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ABSTRACT

The development of students as leaders is a priority for most institutions of higher education and research suggests that students' leadership skills increase as a result of engagement in the collegiate environment. Given the scarcity of leadership models and instruments designed specifically for college students, research regarding leadership development among college students is lacking.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The basic research question was: Were there significant differences between student scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument by student involvement or lack of involvement in various student groups?

The four categories of students created are listed below.

1. Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups (student groups);
2. Students involved with three or more categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities;
3. Students involved with one or two categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities; and
4. Students not involved in any student/extracurricular groups (student groups).
In addition, the responses were analyzed based on the gender and the class level of the respondents in each of the groups.

The specific constructs or values of leadership development analyzed in this study are addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. These values are: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change.

The findings revealed overall significant differences among the levels of involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model. Overall, females had significantly higher mean scores than males. Results indicated no significant interactions between gender and levels of involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model. The findings by class level suggested significant differences in the mean scores of first year/freshmen and senior students by levels of involvement. The overall differences in the mean scores of sophomore and junior students were not significant. The results of the study indicated that involvement in student groups has a positive relationship to students' growth in leadership development.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Most colleges and universities refer to leadership development in their mission statements (Miller, 2003). Boatman (1999) noted, "Nearly every college and university has an expressed commitment to the development of students as leaders" (p. 325). Whether it is the development of students as civic leaders or leaders in their chosen profession, leadership development has become an important learning outcome of the collegiate experience and research suggests that students' leadership skills increase as a result of their collegiate experiences (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Activities, organizations, and courses focused on the topic of leadership have become common on most college and university campuses. Some institutions even have gone so far as to develop academic minors or majors in leadership. Whether it is through formal or informal programs, higher education has a major impact on leadership in society by educating future leaders, establishing curriculum standards, and preparing individuals to educate K-12 students (Astin & Astin, 2000).

While academic programs and individual courses may include leadership as a learning outcome for their respective students, it is through involvement in various student groups or co-curricular experiences that many students develop hands-on leadership skills. "Co-curricular experiences not only support and augment the students' formal classroom and curricular experience, but can also create powerful learning opportunities for leadership development through collaborative group projects that serve the institution or the
community” (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 3). Research suggests that involvement with student peers in co-curricular programs has a positive impact on various learning outcomes, including students' leadership skills development (Astin, 1993).

Given the number of student groups or organizations on most college and university campuses and the diversity of mission and purpose of the organizations, students are afforded many opportunities to engage with their peers in a variety of co-curricular experiences or student groups. Whether the student group focuses on service, academic honors, politics, club sports, or some other area of interest, students have numerous opportunities to engage with their peers and develop leadership skills that will serve them well beyond graduation.

Included in the various categories of student groups are fraternities and sororities. Often some of the most prominent of student organizations, fraternities and sororities offer their members the opportunity to develop leadership skills through various group experiences and/or positional leadership roles. At the national level, many fraternities and sororities have developed programs and curriculum focused on leadership development outcomes. In relation to leadership development, research suggests that membership in a fraternity or sorority can have a positive effect on individuals' growth in leadership abilities (Astin, 1993).

Although leadership development is a goal of most institutions of higher education and many student groups, including fraternities and sororities, there is not a universally accepted leadership development model or program common to all colleges and universities, student groups, or fraternities and sororities. Many collegiate leadership programs are based on models and studies of leaders in business and industry and questions have been raised about their applicability to institutions of higher education and
more specifically college students (Posner, 2004). The current situation regarding leadership development in the collegiate environment is such that there is a disconnect between theory and practice, uncertainty regarding the specific leadership development needs of college students, and a lack of knowledge regarding the impact of the college environment on leadership development outcomes (Komives & Dugan, 2006).

In 1993, through a grant from the Eisenhower Leadership Development program of the US Department of Education, a group of higher education leaders began a project to develop a leadership development model for undergraduate college students. The researchers described the process of leadership as “collaborative relationships that lead to collective action grounded in the shared values of people who work together to effect positive change” (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 1996, p. 17). In designing the model, the researchers began their work with some key assumptions regarding leadership.

