FRATERNITY AT THE CROSSROADS

by

Shawn M. Dowiak

M.A. Seton Hall University
M.A. Teachers College, Columbia University
B.A. Ramapo College of New Jersey

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the School of Education of
St. Peter’s University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
2016

Committee in Charge:

Dr. David Turi, PhD
Dr. Carla Tharp, PhD
Dr. John E. Hammett, III, EdD
SAINT PETER'S UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF ED.D. PROGRAMS

APPROVAL OF SUCCESSFUL DISSERTATION ORALS

Please print the following information:

Candidate:          Shawn Lowrie

Committee: Please sign AND print your name:

Mentor (sign/date):         David H. Tur
PRINT NAME:          David H. Tur

Committee Member (sign/date):       Carla Thery
PRINT NAME:          Carla Thery

Committee Member (sign/date):       John E. Hammott
PRINT NAME:          John E. Hammott
DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my sister...

Who has inspired me
ABSTRACT

FRATERNITY AT THE CROSSROADS

Shawn M. Dowiak
Saint Peter’s University, 2016
Chair: Dr. David Turi

Are fraternities still relevant to the college student experience? By examining the moral, student, and leadership development of IFC fraternity men, while controlling for institutional and student characteristics, the current study analyzed the roots of the purported value-added nature of fraternities using data from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL). Specifically, the current study examined fraternity men’s gains in self-authorship, internalized moral perspective, advancement along Kohlberg’s model of moral reasoning, and the individual “c’s” of the social change model while controlling for the variables of race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and parental education. This quantitative study used both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze data from a national dataset; inferential analysis was performed using Kruskal-Wallis one-way Analysis of Variance and the Mann-Whitney U test as a post hoc analysis. The interesting and troubling findings of this study allowed for the elucidation of much needed policy change, new best practice, and a call for reform in the fraternity movement.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Are social fraternities still relevant to the student experience? This is a question recently explored by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* in several articles (Mangan, 2015; McCurtie, 2015a, 2015b; Kelderman, 2015). The question is no longer valid to ask simply for a practitioner, but has become a valid question for researchers into the fraternity experience as well. Have social fraternities fulfilled their aim of providing value-added activities to the student affairs programming of a college or university? Or have they abdicated the purpose for which they were founded, namely the betterment of student, leadership, and moral development? Are fraternities now embodying popular culture’s notion of them as social clubs with no further aim than the intoxication of their membership, the majority of whom are underage? If the latter is the case, what then is the future of the American college fraternity, an institution which has existed as long as the country it was founded in? By examining the moral, student, and leadership development of social fraternity men, defined as men who have joined an Interfraternity Council (IFC) fraternity, while controlling for institutional and student characteristics, the current study analyzed the base of the fraternity movement. At its base, the aim of the fraternity movement is to be the premiere leadership opportunity on today’s college campuses (Friedman, 2008).

Questions of fraternity identity are the crux of the issue facing the fraternity man today, and for any researcher or practitioner, the queries must give pause; for, if fraternities are in decline and have outlived their worth, as some say, then what do colleges and universities do with the nearly 372,000 college fraternity men on today’s college campuses who will soon be disenfranchised (NIC, 2015)? Further, what happens to the 6,136 chapters on nearly 800 campuses, their property, their financial holdings, and the $20.3 million dollars they raise in
philanthropic activities (or the 3.8 million man hours of community service) that they provide nationally (NIC, 2015)? The fall of the fraternity movement would be the fall, not of one century, but of nearly three centuries of “gown and Greek” relations that have pervaded the American experience in higher education.

The Nature of the “Gown and Greek” Relationship

When we discuss the nature of “gown and Greek” relations, meaning the relationship between non-fraternity and fraternity factions of a student body that has existed for centuries, we see a checkered past for fraternities. Historically, colleges have tended to problematize fraternities, and that viewpoint seems to persist, based on contemporary events (McCormick, 1966; McCurtie, 2015a; Parlin, 1917). In recent years, some critics have considered many fraternity chapters on college campuses as too damaged to repair and perhaps close to criminal in nature (Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b). Despite this tendency toward problematizing fraternities, the fraternity members who graduate from college and remain involved in some capacity in their organizations as alumni, who work with college students as fraternity professionals, or who are researchers examining the fraternity experience can substantiate positive gains for college students who are in fraternities (Callais, 2005; DeSantis, 2007; Dunn, 2005; Eberly, 1967; Huelskamp, 2015; Pressler, 2013). Others have also demonstrated that fraternity participation can increase student involvement and retention (Astin, 1993; Bradford & Jenkins, 2002).

The reason for the controversy surrounding the efficacy of fraternities is because fraternities, as organizations, have posed some significant health and safety risks to college students. Some of these risks include the increased perception of hazing activities as akin to the process of affiliation; excessive drinking that produces, in the students, a social desirability for being intoxicated; racially derogatory speech and actions; and student deaths from hazing,
alcohol abuse, and questionable causes (Allan & Madden, 2008; Fernandez & Pérez-Peña, 2015; Flanagan, 2014a; Nuwer, 1999; Sasso, 2012a).

In a startling juxtaposition, fraternities have been shown to contribute to the college experience by way of involvement, leadership development, and retention. In support, fraternity and sorority alumni demonstrated higher levels of workplace engagement, higher levels of overall well-being, and greater alumni attachment to the institution than alumni who were not fraternity and sorority members in Gallup polling (Astin, 1993; Bradford & Jenkins, 2002; Brown, 2007; Busteed, 2014). These and similar positive findings help substantiate the case for continuing the fraternity experience that has existed for centuries.

Indeed, fraternities have a long and checkered past within the experience of higher education (Rudolph, 1990), but if one thing is evident about that past, it is that fraternities have survived the storms of the centuries and the reinvention of the higher education system in which they exist (Anson & Marchesani, 1990; Cohen & Kisker, 2010; Rudolph, 1990). The fraternity experience is affected by many factors, not least of which is the long-standing practice in college administrations of problematizing the fraternity experience (McCormick, 1966; McCurtie, 2015a; Parlin, 1917).

To take a cue from the realm of educational leadership at the secondary level, when we problematize students or the groups they belong to, we set up a self-fulfilling prophecy that they will act in ways that fulfill our expectations of them (Miller, 2011). Pike (2003) believed that perhaps there wasn’t much of a difference between fraternity members and non-members developmentally, but pointed out that the expectations for fraternity members were lower, thus inhibiting the amount of student and leadership development opportunities a college might offer to them. To make the point more poignantly, as Joseph Louis Clark, former Principal of
Paterson, New Jersey’s Eastside High School once said, “If you treat them like animals, they will act like animals” (Miller, 2011, p. 270). Deciding that some students are a problem simply because they belong to a certain organization, and regardless of whether or not they have done anything wrong, surely affects the developmental gains of these individuals (Miller, 2011; Pike, 2003).

In order to analyze the relationship between fraternity men and the campuses they attend, a deeper understanding of the fraternity professional needs to be understood, as does the current state of praxis in the fraternity profession stemming from attempted reform in the fraternity movement, loosely defined as the support of the growth of fraternities.

The call for values congruence. Now is not the first time that the American social fraternity has faced its share of criticism. Thirteen years ago The Franklin Square Group, a task force composed of fraternity headquarters professionals and college and university presidents to examine the fraternity system, was formed. The task force operated at the behest of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). As a result of their open dialogue, “A Call for Values Congruence” (The Call) was issued to all fraternity/sorority campus and headquarters professionals in the North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC), which is the trade group for social fraternities, and to the contingents of the fraternal movement (The Franklin Square Group, 2003; Veldkamp & Bureau, 2012). The Franklin Square Group was meant to sound the alarm regarding the damaging and dangerous experiences of fraternity men on college campuses (The Franklin Square Group, 2003).
The Call was interpreted as a mandate for fraternities, and the fraternity profession, to prove their collective worth (Veldkamp & Bureau, 2012). Some have said that The Call was the single most important event in the development of student affairs praxis regarding fraternity and sorority life in the early part of the 21st century, and that it spurred needed research into the fraternity movement (Veldkamp & Bureau, 2012). Indeed, The Call provided a set of standards for student affairs professionals to implement within their fraternity/sorority life communities and for national fraternities to implement within their national standards, but in its initial incarnation, members of the Franklin Square Group attempted to create an accreditation process for fraternities, a movement which did not succeed (Veldkamp & Bureau, 2012). The Call has been analyzed, praised, and disparaged for its purported successes and its failures at transforming the fraternity status quo (Bureau, 2007; McCreary, 2014; Vojta, 2012).

The task force did not miss the mark when it set activity boundaries for the fraternity experience; clearly, based on contemporary tragic events on college campuses, it did not go far enough (Fernandez & Pérez-Peña, 2015; Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b; McCurtie, 2015a). The Call proposed a framework of standards for fraternal organizations perhaps in response to researchers who suggested that a lack of high expectations for fraternity men might be negatively impacting their development (Pike, 2003; The Franklin Square Group, 2003). In general, The Call was a necessity at the time that it was developed. However, the task force fell short of fully analyzing the needs of the fraternity movement in that time. Two reasons they fell short are the politics within the fraternal movement and the inability of some professionals to close the chapters they needed to close (Vojta, 2012).

A lack of best practice in the fraternity profession. Besides a political frames analysis as to the reasons why The Call did not demonstrate success within the fraternal movement, there
was not an innovative model of best practice for fraternity/sorority professionals. As McCreary (2012b) stated, “As a profession, we continue to attack the same problems with the same tired approaches” (p. 22). This pointed to the lack of established best practice among fraternity professionals as a cause for the failed reform of fraternities (McCreary, 2012b; Sasso, 2012c). McCreary (2012b) made the case for moral development as a primary goal for educational activity within the fraternity movement by paraphrasing the analogy of psychologist Philip Zimbardo: the bad barrels of fraternity chapters need to be reformed in order to address the bad apples that become some fraternity men.

The McCreary (2012b) method or approach, contrary to Vojta (2012) which suggested removing the bad barrels, was to educate fraternity members from a new perspective, one of moral development. Yet, where do student affairs or headquarters professionals find the best practice in order to do that? In a content analysis of articles published about fraternity and sorority research, Molasso (2005) found what he called troubling results. He asserted that there was a lack of long-term research into the fraternity experience, research available in student affairs publications regarding fraternities, and articles that demonstrate new research findings (Molasso, 2005). The Molasso (2005) content analysis was published almost three years after The Call was made to fraternity headquarters and campus professionals.

Perhaps it was rash to conclude that the values movement initiated by The Call failed (McCreary, 2012b; 2014; Vojta, 2012), but it was fair to say that The Call never had a chance at success because there was a lack of best practice associated with it even after its creation (The Franklin Square Group, 2003; Molasso, 2005). In a more direct way, Sasso (2012c) made his criticism of this lack of best practice clearly visible: “Advising fraternities and sororities, in its current form, is extremely provincial and literally folksy” (p. 2). In Sasso (2012c), he asserted
that the art of fraternity management was “county folk art” that didn’t rely on research or theory, but rather on isolated examples of “what works” and on advisors’ undergraduate experiences. Sasso (2012c, 2013), McCreary (2012), and Molasso (2005) determined that a lack of best practice pervaded the fraternity profession and that fraternity professionals on college campuses were not able to provide the necessary support for fraternity men, to run their organizations safely, or demonstrate student, leadership, and moral development gains beyond the general population.

In contrast, a better picture seemed to emerge with regard to women’s organizations with advisory boards comprised of women of different age groups and experience levels, but for the men in fraternities who had little advisement or only young traveling consultants (hired and paid by the national headquarters) advising them, there was not much professional training involved in providing support to these men (Sasso, 2012c). These advisory teams and/or advisory boards (if they exist) comprised the first line of support for a fraternity chapter (Sasso, 2012c).

Regarding the national headquarters, a continued movement toward the professionalization of the Executive Directorate at each fraternity headquarters had taken place (Dunn, 2005). However, in some organizations, the question of who the executive offices of fraternities actually served (e.g., whether their services were in the best interests of the students or for the preservation of national fraternity assets) had been called into question (Flanagan, 2014a).

The last time that a compendium was published that addressed any sort of best practice in the fraternity profession was many years ago, and that edition was not based on research (Gregory, 2003). Additionally, there was a lack of professional experience in the fraternity profession (Sasso, 2012c). This lack of best practice, significant research, and professional experience in the field provided a foundation upon which to build the current study (McCreary,
Further, the lack of overall congruence between headquarters and campus professionals regarding the types of support they provided to fraternities no doubt impacted the potential developmental outcomes for fraternity members (McCurtie, 2015a). Despite the weaknesses existent within the “gown and Greek” relationship, fraternities by their very nature can support the development of values in their members. The next section deals with the values development of fraternity men, and provides an analysis of how fraternity men’s moral, leadership, and student development, all of which stem from their values development, may be different for fraternity and non-fraternity students.

**Background of the Study**

**Values Development related to Moral, Leadership, and Student Development**

*Moral, leadership, and student development in fraternity men.* An introduction to the fraternity ritual is a necessity when discussing the moral, student, and leadership development of fraternity members, as fraternity members have not only an individual value system (as do other students), but also subscribe to an organizational value system (Schutts & Shelley, 2014). To expand upon this idea further, fraternity members make decisions on a daily basis based on two sets of value systems, the value system that they hold personally and organizational values that belong to their fraternity (Schutts & Shelley, 2014).

Values have been defined as what is considered normatively acceptable behavior (Edwards & Cable, 2009). Values play directly into the development of leadership capacity in the Social Change Model as defined by Astin & Astin (1996) in the way that students show congruence between their actions and their stated values (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Schutts & Shelley, 2014). Additionally, students’ development of consciousness of self, which links practically and theoretically with advancing self-authorship in the Baxter Magolda (2008) model.
of student development, demonstrates a need to internalize one’s own values and act upon them, as opposed to acting upon external forces (Shalka, 2008; Shalka & Jones, 2010). Finally, values development is akin to Kohlberg’s (1987) moral development construct: One cannot act in principled ways unless one learns to value the social contract, at the very least, but then to act according to one’s own internalized standards of right and wrong regardless of the social contract (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010).

To outline the process, students come into a fraternal organization with their own set of values and then once they affiliate, they adopt the values and moral codes of the fraternity (Schutts & Shelley, 2014). The affiliation process affects the personal values system of each member (Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967; Schutts & Shelley, 2014). To what degree individual chapters act in accordance with the fraternity’s stated values in carrying out rituals and promoting adherence to a code of conduct, how fraternity professionals (whether from the headquarters or on the campus) behave, and how chapter advisors behave can all have an impact on increasing ethical or unethical behavior in individual members (Eberly, 1967; Schutts & Shelley, 2014). In other words, an examination of fraternity rituals was important in considering the moral, student, and leadership development of fraternity men, but the influence of fraternity rituals is mitigated by each fraternity chapter’s normative behavior, each fraternity professional’s behavior, and each chapter advisor’s behavior (Schutts & Shelley, 2014). However, any discussion about the moral, student, and leadership development of fraternity members must start with an examination of the fraternity ritual since the fraternity ritual embodied the values of each fraternal organization and transmitted to the affiliated member the moral code they were to follow upon joining (Callais, 2002, 2005; Eberly, 1967).
The nature of the fraternity ritual. Simply stated, the fraternity ritual is the core set of values for a fraternal organization. King (2010), in his first person narrative, wrote as if he were a fraternity or sorority ritual to describe the fraternity ritual’s purpose: “Basically, I am a roadmap to help a person along his/her journey of life and assist him/her in his/her communications with fellow travelers…What am I? A system of values” (p. 2). Although this outlined a strong benefit for fraternity rituals, other evidence indicated that fraternity rituals found a mixed reception among fraternity men (Eberly, 1967). Eberly (1967) contended that the fraternity ritual was not defunct in the fraternity environment, but rather that some fraternity men did not fully integrate the values contained within the ritual into their daily lives, thus potentially limiting their moral, student, and leadership development.

Fraternity secrets and rituals were an aspect of the fraternity experience since the formation of the first fraternity in 1776 (Baird, 1915). The founders of that first fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa at the College of William & Mary, created a secret motto with the Greek letters to mean: “love of learning is the guide of life” (The Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2014, p. 2). Society members had secret passwords for entrance into the organization’s meetings, a secret handshake, an elaborate ceremony of initiation, and secret mottos in both Latin and Greek (The Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2014). This progenitor of present day college social fraternities had all of the hallmarks of modern American college fraternities (Rudolph, 1990; Cohen & Kisker, 2010; The Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2014). Since the beginning of the fraternity movement, fraternities have encrypted within their secret ceremonies a values system known only to the members (Callais, 2002, 2005; Eberly, 1967; King, 2010).

All fraternities formed since Phi Beta Kappa’s inception created similarly elaborate ceremonies which encrypted, for members only, the values and motto of the organization to live
by (Callais, 2005; King, 2010). Based on the work of Callais (2002), who described sorority ritual from a first-person viewpoint, a first-person account of fraternity rituals was called for in order to clarify the profound effect that ritual can have on the life of a fraternity man. An overall description by this researcher was substantiated by the work of other scholars (Callais, 2002, 2005; Eberly, 1967; King, 2010, Rudolph, 1990; The Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2014):

The fraternity ritual was written by the founders or early members of the fraternity in an attempt to encapsulate the values of the society into a secret code that could be transmitted dramatically to the new membership. The secrecy was a necessary response to the problematizing of fraternities. The ritual of a fraternity uses symbols, such as specific tools, which encapsulate the fraternity’s values. These are used to symbolize the specific backgrounds and beliefs of the original members of the society and which transmit meaning to the current members. The Seal and/or coat-of-arms of the fraternity, the fraternity badge or pin, and other symbols related to the fraternity may be used to represent this symbolism as well. In the entrance of the ceremony is usually a chance for the newly initiated to retreat from continuing with the ceremony if they feel they cannot hold themselves to the values of the organization. The ritual is usually done with special lighting (such as by candlelight), and special clothing, such as ceremonial robes, may be involved. The reading of the ceremony is done dramatically and the movements of the ceremony are theatrical in nature (similar in character to a religious ceremony), references may be made to God, to a specific story, to a mythological system, or to a specific code of conduct as a source of inspiration to the members. Members are asked to promise allegiance to the organization, and most importantly to the principles of the organization. They are taught the secret handshake (if one exists), the call signs, the challenge words, and most importantly the secret motto which is represented by the Greek letters that name the fraternity. The ceremony ends with the presentation of the fraternity pin or badge which represents the conferral of membership. In some fraternities, the ritual is broken down into sections and sections of the ritual are revealed at particular points of fraternity affiliation (this is done in developmental chapters that no longer have a pledge process).

An understanding of the fraternity ritual was necessary for the non-affiliate to understand the intense, almost religious, experience that acts upon the development of values within fraternity men (Eberly, 1967). The symbolic traditions of fraternities were tied to the symbolic framework, as Bolman and Deal (2013) wrote, “Transitioning from stranger to full-fledged member grants access to cherished organizational secrets. The key episode is the rite of passage affirming acceptance…But rituals also bond a group together and imbue the enterprise with
tradition and values” (pp. 257-258). The type of ceremony described, which exists in all fraternities, can produce a dramatic effect on a member’s personal value system (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Callais, 2002, 2005; Eberly, 1967), and so the fraternity ritual was relevant to this study because of its potential to impact the leadership, moral, and student development of fraternity men.

