6.7	10.2	
Rather not say	6.9	9.4	7.8	

Education Level of Parents

Some noteworthy data emerged from this demographic variable (see Table 4.6). In the culturally based fraternity group, 13.3% of respondents indicated that their parents' highest attained education level was a high school diploma or GED as compared to 8.5% of the social fraternity group and 10.8% of the not affiliated group. This pattern extended into higher education levels. 89.9% of social fraternity men,

86.1% of non-affiliated men, and 80.1% of culturally based fraternity men had a parent who had some college experience or higher.

Table 4.6

Parental Education by Independent Variable Groups

	Cultural Greek (n=)	Social Greek (n=)	Not Affiliated (n=)	Chi-square
Don't know	2.1	0.7	0.9	$\chi^2 = 33.470$, df = 14, p< .05
Less than high school or GED	4.4	0.9	2.3	
High school diploma or GED	13.3	8.5	10.8	
Some college	11.7	12.4	12.4	
Associates degree	6.9	6.5	6.2	
Bachelors degree	25.3	27.9	27.4	
Masters degree	22.1	29.5	24.9	
Doctorate or professional degree	14.1	13.6	15.2	

Preliminary Analyses

Analysis of Correlation Between Variables

Any multivariate analysis of variance design assumes some relationship between dependent variables, as the design assesses difference across independent variable groups on the combinations of dependent variables in addition to providing univariate information for each of the dependent variables (Pallant, 2007). As a result,

81

Pearson product-moment correlation analyses were conducted to assess the strength of the relationship between the two dependent variables, consciousness of self and congruence. There was a strong, positive correlation between these two variables, $r = .769$, N = 1698, $p < .01$.

In the case of multivariate analysis of covariance, the covariates should be correlated to the dependent variables. Thus, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were generated among these variables (see Table 4.7). Correlations between the covariates and the dependent variables maintained small to medium strength in relationships. Medium, positive correlations (Pallant, 2007) were maintained between the consciousness of self pre-test and consciousness of self ($r = .322$, N = 1698, $p < .01$), the congruence pre-test and consciousness of self ($r = .400$, N = 1698, $p < .01$), and the congruence pre-test and congruence ($r = .455$, N = 1698, $p < .01$). The relationship between the consciousness of self pre-test and congruence was small, but significant ($r = .150$, N = 1698, $p < .01$).

Finally, covariates in analysis of covariance design should not be correlated more strongly than .80 or above (Pallant, 2007). The covariates in this study, the quasi pre-test measures for consciousness of self and congruence, maintained a small, positive correlation ($r = .171$, N = 1698, $p < .01$). This correlation relationship between the covariates does not cause any concern.

Table 4.7

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between Variables and Covariates

Subscale	1	2	3	4
		N = 1698		
1. Pre test Consciousness of Self	1			
2. Pre test Congruence	.171**	1		
3. Consciousness of Self	.322**	.400**	1	
4. Congruence	.150**	.455**	.769**	1

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

Analysis was also conducted to test the strength of the relationship between the covariates and independent variable, which should not be a strong relationship. Using a crosstabulation the consciousness of self pre-test as covariate had a medium effect in terms of strength of relationship (Pallant, 2007) with the independent variable of Greek-letter affiliation (χ^2 [8, n = 1698] = 4.901, $p = .77$, Cramer's V = .038). The congruence pre-test as a covariate showed a large effect size in terms of strength of relationship with the independent variable (Pallant, 2007) when assessed with a crosstabulation (χ^2 [8, n = 1698] = 25.125, $p = .001$, Cramer's V = .086).

Analysis of Assumptions of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance

In order to proceed with multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) various assumptions of this analysis were tested. MANCOVA is the multivariate extension of ANCOVA that takes at least one covariate into account, thus

assumptions are similar to both MANOVA and ANCOVA designs (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Sample size. In order to proceed with multivariate analysis the number of cases in each cell of the design must exceed the number of dependent variables (Pallant, 2007). The current study far exceeds this expectation with each of the three independent variable groups numbering 566, which outnumbers the two dependent variables.

Normality. Multivariate analyses maintain adequate robustness to violations of normality when each cell of the design maintains at least 20 cases (Pallant, 2007). Again, this is far exceeded in the current design with 566 cases per cell, which will allow for some flexibility in meeting this assumption. On the dependent variable consciousness of self skewness was -.211 and kurtosis was -.066. This indicates a fairly symmetrical distribution that was slightly skewed to the right-hand side of the graph based on the skewness value, as a 0 value would indicate perfect symmetry (Pallant, 2007). A kurtosis value of 0 indicates perfect normality, while negative values indicate a flattening out of the graph (Pallant, 2007). Thus, the distribution of the consciousness of self dependent variable was very close to normal based on an examination of the kurtosis value. The skewness value for the congruence dependent variable was -.603, while the kurtosis value was 1.315. This implies normality that is less perfect than the consciousness of self dependent variable. Of particular note, the positive kurtosis value above 1 indicates the distribution is rather peaked (Pallant, 2007). The congruence data is less normally distributed than the consciousness of self data.

Outliers. Multivariate designs are sensitive to outliers (Pallant, 2007). The current study does contain outliers at both the univariate and multivariate levels. However, multivariate designs can accommodate a small number of outliers assuming a larger sample size (Pallant). One respondent, in particular, showed up as an extreme value when investigating Mahalanobis distances across the dependent variables within the social fraternity group. However, upon closer inspection of this case and of the 5% trimmed mean values as compared to the full sample means, the decision was made to leave this case in the sample, as it did not appear to be drastically changing the nature of the sample group, nor were the responses of this case unexpected. Mahalanobis distances were of concern with the culturally based fraternity group, as well, but further investigation of cases exceeding a comparison to a critical value obtained from a chi-square table showed that the scores were consistent with one another in that group.

Linearity. The assumption of linearity in multivariate design is that there is a linear relationship for dependent variables among independent variable groups (Pallant, 2007). Analysis of scatterplots for the dependent variables in this design (consciousness of self and congruence) separated by independent variable groups (men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, men affiliated with a social fraternity and men not affiliated with a fraternity) indicated no concern for a violation of this assumption.

Homogeneity of regression. The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes is used to assess the relationship between the covariate and dependent variables across groups to ensure an interaction is not present between the covariate

and the treatment group, in this case the affiliation (Pallant, 2007). In essence, this assures that the covariates are pulling out variance in a comparable way across the groups on each dependent variable. Both graphical and statistical procedures were conducted to assess this assumption, and both revealed that this assumption was met.

Multicollinearity and singularity. Multivariate analysis assumes correlation of the dependent variables (Pallant, 2007). If the dependent variables maintain a low correlation, separate univariate analyses are more appropriate, while a high correlation in the .80 or above range is also problematic, as it suggests multicollinearity (Pallant, 2007). A Pearson correlation was used to assess this assumption. There was a strong, positive correlation between these two dependent variables, $r = .769$, $n = 1698$, $p < .01$, but this fell below the .80 correlation level that would be problematic (See Table 4.7)

Homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices assesses whether data complies with the assumptions of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, but is sensitive to large sample sizes and can be disregarded if sample sizes are equal (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In the current study, there are equal group sizes in all cells. Regardless, log determinants were examined for all cells and there was not concern about a violation of this assumption.

Equality of error variances. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was fulfilled for consciousness of self (F = 1.908), but violated for congruence (F = 20.397). As a result, interpretations will need to meet a more conservative alpha level of .025 (Pallant, 2007).

Testing of Hypotheses

This section presents results of analyses conducted to test the two research hypotheses. These alternative hypotheses were:

1) There exists a difference between male social fraternity members, male culturally based fraternity members, and non-Greek affiliated males on consciousness of self.

2) There exists a difference between male social fraternity members, male culturally based fraternity members, and non-Greek affiliated males on congruence.

A one-way multivariate analysis of covariance was performed to investigate differences in consciousness of self and congruence based on Greek-letter affiliation on measures of self-awareness. The two dependent variables used as measures of self-awareness were consciousness of self and congruence, both scales that are a part of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale used to measure value dimensions of the social change model of leadership development. The independent variable was Greek-letter affiliation, which was separated into three groups, including: culturally based fraternity men, social fraternity men, and men not affiliated with a fraternity. Quasi pre-tests for consciousness of self and congruence were used as covariates in the model.

Multivariate designs assess the mean differences between independent variable groups on the combination of the dependent variables in addition to providing univariate information for the dependent variables treated separately (Pallant, 2007). As a result, MANCOVA was used to examine possible differences

between men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, men affiliated with a social

fraternity, and men not affiliated with a fraternity across the combination of

consciousness of self and congruence as dependent variables when quasi pre-tests for

both of these variables were used as covariates. A MANCOVA revealed statistically

significant differences among the independent variable groups on the combined

dependent variables (see Table 4.8), $F (4, 3384) = 5.654$, $p = .000$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .987$;

$\eta^2 = .007$. In other words, there was a difference noted between independent variable

groups across the combined dependent variables.