Despite this strong values-based, symbolic frame, fraternities have weathered significant problems (Allan & Madden, 2008; Sasso, 2012a; Fernandez & Pérez-Peña, 2015; Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b), and the students involved with fraternities have faced developmental challenges with regard to their leadership, moral, and student development (Dugan, 2008; McCreary, 2012a; Shalka, 2008). These problems relate directly to the lack of established best practice and research into the fraternity experience, which this study was created to address (McCreary, 2012b; Molasso, 2005; Sasso, 2012c, 2013).

What became clear from Eberly (1967) and, much later, Callais (2002, 2005) was that over time, fraternities and sororities started to lose focus on their ritual. This was supported by King (2010) and by another essay written on the fraternity experience in the early 1970s, which highlighted the decline and subsequent death of a fraternity chapter (Westol, 2007). The movement away from ritual, which created problems within fraternity men’s development, was due in part to a misconception of fraternity culture based on the negative portrayal of fraternity life in popular culture (Bolen, 2013), but it is also due to the lack of cohesive best practice by fraternity professionals that allows a continued decline in what once was considered a successful experience (Anson & Marchesani, 1990; Flanagan, 2014a; Friedman, 2008; Kelderman, 2015; McCurtie, 2015a; Rudolph, 1990; Westol, 2007). The underlying values of fraternities should be measurable in members’ values versus those of the general population; furthermore, these
measurable values should be most visible on a leadership continuum since leadership is the encapsulation of what the fraternity experience is supposed to instill. However, the current state of the fraternity profession may serve as a mitigating factor.

**The Statement of the Problem**

Social fraternities have existed for as long as the nation has existed (Baird, 1915; Birdseye, 1907; Rudolph, 1990). Yet, despite their longevity, there was an incomplete picture in the research literature as to the ongoing value of fraternities at advancing members moral, leadership, and student development (Ahren, Bureau, Ryan, & Torres, 2014; Asel, Seifert, & Pascarella, 2009; McCreary, 2012a; 2012b; Pascarella, Flowers, & Whitt, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Sasso, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c).

The complexity of detailing the positive aspects of social fraternity membership in the research literature (Ahren et al., 2014; Asel et al., 2009; Dugan, 2008; Pascarella, Flowers, & Whitt, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Pike, 2003), the lack of established best practice within the fraternity profession (McCreary, 2012b; Sasso, 2012c), and the self-evident problems that some fraternities demonstrated in contemporary college life (Allan & Madden, 2008; Fernandez & Pérez-Peña, 2015; Flanagan, 2014a; McCreary, 2012a, 2012b; Nuwer, 2004; Sasso, 2012a) begged the question of whether or not social fraternities could demonstrate leadership gains at all, with consideration toward the members who were traditionally excluded from membership either unintentionally or purposefully (Case, 1996; Horowitz, 1989; Rudolph, 1990; Syrett, 2005, 2009).

If fraternities could not demonstrate positive value-added student, moral, and leadership development outcomes for their members, then the lack of demonstrating such gains called into question the basic structure of the fraternity movement (Martin, Hevel, Asel, & Pascarella,
2011). Secondly, if fraternity members could not demonstrate student, leadership, and moral development gains despite the presentation of clear values contributing to each fraternity’s charism (Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967), then headquarters and student affairs professionals needed to consider making significant alterations to the structure of the fraternity profession (McCreary, 2012b; Sasso, 2012c). A number of researchers agreed that, overall, what was happening in fraternities was not working (Allan & Madden, 2008; Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b; Nuwer, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Therefore, in order to continue to frame best practice for the fraternity profession, it was essential to study fraternity members’ student, leadership, and moral development gains while controlling for student characteristics and institutional size, wherein the size of an institution was somewhat correlative to the size of the fraternity community on campus and significantly impacted the development of best practice (Lounsbury & DeNeui, 1996; McCreary, 2015).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to compare the gains made by social fraternity members and non-affiliated members while controlling for sexuality, race/ethnicity, first generation college student status, and institution size by using the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) measurement for Consciousness of Self (CS) and components of the MSL that theoretically correlated to Internalized Moral Perspective (IMP). CS and IMP are constructs taken from the Social Change Model and the Model of Authentic Leadership, respectively (Astin & Astin, 1996; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Additionally, gains in CS showed a demonstrated increase in student development along the self-authorship continuum (Shalka & Jones, 2010), and gains in IMP also correlated with gains in Kohlberg’s model of moral development (Kohlberg, 1987, 2000; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Therefore, when
measuring for students’ leadership development, the study measured for important aspects of their moral and student development as well (Astin & Astin, 1996; Kohlberg, 1987; 2000; Shalka 2008; Shalka & Jones, 2010; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

**Significance of the Study**

This study measured the most basic, necessary purpose of fraternities, the moral and student development of their membership, in the context of leadership development practice. In previous studies, fraternity men were shown to exhibit moral numbness to hazing activities (McCreary, 2012a). The significance of this study was that it did not seek to examine student gains in moral development in the light of any particular activity or negative practice, but rather sought to delineate whether fraternity men develop more in morality at all, in comparison to non-fraternity men. This measurement, while controlling for specific populations and characteristics, included many types of social fraternity men within its comparison. Therefore, this study analyzed how successfully social fraternity men engaged in moral development across the board, but also how successfully moral development was taught by those responsible for the development of the fraternity experience, namely fraternity professionals. Finally, the current study controlled for specific populations of fraternity men in order to shine much needed light on particular populations of students.

It was important to determine if social fraternities have completely escaped their segregated past and can demonstrate benefits for all members (Syrett, 2005, 2009). This question was especially pertinent considering media headlines showing social fraternities as anything but accepting of diverse members (Fernandez & Pérez-Peña, 2015). The question remained as to whether or not fraternities were meeting the mission and vision that they fostered for college students, the vision of premiere leadership development (Friedman, 2008). Additionally, relating
these effects to institutional size and comparing that against non-members could demonstrate whether chapters on larger campuses operated as well as, better, or worse than smaller chapters. A knowledge of this context was a necessity toward tailoring fraternity student development practice, as well as campus student affairs practice.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study follow:

1. Research Question 1: Do social fraternity men differ from non-affiliated men on the MSL measurement for CS, controlling for institution size, sexuality, race/ethnicity, and first generation college student status?

2. Research Question 2: Do social fraternity men differ from non-affiliated men in the components of the MSL theoretically related to IMP, controlling for institution size, sexuality, race/ethnicity, and first generation student status?

3. Research Question 3: Is there a difference between CS and the components of IMP based on institution size when controlling for social fraternity membership and race/ethnicity, sexuality, and first generation student status?

**Hypotheses**

With regard to the gains of fraternity men in CS and IMP, when controlling for race/ethnicity, first generation student status, institution size, and sexuality the current study adopted the null hypothesis. Specifically, it was theorized that fraternity men’s gains on the dependent variables would not differ significantly from the gains of non-fraternity men. Regarding campus population, it was predicted that fraternity men would have similar gains to non-fraternity men regardless of campus size, again demonstrating support for the null hypothesis.
Methodology

The current study used data from the MSL 2012 survey administration in order to perform a quantitative analysis on the gains related to fraternity men’s leadership, moral, and student development. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data trends and a Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA was used to analyze the data. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA is a non-parametric test. Non-parametric testing was used because the dependent variables being studied violated the assumption of normality necessary for parametric testing and because the dependent variables were not continuous.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

An overview of the fraternity ritual, fraternity men’s moral and values development, and the fraternity/sorority professional were presented in Chapter I, and the problem of measuring leadership associated with fraternity life were introduced. The purpose and significance for the study was established and a brief overview of the methodology was outlined. Chapter II provides a complete literature review on the topics under study in this dissertation and introduces the theoretical framework for this study. Chapter III explains the methodology of the study, while Chapter IV discusses the quantitative findings and results of the data analysis. Chapter V details the conclusions drawn from this and provides the reader with implications for further research.
Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Fraternities’ Historic Role

Fraternities as supporting of leadership development. Fraternities have existed since the United States was created (Rudolph, 1990; Syrett, 2005; The Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2014). Fraternities were originally formed when higher education in the United States existed to train men for service as clergymen, and before higher education had taken upon itself the impetus of training for civic engagement (Rudolph, 1990). However, the families that sent students to college at that time were not just sending men to college to train them for the clergy; they were sending men to college so that they could become the societal leaders and the intellectual, merchant or plantation owner middle class of the American colonial and post-colonial period (Rudolph, 1990). During this time, fraternities served the purpose of training men for the leadership and social roles they would occupy post-college, and fraternity rituals reflected a blending of secular and religious values intended to promote leadership and moral development (Rudolph, 1990; Eberly, 1967; Callais, 2002; Callais, 2005). This was the state of fraternities for nearly 175 years, from 1776 through approximately 1950.

The growing criticism of fraternities. Starting in the last half of the 20th century, the value of fraternities was called into question due to some negative fraternity incidents (Allan & Madden, 2008; Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b; Sasso, 2012a). The value of the fraternity experience was also questioned because of the lack of demonstrated student gains in moral, leadership, and student development (Dugan, 2008; McCreary, 2012a; Shalka & Jones, 2010). It was evident that the perspective of fraternity and sorority students toward their rituals had slightly changed
over time (Callais, 2002, 2005; Eberly, 1967;) which could represent a shift in the fraternity experience.

**The Call.** What was meant to be a momentous restructuring of the fraternity experience was set in motion at the beginning of the 21st century. The Franklin Square Group, a task force composed of fraternity headquarters professionals and college and university presidents operating at the behest of several national organizations representing college constituencies, issued “A Call for Values Congruence” (The Call) to all professional college administrators, fraternity headquarters professionals, fraternity/sorority trade groups (the NIC), and contingents of the fraternal movement (The Franklin Square Group, 2003; Veldkamp & Bureau, 2012). The Franklin Square Group was charged with sounding the alarm regarding the damaging and dangerous experiences of fraternity men on college campuses (The Franklin Square Group, 2003), and The Call was to be their manifesto for reform.

**A lack of best practice.** The Call was a set of standards that college campuses should implement within the framework of their programming, and a set of standards that national fraternities should implement within their structural framework (The Franklin Square Group, 2003). Ten years after The Call, there were serious discussions as to its effectiveness (McCreary, 2012b; Vojta, 2012). It was questionable as to whether or not The Call was at all effective but, as evidenced by consensus, there was no documented best practice for working with fraternities on establishing its principles (Franklin Square Group, 2003; McCreary, 2012b; Molasso, 2005; Sasso, 2012c). This lack of best practice has contributed to a lack of institutional commitment, on both the part of national headquarters and institutions of higher education, to keep professionals in the field working with and researching fraternities and sororities; in turn, the dearth of research in this area has contributed to the current crisis in higher education (Flanagan,
2014a; Kelderman, 2015; Molasso, 2005; Sasso, 2012c). Some scholars posit that student gains have been adversely affected in even the most basic areas because of this lack of commitment to best practice (Flanagan, 2014a; Kelderman, 2015; Molasso, 2005; Sasso, 2012c).

The current study sought to analyze the most basic gains that should be a result of the fraternity experience because gains in moral, student, and leadership development measured on a leadership continuum as leadership development has been the continued, historic role of fraternities on college campuses (Friedman, 2008; Rudolph, 1990), and because fraternities are values based organizations as evidenced in the content and intent of their rituals (Callais, 2002, 2005; Eberly, 1967; King, 2010). It was posited that measuring for student success along these continuums would demonstrate support for the creation of successful praxis in the fraternity/sorority profession.

Using data from the 2012 administration of the MSL allowed the researcher to study self-authorship through a quantitative lens, which was an approach lacking in the literature (Creamer, Baxter Magolda, & Yue, 2010). Secondly, a national dataset facilitated the study of fraternity members across a multitude of different campuses of varying sizes and to consider institution size as a factor in support of the fraternity community on an individual campus. Finally, studying the impact of fraternities on self-authorship and moral development through the lens of a leadership assessment helped the researcher understand, from a broad, wide-ranging sample, how fraternity communities performed at promoting the leadership success, positive student development, and positive moral development of their students.

The literature review for this study focused on development of theoretical frameworks; institution size, sexuality, race/ethnicity, and parental education and how those variables may impact the fraternity experience and outcomes related to moral, leadership, and student
development; how undergraduate students have been affected by their fraternity experience; and conceptual frameworks. This literature review accessed scholarly books; scholarly articles published in books and journals; periodical articles; and dissertations. The purpose of the literature review was to inform the study’s theoretical and conceptual frames, and to develop a cohesive synthesis of existent empirical literature on the topic of fraternities as related to the control variables and to the leadership, moral and student development of fraternity men (Cone & Foster, 2006).

The Theoretical Frame

The Social Change Model

The Social Change Model is the theoretical framework which guides the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL, 2011). The model had two stated goals: to enhance student learning and development so as to develop self-knowledge and leadership competence; and to facilitate positive social change at the institution or in the community so that the community can act more humanely (Astin & Astin, 1996; Komives & Wagner, 2012). There were three components to social change: the individual (defined as the individual learner); the group (defined as the leadership development group); and the society/community (defined as the college or university community) (Astin & Astin, 1996; Komives & Wagner, 2012).

Individual Leadership. There were seven constructs (e.g., the seven “c’s”) within the model, each of which are connected to a specific continuum of the model (e.g., the individual, the group, or the society). The values regarding individuals were directly related to this study and were measures of the MSL:
1. **Consciousness of Self (CS)**. Having a reasonably accurate self-concept, understanding one’s values, and being a good observer of one’s state of mind and behavior at any given time.

2. **Congruence**. Feeling, thinking, and acting with consistency, genuineness and authenticity.

3. **Commitment**. The purposeful investment of time and physical and psychological energy in the leadership development process (Astin & Astin, 1996).

**Group Leadership.** The group “c’s” were collaboration (working together on a common purpose), common purpose (having shared aims and values), and controversy (the ability to disagree with civility). These were identified as necessary for the group to create social change (Astin & Astin, 1996). The societal “c” was citizenship, the process by which the group and the individual become collectively responsible for the community and society through a leadership development activity (Astin & Astin, 1996; Komives & Wagner, 2012).

**Authentic Leadership Theory**

**Internalized Moral Perspective (IMP).** IMP, a variable not directly measured by the MSL (MSL, 2011), could be indirectly measured by analyzing the areas of Congruence, Commitment, Resiliency, and Cognitive Skills, which were all measured on the MSL (MSL, 2015a; Walumbwa et al., 2008). IMP is a construct taken from the theory of authentic leadership, which recognizes the development of an internalized code of ethics that a leader clings to even when outside pressure is exerted upon him or her to conform; authentic leaders resist violating their own ethical foundations and usually recognize the need to protect the safety of others, despite any consequences to the group (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Authentic leadership theory posited four aspects to successful managerial leadership: self-awareness (the ability to reflect on
one’s strengths, weaknesses, and values, along with the ability to re-evaluate them as needed); relational transparency (the ability to share one’s thoughts or feelings with colleagues while minimizing inappropriate emotions); balanced processing (the ability to evaluate different perspectives fairly and objectively); and IMP (Walumbwa et al., 2008). This theory of leadership was first elucidated in 2005 (Walumbwa et al., 2008), but aspects of authentic leadership seem to have overlapping components with the Social Change Model (MSL, 2015a).

**Kohlberg’s Model of Moral Reasoning**

While Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development was not directly measured on the MSL, the overlap between Kohlberg’s rationale for moral development and the components of IMP were clear (Evans et al., 2010; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Walumbwa et al., 2008; MSL, 2015a). Kohlberg and Hersh (1977) hypothesized six stages of moral development, as follows (Evans et al., 2010).

**Pre-conventional and conventional stages of development.** The young child operates in the pre-conventional stage of moral development; he or she starts with a heteronomous morality where the learner confuses his or her morality with that of the superior person (e.g., the parent) (Evans et al., 2010; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Kohlberg, 1987). Students, as they grow, typically enter the second level of morality: conventional morality (Kohlberg, 1987; Evans et al., 2010). Conventional morality is characterized by living up to others’ expectations (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Kohlberg, 1987; Evans et al., 2010). After completing the pre-conventional and the conventional level of morality (delineated as the first four stages of the model), the learner may then progress to the principled or post-conventional level of morality marked by the last two stages of the model: social contract (Stage 5) and universal ethical principles (Stage 6) (Evans et al., 2010; Kohlberg, 1987). The social contract stage is where the learner views doing right as a
social contract: moral obligations and social relationships are based on relying on and making agreements to behave morally (Evans et al., 2010). This leads to the final stage of development, universal ethical principles, which Kohlberg (1987) concluded that not everyone reaches, nor do individuals operate in all the time. In his studies, Kohlberg (1987) was unable to empirically prove the existence of this stage of development, but he cited examples of people who have reached it (Evans et al., 2010).

**Post-conventional morality.** Those who have reached universal ethical principled morality believe that there are universal principles of justice: respecting the equality of human rights and having respect for the dignity of others (Kohlberg, 1987). Kohlberg (1987) posited that while individuals are predisposed to follow the law, those who have reached Stage 6 (universal ethical principles) will break the law if it violates their values or universal moral principles respecting the equality of human rights and the dignity of others. This person will accept the punishments for breaking the law despite the fact that the law is perceived to be unjust (Kohlberg, 1987). The individual in this stage also accepts the social contract, but realizes that when the social contract doesn’t work, there is a need to resist it (Evans et al., 2010; Kohlberg, 1987). **The overlap between IMP and Kohlberg.** There is a marked overlap between the IMP and Kohlberg’s sixth stage of development. The person who has developed an IMP has the purpose of supporting and fostering the group they belong to, based on their membership in the organization (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Applying these two principles to the case of a fraternity member could demonstrate the overlap in the theories: the fraternity man promises, through a formal oath during his initiation, to support the betterment of the organization (Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967; King, 2010; Walumbwa et al., 2008). He therefore has what Walumbwa et al. (2008) would call a moral imperative to see the organization be successful. In contrast, by Kohlberg’s (1987) theory, the
fraternity man instead forms a social contract as part of his moral development, because of his fraternity membership. Application of either an IMP (Walumbwa et al., 2008) or the sixth stage of Kohlberg’s (1987) theory would mean that that if the group violates the basic dignity of humans, the leader (in this case the fraternity man) who has developed an IMP or who is operating in the sixth stage of Kohlberg’s (1987) moral development continuum feels obligated to break the contract he has formed with his fraternity, and does what fits only within his moral code, even if it leads to the detriment of the organization (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Therefore, by recognizing a set of principles by which to measure the IMP of students, a concrete measure for the sixth stage of moral development on the Kohlberg (1987) continuum might be elucidated.

Self-Authorship Theory

According to Kegan (1994) and Baxter Magolda (1999, 2008, 2009) beliefs and attitudes are not immediately developed in the maturation of traditional college-aged students. The process of values development, constructing one’s world view, and weaving the pieces of epistemological, interpersonal, and intrapersonal learning together were identified by Baxter Magolda (2008) as the process of developing self-authorship. While developing self-authorship, the individual progresses through four stages of development: following external formulas, the crossroads, becoming the author of one’s own life, and following internal foundations (Evans et al., 2010).

Students follow external formulas when they are relying on the authority figures around them (peers, parents, professors) to define and construct knowledge and values for them (Evans et al., 2010). When students become dissatisfied with the way that others have defined them or their life, they begin to move toward the crossroads (Evans et al., 2010; Baxter Magolda, 2008). At this point, they begin to rebel against others’ ideas of who they should be, what friends they
should have, and what activities/learning opportunities they should be engaged in (Evans et al., 2010). This phase is called the crossroads because students are still tied to the external formulas, and may at times fall in line with others’ perceptions of them, but at other times follow their own perceptions of themselves (Evans et al., 2010).

In order to progress to self-authorship, students need to begin to trust their internal voice, define their own values, and construct an overall values system out of their learned knowledge, as well as from their interpersonal and intrapersonal interactions (Evans et al., 2010). Students next move toward authoring their own life. In this phase, individuals define their lives, their relationships, and themselves in the way that they want to be defined (Baxter Magolda, 2009). Many people enter the phase of self-authorship during their mid-twenties, but Baxter Magolda found that individuals have the capacity to enter this phase of development earlier, during college (Baxter Magolda, 1998, 1999, 2004, 2008, 2009). According to Evans et al. (2010), many students do not progress toward self-authorship during their college years, and remain locked in the crossroads, while some have the ability to progress toward self-authorship based on the type of experiences that they have in college. Furthermore, authoring one’s own life comes with conflict, and the student may practice authoring, but may still feel deep-rooted, internal conflicts because they are acting on their own view of the world while shunning the view of others (Baxter Magolda, 2009).

Baxter Magolda (2009) found that progressing toward an internal foundation comes with a total trusting of one’s inner voice. This does not often happen until much later in a person’s life when they have a clear picture of how they see the world, a personal theory of how the world works gained from epistemological knowledge (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Additionally, individuals reaching internal foundations must have a clear picture of which relationships they
find valuable, and must be able to define their role with others, thus constructing their interpersonal knowledge (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Finally, individuals must have a clear and cohesive picture of themselves and who they want to be, and when making decisions must follow their internal voice (Baxter Magolda 2008, 2009).

The defining aspects of self-authorship development are teaching students from what Baxter Magolda (2004) called a Learning Partnerships Model. The Learning Partnerships Model had several core principles: first, educators are asked to value learners as having knowledge; second, learning should be situated in learners’ own experiences; third, learning is not uni-directional but flows from learner to educator and vice versa. (Baxter Magolda, 2004).

**The connection between CS and self-authorship.** Using the MSL, previous research developed and analyzed the connection between Astin’s and Astin’s (1996) principle of CS, and Kegan’s (1994) model of self-authorship which was further elucidated by Baxter Magolda (2009) in her own research (Shalka & Jones, 2010). This study, therefore, assessed the principles of self-authorship and consciousness of self in tandem with one another, and analyzed the frame of reference from the perspective of fraternity men of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds, varying sexuality, and first generation student status.

**CS and self-authorship further defined.** For the purposes of this study, the other dependent variable to be measured was the CS variable, which was directly measured on the MSL (MSL, 2011). CS is the knowledge of one’s own values and sense of self-knowledge as part of the leadership development process (Astin & Astin, 1996; Komives & Wagner, 2012; MSL, 2011; Shalka & Jones, 2010). The Social Change Model is inclusive and does not just apply to formal leaders (Astin & Astin, 1996). Therefore, it was appropriate to measure for this principle within fraternities (Astin & Astin, 1996). Astin and Astin (1996) defined this principle
as being aware of one’s beliefs and values, as well as the attitudes and emotions, which motivate one’s actions. This principle of internalizing and operating from one’s values was found to be congruent with the principles of self-authorship as distinguished and elucidated by Keegan and Baxter Magolda (Shalka & Jones, 2010). For the purposes of this study, CS was defined as a construct and measurement of both Astin and Astin (1996) and Baxter Magolda’s (2009) advancement to the stage of authoring one’s own life.

**Overarching Connection in the Theoretical Frame**

Like Kohlberg’s (1987) Theory of Moral Development, Kegan’s (1994) Theory of Self-Authorship, which was further researched by Baxter Magolda (1998, 1999, 2004, 2009), was a cognitive theory of development which looks at how the student gains meaning (Evans et al., 2010). Baxter Magolda (1998) found, in her own model, overlap with Kohlberg since the moral development literature, including self-authorship, relies on moving away from following what is the authoritative right, and operating according to the internally, personally known values that one constructs.

Direct overlap between both theories was well documented. Kegan, who developed the concept and the original stages of self-authorship, was one of Kohlberg’s mentees (Kegan, 1994). Additionally, when considering Baxter Magolda’s frame of developing interpersonal relationships, several theorists acknowledged that the frame of interpersonal development, specifically the frame that conformed with leadership theory, overlapped with Kohlberg’s theory of moral development (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; McCauley, Drath, Palus, O’Connor, & Baker, 2006). McCauley et al. (2006), stated that Kohlberg’s (1987) and Baxter Magolda’s (2009) models of interpersonal development overlap in that, according to both models, individuals in the last stage of inter-dependency look to see the universal reality that truth is
relative for each individual, and that all humans and their experiences have value. This fosters a value for diversity (McCauley, Drath, Palus, O’Connor, & Baker, 2006).

Baxter Magolda (2009) built her own cognitive processes for self-authorship, distinct from Kegan’s (1994) initial theory, which move the learner from following external formulas to relying on one’s own internal voice to make decisions (Baxter Magolda, 2004; 2009; Evans et al., 2010; Kegan, 1994). The same was true for Kohlberg (1987), wherein external forces (or as Baxter Magolda would say, “external formula”) cause the learner to be a moral person in both the pre-conventional and conventional stages of moral development (Evans et al., 2010). From there, the individual starts to make an internal foundation for doing what is right (Evans et al., 2010; Kohlberg, 2000). This structure was adopted by Kegan (1994) and subsequently by Baxter Magolda (2009) when discussing self-authorship. To further the understanding of these constructs, the present study examined self-authorship in the measurement of IMP, and just as the theories dovetailed, the two frames also had dovetailing components.

This section provided a theoretical frame for the current study. What follows in the next sections is a specific review of the literature of GBQ (GBQ) fraternity men, first generation students who are members of fraternities, ethnically diverse fraternity members, and the challenges and benefits of fraternity membership generally.

**Review of the Literature**

**Gay/Bisexual Fraternity Men’s Moral Development and Self-Authorship**

**Typologies of the gay social fraternity experience.** In 1996, the first national study of lesbigay (lesbian, gay, and bisexual) fraternity/sorority members was conducted (Case, 1996). Case (1996) was able to find over 500 respondents to his informal 32 question survey. Over 90% of the study respondents were men; women respondents were few because the addition of
women to the survey took place after the survey had already been in distribution (Case, 1996). The study focused on creating a typology of the “lesbigay” fraternity/sorority experience (Case, 1996). This seemed like a logical first step in the research on gay, bisexual, and lesbian fraternity members and sorority members, who were traditionally so hidden from all fraternity and sorority members that they were described by Case (1996) as the invisible membership.

Through the survey results, Case (1996) was able to determine that, on average, approximately 4.5 members of a fraternity chapter were gay or bisexual in an average 52-man chapter, or approximately 5%. Based on the average 52-man chapter size, the average fraternity brother had 70 to 90 brothers walking through his house with him (before or after his own initiation) during his time in college (Case, 1996). In a rewriting of the initial Case (1996) findings, Case, Hesp, and Eberly (2005) found that gay and bisexual fraternity men, and lesbian sorority women, were chapter leaders at a rate of over 80%. Despite acceptance, many of the men and women in the study (almost 70%) faced some sort of homophobia as a result of membership (Case, 1996). The Case (1996) study was extremely important; while it lacked sophisticated statistical methodology or peer review, it was the first time that fraternity men and sorority women who were gay, bisexual, or lesbian were counted as having a distinct experience within the fraternity/sorority movement. Further, it was a distinctive study in that it gives a cross-reference of experiences from different fraternity men of different generations, and the types of different experiences between each generation would become more pronounced over time (Case, 1996). This related to the current study because IMP or CS as associated with student development and leadership gains could be complicated for GBQ fraternity men.

Among 472 fraternity men who self-identified as gay or bisexual, when asked to identify the top three reasons that they joined a fraternity, 75% of these study participants indicated they
joined their fraternity for camaraderie and friendship, which was similar to the reason straight men joined fraternities (Case et al., 2005). Additionally, when asked to identify the top three outcomes that lesbigay members gained from their fraternity experiences, these members listed: long-term friendships (52%), leadership skills (52%), and social and interpersonal skills (34%) (Case et al., 2005). Among the narratives that accompanied the surveys, comments indicated that the fraternity experience was similar in importance for all members: “But fraternity membership was, on balance, a constructive force in my development. Being a member gave me a social identity. It provided a “community” in which to develop leadership and interpersonal skills” (Case et al., 2005, p. 28). Development of a social identity is important to the development of self-authorship, as intrapersonal skills are one of the three elements of self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008, 2009). Additionally, Kohlberg (1987) stated that to progress through the conventional level of development, one must have social perspective. Interestingly, 84% of those surveyed also held a leadership position in their chapter, a number which was considered unusually high by the researchers (Case et al., 2005). Finally, on a Likert scale, 89% of the gay and bisexual men surveyed found themselves “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with their fraternity experience (Case et al., 2005).

The Case (1996) and Case et al. (2005), studies had fraternity men of all ages participate in the sampling and demonstrated the positive effect of fraternities on these men, despite experiences with heteronormism and heterosexism (Case et al., 2005). While the Case (2005) study did not offer a sophisticated methodology, it was an important typology of the fraternity experience for gay, bisexual, and questioning men.

Going beyond typology in describing the gay student experience. As a follow-up to the Case (1996), and Case et al. (2005), studies, Hesp (2006) found that gay fraternity men
experienced tremendous obstacles when they sought to affiliate with a fraternity. In his ethnography, Hesp (2006) found that gay students often tried to mask their true identity, and at the same time demonstrate heteronormative behavior (such as bringing a female date to fraternity functions). Hesp (2006) also found that the fraternity leaders (whether elected or unofficial) set the values of the group. Relating to the current study’s focus on developing CS and IMP, the gay men in the Hesp (2006) study characterized the values that the fraternity sought to provide them through its training and rituals, and the members’ reactions to those values. One participant in the Hesp (2006) study described the values his fraternity sought to provide and how these affected his personal development: “I found the morals and ethics that they were trying to teach as something that I could agree with...I found that the things they were trying to live in their lives and exemplify [the fraternity members], I was trying to live in mine” (p. 78). Another fraternity brother described his identification with his fraternity’s values: “I feel I personally strive for those [the fraternity’s] beliefs and ideals, not just because they are the ideals of the fraternity I am in, but that they’re decent ideals for any citizen to have” (p. 78).

Hesp’s (2006) participants also commented on the social support that they found from their affiliation: “Brothers are like my best friends in the world. They’ve been very supportive, when Ryan and I were breaking up—our relationship—they would come take me out and were just really, really supportive about it” (p. 80). Thus, while Hesp (2006) did make it clear that gay or bisexual fraternity men faced many challenges joining a fraternity, the men also reported benefits from the experience. Hesp (2006) also left an open question: Do the experiential benefits of fraternity outweigh the potential pitfalls for gay/bisexual fraternity men who are seeking to develop their identity? This question called for a quantitative analysis on the benefits that
gay/bisexual fraternity men gain as a part of their fraternal experience, which the current study sought to delineate.

**Masking of non-heterosexual identity in fraternities.** Hesp’s (2006) research, which found that gay men had difficulties expressing their identity, coincided with DeSantis (2007). DeSantis (2007) stated that while some fraternities may accept gay members, the members try to mask their identities, observing: “he did not flaunt his sexuality by ‘bringing guys back to the house’ or by discussing his sexual preferences with the brothers” (p. 56). This was a consistent finding in the literature; often, study participants reported they first joined the fraternity and then once they were comfortable with the group, they discussed their sexuality (Case et al., 2005; DeSantis, 2007; Hesp, 2006). This may be because if the gay men had announced their sexuality early on, they may not have been able to join their organizations (Windmeyer & Miller, 2015).

**The attitudes of heterosexual men toward gay/bisexual men in fraternities.** DeCarlo (2014) found that heterosexual fraternity men’s attitudes were significantly different toward gay men than the attitudes of heterosexual non-members. DeCarlo (2014) suggested that despite evidence the fraternal organizations were more accepting of differing sexuality types, gender roles for men and women were seen as traditional by study participants in fraternities or sororities. Indeed, sexual roles have often been found to be more traditionally defined among fraternity and sorority members (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), and the DeCarlo (2014) study supported those findings. If this sense of intensity existed around the normal identity development of gay college students in fraternities, based on the findings of Baxter Magolda (1999, 2009), it may pose difficulty for students advancing toward self-authorship. Additionally, Kohlberg (1987) found that moral development was based on interactional experiences with the social environment. Kohlberg (1987) did not find that students regressed in their moral
development because of the lack of a positive social environment, but he did observe that students could lack growth based on external factors in their lives.

**The effects of GBQ sexuality in fraternity men on developmental gains.** How would repression affect the moral development of fraternity members? The literature was unclear, but among the participants of Hesp’s (2006) study, the gay and bisexual men expressed the belief that more gay men became fraternity leaders and fraternity executive board members in order to make their membership count. One participant went so far as to say most of the gay guys would be on the executive board leadership of the chapter (Hesp, 2006). As indicated in other qualitative research, leadership in a men’s fraternity did positively impact self-authorship due to increased peer accountability, higher level decision making, and personal reflection (Brown; 2007; Pressler, 2013).

The question remains as to whether the effects of gains in self-authorship among fraternity leaders, as found by Pressler (2013), would be significant among gay fraternity leaders specifically. As was evident within the literature, more research comparing the GBQ fraternity student population to heterosexual fraternity members was needed.

**A holistic picture of GBQ fraternity men’s experiences.** According to multiple studies, the complex social problems associated with fraternity membership may cloud the direct benefit to developing IMP and CS for fraternity men (Danielson, Taylor, & Hartford, 2001; McCreary, 2012a; Shalka & Jones, 2010), and on top of these confounding situations in fraternities, the research found that for a gay man in a fraternity, the inability to express one’s sexuality may lead to specific coping mechanisms within the organization: passing, avoidance, and assimilation (Trump & Wallace, 2006). Trump and Wallace (2006) found that in their study, many of the participants demonstrated a belief that heterosexuality was the only acceptable way of being.
However, Trump and Wallace (2006) did find that gay members of fraternities moved from seeing their brothers as homophobic to seeing their brothers as heterocentric; while this shift demonstrated only slightly more tolerance, heterocentrism is marked by a cultural centrism around heteronormative behavior rather than homophobic hatred of a homosexual person’s lifestyle. Unfortunately, the Trump and Wallace (2006) study was qualitative and included descriptions of the experiences of only five, White students. Therefore, to build a phenomenological case, follow up study would be necessary with a greater diversity in participants.

**The possibility of more than one non-heterosexual experience in fraternities.** Trump and Wallace (2006) focused specifically on the experience of fraternity men who are not heterosexual, while Dilley (2005) focused his qualitative research on the experience of non-heterosexual undergraduate men. In his typology, Dilley (2005) identified 57 men who attended college from 1949 to 1999, spanning a fifty-year period. Dilley (2005) proposed that there were six categories of non-heterosexual students during this period: homosexual, gay, queer, closeted, normal, and parallel. Most of the categories of non-heterosexual college student behavior that were elucidated by Dilley (2005) existed throughout the duration of the time period studied, with the exception of the homosexual category, which Dilley (2005) posited only existed as a distinct category from the 1940’s to the 1960’s, and the queer category, which existed from the 1980’s forward. Homosexual students saw sexuality as a private matter, did not discuss their sexuality, and may have only engaged in clandestine sexual experiences (Dilley, 2005). For the purposes of the current study, which sought to look at current students’ behaviors, the homosexual category as described by Dilley (2005) was not pertinent. Queer students rejected straight conventions, and saw their lives in opposition of heterosexual students (Dilley, 2005). Their experience was
also not pertinent to the current study because they did not associate with fraternities. Students who were gay, as defined by Dilley (2005), acknowledged or announced their feelings and often socialized with other non-heterosexual males. Dilley (2005) did not find that gay students associated with fraternities.

The three categories of closeted, normal, and parallel students (Dilley, 2005) were pertinent to the current study. Closeted students were characterized by Dilley (2005) through one of his participants as living on the fringes; they neither identified with heterosexual students nor with gay or queer students (Dilley, 2005). The men in this category may have been closeted for fear of social shunning, arrest or incarceration, or forced therapy (Dilley, 2005). Closeted students did not allow themselves to interact in situations that could reveal their sexuality, but they were aware of their sexuality and the implications of it (Dilley, 2005). Some of them did join fraternities, and Dilley (2005) included accounts of closeted students. For example, Dilley (2005) described the experience of a student named Juan who joined a fraternity to prove his heterosexuality. Dilley (2005) shared Juan’s experience of finding a fraternity brother who was in the same situation, and the two explored their sexuality secretly with one another in the fraternity house. Dilley (2005) found that closeted students had a sexual and personal identity associated with their sexuality, but hid it. The implications of the findings by Dilley (2005) were of paramount importance to this study since other fraternity researchers have found that most gay and bisexual members enter fraternities as closeted individuals (Hesp, 2006; Trump & Wallace, 2006).

By contrast, students that Dilley (2005) classified as normal did not have an identity that was non-heterosexual. Men in this category engaged in homosexual behavior but did not consider themselves any different from other “normal” students (Dilley, 2005). For example,
study participant Chris was a fraternity member who engaged in homosexual intercourse in random “tearoom experiences,” which was defined as clandestine sexual activity in a public place with strangers (Henson et al., 2013; Dilley, 2005). Chris described how, at his university, there was a library bathroom system (i.e., bathrooms commonly understood as meeting places for specific types of casual sexual intercourse experiences) for men who were heterosexual to the world but engaged in homosexual intercourse (Dilley, 2005). Thus, the difference between normal students and closeted students was not, by the participants’ own accounts, about their homosexual actions—both groups engaged in homosexual activity—but about self-identification as heterosexual or homosexual (Dilley, 2005). In Dilley’s (2005) research, closeted students recognized a non-heterosexual part in themselves, whereas normal students considered their homosexual and sexual activities as “just sex” and not part of their identities. Presumably, denial of one’s own non-heterosexuality might limit the ability of fraternities to contribute to the moral, leadership, or student development of students; one could only assume that not accepting oneself totally would lead to problems developing self-authorship (Evans et al., 2010).

In Dilley’s (2005) study, parallel students realized that their sexual activities created a clandestine life they led alongside their normal life. Students characterized as parallel lived as non-active heterosexuals on-campus and carried on their homosexual sexual relationships off-campus (Dilley, 2005). Dilley (2005) described the experience of Pete, for example, who joined a fraternity and initially became intensely involved under the guise of heterosexuality, but eventually left the fraternity for his parallel non-heterosexual lifestyle.

Dilley’s (2005) research bore heavily on the current study in terms of defining the complexity of the sexual diversity component. Fraternity men who engaged in either closeted, normal, or parallel experiences, as defined by Dilley (2005), would likely have different gains
from developmental experiences within their fraternities (Dilley, 2005). For example, it would be difficult to ascertain the developmental gains from fraternity membership for Chris, who identified as normal (Dilley, 2005), in the current or any study since he did not identify as gay, bisexual, or questioning. Closeted students might experience what Juan experienced by way of confirmation of his identity when he interacted with another closeted person in his fraternity, but for anyone who leads a double life, the developmental impact of an organization can be confounded (Dilley, 2005). Closeted individuals may thus find themselves, as one person in the study described, “a person divorced from his senses of emotion, desire, and community” (Dilley, 2005, p. 68). In this case, fraternity membership might be detrimental to a student’s leadership and student development (Evans et al., 2010).