Table 4.8

Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Tests

Effect		Value	F	df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.411	1213.540	2	.000	.589
PRE-Test Consciousness of Self	Wilks' Lambda	.891	103.468	2	.000	.109
PRE-Test Congruence	Wilks' Lambda	.808	201.669	2	.000	.192
Affiliation	Wilks' Lambda	.987	5.654	4	.000	.007

Based on the above results, the decision was made to support the alternative

hypotheses stated for this study. The results showed that significant difference existed

between the independent variable groups for both dependent variable measures.

Post-hoc Analyses

To further investigate the nature of differences among the independent

variable groups, between-subjects effects were examined. Conducting post-hoc

analyses through univariate ANCOVA results revealed significant differences among

the independent variable groups on both measures. Consciousness of self showed

significance F (2, 1695) = 11.100 , p = .000; η^2 = .013, as did Congruence F (2, 1695)

= 7.030 , p = .001; η^2 = .008 (see Table 4.9). This indicates statistically significant

differences among the independent variables groups on both the consciousness of self

dependent variable and the congruence dependent variable when considered

separately.

Table 4.9

Univariate ANOVA Summary Table

Source	Dependent Variable	F	df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Self	1798.68	1	.000	.515
	Congruence	2306.86	1	.000	.577
PRE-Test Self	Self	146.49	1	.000	.080
	Congruence	11.63	1	.001	.007
PRE-Test Congruence	Self	259.38	1	.000	.133
	Congruence	397.85	1	.000	.190
Affiliation	Self	11.10	2	.000	.013
	Congruence	7.03	2	.001	.008

A comparison of adjusted and unadjusted means for both dependent variables by independent variable group revealed the nature of these differences (see Table 4.10). Investigation of adjusted and unadjusted means revealed a similar pattern on both dependent variables after adjusting for covariates. Means for all independent variable groups were higher than the mean scores for those groups on the quasi pre-tests. On the consciousness of self quasi pre-test mean scores for cultural Greeks, social Greeks, and not affiliated students, respectively, were 3.71, 3.74, and 3.66. On the congruence quasi pre-test mean scores for cultural Greeks, social Greeks, and not affiliated students, respectively, were 3.79, 3.89, and 4.01.

Table 4.10

Adjusted and Unadjusted Means for Consciousness of Self and Congruence by Greek Affiliation Group

Greek Affiliation	Consciousness of Self		Congruence	
	Adjusted M	Unadjusted M	Adjusted M	Unadjusted M
1. Cultural Greeks	3.82	3.80	4.00	3.97
2. Social Greeks	3.96	3.96	4.10	4.10
3. Not Affiliated	3.90	3.92	4.07	4.10

To further investigate the nature of the main effect of the MANCOVA for affiliation group, a Bonferroni post hoc test was conducted. Pairwise comparisons using a Bonferroni test illustrated mean differences on both dependent variables by independent variable groups that were significant.

On the consciousness of self dependent variable, the culturally-based

fraternity group showed a significant difference in the negative direction from both

the social fraternity group (mean difference = -.132, SE = .028) and from the not

affiliated group (mean difference = -.079, SE = .028) (see Table 4.11). The social

fraternity group showed a significant difference in the positive direction only from the

culturally-based fraternity group (mean difference = .132, SE = 0.28). The not

affiliated group showed a significant difference in the positive direction only from the

culturally-based fraternity group, as well (mean difference = .079, SE = 0.28). The

culturally-based fraternity group scored lower than the non affiliated group and the

social group on consciousness of self with statistical significance.

Table 4.11

Pairwise Comparisons for Consciousness of Self

Greek Affiliation		Mean Difference	Standard Error	Significance [a]
Cultural Greek	Social Greek	-.132*	.028	.000
	Not Affiliated	-.079*	.028	.016
Social Greek	Cultural Greek	.132*	.028	.000
	Not Affiliated	.053	.028	.184
Not Affiliated	Cultural Greek	.079*	.028	.016
	Social Greek	-.053	.028	.184

* Mean difference is significant at the .05 level
a Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni

On the congruence dependent variable, the culturally-based fraternity group

showed a significant difference in the negative direction from both the social

fraternity group (mean difference = -.103, SE = .028) and from the not affiliated

group (mean difference = -.071, SE = .028) (see Table 4.12). The social fraternity group showed a significant difference in the positive direction only from the culturally-based fraternity group (mean difference = .103, SE = 0.28). The not affiliated group showed a significant difference in the positive direction only from the culturally-based fraternity group, as well (mean difference = .071, SE = 0.28). The culturally-based fraternity group scored lower than the non affiliated group and the social group on congruence with statistical significance.

Table 4.12

Pairwise Comparisons for Congruence

Greek Affiliation		Mean Difference	Standard Error	Significance [a]
Cultural Greek	Social Greek	-.103*	.028	.001
	Not Affiliated	-.071*	.028	.036
Social Greek	Cultural Greek	.103*	.028	.001
	Not Affiliated	.032	.028	.760
Not Affiliated	Cultural Greek	.071*	.028	.036
	Social Greek	-.032	.028	.760

* Mean difference is significant at the .05 level
a Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni

To further understand the ways that respondents selected their affiliation with a culturally based fraternity, specific assessment of respondents at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) were conducted. A total of four respondents were members of a Greek-letter organization at an HBCU. All four were in the culturally based fraternity group for the purpose of this study. Of these four respondents, two selected that they were only members of a culturally based fraternity. Two selected

that they were members of a culturally based fraternity and a social fraternity. This pattern parallels the overlap that was found in terms of how the culturally based fraternity group identified.

Summary

This chapter outlined statistical results to test the two research hypotheses of this study. Results of MANCOVA indicated that there were statistically significant differences between male members of social fraternities, male members of culturally based fraternity, and men who are not affiliated with a fraternity on the two dependent variables, consciousness of self and congruence. Following this, additional analyses were used to further investigate the nature of this difference. Univariate ANCOVA results and an examination of adjusted and unadjusted means revealed similar differences between the independent variable groups for both dependent variables. Pairwise comparisons using a Bonferroni test indicated that culturally based fraternity men show a significant difference in the negative direction on both consciousness of self and congruence when compared to both the social fraternity group and the not affiliated group. The social fraternity group showed a significant difference in the positive direction on both dependent variables from only the culturally-based fraternity group. The not affiliated group also showed a significant difference in the positive direction from only the culturally based fraternity group. The following chapter will further expand upon these results and draw implications for practice.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore possible differences among men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, men affiliated with a social fraternity and men not affiliated with a fraternity on the dependent variables consciousness of self and congruence. This chapter will summarize results of statistical procedures to explore this difference and discuss the findings. Additionally, this chapter will outline implications for practice and suggestions for future research that emerged through the process of the current study.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

A multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) revealed statistically significant differences among the three independent variable groups (men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, men affiliated with a social fraternity, and men not affiliated with a fraternity) across the combination of two dependent variables (consciousness of self and congruence) $F(4, 3384) = 5.654$, $p = .000$; Wilks' Lambda = .987; $\eta^2 = .007$ (see Table 4.3). Covariates used in this design included quasi pre-test items for the two dependent variables. Further investigation of the results of the MANCOVA showed a statistically significant difference between independent variable groups on both dependent variables when considered individually. Consciousness of self showed significance $F(2, 1695) = 11.100$, $p = .000$; $\eta^2 = .013$, as did Congruence $F(2, 1695) = 7.030$, $p = .001$; $\eta^2 = .008$ (see Table 4.4). Pairwise comparisons using a Bonferroni test were used to further establish specific significant differences between groups. On the consciousness of self dependent variable, the culturally-based fraternity group showed a significant

difference in the negative direction from both the social fraternity group (mean difference = -.132, SE = .028) and from the not affiliated group (mean difference = -.079, SE = .028) (see Table 4.13). On the congruence dependent variable, the culturally based fraternity group also showed a significant difference in the negative direction from both the social fraternity group (mean difference = -.103, SE = .028) and from the not affiliated group (mean difference = -.071, SE = .028). In other words, for both consciousness of self and congruence, culturally-based fraternity men are scoring significantly lower than both their unaffiliated and social Greek peers.

The results of this study are partially consistent with much previous research that has noted differences between fraternity men and their non-affiliated peers on a number of outcome variables (DeBard, Lake & Binder, 2006; Eberhardt, Rice & Smith, 2003; Hayek et al., 2002; Kimbrough & Hutcheson, 1998; Pascarella et al., 2001; Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001; Terenzini et al., 1996), though in the current study only culturally based fraternity men were significantly different from the non-affiliated population. Of particular note in the current study, though, is the disparity on consciousness of self and congruence that seems to exist not simply between men who are affiliated with a culturally-based fraternity and those who are not, but also the discrepancy between men affiliated with a social fraternity and men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity. Previous research has often failed to view the social fraternity and culturally based fraternity experiences as discrete, even though differences do exist (McClure, 2006). This study attempted to treat these two experiences as separate, but there were some limitations to that effort due to the way

95

the three independent variable groups in this study were constructed, which will be discussed further in the limitations section that follows.

The introductory chapter of this study outlined the importance of leadership as an outcome of fraternal membership, particularly because it is a value so often espoused by Greek-letter organizations (Harms et al., 2006). One aspect of effective leadership that has been identified by many authorities on leadership is that of self-awareness and insight (Astin, 1996; Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Considering adjusted mean scores for both consciousness of self and congruence by Greek affiliation showed that all groups maintained aggregate scores that were in the high 3-point to low 4-point range on a 5-point Likert-type scale rating. On this scale rating, 3 was considered a neutral response. Thus, the average response for all three independent variable groups suggests all of these men think of themselves as having a reasonably good sense of self and ability to act congruently with their values and beliefs. Certainly, there is room for improvement across all groups of these men, but it seems that no group, in particular, is scoring low on consciousness of self or congruence that would cause reason for concern about their capacity to effectively engage as self-aware leaders.

That noted, it is of concern that men affiliated with a culturally based fraternity are scoring lower than non-affiliated men and social fraternity men at a statistically significant rate on consciousness of self and congruence, which begs the question as to why this is occurring. In part, this phenomenon may be connected to the nature of the fraternal experience in culturally based organizations. In the case of

96

historically Black Greek organizations (one example of a culturally based fraternity), in particular, membership functions in a way that helps to lower members' feelings of isolation on predominantly White campuses, by linking members to the college community and the larger Black community (McClure, 2006). This is something that is less necessary for White students in historically White fraternities (social fraternities) as they are less in need of seeking out same-race support groups (McClure). Rather, these same-race support groups are inherent for White students on predominantly White campuses through their participation in mainstream campus organizations (McClure). The higher percentage of men of color in the culturally based fraternity group (44.3%) in the current study as compared to that in the social fraternity group (14.0%) or non-affiliated group (27.0%) may fit into this logic pattern.

On predominantly White campuses, in particular, it may be the case that men of color gravitate toward culturally based fraternity affiliation as a mechanism to find this connection of same-race groups as an anchor. In a qualitative study by McClure (2006), male members of historically Black Greek-letter organizations expressed feelings of disorientation and alienation on predominantly White campuses that resulted in what one respondent characterized as causing a general sense of "weariness" (p. 1047). These feelings, however, were transformed through the historically Black fraternity experience, which often left members feeling more connected to the campus and less isolated (McClure).

Although it is very positive that the historically Black fraternal experience in the McClure (2006) study could be helpful in connecting students of color to feeling a

greater sense of belonging in their campus environment, it cannot be overlooked that these students arrive in college with feelings of alienation and the need to adapt to White mainstream culture on most college campuses. This is, perhaps, where a parallel can be drawn to the current study and the lower scores of culturally-based fraternity men on consciousness of self and congruence measures. Though numerically this suggests social fraternity men are more developed on these measures than their culturally based fraternity peers this may be more due to the complexities of privilege (Tatum, 2003) that are at work in the background given the variation in men of color composition in these three independent variable groups. Given the greater proportion of men of color in the culturally based fraternity group in the current study, it is reasonable to expect that many more of these men than is the case in the non-affiliated or social fraternity groups would experience the challenges of adapting to campus environments that are organized around the White mainstream, as described by respondents in the McClure (2006) study. This, in turn, would increase the need for these men to require the anchoring and sense of belonging that would come from a culturally-based group experience. This greater attachment to a group, though, could result in greater sense of self as connected to being a member of a culturally based group as opposed to an individualized sense of self, which may not be as widely supported in the context of the broader White mainstream university environment.

Students frequently do not experience their campus cultural climate in the same way. A study by Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr (2000) confirmed findings of previous research by showing that students of color were much more likely than their

White peers to feel pressure to conform to racial stereotypes of their academic performance and behavior, and to attempt to minimize racial group characteristics in order to be accepted. This certainly points in the direction of students of color feeling pressures of conformity, which could certainly affect aspects of the ability to act congruently with their internal sense of self in the face of these external demands.

For college men of color, these external demands are ever-present. As hooks (2004) explained of Black men, "To build the self-esteem that is the foundation of self-love black males necessarily engage in a process of resistance, during which they challenge existing negative stereotypes and reclaim their right to self-definition" (p. 142). There is a constant struggle for Black men that is connected to tension between an internal definition of self that is not consistent with what the macro society has imposed (Marable, 2001). This reality could certainly explain the results of the current study in which the culturally based fraternity men were lower than their social fraternity peers on consciousness of self and congruence.

Another explanation for the discrepancy between social Greek men and culturally based Greek men may have to do with opportunities for mentorship. One of the complexities of mentorship that is of particular concern for students of color is the importance of race in mentor relationships. A study by Liang, Tracy, Kauh, Taylor and Williams (2006) that looked at differences between Asian American and White American college students on mentorship supported previous findings that cultural similarity is an important component in the formation of successful mentoring relationships. As Patton and Harper (2003) noted, mentorship of persons of color can certainly include the desire to connect with those the student can identify with in

terms of interests, but also in terms of someone who looks like them and has had similar experiences.

A construct related to self-awareness, particularly to congruence, is that of self-authorship. In Baxter Magolda's (2002) study of college students, self-authorship was often not something that students were able to achieve during their college years, the process of which requires the ability to develop an internal sense of self. Baxter Magolda connected this reality to the fact that college students do not frequently receive messages in their collegiate experience that emphasizes the need to develop such an internal definition of self. This may be even more the case for men of color, as they face the constant challenge of externally defined conceptions of their role in society (hooks, 2004; Marable, 2001). The results of the current study may be tied to the fact that men of color have this increased hurdle to overcome in confronting the external before they can come to terms with their internal definitions of self.

All of this said, it might also be useful to look beyond the individuals and groups that comprised these differences as the sources themselves of the discrepancy. In other words, it may be less about differences among these groups so much as the measures and nature of the items that were teasing out these differences. For example, one of the questions on the Consciousness of Self Scale asked participants to respond with their agreement to the statement "I can describe how I am similar to other people." Another question on this same scale asked respondents to indicate their agreement with the statement "I am comfortable expressing myself." It could certainly be argued that these questions are biased towards those in a majority identity group. For those men who are in an underrepresented racial group, it may be that their

experience of difference from others is more salient than that of how they draw similarity. In a related way, men of color who may experience their campus environment as one requiring conformity (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000) may not feel as comfortable expressing themselves not because of a lack of consciousness of self, but rather because of a climate that sends messages to restrict such authenticity for these men.

Similar concerns can be drawn for the Congruence Scale items. One of the questions on this scale asked respondents to indicate their agreement with the statement "It is easy for me to be truthful." The question for men of color on college campuses may not be so easy as to whether or not they are congruent with the values and actions. With the increase stakes created by external definitions of identity expression for men of color (hooks, 2004; Marable, 2001) and campus environments that inherently demand conformity to dominant paradigms (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000) men of color may very well act congruently, but it may not be with ease as the above question for the Congruence Scale would suggest. In this scenario, the hurdle has nothing to do with the ease of the activity, but the barriers to cross in reaching a place of personal congruence are already so high with so many external forces pushing in an opposite direction against these men of color. Thus, caution must be made with the interpretation of these results as not so much shortcomings on the part of the culturally based fraternity group, but at least also in part due to the nature of the frame through which consciousness of self and congruence were conceptualized. It is important to keep in mind that the scale used in this study was derived from the MSL,

which was a leadership study. This, in particular, would have affected the frame through which respondents were considering either of these dimensions.

<p style="text-align:center">Implications for Practice</p>

Anson and Marchesani (1991) claimed that, "fraternities and sororities offer today's students opportunities for personal development unmatched in most campus organizations" (p. ix). That opportunity may very well exist. However, the results of this study suggest that Greek-letter affiliation, uniformly, does not account for such positive outcomes on personal development in terms of aspects of self-awareness, as evidenced by the discrepancy between the independent variable groups on consciousness of self and congruence. In the current study, culturally based fraternity men fall below their social Greek and non-affiliated peers on these two dimensions of self-awareness.