Similarly, students living a parallel lifestyle may see their fraternity membership as inconsequential to their identity. This can be, as described in the Dilley (2005) study, because they perceive their true identity as incongruent with fraternity membership, which may mean they realize fewer developmental gains. Dilley’s (2005) study has major implications for the current research because, no doubt, the classifications in that study apply to students in this contemporary study, and therefore fraternity membership might have a bearing on leadership and student development to varying degrees for each non-heterosexual classification.

**A diverging view of the non-heterosexual student experience.** In this literature search, a divergent view from Dilley’s (2005) study emerged, indicating that fraternities became more accepting of gay and bisexual men in the decade after 2005. Rankin, Hesp, and Weber (2013) found, in their cohort analysis, a significant difference in students and alumni who joined their fraternities prior to the year 2000 and after the year 2000 in the acceptance they felt from the fellow members of their chapters, their ability to be open about their sexuality in their chapters,
and their rate of attendance at Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender-Queer (LGBTQ) events. The researchers concluded that the fraternity system was indeed becoming more diverse and less of a place where LGBTQ students had to worry about the perception their lifestyles had for their fraternity membership: they no longer should fear shunning by their fraternity brothers (Rankin et al., 2013). While the Rankin et al. (2013) findings shed hope for gay, bisexual, and questioning men in college fraternities, it was unclear whether the experience of these men would be as developmentally positive as it would be for heterosexual students.

A different type of fraternity. Using a qualitative approach, Yeung and Stombler (2000) studied the identity development of men in a national gay fraternity, Delta Lambda Phi, which was founded in the 1980’s for gay, bisexual and progressive men (i.e. men who were accepting of alternative sexualities). Yeung and Stombler (2000) found that the national gay fraternity, through its chapters and national convention, was able to create a bridge between the perceived straight, heterosexist world of the American college fraternity and the gay world, while rejecting what members did not like about each experience. This allowed for completely open membership identity formation (in fact, many men’s coming out experience was when they showed up at a rush, or membership recruitment, event for the fraternity) (Yeung & Stombler, 2000). However, in order to fit into the mainstream fraternity culture, members sometimes engaged in defeminizing (i.e., actively downplaying feminine behaviors) to tone down the gay rhetoric of the effeminate men in their chapters (Yeung & Stombler, 2000). In the same vein, Yeung and Stombler (2000) found that members of the fraternity constructed their identities to coincide with the organization’s gay identity. This could pose a problem to self-authorship development since excessive authority (even the perceived authority in the rhetoric of fraternity brotherhood) may inhibit the development of authoring one’s own life (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Yeung & Stombler,
2000). Interestingly, even non-heterosexual members in a fraternity created for gay, bisexual and
progressive men engaged in defeminizing as if the men in the fraternity wanted to
heteronormalize. If this was the case in an openly non-heterosexual fraternity, how much more
might that urge exist for non-heterosexual men within the typically heterosexual fraternity?
Perhaps the developmental gains from fraternity membership for non-heterosexual men in non-
heterosexual fraternities would not be less complex than for non-heterosexual men in
heterosexual fraternities.

A comparison of heterosexual and non-heterosexual fraternity students. Another
study which sought to measure developmental gains in the gay and bisexual fraternity member
community, as compared to heterosexual or questioning students, demonstrated significantly
different development scores in five out of nine areas of personal gains on the Association of
Fraternity/Sorority Advisors/Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (AFA/EBI) Fraternity/Sorority
Assessment Survey between gay, bisexual, questioning, and heterosexual fraternity members
(Long, 2011). Long (2011) found that in the areas of personal gains associated with one’s sense
of belonging; interpersonal relationship skills; interpersonal competence; and leadership skills,
the scores of GBQ students were significantly different and lower than heterosexual fraternity
members. Conversely, it was found that gay/bisexual fraternity members had significantly more
diverse interactions than heterosexual or questioning fraternity members. The weakness of the
Long (2011) study was that it only included samples of students from research universities, thus
not exposing the effects of different college communities, or different institution sizes. However,
gay/bisexual fraternity members advanced in their development differently to such a significant
degree that it warranted further study. While fraternity men may find a home that they are at
peace with in the fraternity system (Case et al., 2005; Hesp, 2006), the home they find beneficial may have no actual effect on their personal development (Long, 2011).

The experience of openly gay fraternity men. Despite the apparent challenges that gay/bisexual men face when they join a fraternity, the expectation that fraternity membership can bring positive personal gains is chronicled in this section in the experience of several, gay/bisexual fraternity men across several studies (Hesp, 2006; Case et al., 2005; Case, 1996). No experience by an openly gay fraternity man deemed itself more positive than that of Benjamin Z. Huelskamp (2015), who chronicled his personal journey in an Epistolary Scholarly Personal Narrative (ESPN). Of note, Huelskamp did not join a fraternity until he was a graduate student, making him an exception to the literature; however, his personal narrative was significant for detailing the benefits he received from his fraternity experience. In contrast to Heulskamp’s (2015) unwavering applause for all aspects of his non-heterosexual experience in a traditional fraternity, previous research indicated the fraternity experience may fall short in supporting the needs of gay/bisexual members (Case, 1996; Case et al., 2005; Hesp, 2006; Long, 2011). The current study sought to determine if a positive experience could be found in the leadership development and student development of GBQ fraternity men using a national dataset.

While the membership experience of GBQ fraternity men suggested troubling duality, the experience of these men was no less troubling than that of racial minorities in traditionally White social fraternities. The next section of the literature review focuses on the experience of minority men choosing to join a fraternity.
Racial/Ethnic Minority Fraternity Men’s Self-Authorship and Moral Development

Minority men’s exclusion from social fraternity membership. The phenomenon of men of racial/ethnic minorities in traditionally White fraternities is a relatively new research area in the literature as fraternity men only started creating integrated chapters in the 1940’s (Dowiak et al., 2014; James, 2007) and in the wider fraternity movement in the 1960’s (Horowitz, 1987). Prior to 20th century radical conservatism among fraternity members, fraternities had been, in their early years, characterized as radically liberal anti-administrative organizations that rebelled against the excessive disciplinary demands of faculty members (Anson & Marchesani, 1990; Baird, 1915; Brown, 1920; Horowitz, 1987; Rudolph, 1990).

From radically liberal to radically conservative. The views on race in the fraternity movement were institutionally, radically conservative at the onset of the civil rights movement in the 1960s, and when the NIC, as the trade group for social fraternities, decided to stand in favor of segregation and restrictive clauses regarding who could join their member organizations at state universities, the fraternities’ actions were deemed in violation of the 14th amendment by legal scholars (Horowitz, 1951). The next section specifically analyzes what it is like to be a minority student in an IFC fraternity.

The experience of minority fraternity men in social fraternities. The radical view of racial separation caused black men to join black fraternities, White Anglo-Saxon Protestants to join traditionally white fraternities, and Catholic and Jewish students to join their own, newly created organizations (Horowitz, 1987; Sanua, 1994; Syrett, 2009; Syrett, 2005). Therefore, like gay men who felt forced to hide who they are (Case, 1996; Case et al., 2005), men of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds felt the need to mitigate the aspects of identity dealing with race
and ethnicity when they chose to cross racial lines and join traditionally White fraternities (Winkler, 2014).

**The Black student experience in social fraternities.** In Winkler (2014), Black students of varying ages from recent college graduates to alumni in their 40s participated in a phenomenological study of what it means to be Black in a social fraternity. The findings were perhaps unsurprising: Winkler (2014) found that participants mitigated their racial identities, saw themselves as in between the White world and the Black world, and did not see issues of race as pertaining to them.

The participants of the Winkler (2014) study demonstrated that to be accepted into social fraternities as a member, minority students had to successfully straddle the world between White and Black. Additionally, Winkler (2014) found this was possible to do since many already had the ability to see themselves as separate from traditionally Black because of the attitudes of their parents, the high schools they went to, and their socioeconomic class. The phenomenon of being in the middle or “the middleness” was coined by one of the participants of the study (Winkler, 2014). This need to identify a tenuous stronghold on racial heritage and cultural context could either have the effect of an excessive reliance on authority to manage the student’s personal development, or a quickening of movement toward self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008). What seemed to have taken place in the study participants was a denial of a part of themselves in order to achieve membership in their fraternity; this repression might have mitigated the developmental effects of that very fraternity (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Winkler, 2014).

**The minority student experience in social fraternities.** Hughey (2010) discussed the experiences of non-White students in what he called White Greek Letter Organizations (WGLOs). In his qualitative study, he found that non-White members were enmeshed in a
paradox of participation (Hughey, 2010). In one vein, Hughey (2010) saw the marginalization of members, an example of which was the prevalent scenario of Black men and women continuously called to manage community service projects for their WGLOs. Another example provided by Hughey (2010) was the common belief that Latino/Latina members were lazy and did not like to participate in networking activities.

Despite the stigmatization created by White members, non-White members of social fraternities and sororities reported feeling trust in their fellow fraternity and sorority members, as well as the bond of brotherhood or sisterhood, which was something that all the participants in the study valued (Hughey, 2010). Hughey (2010), like Winkler (2014), concluded that there was an underlying racism existent within the social fraternity forcing the non-White members to mitigate their racial identity and develop a non-threatening approach to expressing their race. Unlike Winkler (2014), Hughey was a White member of a traditionally National Pan Hellenic Council (NPHC) organization; NPHC fraternities and sororities are traditionally African American.

_Mitigation of self and the theoretical frame of the current study._ In tying the struggle that Hughey (2010) reports of non-White members in WGLOs to the theory of self-authorship, the struggle that Hughey (2010) reported could either enhance epistemological development, thus leading to self-determining value in interpersonal relationships as cited by Baxter Magolda (2008), or it could lead to an even deeper confusion about self-identity.

Regarding moral development, Kohlberg (2000) expressed the belief that with the exception of extreme trauma, members remain stagnant or progress forward in their moral development. A major reason for not developing forward was because students could not get past the pre-conventional level of fairness, or had not been taught how to reason and think at the next
moral stage of development (Kohlberg, 2000). Kohlberg’s (2000) theory does not specifically cover race, nor does it define what is considered as significant trauma. Therefore, it was impossible to determine how a consistent feeling of racial inequality might impact a member of a social fraternity, and how traumatic membership, which should breed acceptance and brotherly love, might become. The previous two studies identified that being in that position appeared to cause participants of these studies to mitigate their racial/ethnic identity (Hughey, 2010; Winkler, 2014).

Feeling isolated and wanting to join a social fraternity because of race/ethnicity.

Expressed tensions with race may surface in regard to the problems that students who are ethnic/racial minorities may face while being social fraternity members. A research report at the University of Maryland found, in a survey of over 200 participants of Asian Pacific and Latino men, that those most likely to seek counseling for alcohol problems were likely to also join a fraternity (Liu & Sedlacek, 1996). The same cohort of students who showed these correlated interests were interested in seeking help organizing their time and believed it would be difficult adjusting to college work (Liu & Sedlacek, 1996). Liu and Sedlacek (1996) theorized that the Asian Pacific and Latino students were feeling isolated on a campus and were looking for the social support that a fraternity could provide. Liu and Sedlacek (1996) also extrapolated from their survey that the students thought they would need help with managing their alcohol use because they felt lonely and without connections, and therefore were drinking and partying to socialize. This would suggest that these minority students were only attracted to the negative aspects of fraternity as defined by Sasso (2012a). Mutual support and camaraderie are factors that students have consistently looked for when joining a fraternity (Winkler, 2014; Case et al., 2005; Hughey, 2010).
Aggression and micro-aggression toward non-white social fraternity members.

Summers (2010) also conducted an interview of six African American men who chose to join traditionally White fraternities; Summers used a qualitative interview process. Four of the participants of the study were current undergraduates at one of four universities, all with larger student populations, and two were recent alumni of the same institution (Summers, 2010). Summers (2010) found that the men in his study faced both racial intolerance on a micro-aggressive (i.e., subtle hints of racist thinking) and aggressive (i.e., overt racial aggressions) scale. Additionally, the Summers (2010) study found that the racial micro-aggressions and aggressions took place at the beginning of participants’ affiliation in the fraternity. As the study participants’ fraternal experience progressed, they found that more and more they were accepted, and that they came to rely on the group of men as a family, forming deep and lasting bonds with men they expected to be friends with their whole life (Summers, 2010). Five out of the six participants in the study held significant leadership positions within their chapter as well (Summers, 2010). What was most interesting in this study were the reports of participants that members of the African American community on campus, and especially the traditionally black fraternities on campus, demonstrated resentment that these men joined the traditionally white fraternity groups on campus (Summers, 2010).

Moving from marginalization to mattering. Overall, Summers (2010) identified the experience of these six men as moving from marginalization to mattering within the organization. The mattering that these men came to feel was significant in the positive feelings they exhibited for their fraternity experience and the lack of regret they had for joining their fraternity (Summers, 2010). As with other studies that explored African American males joining white fraternities, it was unclear how the overall joining and affiliating process affected these
men’s self-authorship or moral development. However, it was clear from the literature that these men were deeply affected by their fraternal experience, sometimes negatively, though they did have an overall, positive experience throughout the entirety of their undergraduate affiliation (Summers, 2010). Summers (2010) made a seemingly compelling argument in his study, but rather than approaching the study from an ambivalent perspective, he stated that his qualitative study came from the frame of a researcher who believes that fraternities are still exclusionary. This was significant in that the reader cannot determine if Summers (2010) was genuine in sharing his bias because he worked around it, or if he shared his bias because it tainted his interviews.

**An alternative view of race in regards to social fraternity membership.** Similar to the Summers (2010) study, Newsome (2009) researched the effects of joining a social fraternity on African American students. However, Newsome (2009) further delineated the challenges and benefits that African American males faced when they joined a White fraternity. While the challenge with affiliation continues to be racial sensitivity, the challenge seems much more pronounced in this study (Newsome, 2009). One of the positive factors that Newsome (2009) pointed out was the ability to network with alumni; an example was that one male from the study was able to secure a post-graduate position working for his national fraternity. Additionally, the participants in this study felt that their fraternity brothers cared for them, and they described how important feeling cared for was in supporting the students’ navigation through college (Newsome, 2009). Newsome (2009) also cited that several men in the study had the opportunity to serve in multiple leadership positions within their fraternity and in the campus community because of their fraternity experience; this positively affected their leadership ability. Two of the participants believed that they were offered jobs with their national fraternity headquarters.
because they were extremely involved as an undergraduate (Newsome, 2009). Interacting with diverse individuals was also one of the stated benefits (Newsome, 2009).

**The theoretical frame in regards to Newsome and Summers.** It should be noted that interacting with diverse individuals was one of the primary ways that Baxter Magolda (2008) established a path toward self-authorship. This made this finding by Newsome (2009) significant to the current study. Newsome (2009) concluded by finding that despite the lack of racial identity development in the participants, the participants all praised their fraternity experience. She stated that if social fraternities addressed issues of racial identity and sensitivity, that the experience would become thoroughly rewarding for “students of color” (Newsome, 2009). Newsome’s (2009) findings were more impactful than Summers’ (2010) findings because Newsome (2009) seemed to come from a more unbiased perspective. Still, both of these qualitative studies needed follow up with a quantitative analysis to determine impact on a broader scale.

**A reverse analysis of race.** In a reverse analysis, Hughey (2006) studied the students of Howard University, a Historically Black College or University (HBCU), as the administration in 2006 was permitting the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity, a social fraternity, to install an undergraduate chapter on campus. The chapter grew to 55 men at its February 2006 chartering (Hughey, 2006). In Hughey’s (2006) analysis, the researcher delved into the personal feelings of the campus community when a traditionally White fraternity was put on an HBCU. Based on what Hughey (2006) reported, it was significant to note that the campus members at Howard University had a fearful feeling about the White fraternity coming to campus. Additionally, Hughey (2006) attempted to analyze the speech of the students (both those who joined the new organization and the students who were against anyone joining) to show a dichotomy of feelings about this new fraternity coming to campus, and to show that not all those feelings were negative. Conversely,
Hughey (2006) suggested strongly that the presence of the White fraternity on the HBCU represented some sort of colonization or oppressive act for the campus at large.

*Clear bias in the analysis.* Hughey (2006) presented ample evidence to show why race was a sensitive issue at Howard University, especially among the members of the fraternity and sorority community there, who represented the founding chapters of five of the nine NPHC fraternities and sororities. However, what seemed difficult to comprehend was the negative bias of the researcher in the process of analysis. Hughey (2006) reported the positive comments coming from students, but seemed to center on the conflict and neglected to examine the commonality between participants’ viewpoints, except to point out that fear was an underlying variable for all members of the community. This called for a review of this researcher’s conclusions because he saw more value in the NPHC fraternity experience than the social fraternity experience.

**Race and social fraternity membership in the light of developmental gains.** In an analysis on the effects of race on joining social fraternities, the studies all concluded that there was a sense of racial tension, micro-aggression, or even full aggression against members from ethnic/racial minorities who joined these organizations (Hughey, 2010; Newsome, 2009; Summers, 2010; Winkler, 2014). As stated, the effect of these experiences on self-authorship could either be detrimental or enhancing within the student development paradigm, depending on how the students cope with the difficulties of affiliation they experience (Baxter Magolda, 2008).

When discussing this in terms of moral development, all of the studies addressed the positive impressions and growth that fraternity men reported from their fraternity experience, and many participants in these studies reported making leadership gains and/or holding leadership office in their organizations (Hughey, 2010; Newsome, 2009; Summers, 2010;
If these students’ reported leadership gains were along the social change continuum, then a growth in moral development and social consciousness, leading to advancement in self-authorship and Kohlberg’s moral development paradigm, could be possible (Astin & Astin, 1996; Baxter Magolda, 2008; Kohlberg, 1987; Shalka & Jones, 2010).

Unfortunately, earlier research indicated that fraternity/sorority membership traditionally inhibited one’s appreciation for diversity (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Significant in this analysis was also the reverse interpretation, from the perspective of a community of NPHC fraternities at an HBCU that allowed a new social fraternity on campus (Hughey, 2006). In the reverse, it seemed that tensions ran high when a social fraternity began to colonize on a HBCU campus though in this secondary case, there was a weak context presented to explain the high-running feelings (Hughey, 2006).

**Fraternity men’s status quo leadership as continually troubling.** In the literature, fraternities, organizations which rely very much on their past and are “traditionally” run organizations (Horowitz, 1987), seemed to be tied to the traditions of exclusion within their organizations even after the society gave up those paradigms of exclusion. This posed a significant problem for fraternity men; maintaining the status quo was one thing, but maintaining it after it was no longer existent was quite another altogether. This paradigm was bound to have an effect on the student and leadership development of both White and racially/ethnically diverse members.