One immediate implication of this finding is in considering how it plays into assumptions, either positive or negative, that are held of the experience offered by Greek-letter organizations. Would it be reasonable to expect that Greek-affiliated men may score lower on aspects of self-awareness as compared to their non-affilaited peers based on the plethora of negative outcomes often associated with Greek-letter membership such as hazing, alcohol abuse, and poor academic performance (Danielson, Taylor, & Hartford, 2001; Eberhardt, Rice & Smith, 2003; Nuwer, 1999; Pascarella, Flowers & Whitt, 2001)? Or would it be reasonable to expect that Greek-affiliated men may derive the positive personal benefits that might be associated with membership in what can be characterized as a values-based organization (Franklin Square Group, 2003; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998b)? These are assumptions in need of

<p style="text-align:center">102</p>

consideration for all those who interface with students on college campuses today. The implication for practice from the current study is certainly that effort must be made to continuously challenge assumptions about the nature of the Greek-letter experiences and to understand it through research that can tease out the subtleties of those experiences. In particular, current practitioners need to be reminded that most previous research of the Greek-letter experience has not looked at culturally based groups as a separate entity, although practice has often extrapolated about fraternity experiences as a conglomerate from these findings (Kimbrough, 1995; McClure, 2006).

Participants in Davis' (2002) qualitative study responded to the question of what it was like for them to be a man on campus with some difficulty in conceptualizing their experience as male. Those who were able to answer the question, though, expressed the common theme of feeling left out on their campus. While many services existed to support and affirm women's identities, there was a lack of corresponding services for men (Davis). If this crisis in affirming men's identities exists, it seems from the findings of the current study that there exists a corresponding concern within subgroups of college men, in this case that culturally based fraternity men are scoring lower on consciousness of self and congruence compared to their non-affiliated and social Greek peers. Davis' study suggests a situation of inequity in terms of services for men on college campuses, and the current study gives reason to consider even further whether the services we are presently providing men, as in the case of fraternity advising, are reaching all men equally or in the ways that would be most beneficial to their development as self-

aware men. Student affairs practitioners must continue to help men probe their sense of self and ask questions that encourage men to become more self-aware. In particular, practitioners must be sensitive to the societal pressures at play that may make an internal definition of self even more difficult for men of color to explore (hooks, 2004; Marable, 2001).

The discrepancy between two types of male Greek-letter experiences, social or culturally based, suggests that there is room for increased attention to helping to craft the fraternity experience for all groups into one that can be connected to personal growth in the form of aspects of self-awareness, such as consciousness of self and congruence. Such an experience would include elements of reflection that encourage members to explore their sense of identity complexly. In considering the ways the fraternal experience can be part of continuous development for members, attention must be made to ensuring that development also occurs along the lines of emotional health in the form of consciousness of self and congruence.

The question must be asked, then, as to why this discrepancy exists between fraternal experiences. Are those who work with fraternities missing a huge opportunity in terms of promoting personal development and growth within the fraternal experience in ways that will be most beneficial to particular kinds of fraternal experiences? Or are we already interfacing differently with these two distinct fraternal groups in ways that contribute to the differences noted in this study? These are questions that should be considered by all those who work with fraternity men from full time professionals to volunteers as a gap that must be addressed.

Within the parameters of the large sample used for this study from the MSL it is clear that the lines between a culturally based fraternity experience and a social fraternity experience began to blur in terms of identification for the respondents. These two categories were ultimately not as discrete in the eyes of respondents as they presumably are in the eyes of practitioners and researchers. An implication for practice that emerges from this is a continued need for practitioners to challenge their own notions of how they are categorizing students. As much as the idea of culturally based fraternities versus social fraternities makes categorical sense for practitioners and researchers it does not appear the case from the current study that students identify with their Greek-letter experience being delineated in this way.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Further Research</div>

Currently, research on the unique experience of members of culturally based fraternities is sparse. It is often the case that research about fraternities does not recognize culturally based Greek-letter organizations as something different than social fraternities (Kimbrough, 1995; McClure, 2006). The nature of outcomes as a result of membership in a culturally based fraternity must be further explored. Research must look beyond the majority group, in this case social fraternities, in considering the impact Greek-letter membership has on students.

As the current study supports, there is an element of complexity in accurately parsing out membership in a culturally based fraternity versus a social fraternity. Data from the MSL attempted to delineate these two groups, but it is clear from the results of the current study that students do not necessarily identify with the same terminology that researchers and practitioners may gravitate towards. That said, it is

critical that future research continue to work to understand differences that exist between these experiences. One venue to pursue this given the current data may be to look at differences between four different independent groups, which would split the current culturally based group into two further groups (men who selected only affiliation with a culturally based fraternity and men who selected simultaneous affiliation with both culturally based and social fraternities). Of particular note, future research must investigate the best means or language that will assess the unique experiences of culturally based fraternity men.

More needs to be explored about ways fraternity experiences influence men's personal development and growth, particularly related to gender role conflict (O'Neil, 1981), as social fraternities, in particular, are viewed as bastions of hegemonic masculinity (Rhoads, 1995). As Rhoads discovered in his ethnographic study, fraternity culture has the potential to enact very limited definitions of masculinity that reinforce the need to oppress women and gay males, all couched in an environment that places emphasis on physical power and aggression. The implications of such an environment are of great concern to the male members of such organizations. Further research is needed to understand how prevalent such hegemonic cultures are within fraternities and what effects they produce among members, particularly in terms of potential stress and strain related to gender role conflict.

Wade's (1998) construction of a theory of male reference group identity dependence is an intriguing concept. In particular, this theory holds much appeal when thinking about the way that groups, such as fraternities, affect a man's sense of self and identity formation. The current study would have been interesting to

investigate through the window of a male's reference group identity dependence status as connected to measures of consciousness of self and congruence. There is work that needs to be done with the concept of male reference group identity dependence and how it interfaces with the Greek-letter organization experience. A fraternity certainly has the potential to act as a reference group in the way it is conceived of in Wade's work, but more information is needed on the ways this reference group can either positively or negatively impact a man's identity formation and sense of self as a fraternity member.

Dugan (2006a) discovered differences between men and women on the consciousness of self and congruence dimensions of the social change model of leadership development. In particular, men scored lower than their female counterparts on these aspects of self-awareness. This finding is something that needs to be explored further, particularly in terms of understanding why men are doing more poorly on these dimensions. The potential that men are not as self-aware as their female peers is a disturbing possibility that needs to be on the radar of practitioners and researchers alike. Further research into aspects of male self-awareness among college students is certainly a venue that must be explored.

Finally, the current study brought to light some of the challenges and limitations inherent in quantitative research, particularly in terms of trying to understand groups that are not widely represented in the current canon of research, such as cultural based fraternity men. A limitation of the current study was in accurately assessing the nature of a man's Greek-letter affiliation as culturally based or social. Evidently, the ways students see their experience is not congruent with the

107

ways researchers and practitioners have attempted to partition it in discrete categories such as culturally based or social. To truly understand the nature of these experiences through the eyes of the students' themselves, qualitative research is a venue that needs to be further explored. Particularly in terms of understanding the experience of our students in culturally based fraternities, an area that has to date not been widely explored, qualitative research could help future research by identifying aspects of the experience that are most salient to the students.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

One of the most obvious limitations of the current study is due to its construction as an *ex post facto* design. This limited the nature of information that could be assessed for the purposes of exploring dimensions of male self-awareness, as the current researcher did not influence questions or items that appeared on the MSL. Additionally, the MSL was a study concerned primarily with leadership outcomes, and, although the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales were able to provide information about self-awareness they did so through the frame of leadership. Ultimately, the current study worked within parameters that were pre-established through the MSL.

The independent variable groups in this study were all self-selecting. As a result, it is difficult to make too much commentary on the nature of the Greek affiliation experience or lack thereof on outcomes explored in this study. Although a quasi pre-test measure was used in this study to attempt to control for potential inherent pre-existing differences among the groups, this quasi pre-test had its limitations in terms of explanatory power, also. The quasi SRLS pre-tests used on the

MSL relied on participants reflecting back on their thought processes in high school, as opposed to being a true pre-test. Additionally, the quasi pre-tests for both the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales were respectively only one item each.

Data gathered for the MSL relied entirely on student self-reports. Thus, there is much subjectivity that occurred in this process depending on how respondents interpreted certain questions and their responses to those. Although the Consciousness of Self and Congruence Scales have maintained good reliability in many studies, assessing validity is somewhat more difficult. Previous research (Dugan, 2006a) noted differences between men and women on the consciousness of self and congruence dimensions of the social change model of leadership development, which could be explained as identified differences on these constructs or as different frames of approaching these constructs for understanding of what is being asked.

There appeared to be some problem with reporting Greek affiliation for many participants of the MSL. Although students cannot simultaneously be members of a social fraternity and a culturally based fraternity, several respondents selected both options. For the purpose of this study, these cases were included as part of the culturally based fraternity group. The decision to do so was based on the judgment that something about a cultural component to their fraternity experience was salient to these men, and, thus, they were included as part of the culturally based group.