**Engagement homogeneity.** Findings of engagement homogeneity were found to be significant from a quantitative perspective (Asel et al., 2009). Asel et al. (2009) studied freshman and senior non-affiliated and affiliated fraternity/sorority students at a public, Midwestern research university. In their survey of approximately 3,000 affiliated and non-affiliated students,
Asel et al. (2009) found that, regarding diversity experiences on campus, fraternity/sorority affiliated students at both the freshman and senior levels lagged behind their unaffiliated peers. This raised a major concern because engagement seemed to be more significant in fraternities, but fraternities continually demonstrated a lack of diversity experiences among their members (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Asel et al., 2009).

How this lack of diversity in the fraternity/sorority experience might affect the measure of gains related to minority fraternity men did not seem to be positive, but if fraternities seek to stay true to their values-based mission of inclusion, then it would seem that this effect should not hamper the results in the current study.

An MSL study of racially diverse fraternity men. Shalka and Jones (2010) found in their study using the MSL data that measures of CS and of congruence showed a non-significant difference between social fraternity men and unaffiliated students. Additionally, it showed that minority fraternity men in ethnic fraternities demonstrated lower gains than White fraternity men (Shalka & Jones, 2010).

These results were impactful to the current study. Shalka and Jones (2010) measured one of the same constructs that was measured in this study, though the current study sought to expand upon what was already considered by controlling for student characteristics (specifically, race/ethnicity, parental education, campus size, and sexuality). Additionally, instead of measuring both ethnic and social fraternity men as Shalka and Jones (2010) did, the current study addressed only social fraternity men, men who were members of IFC fraternities and whose national headquarters were part of the NIC.

Conclusions on race/ethnicity and social fraternity membership. The research that was heretofore presented showed a mix of outcomes related to diverse men in social fraternities.
While overall it was clear that fraternities, whether ethnically inclined or traditionally White, had some resistance to diversity, it was also apparent that students of diverse backgrounds reported mainly positive experiences within fraternities and did not regret the decisions they made to join their fraternities (Hughey, 2006; 2010; Newsome, 2009; Summers, 2010; Winkler, 2014). One significant statistical analysis of leadership and student development gains among fraternity men was shown to be inconclusive (Martin et al., 2011). The current study was designed to draw the unclear pictures in the research into the light to show whether or not social fraternities fulfilled their mission to their most marginalized populations. The literature review for the current study focused on the experience of GBQ fraternity men and men of ethnic/racial minorities who sought to affiliate with fraternities. The next section focuses on the experience of FGCS who join fraternities.

**FGCS and the Social Fraternity Experience**

**FGCS social fraternity men and retention.** The major problem that FGCS faced was the ability to be retained to graduation, an effect which often contributed to students’ lack of knowledge about the college environment because of not having parents who went to college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). One study that tested the net effects of fraternities and sororities on members demonstrated that while it may take fraternity and sorority students longer to graduate, fraternity and sorority students were significantly more likely than non-affiliated peers to graduate (Bradford & Jenkins, 2002). Specifically, when looking at the measured effects of fraternities on identity development, one research study found that Latino FGCS (men) discovered a tremendous support structure within the ethnic fraternity that they joined (Harrington, 2009).
Additionally, Astin’s (1993) research found that fraternity and sorority membership positively impacted involvement and retention. The current study sought to determine if fraternity and sorority affiliation created a net gain in leadership skills (specifically the areas of CS and IMP) for FGCS. These areas of leadership development ran akin to the work of Kohlberg (1987) and Baxter Magolda (2009). Astin’s involvement model was never meant to be seen as a means for achieving student development, but as a means for achieving involvement toward student development (Astin, 1999).

**FGCS fraternity men and engagement gains.** These preliminary studies led to a National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) study that looked at the engagement of FGCS in fraternities/sororities (Ahren et al., 2014). This study found that on the focus of deep learning within the NSSE’s academic challenge continuum, fraternity/sorority members who were FGCS demonstrated significantly greater gains than non-first generation members, first generation non-members, and non-first generation non-members on the areas of achievement in general education, higher order thinking, integrative learning, and reflective learning (Ahren et al., 2014). This finding was significant because it conflicted with past findings demonstrating that FGCS who participated in fraternities/sororities showed significantly lower engagement in academic challenge than any other group, which posed an upset to past research finding positive cognitive gains in fraternity members (Ahren et al., 2014; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

The findings of the Ahren et al. (2014) study showed promise for the fraternity experiences of FGCS since the theory of engagement suggested that students who engage at higher levels would tend to have higher measures along student development continuums (Kuh, 2008). This particular study was impactful because the data, taken from a national dataset, was widely applicable to many populations (Ahren et al., 2014).
Easing the social transition to college. FFGCS and fraternity/sorority involvement were significantly, negatively correlated regarding the ease of social transition to college (Inkelas et al., 2007). These findings for FGCSs were similar to the findings of earlier researchers which indicated that fraternity and sorority affiliation created significant initial drawbacks for students during their first year of college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Despite initial findings of FGCS and difficulty with social transition (Inkelas et al., 2007), and first year students and their net losses academically and socially according to Pascarella and Terenzini (2005), Kuh (2008) suggested that research from the NSSE demonstrated that fraternities and sororities significantly helped students to persist to graduation.

Significant involvement stemming from social fraternity membership. Additionally related to Kuh’s (2008) findings, Pike (2003) found significant involvement gains stemming from fraternity and sorority membership during the senior year, and slight involvement gains stemming from membership in the freshman year. Pike (2003) also found that students who were in fraternities and sororities engaged more significantly in educationally purposeful activities than those who were not fraternity or sorority members. Finally, Pike (2003) found a weak positive correlation between fraternity and sorority membership and learning by senior year. This is counter-intuitive to earlier research that suggested cognitive losses to the fraternity/sorority student from affiliation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). It is also counter-intuitive to Astin’s (1993) theory of involvement which posited that greater gains in involvement led to increased development. Regarding the present study, the literature indicated that FGCS who were social fraternity members may face issues of progressing to self-authorship by way of cognitive losses since epistemological construction and different ways of knowing are considered as necessary for advancement toward self-authorship (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Baxter Magolda, 2008).
Income as a factor to fraternity membership. One major battle present when studying FGCS and fraternity affiliation was the fact that many FGCS came from homes with less income (Inkelas et al., 2007). Less income made it less likely that they would be able to afford joining a fraternity or sorority (The Pell Institute, 2006). Yet, among FGCS who join fraternities, a supportive bond that helps the students could be formed (Cushman, 2007). However, it should be noted that in the Cushman (2007) study, the chief study participant was a Latino student joining what would be classified on the MSL as an ethnic fraternity (MSL, 2011). Therefore, it was impossible to posit gains in student development from Cushman’s (2007) research supporting student development gains among social fraternity members.

Traditionally, fraternities did not serve FGCS (Syrett, 2005; Rudolph, 1990), perhaps due to membership expenses (Cushman, 2007; The Pell Institute, 2006). The articles reviewed that describe fraternity support of FGCS and student development gains came from ethnic fraternities (Cushman, 2007; Harrington, 2009; MSL, 2011). However, based on the established gains in involvement from fraternities found in Astin (1993), and considering links between involvement and other developmental gains, the involvement experience should lead to gains in other areas even though the research has struggled to delineate some of those gains (Kuh, 2008; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Pike, 2003). Thus, the current study specifically measured FGCS who were involved in social fraternities and gains toward student development (in self-authorship and moral development).

Fraternities and Institution Size

Sense of community in fraternity members based on university size. The current study analyzed the effect of college size on fraternity members’ gains in the areas of CS and IMP. There was a previously demonstrated connection between campus size and chapter size,
and the relative success of fraternity/sorority chapters. Lounsbury and DeNeui (1996) found in their study that there was a significant, negative correlation between psychological sense of community on campus and the increase of school undergraduate population. Additionally, Lounsbury and DeNeui (1996) found that psychological sense of community was more positive among fraternity and sorority members. The researchers described the construct of a psychological sense of community as feelings of belongingness, togetherness, attachment, commitment to the setting, positive affect, concern for the welfare of the community, and an overall sense of community (Lounsbury & DeNeui, 1996). Developing the idea of one’s campus as a community could allow students to progress in their self-authorship and moral development because of the potential group benefit in the area of constructing meaning, which is the ability to engage in group development and come to one’s own understanding of the world (Baxter Magolda, 2004). Constructing meaning, as defined, was considered as necessary to a cognitive approach to moral development since meaning helped to cement movement from one stage to another (Kohlberg, 2000).

Chapter size and its relationship to developmental gains. In two different studies, the size of fraternity or sorority chapters was directly examined to determine the effects of fraternity/sorority chapter size on student development. In initial research which has yet to be published formally, the researcher looked at the progression of sisters of sororities toward what was termed selfless sisterhood, which resulted from a developmental process of establishing a common goal or purpose among all sisters in the chapter (McCreary, 2015). What was interesting to note in the initial display of statistics that McCreary (2015) provided was that a chapter size of over 150 members resulted in the decreased ability to find common purpose, and
thus a regression toward selfish sisterhood (e.g., “what I can get from fellow members”) as opposed to selfless sisterhood (e.g., “what I can give to fellow members”).

Conversely, one study found that fraternity gains in leadership and diversity were congruent in a regression model only when fraternity chapter sizes were bigger (Turk, 2012). Turk (2012) provided a relatively small explanation of the effect of openness to diversity and leadership based on chapter size and did not find a chapter size topping out point as in McCreary’s (2015) 150-member critical size limit.

**Social groups and the maximum size of membership.** Research into the size of fraternity chapters dovetailed the research of others who found that 150 people was the maximum number that a social organization could hold and still provide membership development (Dunbar, 1992; Gladwell, 2002). Fraternity chapter size should therefore link with institution size, but the literature is inconclusive.

Regarding institution type differences, in a study by Gleason (2012) institution type was used to compare scores on the Socially Responsible Leadership Survey (SRLS) omnibus measure of the MSL. The SRLS omnibus measure, which is used to measure many of the variables in this study, showed the overall gains that a student made in all aspects of the social change model (Gleason, 2012). Gleason (2012) separated institutions by Carnegie Classification, a commonly referenced system that measures schools by type (e.g., research institution, master’s level institution, bachelor’s level institution) and found no significant difference in the omnibus scores based on institution type; this indicated that development differences were not due to the type of higher education institution. Gleason’s (2012) findings were relevant to the current study because institution classifications did not separate institutions by size; however, bachelor level institutions tend to be smaller and research institutions tend to be larger. Despite the significant
similarities that Gleason (2012) found based on institution type, the researcher did not differentiate by student characteristics or involvement. As the current study addressed, aspects of the MSL might differ for students based on student characteristics and involvement.

Analyzing the benefits and challenges of GBQ, racial/ethnic minority, and FGCS fraternity members, while taking into account campus population, would demonstrate whether or not positive leadership and student development gains were made by these particular populations and how those gains differed by campus undergraduate population. However, to fully understand and explain the fraternity experience, a section of this literature review focuses on the experiences of fraternity men generally. There was no evidence that GBQ, racial/ethnic minority, or FGCS men who join fraternities were exempt from the same benefits and challenges that fraternity men face regardless of distinguishing characteristics. The next section focuses on this literature.

Social Fraternity Membership Benefits and Challenges Generally

Social fraternity men and drinking. The challenges and benefits which face fraternity men generally also impacts the development of social fraternity men who are GBQ, racial/ethnic minorities, or FGCS. According to Cory (2011), because fraternities “began as a student resistance to the power structure in higher education and existed in a cloak of secrecy, it is not surprising that early on the academy began to problematize fraternities” (pp. 13-14). It was clear that within the existing research, fraternity culture was seen as a distinct and separate population from the general college student experience; this was nowhere more true than when considering the drinking patterns of fraternity men (Arnold, 2004; Cory, 2011; Danielson et al., 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Sasso, 2012a).
Socially desirable outcomes from drinking. Sasso (2012a) researched the drinking patterns of fraternity members and pledge members and found a significant relationship between these men’s beliefs about social desirability in the areas of sexual prowess, overall gains, belligerence (e.g., aggressiveness) and their drinking behaviors. Associate or new members showed even more conformity than active members to the belief that drinking leads to socially desirable behaviors (Sasso, 2012a). This demonstrated a connection found in the research of Sasso (2012a) and the writing of Kimmel (2008), namely one between drinking and what was called hyper-masculinity (Kimmel, 2008; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Sasso, 2012a) or termed the Guy Code by Kimmel (2008). The belief that drinking excessively can cause greater aggressiveness, greater sexual prowess, and overall social desirability was clearly held by the men in Sasso’s (2012a) study. This cognitive construction around drinking may relate to the development of CS. Fraternity men, especially those men in the process of joining a fraternity, showed more conformity to group-think (i.e. adopting the mentality of everyone else in their social group) regarding alcohol use (Sasso, 2012a). Could college men in fraternities establish a clear identity of values construction amidst the excessive need to conform as demonstrated by Sasso (2012a) and Kimmel (2008)? The current study sought to analyze exactly that possibility.

Lack of situational moral development. McCreary (2012a) found in a study comparing fraternity men and non-affiliated men at four different southeastern university campuses that fraternity men were significantly more likely to be morally disengaged when it came to hazing and bullying than non-affiliated men. Moral disengagement was defined in McCreary’s (2012a) study as possessing the belief that certain moral codes or behaviors did not apply in particular situations (McCreary, 2012a). The particular situations presented in the McCreary (2012a) study were a hazing vignette and a bullying vignette. Based on Kohlberg’s (1987) concept of moral
judgment, McCreary (2012a) found that fraternity men, when specifically considering issues of hazing and bullying, demonstrated less moral judgment than non-affiliated members. This was significant to the current study because it demonstrated that fraternity men were not operating at the highest levels of Kohlberg’s (1987) moral development scale. Finally, fraternity men ultimately showed more supportive attitudes toward hazing and bullying than non-affiliated men (McCreary, 2012a).

A second aspect of the McCreary (2012a) study, which measured whether or not fraternity members would attempt to intervene in a hazing or bullying scenario, demonstrated that fraternity men were less likely to intervene in either a hazing or bullying scenario than non-members. This was of direct importance to the current study. The idea of developing an IMP was that the leader will intervene when he (or she) felt that the safety of human beings was threatened (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Based on the McCreary (2012a) study, this necessary component of an IMP would be more likely to not be found within fraternity men.

The divergence of fraternity men from their organization’s values. A second aspect besides moral engagement and judgment which affected the measures of fraternity members in developing an IMP was values congruence (MSL, 2015c; Walumbwa et al., 2008). In a study that measured the stated values of fraternities and sororities in comparison to the enacted values, one qualitative study found a divide between the enacted and stated values of these groups (Matthews et al., 2009). Matthews et al. (2009) noticed in the casual setting of a bus route on campus that students freely discussed different scenarios and activities among themselves which indicated their personal values differed from the stated values they knew of their organizations. Some of these value differences included the way that academics in their institutions were characterized (e.g., as not focusing on knowledge acquisition, but rather on grades) and
perceptions of incidences of alcohol use and abuse by members of their fraternal community. These publicly discussed values were not congruent with the study participants’ fraternity or sorority values (Matthews et al., 2009). This incongruence in public demonstrations of behavior could pose problems for the development of an IMP and for self-authorship. Knowledge and understanding of one’s values was essential to developing self-authorship or CS (Astin & Astin, 1996; Baxter Magolda, 2009).

**Fraternity members gains more clearly shown as alumni.** On the positive side of fraternity and sorority affiliation, the research done at Gallup on fraternity and sorority alumni found that fraternity and sorority members were more likely to be thriving in the five sub-scales of overall well-being than non-members (Busteed, 2014). Those areas of well-being were social, physical, life purpose, financial, and community (Busteed, 2014). This research did not consider any of the student characteristics addressed in this study by name, nor did it delve into any characteristics of the men that were surveyed, with the exception that they were all in a fraternity and came from diverse backgrounds (Busteed, 2014).

The Busteed (2014) study made all aspects seem positive, but it did not delineate the characteristics of the participants from fraternities. For example, the Busteed (2014) study does not delineate by sexuality, parental education, age, nor race/ethnicity. As the literature search indicated, groups that traditionally joined fraternities, prior to the current generation, often came from educated, middle to upper middle class households, and were White (Syrett, 2009). However, in considering studies of any date, the demographics of fraternity members could not be rightly assumed, which limited the applicability of many studies that did not disclose participant demographics.
The importance of program type to fraternity gains. Proving that the fraternity profession played a role in the student development of fraternity members, Asel et al. (2009) contradicted earlier studies indicating that fraternity/sorority members were more anti-intellectual than non-affiliated/sorority members. The finding of a positive correlation in Asel et al. (2009) suggested that cognitive development between affiliated and non-affiliated peers was relatively equivalent. This supported the possibility that fraternity men may develop both an IMP and self-authorship as measured through CS (Astin & Astin, 1996; Baxter Magolda, 2008; MSL, 2015c; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Asel et al. (2009) also found that the fraternity/sorority experience was more likely to foster close, influential friendships and social integration. This was important to the development of self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008).

Lack of development among fraternity men in leadership gains. Finally, in a comparison of fraternity and sorority members, Dugan (2008) used the MSL (2011) data and analyzed all eight of the C’s of the social change model. Dugan (2008) found significant differences between fraternity members and sorority members in the areas of: congruence, commitment, collaboration, and controversy with civility. This finding is significant because it suggests that women members of Greek letter organizations may outperform their male counterparts.

In Dugan (2008), both fraternity and sorority members measured highest in the area of commitment. This was significant to the current study because it suggests the phenomenon elucidated by Pike (2003), namely that perhaps the deficiencies existent in student learning were not actually student deficiencies, but deficiencies in expectations for fraternity and sorority students (Pike, 2003). The parallel between the two studies was drawn because it was understood that if commitment, as a value in the Astin and Astin (1996) model, was strongest within groups
of fraternity/sorority affiliated students, then it would be easier to produce student outcomes through models of education. In short, a student with commitment would be easier to teach than a student who was apathetic.

While the checkered past and unclear research outcomes of fraternities and sororities marked a troubling road for research into fraternities, it was only by studying more specifically targeted populations within fraternities and sororities that the research community could come to a greater understanding of the intricate details of fraternity affiliation. The emerging research in the literature must be integrated into policy considerations. Therefore, an exploration of policy regarding the fraternity movement is next expounded upon to conclude a review of the literature.

**Current Policy Issues Affecting the Fraternity Movement**

No statement of the literature would be complete without analyzing modern trends in higher education. In 2015, the fraternity movement was embroiled in turmoil as a result of the resignation of the NIC President & CEO who was, de-facto, the leader of the movement (Cote, 2015). Further, the question had been raised among higher education administrators whether fraternities should exist anymore on the modern college campus, and the deteriorated relationship between headquarters professionals and campus administrators had been described as a divorce (McCurtie, 2015a). McCurtie (2015a) cited statistics from representatives of the AFA, which represented the interests of the field of fraternity professionals, estimating that campus professionals who worked with fraternities dealt with on average of 750 students for one staff member, while residence halls dealt with 20 students per one staff member. In a series of articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a leading higher education periodical, strategies for fraternity management were discussed alongside discussions on the ineffectiveness of
national fraternities’ headquarters and the potential elimination of social fraternities (Kelderman, 2015; Mangan, 2015; McCurtie, 2015a).

Several of these articles also discussed the role of insurance coverage and the rules governing fraternity risk management (Mangan, 2015; Kelderman, 2015). In response, the NIC reconsidered: it increased the membership standards for social fraternities and even considered new accountability measures to assure compliance (NIC, 2015a).