It is clear from the situation of cases selecting both cultural and social affiliation that there was a problem in accurately gauging male Greek affiliation on the MSL. Whether this was a problem of language or ordering of questions is

109

something that will need to be explored further, but the reality that well over half of the men in the data set (excluding institutions that did not meet the criteria of having a recognized Greek-letter system) who indicated that they were members of a culturally based fraternity also indicated that they were members of a social fraternity is problematic.

This study is also limited in attempting to construct Greek affiliation as a discrete experience. Students are involved in many experiences during their college years and their choice to affiliate with a Greek organization or to not affiliate is but one experience. The current study viewed Greek-letter affiliation as a possible place where issues of male self-awareness may unfold in different ways. That said, there may be a myriad of other student groups or experiences that male students are involved in that could also account for differences or lack thereof in terms of their senses of consciousness of self and congruence. This study did not look at other comparable student group involvement that may also provide important information about male self-awareness.

Finally, variation exists in the student experience by institutional type. This study looked at an aggregate student sample restricted only by excluding institutions that did not have a recognized Greek-letter system on their campus or were female only institutions. As the Hayek et al. (2002) study suggested, institutional type might have an effect on the nature of the Greek-letter experience and the magnitude of differences that exist between Greek-affiliated students and their non-affiliated peers as a result. This was not accounted for in the current study.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to examine if there are differences on the congruence and consciousness of self dimensions of the social change model of leadership among men who are affiliated with a social fraternity, men who are affiliated with a culturally based fraternity, and men who are not affiliated with a fraternity. Quasi pre-tests for both of these dimensions (consciousness of self and congruence) were used in order to account for potential inherent differences among these self-selected groups. The results of a MANCOVA revealed significant difference across the independent variable groups for the dependent variables while adding the covariates of quasi pre-tests for both measures. Further investigation of this result revealed that culturally based fraternity men scored significantly lower than both non affiliated men and social fraternity men on both dependent variables. There are several implications of these findings for practice, not the least of which is considering what about the current state of fraternities on college campuses allows for these discrepancies between these two types of fraternal experiences. There are many areas for future research, but attention needs to be made to looking more critically at the nature of culturally based fraternal experiences, something that has been sparsely accomplished in the past. The experiences of these students need to be captured in greater depth and accuracy in research.

Appendix A: MSL Instrument

NOTE:
This is a paper and pencil version of what will be presented as an on-line web survey. Skip patterns will automatically take the respondent to the appropriate section. Shaded sections/ items will be used in split samples and will not be asked of all participants.

COLLEGE INFORMATION

1. **Did you begin college at your current institution or elsewhere?** (Choose One)

   ○ Started here
   ○ Started elsewhere

2. **Thinking about this academic term, how would you characterize your enrollment?** (Choose One)

   ○ Full-Time
   ○ Less then Full-Time

3. **What is your current class level?** (Choose One)

   ○ First year/freshman
   ○ Sophomore
   ○ Junior
   ○ Senior
   ○ Graduate student
   ○ Other

4. **Are you currently working OFF CAMPUS?**
   (Circle one)   YES NO
   If NO skip to #5

   4a. Approximately how many hours do you work off campus in a typical 7 day week?

   [ ]

   4b. In your primary off campus position, how frequently do you: (Circle one for each item)

   | 1 = Never | 3 = Often |
   | 2 = Sometimes | 4 = Very Often |

Perform repetitive tasks	1	2	3	4
Consider options before making decisions	1	2	3	4
Perform structured tasks	1	2	3	4
Have the authority to change the way some things are done	1	2	3	4
Coordinate the work of others	1	2	3	4
Work with others on a team	1	2	3	4

5. **Are you currently working ON CAMPUS?**
   (Circle one)   YES NO
   if NO skip to #6

   5a. Approximately how many hours do you work on campus in a typical 7 day week?

   [ ]

   5b. In your primary position, how frequently do you: (Circle one for each item)

   | 1 = Never | 3 = Often |
   | 2 = Sometimes | 4 = Very Often |

Perform repetitive tasks	1	2	3	4
Consider options before making decisions	1	2	3	4
Perform structured tasks	1	2	3	4
Have the authority to change the way some things are done	1	2	3	4
Coordinate the work of others	1	2	3	4
Work with others on a team	1	2	3	4

6. **In an average academic term, do you engage in any community service?**
         YES NO
   if NO skip to #7

   In an average academic term, approximately how many hours do you engage in community service? (circle one for each category).

   As part of a class
   0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

   With a student organization
   0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

   As part of a work study experience
   0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

   On your own
   0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30

7. **Check all the following activities you engaged in during your college experience.**

   ○ Studied abroad

   ○ Experienced a practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical experience

   ○ Participated in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together.

   ○ Enrolled in a culminating senior experience (capstone course, thesis etc.)

○ None of the above

YOUR PERCEPTIONS BEFORE ENROLLING IN COLLEGE

8. Looking back to *before you started college*, **how confident were you that you would be successful at the following:** (Circle one response for each.)

| 1 = Not at all confident | 3 = Confident |
| 2 = Somewhat confident | 4 = Very confident |

Handling the challenge of college-level work	1	2	3	4
Feeling as though you belong on campus	1	2	3	4
Analyzing new ideas and concepts	1	2	3	4
Applying something learned in class to the "real world"	1	2	3	4
Enjoying the challenge of learning new material	1	2	3	4
Appreciating new and different ideas, beliefs	1	2	3	4
Leading others	1	2	3	4
Organizing a group's tasks to accomplish a goal	1	2	3	4
Taking initiative to improve something	1	2	3	4
Working with a team on a group project	1	2	3	4

9. Looking back to *before you started college*, **how often did you engage in the following activities:** (Circle one response for each.)

| 1 = Never | 3 = Often |
| 2 = Sometimes | 4 = Very Often |

Performing volunteer work	1	2	3	4
Participating in student clubs/ groups	1	2	3	4
Participating in varsity sports	1	2	3	4
Took leadership positions in student clubs, groups or sports	1	2	3	4
Participating in community organizations (e.g. church youth group, scouts)	1	2	3	4
Taking leadership positions in community organizations	1	2	3	4
Participating in activism in any form (e.g. petitions, rally, protest)	1	2	3	4
Getting to know people from backgrounds different than your own	1	2	3	4
Learning about cultures different from your own	1	2	3	4

Participating in training or education that developed your leadership skills 1 2 3 4

10. Looking back to *before you started college*, **please indicate your agreement with the following items by choosing the number that most closely represented your opinion about that statement AT THAT TIME:** (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Strongly disagree	4 = Agree
2 = Disagree	5= Strongly Agree
3 = Neutral	

Hearing differences in opinions enriched my thinking	1	2	3	4	5
I had low self esteem	1	2	3	4	5
I worked well in changing environments	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoyed working with others toward common goals	1	2	3	4	5
I held myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to	1	2	3	4	5
I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group	1	2	3	4	5
My behaviors reflected my beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
I valued the opportunities that allowed me to contribute to my community	1	2	3	4	5
I thought of myself as a leader ONLY if I was the head of a group (e.g. chair, president)	1	2	3	4	5

11a. Before you started college, **how would you describe the amount of leadership experience you have had (e.g., student clubs, performing groups, service organizations, jobs)?** Please circle the appropriate number

No experience   1   2   3   4   5   Extensive experience

11b. Before you started college, **how often did others give you positive feedback or encourage your leadership ability (e.g., teachers, advisors, mentors)?**
Please circle the appropriate number
Never   1   2   3   4   5   frequently

11c. Before you started college, **How would you have reacted to being chosen or appointed the leader of a group?** Please circle the appropriate number
Very   1   2   3   4   5   very
uncomfortable   comfortable

11d. Before you started college, **how often did you see others be effective leaders?**
Please circle the appropriate number
Never   1   2   3   4   5   frequently

11e. Before you started college, **how often did you think of yourself as a leader**
Please circle the appropriate number
Never   1   2   3   4   5   frequently

YOUR EXPERIENCE IN COLLEGE

12. How often have you engaged in the following activities during your college experience:
(Circle one for each item)

1 = Never   3 = Often
2 = Sometimes   4 = Very Often

Paid attention to national issues 1 2 3 4

Paid attention to global issues........................ 1 2 3 4

Was aware of the current issues facing the
    community surrounding your institution..... 1 2 3 4

Signed a petition or sent an email about a
    social or political issue................................. 1 2 3 4

Bought or did not buy a product or service
    because of your views about the social or
    political values of the company that produces
    or provides it 1 2 3 4