These trends and important discussions were central to the development of leadership in fraternity men. With the overburdened national offices, the rules which made students personally and legally liable for breaking them, and the overburdened campus administrators, the role of leadership and student development for fraternity men came second to other considerations related to safety and risk management training; these considerations were based on following the rules and not on health and human safety (Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b; Kelderman, 2015; Mangan, 2015; McCurtie, 2015a). The issues directly affected the performance of fraternity men on any leadership variables studied.

Additionally, as was self-evident in the research presented, and as further made clear by other researchers (Molasso, 2005; Sasso, 2012c), there was a lack of demonstrated best practice when it came to working with fraternity men from either a campus or a headquarters perspective. In the field of higher education student development, no fraternity group successfully attempted to be universally controlled in their behavior without the development of established, researched best practice (Flannigan, 2014a, 2014b; Kelderman, 2015; Sasso, 2012c). And, the controls currently in place on fraternities were not working (Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b; McCurtie, 2015). The conceptual framework provided in the next section allowed the researcher to create a wide-
ranging study of different populations of fraternity men to inform the creation of best practice
and add to the literature on fraternity men’s gains in student, leadership, and moral development.

The Conceptual Framework

This study used the framework taken from the MSL for CS and proposed a framework to
measure IMP supported by data from the MSL (2011) and led by a theoretical understanding of
IMP; this was with the intention to examine constructs of self-authorship and advancement of
moral reasoning according to Kohlberg’s (1987) model of cognitive moral reasoning (Baxter
Magolda, 2009; Kohlberg, 1987; MSL, 2011; 2015c; Walumbwa et al., 2008). What this
literature review indicated was that in the areas of race/ethnicity, sexuality, and FGCS status,
fraternities were consistently rated as positive by students’ perceptions, but did not demonstrate a
totally positive relationship for the student in the actual findings of student development, moral,
or leadership growth (Case et al., 2005; Dugan, 2008; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Winkler,
2014). This being the case, the study used undergraduate population size as an additional
controlling variable to measure student development, moral, and leadership gains (Lounsbury &
DeNeui, 1996). In general, when looking at undergraduate population size of a campus, the
relative chapter sizes of the fraternities on campus were also considered (McCreary, 2015; Turk,
2012).

Below, Figure 1, shows a proposed framework for this study:
Based on the review of prior literature, future researchers examining the relationship between fraternities, leadership development, moral development, and student development outcomes needed to consider how specific sub-groups of fraternity culture demonstrated growth, along with how members’ fraternity experience factored into their growth, since overarching research into fraternity men continually brought forth what other researchers called confusing outcomes (Asel et al., 2009). By breaking down fraternity members into subsets of the fraternity population, a clearer view of the potential benefits and complications of membership might be developed.

Conclusion

Based on the review of prior literature, future researchers examining the relationship between fraternities, leadership development, moral development, and student development outcomes needed to consider how specific sub-groups of fraternity culture demonstrated growth, along with how members’ fraternity experience factored into their growth, since overarching research into fraternity men continually brought forth what other researchers called confusing outcomes (Asel et al., 2009). By breaking down fraternity members into subsets of the fraternity population, a clearer view of the potential benefits and complications of membership might be developed.
Secondly, prior research indicated that more quantitative research into fraternities, specifically controlling for student characteristic variables, needed to take place. It was previously acceptable to create typologies of experience within the literature; however, the research lacked a focus on student development or leadership outcomes from fraternity membership even while analyzing extracurricular activities that were supposed to foster student, moral, and leadership development.

Thirdly, over and over again in the literature individuals who studied fraternities and sororities allowed their personal feelings to find their way into the research. This was especially true when considering the experience of race and the social fraternity. As the former CEO of the NIC stated, “Often, arguments both for and against the fraternity experience focus on personal experience and anecdotal information” (Biddix, Matney, Norman, & Martin, 2014, p. 1). This was problematic when the anecdotal information unintentionally poisoned the well of research, as it happened in several studies on fraternities. Researchers must approach their study topics with an ambivalent feeling toward what is being researched (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). While the research topic of fraternities caused high emotional feelings in all members within this field, biased findings without objective study processes could only kindly be labeled as confusing (Asel et al., 2009).

Along these lines, the inequivalent results of multiple studies which utilized overlapping variables meant that there was something unexplained within the phenomenon of the fraternity experience, some variable that had not yet been discerned as having a significant impact in both the quantitative and qualitative research. The current research, which was based on the strong research on social groups, posited that the variable in question was correlated with the size of the campus population; also, that the structure of the fraternity community, which was earlier
classified by the type of assessment existent within the fraternity community, could also be typed according to campus size (Ahren et al., 2014; Asel et al., 2009; Dunbar, 1992; Gladwell, 2002; Lounsbury & DeNeui, 1996; McCreary, 2015; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Sasso, 2012b).
Chapter III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to analyze the developmental gains of social fraternity men with specific characteristics, and to compare these gains with non-affiliated men with similar characteristics. Additionally, the current study sought to delineate these outcomes by the undergraduate population sizes of the reported cases in order to create a robust analysis and further the literature regarding specific populations of social fraternity men. The following research questions guided this study:

1. Research Question 1: Do social fraternity men differ from non-affiliated men on the MSL measurement for CS, controlling for institution size, sexuality, race/ethnicity, and FGCS status?

2. Research Question 2: Do social fraternity men differ from non-affiliated men in the components of the MSL theoretically related to IMP, controlling for institution size, sexuality, race/ethnicity, and FGCS?

3. Research Question 3: Is there a difference between CS and the components of IMP based on institution size, controlling for social fraternity membership and race/ethnicity, sexuality, and FGCS?

Research Model

In order to address the research questions presented, this study used a quantitative design to explore the relationship between institutions’ undergraduate population size and social fraternity members who self-identify as GBQ, a minority race or ethnicity, or a FGCS, when measuring for CS and IMP.

The conceptual framework for this study, which ultimately aimed at measuring advancement of student, leadership, and moral development among fraternity men, when
controlling for personal and institutional variables, through the MSL measures for CS and measurements which theoretically align with IMP. This was presented as a conceptual framework in Chapter II (see Figure 1).

This study draws on data from the MSL (2012) survey and the data were analyzed both descriptively and inferentially. Inferential analysis proceeded with non-parametric main and post hoc analysis (in the event of significant results). The research model was constructed in such a way that, from the pre-existing dataset, no identifying information of any individual student or institution would be identifiable to the researcher.

Data Source

The respondents in this study were students who participated in the 2012 administration of the MSL (MSL, 2012). The first version of the survey was administered in the spring of 2006 and included over 60,000 participants at over 52 institutions (MSL, 2015a). In total, over 300,000 students participated in the MSL in the several different administrations in 9 years at over 250 different institutions (MSL, 2015a). The MSL international research program focused on researching how higher education shaped socially responsible leadership and other leadership-related outcomes (MSL, 2015b). The MSL was created to fill the gap in the research and practice of higher education by promoting and assessing leadership skills in higher education (Dugan & Komives, 2006; Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006). The main scale of the MSL was the SRLS; it was measured for reliability and extensive work was done to measure content validity (MSL, 2015c). The MSL was commonly used to produce research articles, dissertations, theses, and national research studies into the study of leadership and became a successful example of a national dataset that could be extrapolated to study the variables in this study.
MSL Dataset Survey Administration

The MSL was, since its creation, administered using an online survey format, and was formed by grants from the American College Personnel Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the Maryland General Research Board, and the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006). The MSL was administered by Loyola University of Chicago at the time of this study and was founded by a team of researchers at the University of Maryland, which originally housed the national program (Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006; MSL, 2015a). The MSL was administered between January 15 and May 1 of each collection year. The MSL invited potential participants via email, and students responded to the email invitation in order to complete the electronic survey. Reminder emails were sent out to students who did not start the survey within a specified timeframe (Beazley, 2013). At each institution with over 4,000 students, a sample of approximately 4,000 students were invited to take the survey (Beazley, 2013). At institutions with less than 4,000 students, the whole undergraduate population was invited to take the survey (Beazley, 2013). Students invited to take the survey were issued a non-institutional random 9-digit code, and then after e-signing the consent form, all students were given a new 9-digit code which ensures anonymity (Beazley, 2013).

Sample

The data used to address the research questions for this study came from the 2012 administration of the MSL (MSL, 2012). Based on the 2012 administration of the MSL, data from approximately 77,150 students from 82 campuses in the United States, Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean constituted the entire collection of MSL data (MSL, 2015d; MSL, 2015e). Of these, 22,680 seniors (MSL, 2015e) constituted the total number from which the sample of 8,025
senior students was drawn for this study. This study focused on the answers of senior students because the measurements that this study sought would only be characteristic of older students based on the underlying theories of student development central to this study.

**Validity and Reliability**

Validity and reliability measures of the MSL were continuously tested since the survey’s inception (MSL, 2015b; Beazley, 2013). The main scale of the MSL was the SRLS, now known as SRLS-Rev3 (Beazley, 2013). This was initially tested for validity and reliability through extensive focus group research (Beazley, 2013; Dugan et al., 2009). The composite scales of the MSL were also tested for reliability, validity, and measurement on other leadership continuums (Beazley, 2013). Additionally, reliability across all scales of the survey was consistent and did not deviate significantly (MSL, 2015c).

In the past, the main scale of the MSL the SRLS, had a very high Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$), which ranged from .75 to .87 (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Rosch, Collier, & Thompson, 2015). The current SRLS version (SRLS-Rev3), first used in the 2012 data administration of the MSL, had a high degree of internal consistency for the 39 participant questions; Cronbach’s alpha=.96 (Rosch et al., 2015). The reliability of this scale related directly to the variable in this study that measures CS, from SRLS-Rev3. Two of the component scales that this study used to measure IMP (congruence and commitment) were also measured by the SRLS-Rev3.

Current Cronbach’s alpha analyses were run on the outputs under examination in order to test for internal reliability. For the CS scale, a valid measure of internal reliability was obtained, $\alpha=.79$ since anything above a .7 on newer scales was considered reliable (Field, 2009). For the remainder of the items tested in this study which related to the variable of IMP, a Cronbach’s alpha of above .8 was discovered, which demonstrated a very high level of internal reliability.
The Cronbach’s alpha for commitment was measured at $\alpha=.817$. The Cronbach’s alpha for congruence was measured at $\alpha=.846$. The Cronbach’s alpha for cognitive development was measured at $\alpha=.868$. The Cronbach’s alpha for resiliency was measured at $\alpha=.898$. Finally, to test the construct of IMP, all the items for each of the scales that were sub-constructs were tested using a Cronbach’s alpha, yielding internal reliability, $\alpha=.92$. All the reliability findings fell within the acceptable scale for analysis of the topics being covered (Field, 2009).

Additionally, the measurements of CS, congruence, commitment, resiliency, and cognitive skills were tested for normality in consideration of the possibility of parametric testing, despite the fact that they were ordinal variables, because they represented continuing constructs, one of the possible considerations for analyzing ordinal data parametrically (Grace-Martin, 2008). Below, Figures 2 through 6 present histograms in visual analysis of normality of the variables. Visual analysis of the variables was best for large data (Field, 2009).

![Histogram for Consciousness of Self](image)

*Figure 2. Histogram for Consciousness of Self*
From a visual analysis of Figure 2 above, it was clear that the CS scale deviated from a normal distribution, which made parametric testing impossible (Field, 2009). Pictured below is Figure 3, which demonstrates that congruence deviated from the normal distribution.

Since Figure 3 above demonstrates that congruence did not follow a normal distribution, non-parametric testing was considered as the only alternative for this variable as well (Field, 2009).
Commitment (see Figure 4 above) demonstrated a significant deviance from normality, so non-parametric testing was considered as the acceptable alternative to test this variable (Field, 2009). Resiliency was the next variable analyzed for normality.

Figure 5. Histogram for Resiliency

Despite a better shape for resiliency than for the other variables, it also does not meet the required shape of a normal distribution, and so non-parametric testing was considered as the next best option (Field, 2009).
Lastly, an analysis of the Histogram for cognitive skills (see Figure 6 above) demonstrates once again that this study must proceed using non-parametric testing since it seemed to also deviate significantly from the normal distribution (Field, 2009). Statistical measurements of normality, such as reporting the kurtosis and skew, and performing Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, were not conducted on this data because the data was ordinal, and since visual measurements of normality were already demonstrative of non-normality, it was understood that it was statistically more prudent to continue with non-parametric testing (Field, 2009; Grace-Martin, 2008). Additionally, Field (2009) found that, in larger distributions, visual normality testing was more reliable than statistical normality testing.

**Research Variables**

The purpose of this study was to examine how social fraternity men who were GBQ, of differing races and ethnicities, and FGCS compared to non-affiliated men who self-identify similarly, when controlling for institutional size on the measures of the MSL (2012) regarding
CS and variables theoretically aligned with IMP. The research variables for this study were divided into three groups: independent variables, dependent variables, and control variables.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variable for this study was IFC or social fraternity affiliation. The MSL (2012) asked (Item 16) if students were part of any particular student groups. Students who answered yes to 16q “social fraternities or sororities (ex. Panhellenic or Interfraternity Council groups such as Sigma Phi Epsilon or Kappa Kappa Gamma)” and who identified as male were included in the social fraternity group in the current study (MSL, 2011). All other males, excluding members of multi-cultural fraternities (who were removed from the sample, and who answered yes to a separate question item, 16p: Multicultural Fraternities and Sororities), were classified in the non-affiliated group. It was important to eliminate the multicultural fraternity students to ensure that students did not check both boxes, and it was important to eliminate this data in order to ensure a correct sample of social fraternity men (Johnson, Johnson, & Dugan, 2015).

**Control Variables**

The control variables for this study were institution size, race/ethnicity, sexuality, and parental education.

**Institution size.** Institutions on the MSL were divided into three categories: small, medium, and large (Beazley, 2013). This was based on the iPeds data related to undergraduate institutions as captured by the MSL (2012): small institutions had fewer than 5,000 undergraduate students; medium institutions had between 5,000 and 15,000 undergraduate students; and large institutions had above 15,000 undergraduate students.
Race/ethnicity. On the MSL (2012), students identified as either White, Middle Eastern, Latino, Native American, Asian, African American or Black, multiracial, or other. Students were also asked to identify their ethnicity on the survey (as a sub-demographic of the racial demographic). The researcher considered the performance of students based on the classification system above.

Sexuality. The MSL (DATE) survey asked students to identify their sexuality (Item 32). Answers were coded 1 through 5:

1. Heterosexual
2. Bisexual
3. Gay/Lesbian
4. Questioning
5. Rather Not Say

The researcher considered all students who identified as Bisexual (2), Gay/Lesbian (3), Questioning (4), or Rather Not Say (5) as part of the GBQ group.

FGCS. The MSL asked students (Item 39) for survey participants’ parental education. Those participants who answered either 1=less than a high school diploma or 2=high school diploma or GED when asked, “What is the highest level of education obtained by any of your parents or guardians?” (MSL, 2011, p. 19) were considered as FGCS for the purpose of this study.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables on this study were CS and IMP.

CS. CS was measured on the MSL (2012) through the main portion, the SRLS-Rev3 (Beazley, 2013) because it was one of the direct variables of the social change model. There
were nine questions on the SRLS (2012) which measured this variable. Students responded to these items on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The participants’ mean score of all those self-reported outcomes constituted their score on CS.

**IMP.** Values congruence was one of several measures that were compounded to make up the variable of IMP. Congruence was measured on the SRLS-Rev3 (MSL, 2011). There were 7 items that measured for values congruence and students answered based on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Commitment, the third individual “C,” made up the second component of IMP, and this too was measured on the SRLS-Rev3. Four items made up the scale for commitment. Next, resiliency was measured via a 5 point Likert scale rated from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and it measured the ability to thrive in the face of adversity. It was not measured as part of the SRLS and was a sub-scale on the MSL (MSL, 2011). Finally, cognitive skills were measured on a 4 point Likert scale from not grown at all to grown very much, and this was the final component of the IMP variable. Four items constituted this final scale and it was measured separately from the SRLS-Rev3.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis for this study consisted of descriptive statistics in the way of frequency distributions and cross tabulations. Following descriptive analysis, the current study tested the independent variable in the study while controlling for each of the controlling variables by using the Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA. The Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA was a non-parametric test that ranked the scores between two or more groups, and then determined which of the groups had the highest ranking, in order to yield a statistically significant or insignificant result. With the current dataset and research questions, the way that analysis was performed was to control for each of the controlling variables so that, for example, gay/bisexual/questioning fraternity men
would be ranked against gay/bisexual/questioning non-affiliated men in order that the test statistic could rank the groups. The equation for the Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA was as follows:

\[
H = \frac{12}{N(N + 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{R_i^2}{n_i} - 3(N + 1)
\]

To tabulate the Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test), a ranking of the scores in both groups from lowest to highest was first. Then, dividing the scores into their groups and summing the ranks was performed for each group. The sum was denoted in the equation by \( R \) and \( i \) represented the particular group; \( N \) represented the total sample size, and \( n_i \) was the sample size of a particular group. Similar to the Chi-Square test, there was an expected Chi-Square distribution, and this limited the value for the degrees of freedom (df) to one less than the number of groups, \( k-1 \).

A Kruskal-Wallis test was run for every controlling group in the study to compare the ranks of fraternity men and non-affiliated men by race/ethnicity, sexuality, FGCS status, and institution size.

**Predicted Outcomes**

Based on the observation that the fraternity/sorority profession does not well support fraternity chapters, the lack of best practice within the field, and the way that fraternities have been characterized in the literature, the null hypothesis was adopted for all tested variables: there were no predicted differences between fraternity and non-fraternity men’s development.

**Limitations**

Because this study used a national dataset based on self-reported data (MSL, 2011), caution should be used when making institutional policy based on the results. Second, fraternity
membership long produced confusing quantitative results for college administrators (Ahren et al., 2014; Asel et al., 2009), so the results of the current study should be considered in light of all available relevant studies. Third, developmental outcomes of the fraternity experience may strongly relate to institutional support and best practice, producing great variety even within one national fraternity on different campuses, as with any other campus program (Callais, 2005).

Another limitation was that campus programming and expectations for fraternity members were not known for this research, and it was speculated that expectations for fraternities were low nationally (Pike, 2003). On the positive end, leadership success may be a direct result of campus programming (Beazley, 2013), but of course the programming must be effectively and consistently run in order to realize positive outcomes. Therefore, where an organization offers ritual training to its men, the men should develop in the area of analyzing and interpreting values congruence, but based on institutional practices, that may not be the case (Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967; Pike, 2003). Therefore, these results were expected to show that values congruence development efforts (Bureau, 2007) were unsuccessful at producing leadership, student, and moral development gains. However, since national datasets do not measure for best practices on a particular campus, one could not generalize about the nature of all fraternity programs everywhere based on the results here.

Summary

This chapter explained the data used, the statistical methods for analysis, the research model, and the design, and it repeated the framework for the study presented in Chapter II. Chapter IV of this dissertation commences with data analysis, and Chapter V concludes the results and gives implications for further research.
Chapter IV

FINDINGS

The last chapter provided the structure of the current study, including the statistical analysis, the type of descriptive statistics used, and the plan for the model of study. The current chapter provides the statistical analysis, including descriptive statistical presentation and analysis and inferential statistical testing.