Contacted a public official, newspaper,
    magazine, radio, or television talk show to
    express your opinion..................................... 1 2 3 4

Took part in a protest, rally, march, or
    demonstration... 1 2 3 4

13. Since starting college, how often have you:

been an involved member or active participant in college organizations?
          Never 1   2   3   4   5   Much of the time

held a leadership position in a college organization? (for example, serving as an officer or a club or organization, captain of an athletic team, first chair in a musical group, section editor of the newspaper, chairperson of a committee)
          Never 1   2   3   4   5   Much of the time

been an involved member or active participant in an off-campus community organization (e.g. PTA, church group)?
          Never 1   2   3   4   5   Much of the time

held a leadership position in a community organization? (for example, serving as an officer or a club or organization, leader in a youth group, chairperson of a committee)
          Never 1   2   3   4   5   Much of the time

YOUR STUDENT GROUP INVOLVEMENTS

14. Which of the following kinds of student groups have you been involved with during college?
(Check all the categories that apply)

o   Academic/ Departmental/ Professional (e.g., Pre-Law Society, an academic fraternity, Engineering Club)

o   Arts/Theater/Music (e.g., Theater group, Marching Band)

o   Campus-wide programming groups (e.g., program board, film series board, a multicultural programming committee)

o   Cultural/ International (e.g., Black Student Union, German Club)

o   Honor Society (e.g., Omicron Delta Kappa [ODK], Mortar Board, Phi Beta Kappa)

o   Living-learning programs (e.g., language house, leadership floors, ecology halls)

o   Leadership (e.g., Peer Leadership Program, Emerging Leaders Program)

o   Media (e.g., Campus Radio, Student Newspaper)

o   Military (e.g., ROTC)

o   New Student Transitions (e.g., admissions ambassador, orientation advisor)

o   Para professional group (e.g., Resident assistants, peer health educators)

o   Political/ Advocacy (e.g., College Democrats, Students Against Sweatshops)

o   Religious (e.g., Campus Crusades for Christ, Hillel)

o   Service (e.g., Circle K, Alpha Phi Omega [APO])

o   Culturally based fraternities and sororities (e.g., National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) groups such as Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Inc., or Latino Greek Council groups such as Lambda Theta Alpha)

o   Social fraternities or sororities (e.g. Panhellenic or Interfraternity Council groups such as Sigma Phi Epsilon or Kappa Kappa Gamma)

o   Sports- Intercollegiate or Varsity (e.g., NCAA Hockey, Varsity Soccer)

o   Sports- Club (e.g., Club Volleyball)

○ Sports- Leisure or Intramural (ex: Intramural flag football, Rock Climbing)

○ Special Interest (ex: Comedy Group)

○ Student governance group (ex: Student Government Association, Residence Hall Association, Interfraternity Council) IF CHECKED go to item 14A

14A. Were you involved in your campus-wide student government association? (Circle one) YES NO

If No, skip to item 15.

Thinking about your student government experience, indicate your level of agreement with the following items:
(Circle one response for each.)

     1 = Strongly disagree   4 = Agree
     2 = Disagree   5 = Strongly agree
     3 = Neutral

I found it hard to represent my constituents' concerns 1 2 3 4 5

I successfully initiated change on behalf of my constituents (e.g., policy, institutional, or social) 1 2 3 4 5

My motivation for involvement was about gaining influence 1 2 3 4 5

My motivation for involvement was to receive recognition 1 2 3 4 5

My motivation for involvement was to help others 1 2 3 4 5

I have witnessed effective constituency-based efforts for change 1 2 3 4 5

Effective constituency-based efforts for change have influenced my own actions 1 2 3 4 5

I held a constituency-based position prior to this college SGA experience (e.g. high school or other governance group) 1 2 3 4 5

Experience with previous constituency based positions did NOT make me more effective in my college SGA work 1 2 3 4 5

15. At any time during your college experience, how often have you been in mentoring relationships where another person intentionally assisted your growth or connected you to opportunities for career and personal development?
Indicate how many times

Student affairs staff
(e.g., a student organization advisor, career counselor, the Dean of Students, or residence hall coordinator):
.... never once several many

Faculty .... never once several many

Employers .... never once several many

Community members .... never once several many
Other students .... never once several many

16. During interactions with other students outside of class, how often have you done each of the following in an average school year? (Circle one for each.)
     1 = Never   3 = Often
     2 = Sometimes   4 = Very Often

Talked about different lifestyles/ customs 1 2 3 4

Held discussions with students whose personal values were very different from your own 1 2 3 4

Discussed major social issues such as peace, human rights, and justice 1 2 3 4

Held discussions with students whose religious beliefs were very different from your own 1 2 3 4

Discussed your views about multiculturalism and diversity 1 2 3 4

Held discussions with students whose political opinions were very different from your own 1 2 3 4

DEVELOPING YOUR LEADERSHIP ABILITIES

17. Since starting college, how many times have you participated in the following types of training or education that developed your leadership skills (ex: courses, Resident Assistant training, organization retreats, job training) (Circle one for each.)

17a- Short-Term Experiences (ex: individual or one-time workshops, retreats, conferences, lectures, or training)
     Never   once   several   many

17b-Moderate-Term Experiences (ex: a single course, multiple or ongoing retreats, conferences, institutes, workshops, and/or training.
     Never   once   several   many

If NEVER skip to 17c.

Did your experience involve any academic courses? YES NO

If no, skip to 17c

a. How many leadership courses have you completed?

[   ]

b. How many other courses have you taken that contributed to your leadership abilities (e.g. ethics course, personal development courses, management courses)? *Keep in mind you might have taken such a course but it did not contribute to your leadership.*

17c- **Long-Term Experiences** (ex: multi-semester leadership program, leadership certificate program, leadership minor or major, emerging leaders program, living-learning program),
Never   once   several   many

if NEVER skip to 18

Which of the following Long-Term Activities did you experience? (check all that apply)
- o Emerging or New Leaders Program
- o Peer Leadership Program
- o Leadership Certificate Program
- o Multi-Semester Leadership Program
- o Senior Leadership Capstone Experience
- o Residential Living-learning leadership program
- o Leadership Minor
- o Leadership Major
- o Other

ASSESSING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

18. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following items by choosing the number that most closely represents your opinion about that statement.
(Circle one response for each.)

For the statements that refer to a group, think of the most effective, functional group of which you have been a part. This might be a formal organization or an informal study group. For consistency, use the same group in all your responses.

1 = Strongly disagree	4 = Agree
2 = Disagree	5= Strongly Agree
3 = Neutral	

I am open to others' ideas 1 2 3 4 5
Creativity can come from conflict 1 2 3 4 5
I value differences in others 1 2 3 4 5
I am able to articulate my priorities 1 2 3 4 5
Hearing differences in opinions enriches my thinking 1 2 3 4 5
I have low self esteem 1 2 3 4 5
I struggle when group members have ideas that are different from mine 1 2 3 4 5

Transition makes me uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5
I am usually self confident 1 2 3 4 5
I am seen as someone who works well with others 1 2 3 4 5
Greater harmony can come out of disagreement 1 2 3 4 5
I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking at things 1 2 3 4 5
My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs 1 2 3 4 5
I am committed to a collective purpose in those groups to which I belong 1 2 3 4 5
It is important to develop a common direction in a group in order to get anything done 1 2 3 4 5
I respect opinions other than my own 1 2 3 4 5
Change brings new life to an organization 1 2 3 4 5
The things about which I feel passionate have priority in my life 1 2 3 4 5
I contribute to the goals of the group 1 2 3 4 5
There is energy in doing something a new way 1 2 3 4 5
I am uncomfortable when someone disagrees with me 1 2 3 4 5
I know myself pretty well 1 2 3 4 5
I am willing to devote the time and energy to things that are important to me 1 2 3 4 5
I stick with others through difficult times 1 2 3 4 5
When there is a conflict between two people, one will win and the other will lose 1 2 3 4 5
Change makes me uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5
It is important to me to act on my beliefs ... 1 2 3 4 5
I am focused on my responsibilities 1 2 3 4 5
I can make a difference when I work with others on a task 1 2 3 4 5
I actively listen to what others have to say 1 2 3 4 5
I think it is important to know other people's priorities 1 2 3 4 5

My actions are consistent with my
values...1   2   3   4   5

I believe I have responsibilities to my
community...1   2   3   4   5

I could describe my personality.................1   2   3   4   5

I have helped to shape the mission of
the group 1   2   3   4   5

New ways of doing things frustrate me 1   2   3   4   5

Common values drive an organization........ 1   2   3   4   5

I give time to making a difference for
someone else.....................................1   2   3   4   5
I work well in changing environments 1   2   3   4   5

I work with others to make my
communities better places........................1   2   3   4   5
I can describe how I am similar to
other people 1   2   3   4   5
I enjoy working with others toward
common goals....................................1   2   3   4   5

I am open to new ideas 1   2   3   4   5

I have the power to make a difference in
my community......................................1   2   3   4   5

I look for new ways to do something 1   2   3   4   5

I am willing to act for the rights of
others 1   2   3   4   5

I participate in activities that contribute
to the common good 1   2   3   4   5

Others would describe me as a
cooperative group member 1   2   3   4   5

I am comfortable with conflict 1   2   3   4   5

I can identify the differences between
positive and negative change.................1   2   3   4   5

I can be counted on to do my part 1   2   3   4   5

Being seen as a person of integrity is
important to me....................................1   2   3   4   5

I follow through on my promises 1   2   3   4   5

I hold myself accountable for
responsibilities I agree to........................1   2   3   4   5

I believe I have a civic responsibility to
the greater public 1   2   3   4   5

Self-reflection is difficult for me.............. 1   2   3   4   5

Collaboration produces better results........ 1   2   3   4   5

I know the purpose of the groups to
which I belong 1   2   3   4   5

I am comfortable expressing myself.......... 1   2   3   4   5

My contributions are recognized by
others in the groups I belong to 1   2   3   4   5

I work well when I know the collective
values of a group 1   2   3   4   5

I share my ideas with others........................1   2   3   4   5

My behaviors reflect my beliefs.................1   2   3   4   5

I am genuine..1   2   3   4   5

I am able to trust the people with
whom I work 1   2   3   4   5

I value opportunities that allow me to
contribute to my community...................1   2   3   4   5

I support what the group is trying to
accomplish...1   2   3   4   5

It is easy for me to be truthful 1   2   3   4   5

THINKING MORE ABOUT YOURSELF

19. **How would you characterize your political views?**
(Mark One)
- Far left
- Liberal
- Middle-of-the-road
- Conservative
- Far right

20. **In thinking about how you have changed during
college, to what extent do you feel you have grown in
the following areas?** (Circle one response for each.)

| 1 = Not grown at all | 3 = Grown |
| 2 = Grown somewhat | 4 = Grown very much |

Ability to put ideas together and to see
relationships between ideas 1   2   3   4

Ability to learn on your own, pursue
ideas, and find information you need 1   2   3   4

Ability to critically analyze ideas and
information 1   2   3   4

Learning more about things that are new
to you 1   2   3   4

21. **Please indicate the extent to which you agree or
disagree with the following statements.**
(Circle one response for each.)

| 1 = Strongly disagree | 3 = Agree |
| 2 = Disagree | 4 = Strongly agree |

Since coming to college, I have learned a
great deal about other racial/ethnic
groups...1   2   3   4

I have gained a greater commitment to my
racial/ethnic identity since coming to college .. 1   2   3   4

My campus's commitment to diversity fosters
more division among racial/ethnic groups
than inter-group understanding 1   2   3   4

Since coming to college, I have become aware
of the complexities of inter-group
understanding... 1   2   3   4

THINKING ABOUT LEADERSHIP

**22. How confident are you that you can be successful at the
following:** (Circle one response for each.)
  1 = Not at all confident   3 = Confident
  2 = Somewhat confident4 = Very confident

Leading others.. 1   2   3   4

Organizing a group's tasks to accomplish a goal. 1   2   3   4

Taking initiative to improve something 1   2   3   4

Working with a team on a group project....... 1   2   3   4

23.   To what degree do you agree with these items?
  (Circle one response for each.)

  1 = Strongly disagree
  2 = Disagree
  3 = neither agree or disagree
  4 = Agree
  5 = Strongly agree

It is the responsibility of the head of a group
to make sure the job gets done 1   2   3   4   5

A person can lead from anywhere in the
organization, not just as the head of
the organization 1   2   3   4   5

I spend time mentoring other group
members.. 1   2   3   4   5

I think of myself as a leader ONLY if I am
the head of a group (e.g. chair, president) 1   2   3   4   5

Group members share the responsibility
for leadership 1   2   3   4   5

I am a person who can work effectively
with others to accomplish our shared
goals... 1   2   3   4   5

I do NOT think of myself as a leader
when I am just a member of a group....... 1   2   3   4   5

Leadership is a process all people in the
group do together 1   2   3   4   5

I feel inter-dependent with others in a
group. 1   2   3   4   5

I know I can be an effective member of
any group I choose to join......................... 1   2   3   4   5

Teamwork skills are important in all
organizations 1   2   3   4   5

The head of the group is the leader and
members of the group are followers 1   2   3   4   5

YOUR COLLEGE CLIMATE

24. Select the number that best represents your experience
with your overall college climate

Closed, hostile,   Open, inclusive,
intolerant,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   supportive,
unfriendly   friendly

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

25. What were your average grades in High School?
(Choose One)

  ○   A or A+
  ○   A- or B+
  ○   B
  ○   B- or C+
  ○   C
  ○   C- or D+
  ○   D or lower

26. Did your high school require community service for
graduation? (Circle One) ....   YES NO

27. What is your age?

28. **What is your gender?**

  ○   Female
  ○   Male
  ○   Transgender

29. **What is your sexual orientation?**

  ○   Heterosexual
  ○   Bisexual
  ○   Gay/Lesbian
  ○   Rather not say

30. **Indicate your citizenship and/ or generation status:**
  (Choose One)

  ○   Your grandparents, parents, and you were born in the
      U.S.
  ○   Both of your parents AND you were born in the U.S.
  ○   You were born in the U.S., but at least one of your
      parents was not
  ○   You are a foreign born, naturalized citizen

- You are a foreign born, resident alien/ permanent resident
- You are on a student visa

31. Please indicate your racial or ethnic background. (Mark all that apply)
- White/Caucasian
- African American/Black
- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian American/Asian
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- Mexican American/Chicano
- Puerto Rican
- Cuban American
- Other Latino American
- Multiracial or multiethnic
- Race/ethnicity not included above

32. Do you have a mental, emotional, or physical condition that now or in the past affects your functioning in daily activities at work, school, or home?

            Yes   No

if Yes Please indicate all that apply:

- Deaf/Hard of Hearing
- Blind/Visually Impairment
- Speech/language condition
- Learning Disability
- Physical or musculoskeletal (e.g. multiple sclerosis)
- Attention Deficit Disorder/ Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
- Psychiatric/Psychological condition (e.g. anxiety disorder, major depression)
- Neurological condition (e.g. brain injury, stroke)
- Medical (e.g. diabetes, severe asthma)
- Other

33. What is your current religious affiliation?
(Choose One)

- None
- Agnostic
- Atheist
- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Hindu
- Islamic
- Jewish
- Mormon
- Quaker
- Protestant (e.g. Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian)
- Other
- Other Christian
- Rather not say

34. What is your best estimate of your grades so far in college? [Assume 4.00 = A]   (Choose One)

- 3.50 – 4.00
- 3.00 – 3.49

- 2.50 – 2.99
- 2.00 – 2.49
- 1.99 or less
- No college GPA

35. What is the HIGHEST level of formal education obtained by any of your parent(s) or guardian(s)? (Choose one)

- Less than high school diploma or GED
- High school diploma or GED
- Some college
- Associates degree
- Bachelors degree
- Masters degree
- Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., JD, MD, PhD)
- Don't know

36. What is your best estimate of your parent(s) or guardian(s) combined total income from last year? If you are independent from your parents, indicate your income. (Choose one)

- Less than $12,500
- $12,500 - $24,999
- $25,000 – $39,999
- $40,000 - $54,999
- $55,000 - $74,999
- $75,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 and over
- Don't know
- Rather not say

37. Which of the following best describes where are you currently living while attending college? (Choose one)

- Parent/guardian or other relative home
- Other private home, apartment, or room
- College/university residence hall
- Other campus student housing
- Fraternity or sorority house
- Other

INDIVIDUAL CAMPUS ITEMS
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Appendix B: Email Invitation

Dear [INSTITUTION] student,

[INSTITUTION] has been selected to participate in a national study which will focus on student leadership experiences in college. As an institution, we are very interested in developing leadership among our graduates and hope to learn more about our students' experiences through participation in this study.

You have been randomly selected to participate in this national study! Your participation is VERY important and will contribute a great deal to understanding the college student experience at both [INSTITUTION] and within the context of higher education. This is an amazing opportunity for [INSTITUTION] and we hope you are excited to participate.

Participation is easy and just by completing the survey, you will automatically be eligible for numerous prizes including... [institution will insert incentives here]

What does it mean to participate?
- Participation in the study will involve completing an online survey/questionnaire about your college involvements and your thoughts about leadership.
- The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.
- Your response is completely confidential. Only the researcher will be able to attach your name to your response so please be candid and honest.
- Participation is of course, totally voluntary.