Descriptive Statistics

The dataset used in this study was taken from the 2012 administration of the MSL survey. From this, a purposive sample was created by the MSL at Loyola University Chicago which included the variables needed for the study.

The tables below (see Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5) provide frequency distributions of the independent and control variables in the study. Fraternity men made up approximately 13.8% of the dataset, while non-affiliated men made up 86.2%. Heterosexual men equaled 90.9% of the sample, while gay/bisexual/questioning fraternity men made up 9.1% of the sample. Sample estimates for race demonstrated an overwhelming majority of White students, 21.7%, followed by a large Asian population of 9.8%. Latino men comprised 8% of the dataset, and African American men comprised 4.9% of the database. Middle Eastern men made up approximately 1.8% of the database, as did Native American students (1.8%). Multi-racial students and students whose ethnicity/race was not listed comprised 2.9% and 1.3% of the database, respectively. FGCS comprised 14.7% of the dataset. Students from small institutions comprised approximately 8.7% of the dataset, medium institutions were 48%, and large institutions were 43.4%.
Table 1

*Frequency Distribution of Fraternity Men and Non-Affiliated Men (n=8025)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-affiliated Men</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Men</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Frequency Distribution of Heterosexual and GBQ Men (n=8025)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Bisexual/Questioning</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Frequency Distribution Broken Down by Race (n=8025)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Frequency Distribution Broken Down by Parental Education (n=8025)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Generation College Student</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Whose Parent(s) Attended College</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Frequency Distribution Broken Down by Institution Size (n=8025)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From a Small Institution</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a Medium Institution</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a Large Institution</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When looking at cross-tabulations of the data, a picture emerged about the sample sizes of the groups. Fraternity men who were GBQ comprised 91 out of 1,105 students who identified as social fraternity men; this was slightly higher than the analysis that found approximately five% of fraternity men are gay (Case, 1996). Non-affiliated men identified as GBQ in 635 of the 6,906 cases. Regarding race, 939 fraternity men were White, 14 were Middle Eastern, 31 were Black or African American, 19 were American Indian or Native Alaskan, 76 were Asian, 78 were Latino or Hispanic, 25 were multiracial, and 8 had a race not-included in the question. Additionally, 115 fraternity men were FGCS. Regarding institution size, 57 fraternity men came from small institutions, 548 from medium size institutions, and 502 from large institutions. Table 6 below includes the cross tabulations for fraternity men and non-affiliated men based on each of the controlling variables.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Tabulation of Independent and Controlling Variables (n=8025)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Bisexual/Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity Not Included Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Size: Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Size: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Size: Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation College Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparation of the Dependent Variables

Having analyzed the components of the dataset and developed an understanding of the size of the independent and control variable groupings for the study, the researcher examined the dependent variables for analysis. At first, parametric testing was considered for the dependent variables prior to normality testing, due to the debate in educational research as to whether or not Likert scale scores could be considered continuous. Grace-Martin (2008) made the argument that Likert scale data could be considered continuous if it seems the answers did not have an ending point. Because the current study considers advancement in the area of specific leadership principles, the researcher considered using the ordinal scales of this study as continuous. However, based on the best practice of several statisticians, non-parametric testing was determined to be the most viable option for the current study (Allen & Seaman, 2007; Field, 2009; Sheskin, 2000). Before analysis, data cleaning eliminated any student who was missing scores in any of the dependent variables, as well as all students who checked that they were in a multicultural fraternity.

Inferential Statistical Analysis

FGCS. The first comparison that was tested using the Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were FGCS who either were or were not fraternity men. Interestingly, there was a significant difference between FGCS who were fraternity men and non-affiliated men who were FGCS. FGCS fraternity members showed greater gains in CS than non-affiliated men. Table 7 below shows the significant result of the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA. Additionally represented is an analysis of FGCS fraternity members compared to non-members while controlling for campus size (see Table 7 below). It was clear that the significant result across
institution sizes was realized solely for the FGCS fraternity men, who showed greater gains than non-fraternity men, at large institutions.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Test Statistic (H) Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Total</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.900</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Small</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>Fail to Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Med</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>Fail to Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.332</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field (2009) suggested Mann-Whitney U testing as a post hoc to prove a statistically significant result to a Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA. Therefore, a post hoc analysis was run on both significant results (see Table 8 below).

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>U Score</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Total</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,940</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>-3.650</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mann-Whitney U Test, run as a post hoc without Bonferroni correction since there were no repeated analyses, was also significant, both when considering the FGCS sample in total and when considering FGCS at large institutions. Further, at large institutions the effect size was negligible (less than weak), while overall (without regard to campus size), the significant score also demonstrated a negligible effect (Field, 2009).

Regarding the other variables related to the construct of IMP, each demonstrated an insignificant difference between FGCS fraternity and non-affiliated men. Further investigation
was done in a between-groups analysis via campus size, which sustained the majority of the insignificant results (see Table 9 below). However, as can be seen from Table 9 below, FGCS who are in a fraternity at a larger institution demonstrated significantly greater gains in the area of congruence.

Table 9

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Analysis for components of Internalized Moral Perspective among FGCS Fraternity and Non-Affiliated men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>H Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Total</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Total</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Total</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Total</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Small</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Small</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Small</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Small</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Med</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.999</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.166</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant result in measuring the congruence of FGCS men who were in a fraternity and attended a large institution called for a follow-up analysis using the Mann-Whitney U Test to show effect size and substantiate the scores of the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA. The score of the Mann-Whitney U Test is shown in Table 10 below.
Table 10

*Mann-Whitney U Test Post Hoc Analysis on Congruence for FGCS Fraternity and Non-Fraternity Men at Large Institutions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>U Score</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGCS Large</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,032.5</td>
<td>-2.449</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mann-Whitney U Test substantiated the finding of the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA, and the Pearson’s r measuring effect size further indicated that the effect size is weak.

**Leadership development in fraternities and sexuality.** The gains of GBQ fraternity men, when not considering campus size, were not significantly different from non-fraternity men. Specifically, regardless of campus size, GBQ fraternity men did not differ significantly from their non-affiliated peers in the measures of CS, congruence, commitment, resiliency or cognitive skills. However, heterosexual fraternity men at medium and large campuses demonstrated significant differences from non-affiliated heterosexual men at medium and large campuses in CS. Heterosexual fraternity men, overall, demonstrated significant differences from heterosexual non-affiliated men in the MSL measure for CS. Table 11 below lists the detailed findings regarding fraternity and non-affiliated students while controlling for sexuality and institution size.
Table 11

*Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA for Sexuality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Group</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Total</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Total</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>7295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.668</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Total</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Total</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>7295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Total</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Total</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>7295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Total</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Total</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>7295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Total</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Total</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>7295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Small</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Small</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Small</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Small</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Small</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Small</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Small</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Small</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.952</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Small</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Small</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Med</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Med</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.460</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Med</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Med</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.597</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBQ Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As per Field (2009), post hoc analysis was run using the Mann-Whitney U Test on the significant results. Table 12 below provides the post hoc analysis.

**Table 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>U Score</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Total</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,936,865</td>
<td>-4.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Med</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>684,846</td>
<td>-2.731</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero Large</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>582,600</td>
<td>-3.098</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The post hoc analysis supports the significant results in the original Kruskal-Wallis findings. Further, it gives an effect size for each of the significant findings. While heterosexual students in general, at large and medium institutions, demonstrated greater gains in CS than non-fraternity men, as per Field (2009) the effect size was negligible (not even weak).

Having concluded our analysis of the relationship between fraternity status and sexuality, along with leadership, student, and moral development gains, what follows is an examination of gains made in these development areas by racially and ethnically diverse fraternity men.

**Student, leadership, and moral development gains for fraternity men and non-affiliated men while controlling for race.** In contrast to the analysis of fraternity men who were FGCS, and more in concert with GBQ fraternity men, an analysis of race produced many of the predicted null hypotheses while substantiating gains made by fraternity men among particular racial groups. The first analysis was of White fraternity men and non-affiliated men, respectively. Table 13 below includes these results.
The current study considered each racial/ethnic group separately for the purposes of analysis. Starting with White fraternity men, all measures related to IMP were not significant; however, White fraternity men performed significantly differently than White non-affiliated men on CS overall and at medium and large institutions. Table 14 below includes the post hoc analysis which, as per Field (2009), is a Mann-Whitney U Test.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.496</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.592</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.025</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mann-Whitney U Test was performed on Consciousness of Self for White fraternity and non-affiliated men.
As can be seen from the post hoc analysis, the White fraternity students demonstrated significantly more gains than White non-fraternity students on the MSL measure for CS, but the effect size was negligible (less than weak) (Field, 2009).

Having analyzed the first racial/ethnic group, the study next examined fraternity members who were Middle Eastern against non-affiliated students who were Middle Eastern, for all of the dependent variables. Because the sample size was considerably smaller than for the White students examined, the researcher combined students at small and medium institutions and ran the analysis on those groups together out of necessity because some test groups would have included less than five cases, which was not fit for analysis as per Field (2009). Large institutions were considered separately. Table 15 below shows the findings for Middle Eastern men who joined fraternities and those who did not when controlling for ethnicity/race and institution size.

Table 15

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Analysis of Middle Eastern Fraternity and Non-Affiliated Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.025</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As can be seen from Table 15, the only two significant scores demonstrated that gains in commitment were lower among fraternity men who were Middle Eastern generally and specifically among those Middle Eastern fraternity men who attended a small or medium size institution. As per Field (2009), post hoc analysis substantiated the results (see Table 16 below).

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>U Score</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,260.5</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, besides substantiating the results, the Pearson’s r for Middle Eastern fraternity and non-affiliated students at small and medium institutions demonstrated a medium effect size, thus thoroughly substantiating the result that fraternity men demonstrated significantly poorer gains in the MSL measure for commitment.

The next group analyzed were African American or Black IFC fraternity men. Table 17 below includes the results for Black or African American men who were fraternity members and for non-affiliated Black and African American men, while controlling for institution size. Due to the low sample size of Black or African American students who joined fraternities at small campuses, cases at small and medium campuses were combined and Black and African American fraternity men at large institutions were analyzed separately.
Table 17

*Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Analysis of Black or African American Fraternity and Non-Affiliated Men*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of Black fraternity men and non-affiliated men, regardless of campus size, yielded an insignificant result in every dependent variable examined. In no way did fraternity membership, regardless of campus size, alter the experience of Black or African American men from their non-affiliated peers. As there were no significant results, no post hoc analysis was necessary.

For Native American students, there was not a large enough sample to run analyses on students from small institutions separately, and therefore Table 18 below shows the findings for the dependent variables while combining the cases from small and medium institutions.
Table 18

*Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Analysis of Native American Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to African American students, there were no significant differences in any of the measures of the MSL analyzed with regard to Native American fraternity and non-affiliated students, regardless of campus size.

The findings regarding Asian students are presented below (see Table 19). Once again, there were not enough Asian fraternity students at small institutions in the dataset to analyze their experience separately, and so the findings are presented for Asian students overall, at small and medium institutions, and at large institutions, controlling for fraternity membership. Similar to the experiences of African American and Native American students, no significant difference was found between Asian fraternity men and Asian non-affiliated men, regardless of campus size.
Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Med</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there were no significant results among Asian students, no post hoc analysis was necessary. Therefore, Latino students were next examined. Similar to many other racial/ethnic minorities, Latino students who joined social fraternities showed no significant gains in the leadership measures of the MSL (2012) used in this study. Table 20 below shows the findings regarding Latino students. Since there were only two cases of Latino students from small institutions in the sample for this study, the cases of Latino students from small institutions were combined with the cases from medium size institutions for analysis.
Multiracial fraternity members and non-affiliated students were examined next, and the findings are presented in Table 21 below. Once again, fraternity membership produced no significant difference in gains in the areas of leadership that were measured by the MSL. Further, it was impossible to analyze multiracial students from small institutions as the sample of students who were in fraternities was too small. Therefore, analysis proceeded by combining the cases of students from small institutions with those from medium size institutions.
As there were no significant results for multiracial students, we must accept the null hypothesis that there were no leadership differences, based on the constructs studied, between fraternity and non-fraternity men who were multiracial, regardless of campus size. Therefore, analysis of the final racial category commenced, and the findings are presented below (see Table 22). The men examined are men whose race was not listed on the MSL (DATE). As there were only 8 fraternity members within the sample of 109 students, results by campus size were not possible for this analysis.

Table 22

*Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Analysis of Students Whose Race Was Not Listed on the MSL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis above (see Table 22) shows a similar picture to the experience of other fraternity men who are racial minorities, i.e., that fraternity membership did not support significantly different leadership gains in the constructs that were examined in this study. What follows next is a pure analysis of the effect of campus size on the gains that fraternity men made on the leadership continuums measured by the MSL (2012) and included as dependent variables in this study.

**Campus size and its effect on leadership gains for fraternity men.** Table 23 below presents the final analysis for this study which compares the gains made by fraternity men in the dependent variables while controlling only for campus size. Two significant results were found regarding the MSL measure of CS, but no gains were demonstrated regarding any of the components of IMP.

Table 23

*Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Analysis of Fraternity and Non-Affiliated Students Controlling Only for Campus Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>H value</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.881</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.720</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.343</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.960</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>Cannot Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because there was a significant between fraternity men and non-affiliated students at medium and large institutions in the MSL measure for CS, a Mann-Whitney U Test was run on the two significant results as a post hoc analysis. The results of the post hoc Analysis are reported below in Table 24.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>U Score</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>836,941</td>
<td>-2.807</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>676,807</td>
<td>-3.423</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mann-Whitney U Test substantiated the significant results, but the effect size for both groups was negligible (less than weak) (Field, 2009).

Having concluded the analyses, it was evident that, despite the flurry of results lacking significance, the findings of the current study indicated noteworthy conclusions about the leadership, moral, and student development gains that particular sub-sets of the fraternity population made, or perhaps more insightfully, did not make, as undergraduates.

**Conclusion**

In the current chapter, the descriptive statistics demonstrated a testable sample for each variable of the current study, but due to the lack of normality of the data and the data being ordinal, as opposed to continuous, inferential statistical analyses proceeded with the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA using the Mann-Whitney U Test as a post hoc. The findings indicated that fraternity men, in specific samples, may have developed CS beyond that of their non-affiliated peers; however, fraternity men showed no gains over non-affiliated men with regard to any of the aspects of IMP, with the exception of FGCS fraternity men who showed greater gains in congruence at large institutions. The next and final chapter of this dissertation, Chapter V,
summarizes the findings, interprets the results using the theoretical frame, and provides an analysis of the results, recommendations for best practice and policy, and ideas for further research.
Chapter V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to analyze CS and the component variables of IMP when controlling for race/ethnicity, sexuality, parental education, and college/university population size. The previous chapter compared the rank of scores of fraternity men and non-affiliated men for the construct of CS and the component scales related to a development of IMP (congruence, commitment, resiliency, and cognitive skills). The current chapter presents a summary of the findings, interprets the results using the theoretical frame, provides recommendations for best practice and policy, and gives ideas for further research.

Summary of the Findings

It was evident from the findings that regardless of what variables were controlled for, fraternity men were not able to demonstrate a significant difference in their development toward an IMP from non-fraternity men. None of the components of the IMP construct were found to be significantly more positive for fraternity men, with the exception of congruence, among FGCS who were fraternity men at large institutions (with a weak effect). This means that at least for FGCS who joined fraternities, the impact of fraternity had some small effect on their ability to behave authentically toward others and consistently with their values (Astin & Astin, 1996). With regard to Middle Eastern fraternity men, there were significantly worse measures of commitment than for non-affiliated fraternity men, and the significant result for these men demonstrated a medium effect size, indicating that fraternity membership impedes their development of commitment. This indicated that the Middle Eastern fraternity men did not commit the energy needed to engage actively in their college activities (Astin & Astin, 1996). The significance of these findings are discussed in the analysis section, but the lack of development of leaders, those who would be willing to take a stand against people who violate
their principles, had significant meaning for fraternities which indicated a lack of moral
development despite earlier calls for this type of education in fraternity men (McCreary, 2012b).

With regard to men in the specific populations studied, GBQ fraternity men showed no
distinction from GBQ non-fraternity men in any of the scales measured. Additionally, the lack of
the current research to show greater development across any racial/ethnic category in the area of
CS, with the exception of White fraternity men, posed another marked area of concern for
fraternities. Interestingly, however, fraternities were shown to be successful at fostering the
advancement of the CS for students who were FGCS and for students generally at medium and
large institutions. However, we know from the extended analysis in Chapter IV that the
significant result is due to the White fraternity members as the non-White fraternity members
showed absolutely no gains in this area.

When summarizing the findings for fraternity men’s leadership development based on
campus population size, it was interesting to find no significant difference between fraternity
men and non-affiliated men at small institutions, but at medium and large institutions there was a
significant difference in CS. Even though these findings had a weak effect, they still
demonstrated a marked difference between the fraternity experiences of men at small schools
versus those at medium or large institutions. Something which could be further deduced from
this study, and which may be painfully apparent, was that there was more diversity among
fraternity men from medium and large campuses. This may be why the CS construct, which
ultimately measured self-authorship (a principle shown to be affected by diversity experiences),
might show significant results at medium and large campuses (Baxter Magolda, 1998, 1999,
2008, 2009; Evans et al. 2010; Shalka, 2008; Shalka & Jones, 2010).
While there was a plethora of non-significant results in the study, the findings which were significant, and even those which were not significant, shape the knowledge of fraternities and help to formulate analysis and policy implications. The next section analyzes the results using the theoretical frame.

An Analysis of the Statistical Findings

The lack of development of IMP, in most groups of fraternity men regardless of controlling variables, was important to the current study. Earlier studies, such as McCreary (2012a), demonstrated moral disengagement of fraternity men when considering hazing activities. The lack of development toward an IMP in this study, however, did not substantiate this disengagement. Rather, it reflected the idea of some theorists that there was a lack of leadership intervention among those who ended up in hazing incidents (Lipkins, 2006), and the current study suggested that fraternity men will likely not stand up to their peer group when they believe that something violates their own internal moral code if they fear perceived negative consequences (regardless of the situation). The current study predicted that fraternity men would not have significantly different gains in any construct having to do with either self-authorship, leadership, or moral development despite the nature of fraternal organizations as values-based groups (Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967); the findings bear out many, though not all, of these predictions. If the findings of McCreary (2012a) and the current study are combined, there is a bleak picture for fraternity men, and one that does not bode well for the established problems of fraternities (DeSantis, 2007; Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b; McCreary, 2014; Sasso, 2012a). Clearly, if fraternities undertook moral education as part of their current calling, as was originally suggested by other researchers (McCreary, 2012b), then it would be possible to foster more fraternity leaders who act against things which morally violate their conscience and which echo universal
ethical principles. As substantiated by the results of the current study, this was not taught as part of fraternity membership, even though fraternities were purported to be values-based leadership organizations (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Nuwer, 1999; 2004; Walumbwa et al., 2008). This failure therefore was a result of the lack of best practice in the field of the fraternity/sorority professional (Sasso, 2012c).

The development of CS in specific populations of fraternity men was shown to be significant. CS theoretically ties specifically to the development of self-authorship, as was found in earlier literature (Shalka, 2008; Shalka & Jones, 2010). The fact that FGCS have developed CS more often in fraternities than not in fraternities, even with a weak effect size, was important. It showed the relative success of fraternities at developing self-authorship in specific populations. Based on the theory of Baxter Magolda (2008, 2009), the development of self-authorship could help students in their cognitive development and success at college, and based on Tinto (2012), their success in this group might aid retention.