We encourage you now to click on the link below to indicate your consent to participate in the survey. If you have any questions, please contact [INSTITUTION CONTACT PERSON NAME EMAIL and PHONE].

Thank you for your participation!

[INSTITUTION CONTACT PERSON]

CLICK HERE TO BEGIN
http://www............link for survey

References

Allen, K. E., & Cherrey, C. (2000). *Systemic leadership: Enriching the meaning of our work.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race [Electronic version]. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78,* 180-185.

Anson, J. L., & Marchesani, R. F., Jr. (Eds). (1991). *Baird's manual of American college fraternities (20th ed).* Indianapolis, IN: Baird's Manual Foundation.

Appel-Silbaugh, C. (2005). *SLRS2: The revision of SRLS.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

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

Astin, H. S. (1996, July-August). Leadership for social change [Electronic version]. *About Campus*, 4-10.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the processes by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors [Electronic version]. *Leadership Quarterly, 15,* 801-823.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1998). Developing self-authorship in young adult life [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development, 39,* 143-156.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2002, January-February). Helping student make their way into adulthood: Good company for the journey [Electronic version]. *About Campus,* 2-9.

Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and culture.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University

    Press.

Bird, S. R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance

    of hegemonic masculinity [Electronic version]. *Gender and Society, 10*(2),

    120-132.

Bureau, D., Schendel, K., & Veldkamp, S. (2006, Summer). Values & action

    congruence. *Perspectives,* 16-17.

Connell, R. W. (2002). *Gender.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Connell, R. W. (2001). Masculinities and globalization. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A.

    Messner (Eds.), *Men's Lives* (5th ed., pp. 56-70). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinites.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking

    the concept [Electronic version]. *Gender & Society, 19,* 829-859.

Davis, T. L. (2002). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college

    men's identity [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development,*

    43, 508-521.

Davis, T. L. (2006, May). Men, masculinity, and fraternities: An overview.

    Essentials. Retrieved September 5, 2007 from

    http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/PrinterFriendly.aspx?ContentId=364

DeBard, R., Lake, T., & Binder, R. S. (2006). Greeks and grades: The first-year

    Experience [Electronic version]. *NASPA Journal, 43,* 56-68.

Danielson, C., Taylor, S. H., & Hartford, M. (2001). Examining the complex

relationship between Greek life and alcohol: A literature review [Electronic version]. *NASPA Journal, 38*, 451-465.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? [Electronic version] *Theory and Society, 22*(5), 643-657.

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

Dugan, J. P. (2006b). *SRLS-Rev2: Third revision of SRLS.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Earler, C. (1998). Influencing ethical development in Greek letter organizations. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New Challenges for Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into Learning Communities* (New Directions for Student Services No. 81, pp. 39-47). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eberhardt, D., Rice, N. D., & Smith, L. D. (2003). Effects of Greek membership on academic integrity, alcohol abuse, and risky sexual behavior at a small college [Electronic version]. *NASPA Journal, 41*, 137-148.

Edwards, K. E. (2007). *"Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Espiritu, Y. L. (2001). All men are *not* created equal: Asian men in U.S. history. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's Lives* (5th ed., pp. 17-23). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Franklin Square Group. (2003). *A call for values congruence*. Retrieved September

    15, 2007, from

    http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/uploads/PublicDocuments/CallforValuesCo

    ngruence.pdf.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2003). *The new leaders: Transforming the*

    art of leadership into the science of results. London: Time Warner

    Paperbacks.

Grund, N. F. (2005, Fall). Returning to core values: Changing behavior in sororities

    and fraternities [Electronic version]. *Leadership Exchange,* 5-10.

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.

    Retrieved September 30, 2007, from

    http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/Default.aspx?action=ViewFile&file=Oracle

    _vol2_iss2_Harms.pdf

Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for Black

    identity expression and development among African American male student

    leaders [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*,

    127-144.

Hayek, J. C., Carini, R. M., O'Day, P. T., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Triumph of tragedy:

    Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter

    organizations and other students [Electronic version]. *Journal of College*

    Student Development, 43, 641-663.

Heida, D. (2006, Summer). Hope for jaded deans. *Perspectives,* 14-15.

Hennessy, N. J., & Huson, L. M. (1998). Legal issues and Greek letter organizations. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New Challenges for Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into Learning Communities* (New Directions for Student Services No. 81, pp. 61-77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

hooks, b. (2004). *We real cool: Black men and masculinity.* New York: Routledge.

Jackson, P. (1991). The cultural politics of masculinity: Towards a social geography [Electronic version]. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 16*(2), 199-213.

Kaufman, M. (2001). The construction of masculinity and the triad of men's violence. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's Lives* (5th ed., pp. 4-16). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). *Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Kimbrough, W. M. (1995). Self-assessment, participation, and value of leadership skills, activities, and experiences for Black students relative to their membership in historically Black fraternities and sororities [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Negro Education, 64*(1), 63-74.

Kimbrough, W. M., & Hutcheson, P. A. (1998). The impact of membership in Black greek-letter organizations on Black students' involvement in collegiate activities and their development of leadership skills [Electronic version]. *Journal of Negro Education, 67,* 96-105.

King, P. M. & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 571-592.

Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S. D., Owen, J. E., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 401-418.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. M. (2007). *Exploring leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Liang, B., Tracy, A., Kauh, T., Taylor, C., & Williams, L. M. (2006). Mentoring Asian and Euro-American college women [Electronic version]. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34*, 143-154.

Liu, W. M. (2005). The study of men and masculinity as an important multicultural

competency consideration [Electronic version]. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 6*, 685-697.

Marable, M. (2001). The black male: Searching beyond stereotypes. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's Lives* (5th ed., pp. 17-23). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McClure, S. M. (2006). Voluntary association membership: Black Greek men on a Predominantly White campus [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1036-1057.

North-American Interfraternity Conference. (2006). The North-American Interfraternity Conference fact sheet. Retrieved November 30, 2007, from http://www.nicindy.org/about_us/factsheet.php

Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives [Electronic version]. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*, 203-210.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows* (3rd ed.). New York: Open University Press.

Patton, L. D., & Harper, S. R. (2003). Mentoring relationships among African American women in graduate and professional schools. In M. F. Howard-Hamilton (Ed.), *Meeting the Needs of African American Women* (New Directions for Student Services No. 104, pp. 67-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E., Edison, M., Whitt, E., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L., & Terenzini, P. (1996).

    Cognitive effects of Greek affiliation during the first year of college

    [Electronic version]. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 242-259.

Pascarella, E. T., Flowers, L., & Whitt, E. J. (2001). Cognitive effects of Greek

    affiliation in college: Additional evidence [Electronic version]. *NASPA*

    Journal, 38, 280-301.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology: Its impact

    on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships [Electronic version]. *Journal*

    of Social Issues, 49(3), 11-29.

Rhoads, R. A. (1995). Whales tales, dog piles, and beer goggles: An ethnographic

    case study of fraternity life. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 26*, 306-

    323.

Riordan, B. G., & Dana, R. Q. (1998). Greek letter organizations and alcohol:

    Problems, policies, and programs. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New Challenges for*

    Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into

    Learning Communities (New Directions for Student Services No. 81, pp. 49-

    59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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. Retrieved September 30,

    2007, from

    http://www.fraternityadvisors.org/Default.aspx?action=ViewFile&file=Oracle

    _vol2_iss2_Strayhorn.pdf

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

Sweet, S. (1999). Understanding fraternity hazing: Insights from symbolic interactionist theory [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development, 40,* 355-364.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics.* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Tatum, B. D. (2003). Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?: A psychologist explains the development of racial identity. New York: Basic Books.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development, 37,* 149–162.

Tyree, T. M. (1998). *Designing an instrument to measure socially responsible leadership using the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Wade, J. C. (1998). Male reference group identity dependence: A theory of male identity [Electronic version]. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(3), 349-383.

Wade, J. C., & Brittan-Powell, C. (2000). Male reference group identity dependence: Support for construct validity [Electronic version]. *Sex Roles, 43*(5/6), 323-340.

Wade, J. C., & Brittan-Powell, C. (2001). Men's attitudes toward race and gender

equity: The importance of masculinity ideology, gender-related traits, and reference group identity dependence [Electronic version]. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*(1), 42-50.

Wagner, W. (2006). The social change model of leadership: A brief overview [Electronic version]. *Concepts & Connections, 15*(1), 8-10.

Whipple, E. G., & Sullivan, E. G. (1998a). Greeks as communities of learners. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New Challenges for Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into Learning Communities* (New Directions for Student Services No. 81, pp. 87-94). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whipple, E. G., & Sullivan, E. G. (1998b). Greek letter organizations: Communities of learners? In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New Challenges for Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into Learning Communities* (New Directions for Student Services No. 81, pp. 7-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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.