The lack of a demonstration of self-authorship development in any racial/ethnic category with the exception of among White students, however, was problematic. It calls for a re-analysis of Syrett’s (2005) claims in his dissertation that the problems with diversity in social fraternities were in the past, they may just be in the immediate past. The findings of the current study were additionally substantiated by recent events on college campuses (Fernandez & Pérez-Peña, 2015; Flanagan, 2014a). The lack of success among diverse student populations in social fraternities found in the current study echoed the warnings in earlier literature that the fraternity experience can be troubling for minority students (Hughey, 2006; 2010; Newsome, 2009; Turk, 2012; Winkler, 2014). Based on Baxter-Magolda’s (2008) theory, this is also troubling because the development of self-authorship necessitates the development of diverse relationships in order to
promote more self-authorship (Evans et al., 2010). Therefore, the development of self-authorship in some student populations of social fraternities means that the different populations may be living different experiences within the same fraternity house. How can White fraternity members develop significantly toward self-authorship while non-White fraternity members cannot, when diversity is a factor in the development of self-authorship? This was the most troubling aspect of this study’s findings.

Regarding sexuality, the findings were also troubling, and echo the findings of earlier researchers (Case, 1996; Case et al., 2005; Hesp, 2006). Fraternity men who were GBQ demonstrated factors related to their fraternity experience which may have inhibited their development of self-authorship. In order for self-authorship to develop, students must feel supported in the educational environment (Baxter Magolda, 2004), and for GBQ fraternity men the literature has shown that this may not be taking place (Case, 1996; Case et al., 2005; Hesp, 2006). Those findings were substantiated by this study.

Finally, fraternity men at smaller schools were not significantly different than their peers in the development of CS across any other control variables, but fraternity men were significantly different from their peers at medium and large institutions. This demonstrated something which was touched on in the literature (Sasso, 2012b). Just as there are typologies of fraternity advisement models, so too are the resources for fraternities different at larger institutions, something which may be logically deduced when one examines the difference in fraternity/sorority advisement offices at larger and smaller institutions. Fraternities can provide a conducive learning environment at medium and large universities for some leadership variables; therefore, the members of the fraternity/sorority profession would do well to focus attention and support on small institutions through their national/regional education programs, national offices,
and trade groups. While social groups with too many members may realize diminished returns (Dunbar, 1992; Gladwell, 2002; McCreary, 2015), where fraternity life on campus is not large enough to have even one full-time person overseeing it, there may be a cause for concern.

**Implications for Policy**

The variables chosen for this study were chosen because fraternities have all the pieces which should foster successful leadership, moral, and student development in the areas of developing CS and IMP. Fraternity rituals offer members a set of guidelines on how to live their lives, and these rituals are formalized ceremonies that are clearly meant to develop values (Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967).

It is the primary necessity of fraternities to imbue members with moral development that will help them toward self-authorship; then, fraternity chapters may have stronger members and students on university campuses may be safer. Indeed, fraternities have every aspect within them that can help to develop self-authorship: interpersonal relationships, opportunities to evaluate learning and leadership (intrapersonal perspective), and the construction of values cognitively through the fraternity ritual (epistemological development), which are all of the factors necessary for self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008).

Additionally, based on Walumba et al. (2008), the development of authentic leadership is based on training leaders to be strong enough to stand up for their values, meaning that fraternities need to support cognitive development, foster commitment to the organization and the community, demonstrate and train for resiliency in leadership, and foster values congruence, values which are self-evident in fraternity rituals and have been self-evident in earlier attempts at creating successful fraternity programming (King, 2010; The Franklin Square Group, 2003; Turk, 2004). However, as the NIC embarks on a new version of itself, it is important to
remember where we have failed. The setting of standards, or the monitoring of standards in
different ways, is not enough to support real change in the movement (NIC, 2015a). Instead, a
commitment must be made to the students that has been sorely lacking from both the
headquarters and the campus.

It is clear that the results of this study are hardly overwhelmingly positive for fraternities.
The implications for policy and practice echo the call of Pike (2003) and DeSantis (2007) that
there must be significant change within the fraternity/sorority profession and in the fraternity
movement if the movement is going to remain relevant. This is substantiated by the current
trends taking place in higher education right now (Kelderman, 2015; Mangan, 2015; McCurtie,
2015a). First, campus professionals and national headquarters professionals need to re-marry and
work toward cohesive solutions to educating for moral development (Kelderman, 2015; Mangan,
2015; McCurtie, 2015a). It is only through a combined circular effort of support, and not
antagonism, that fraternities will advance, and thus may survive in the current higher education
environment. Secondly, both groups need to formulate best practice for successful fraternity
experiences that are based on research and theory. Too often, fraternity researchers, student
affairs practitioners, and headquarters professionals are anecdotally speculating at how to
successfully work with fraternities (Biddix et al., 2014; Kelderman, 2015; McCurtie, 2015a;
Pike, 2003; Sasso, 2012c). The formulation of a code of best practice needs to emerge from the
research literature. Among the best practices, there must be established educational outcomes
that are expected by campus and headquarters and that relate to the leadership development of
students, specifically pointed at developing authentic leaders with strong CS and IMP. This will
help students to self-govern and to create safer chapters.
Fraternity professionals need to demonstrate more support for students who are of particular racial/ethnic minorities, who are FGCS, and who are GBQ. The face of the modern fraternity is not the face of the fraternity of the past; organizations are becoming more and more diverse, and that diversity needs to be supported by best practice that creates a matrix of support between the campus and headquarters in promoting diversity and acceptance in today’s fraternity chapters.

Further, it is clear that once fraternity headquarters professionals and student affairs practitioners work together, issues of policy must be addressed. It is overwhelmingly clear in the literature that the risk management practices of fraternities are not nationally successful, and cause students to see the rules as easy to break (Flanagan, 2014a; Kelderman, 2015; Mangan, 2015; McCurtie, 2015a). The stated rules are also considered as impossible to follow, which sets students up for failure in their moral and leadership development. Risk management must be attainable. Fraternities are not the only organizations that have demonstrated binge drinking, however because of their social nature they are a target for the problems which emerge from underage drinking (Flanagan, 2014a). If the drinking age were lowered, students may not disregard the Minimum Legal Drinking Age (MLDA) 21 law, a law that is difficult for them to follow on a college campus where older students can socialize with alcohol. This would allow for a more cohesive and realistic health and human safety model as well as provide a guideline attainable for student leadership. This relates to IMP and CS of fraternity men because if MLDA 21 were reversed, students would again be operating within the bounds of the law. Teaching students to develop values cannot come easily when campus and headquarters administrators focus on helping students be safe out of one side of their mouths, while out of the other they realize that their students are consistently breaking the law regarding drinking illegally. Further,
punishment of every infraction would be unreasonable. The only alternative, if MLDA 21 is not changed, is a totally dry fraternity experience, but this looks distant in the current environment on most campuses. Working in the middle, using unrealistic risk management standards, has not worked.

Finally, it is necessary that ethical and moral training take place as part of the fraternity experience. This is the only way that students will reflect cognitively upon the values that they profess to believe in. Training has to be a clear goal across all constituencies within the fraternity movement and the matrix of continual educational programming, not simply token programs, must be tied to students’ success and learning outcomes.

**Implications for Practice**

Based on the findings of the current study, a model of best practice for authentic leadership development and self-authorship development is presented. It is purported that the development of these principles within fraternity men will help to make stronger student leaders who will stand up to the negative influences of what McCreary (2012a, 2012b) cites from Zimbardo as being the bad barrel.

The development of sound principles in fraternity men can only come from a wider range of educational opportunities. Too often, fraternity men are reminded of the founders of the fraternity they belong to as a way to shame them into values development (Novak, 2013). However, they are not given the adequate resources to develop their own values while integrating the values of the organization. The fraternity’s values are talked about abstractly as something almost super-human and are put forward to students generically, but are never fully worked into an integrated model of moral development. In the traditional new member process, known as the pledge process, too often the emphasis of education is surrounded by a call for
uniformity of persona (Nuwer, 2004). In forcing uniformity, the pledge process can, too often, become extreme. Some fraternities have done away with the outdated pledge process and report safer chapters because of it (Sigma Phi Epsilon, 2012). By totally eliminating the two-tier hierarchy of fraternities (e.g. the pledge and the brother), the lower cognitive development gains among fraternity men during the freshman year would likely cease to exist (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Pike, 2003). Therefore, it would be considered best practice to not allow pledging at the campus level so that national headquarters follow suit. Once pledging is made an antique of the fraternity system, students will move forward developmentally in integrated developmental education models. Students in chapters along with chapter professionals can self-design, in a constructivist fashion, their education programs until the NIC can form unanimous agreements among fraternities to put together programs that are developmentally oriented in nature.

Another best practice in fraternity education would be to help fraternity students create their own public statements, at the chapter level, which emphasize publicly the values of their respective rituals (e.g., mission and vision). From this, they can develop advertising and marketing campaigns which they should be trained in by campus professionals, and which are centered on a mission and vision that is congruent with the national fraternity. This should be a guided practice for each chapter, and should be renewed every two years so it coincides with each fraternity’s national convention and allows for the integration of possible changes in the way each fraternity sees its values. Fraternity men can then demonstrate what their fraternity values are, without reciting from rote memory their motto or creed, but instead consider and integrate the values of their organizations through careful analysis (Baxter Magolda & King, 2004). By helping students to market their fraternities from the symbolic frame and integrate
symbolic frame leadership principles into every member’s experience vis-à-vis Bolman and Deal (2013), students will understand the values of their fraternity rituals and come to a further appreciation of those ideals. Fraternity men who may be outside the formal leadership structure may then come to fully understand what they promised, and to seek more than just the “bromance” of fraternity.

Currently, common practice is to allow fraternity communities on a particular campus to develop their own “pillars” or “principles” for their fraternity community. It would be better to get students to critically market and analyze their own fraternity’s values rather than generic campus “Greek” values. This way, a fraternity man’s development would be centered upon the full integration of values that they swore to uphold. Additionally, if the whole chapter works toward symbolic frame leadership development and advertising, the values of particular organizations are made abundantly clear to potential members.

Along the same continuum comes an increased focus on fraternity ritual. More resources need to develop which focus not just on the leadership development of student leaders, but on the general membership as well, specifically with regard to ritual understanding and integration. The fraternity headquarters should lead the effort to ensure that fraternity rituals are taught by visiting headquarters professionals every visit as part of the core competencies. The core competencies should be developed around creating authentic leaders and around moral development through ritual education. This will support the work of developing the symbolic leadership frame in fraternity men.

Regarding the development of morality, and specifically of authentic leadership, to teach morality involves the implementation, at the chapter level, of ethics training. This should be based around the symbolic frame of each organization. Ethics education, as part of leadership
development, should be a focus of ongoing education that is developmental, intentional, and placed in the students’ hands by each respective national headquarters. Part of the ethics training, which would be imbedded within the leadership curriculum of each fraternity, needs to be externally monitored by the national headquarters in conjunction with the fraternity/sorority professional on campus.

Student development programming and resources should be explicitly explained to student members so they can learn about their own development. Again, national headquarters and campus professionals need to move from educating just the leaders of chapters to providing educational opportunities for all members. Using available financial resources, every chapter should be required to send a critical mass of delegates to regional and national leadership schools and to the national convention. Financial efforts through fraternity foundations can be utilized to support this practice.

Campuses and fraternity headquarters need to come to an agreement on the assessment of chapters, which is often done yearly by campus administrators, and assessment results should feed into a cohesive learning plan for chapters who are under performing, but also for chapters that are excelling so they can excel even further. Ideally, the Fraternity Executives Association (FEA) and AFA should come up with several sample assessments (based on institutional type, size, and fraternity program) that can be agreed to by national headquarters and campus professionals for use as best practice in assessment. Parts of each assessment should be measured by the campus and parts should be measured by the headquarters, thereby allowing for a cohesive model of communication regarding every chapter. The assessments should be focused on the areas of leadership, ethical/moral, academic, and student development.
Based on the issues that fraternity men face with regard to sexuality, both the acceptance of non-hetero lifestyles, which should be center stage to the creation of educational practice in this area, and addressing the problems that have been demonstrated regarding sexual assault (Flanagan, 2014a, 2014b) should be created by the national headquarters. Gains in understanding among fraternity men also need to be assessed in this area. Additionally, national headquarters trade groups and campus professional trade groups need to make bold statements to undergraduate fraternity men that inclusion rather than exclusion needs to be the new norm of the chapter house. Besides public service announcements, headquarters professionals should move ahead of the curve, and work toward their own educational opportunities that demonstrate an inclusive fraternity model regarding accepting diverse sexualities and respecting women.

The need for further diversity training above and beyond what the campus provides is necessary best practice for fraternities regarding race, socio-economic status, FGCS, and ethnicity. Headquarters teams should put together developmental educational programming in this regard as well. Again, campus professionals need to be a partner in creating and implementing this programming.

To foster less disparagement of leadership gains by campus size, campuses that have less support because they are smaller need to develop a web of support among all aspects of a student affairs program team. One person who only works on fraternities part-time is not enough support for a fraternity community unless that one has the support of colleagues in the student affairs office to successfully educate and advise such intense organizations.

Finally, the time for real accountability has come for both the fraternity headquarters community and the campus professionals responsible for fraternities. The AFA, in conjunction with the NIC, should create an external accreditation agency that accredits fraternities and
demonstrates how they measure nationally to one and other in creating safe, sound, educationally positive fraternity experiences. Further, campus fraternity programs should also be accredited. This will allow for several things to develop: 1) increased transparency to constituents (i.e., students and parents); 2) a deeper understanding of what each organization needs to improve upon in their educational programming and self-governance; 3) an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each college’s fraternity program that demonstrates where campuses need to improve their programming; and 4) external accreditation to create a continued evaluation of practice to see if it is truly best practice or simply “country folk art” (Sasso, 2012c). External measures, such as the MSL, should be used to measure success among fraternity leaders at demonstrating gains in leadership, moral and student development because of the wide gains measured by the MSL, but also because it provides the most background information on each student of any national survey. This will thereby allow further research into who is joining fraternity chapters and how chapter members are performing.

When one considers the suggested best practice in this section, it is possible to conclude that this researcher wishes to over-regulate the fraternity experience. On the contrary, the goal in presenting the best practices in this section, all of which directly tie to the findings of this study, is to allow for the continued self-governance of fraternities, and for a more successful “gown and Greek” relationship. No institution in the United States which negatively impacts students remains unregulated for long. Institutions of higher education have, themselves, sought to maintain their own independence from government oversight. Similarly, any industry which has demonstrated public policy concerns, similar to what has risen up within fraternity, is soon followed by outside intervention. It would be better for fraternities and colleges to make the changes necessary rather than allow the intervention of either the government or the courts in
regulating colleges and fraternities. Additionally, accrediting fraternities and campus programs will give the other members of both the higher education community and the national headquarters community the opportunity to hold each other accountable. All of the educational programming and policy changes that have been suggested are related directly to the growth of developmental education, and so as national headquarters partner with campus professionals to create successful developmental programming for fraternities, there is no doubt that the inner potential of fraternities will once again be fully unleashed.

**Implications for Further Research**

Further action research is necessary into learning outcomes, programming, and policies that establish best practice within fraternities. The lack of best practice at both the headquarters level and the campus level demonstrates a need for the creation of learning outcomes for fraternities. As Pike (2003) said, it may not be that fraternity men are so different from other men, just that our expectations for them are lower. By performing action research on what works and what does not, best practice is attainable for the fraternity/sorority profession.

Research needs to continue into the minority experience of social fraternity men. It is clear from the current study that fraternity men who are not White are not advancing at the same rate of White fraternity men. It is therefore a necessity at both the campus and headquarters levels that diversity programming be more embedded within the fraternity experience, and that research is done to evaluate the success of those programs. Additionally, research directly into the minority experience will help practitioners better understand the minority experience among fraternity men.

More research into the experience of GBQ fraternity men needs to take place. By performing research into the experience, tied to specific student development and student
leadership outcomes, practitioners will be able to understand the challenges of GBQ fraternity students on campus. Additionally, action research into strategies that help support diversity in fraternity communities that successfully integrate GBQ students into the fraternity community needs to be investigated.

The effect of fraternities on FGCS has now been established in two studies. More research into how fraternities can benefit and aid these students is necessary to advance what is known about the experience.

More research is also necessary into how fraternity communities teach leadership and student development skills based on campus size and chapter size. By performing more research into campus and chapter size, best practice can emerge regarding how to work successfully with fraternity communities, taking into account the differences between communities based on the size of the fraternity community on campus and the size of each chapter.

**Conclusion**

The current study sought to analyze the most basic variables of the fraternity experience while controlling for sexuality, race/ethnicity, parental education, and institution size. The findings demonstrated that fraternity men were advancing, as compared to the literature, in some continuums while demonstrating no gains in others. Tying everything full-circle, this dissertation opened with the question of whether or not the experience of fraternity still had value. The answer is similar to what others have said, that when fraternity is done correctly it does develop leadership in its members (Biddix et al., 2014), but researchers and practitioners at both the campus and headquarters must do more to demonstrate that the strategies developed are tied to researched best practice in order to move the fulcrum for fraternity men nationally.
Fraternities can develop potential in members, but what fraternity professionals either on the campus or in the headquarters must remember is that student affairs programs offer a plethora of activities to support student leadership, moral, and student development gains. If fraternities are going to remain relevant, they must once again take their place as the leaders on campus, and excel against other student populations.
## APPENDIX A

### Table A1

**List of Control Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Descriptions</th>
<th>Codebook Code</th>
<th>Choice Options</th>
<th>Test Group Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Membership (IV)</td>
<td>ENV7Q</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality (CV)</td>
<td>DEM8</td>
<td>1=Heterosexual 2=Bisexual</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Gay/Lesbian 4=Questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Rather Not Say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education of Parents</td>
<td>DEM14</td>
<td>1=Less than High School 2=High School</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma or GED 3=Some College 4=Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Bachelor's Degree 6=Masters Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Doctorate or Professional Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>DEM10A.1 to DEM10A.8</td>
<td>0=No (not Ethnicity) 1=Yes (of Ethnicity)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Size</td>
<td>(No Code)</td>
<td>1=Small 2=Medium 3=Large</td>
<td>Group 1=1 Group 2=2 Group 3=3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX B**

*List of Recoded Independent and Controlling Variables*

Table B2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Category Description</th>
<th>Recoded Description</th>
<th>Old Categories</th>
<th>New Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Membership (IV)</td>
<td>No Recoding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>No Recoding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Parents Education</td>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Less than High School</td>
<td>0=First Generation College Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=High School Diploma or GED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Some College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Maters Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Doctorate or Professional Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>Sexuality Recoded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Heterosexual</td>
<td>0=Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Bisexual</td>
<td>1=Non-Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Rather Not Say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Size</td>
<td>No Recoding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

**Dependent Variable Descriptions**

Table C2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Name</th>
<th>Measurement Scale for Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congruence Scale (IMP Component)</strong></td>
<td>SRLS Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment Scale (IMP Component)</strong></td>
<td>SRLS Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resiliency</strong></td>
<td>1=Not Grown at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Grown Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Grown Very Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Skills</strong></td>
<td>1=Not Grown at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Grown Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Grown Very Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consciousness of Self</strong></td>
<td>SRLS Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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