1. Leadership is concerned with effecting change on behalf of others and society.
2. Leadership is collaborative.
3. Leadership is a process rather than a position.
4. Leadership should be value-based.
5. All students (not just those who hold formal leadership positions) are potential leaders.
6. Service is a powerful vehicle for developing students’ leadership skills. (HERI, 1996, p. 10)

The project resulted in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). The specific leadership development values identified in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI) often are referred to as the Seven C’s: consciousness of
self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship. In addition, change is identified as the eighth C because it is the value “hub” which gives meaning and purpose to the other seven. Table 1 (HERI) provides brief definitions of the values addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

Table 1. Definitions of the Values in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>Being aware of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>Thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty toward others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>The psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>To work with others in a common effort. It constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>To work with shared aims and values. It facilitates the group’s ability to engage in collective analysis of the issues at hand and the task to be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>To recognize two fundamental realities of any creative group effort: that differences in viewpoint are inevitable, and that such differences must be aired openly, but with civility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>The process whereby the individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>To make a better world and a better society for self and others - the ultimate goal of the creative process of leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Social Change Model of Leadership Development has two main goals: to assist students in their leadership self-knowledge and leadership competence and to facilitate positive social change (HERI, 1996). The model focuses on leadership as a collaborative process and considers three perspectives of leadership: the individual (consciousness of self,
congruence, and commitment); the group (collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility); and the society/community (citizenship).

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). From the perspective of the individual, the model addresses the personal qualities that are fostered through leadership development programs as well as the qualities that support group collaboration. The group perspective builds on the individual perspective by looking at collaborative qualities that effect positive social change. Finally, the community perspective looks at the types of activities or positive social changes that lead to the development of the desired individual and group qualities (HERI).

In Figure 1, arrows a and b indicate that the group values depend in part on the personal values of individual leaders and the reciprocal impact of the group on the individual. Arrows c and d indicate that the group values impact the society/community values and that the response of the society/community affects the group values. Arrows e and f symbolize the direct impact of individuals on the society/community and vice versa.

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development is applicable to colleges and universities as well as student groups, including fraternities and sororities. The authors of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996) suggested that leadership development programs based on it will result in outcomes that “prepare a new generation of leaders who understand that they can act as leaders to effect change without necessarily being in traditional leadership positions of power and authority” (p. 12).

The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale was designed to measure leadership development across the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Tyree, 1998). With the Social Change Model of Leadership as its theoretical model and a revised version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale as a portion of the instrument,
the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership was administered in 2006. The purpose of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership was to "examine leadership development at both the institutional and national levels with specific attention being paid to environmental factors that influence student leadership development" (Komives & Dugan, 2006, p. 3).


Purpose of the Study and Research Question

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The basic
research question was: Were there significant differences between student scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument by student involvement or lack of involvement in various student groups?

The four categories of students created are listed below:

1. Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups (student groups);
2. Students involved with three or more categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities;
3. Students involved with one or two categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities; and
4. Students not involved in any student/extracurricular groups (student groups).

In addition, the responses were analyzed based on the gender and the class level of the respondents in each of the groups.

The specific constructs or values of leadership development analyzed are addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). These values are: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change.

**Significance**

Leadership development is a goal of most colleges and universities, a majority of student groups, and many fraternities and sororities. In *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change*, Astin and Astin (2000) asserted, "...leadership development should be a critical part of the college experience" (p. 17). In addition, Astin and Astin noted opportunities exist in both the academic as well as the co-curricular environment to enhance students' leadership development and they cited student activities
and organizations, including fraternities and sororities, as settings in which leadership development experiences occur.

There are numerous books and articles on the subject of leadership. Bass (1990) emphasized, "There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 11). The literature on leadership includes leadership theories, behaviors, effective practices, particular populations (e.g., women, minorities), specific environments (e.g., business, education), or unique outcomes such as satisfaction or effectiveness (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Given the breadth and depth of information that exists on the subject of leadership, it is a challenge to address the subject in simple and concise terms. As Burns (1978) suggested, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 2). While nearly thirty years have passed since Burns made this observation, his statement continues to be relevant and accurate and especially regarding college students.

Institutions of higher education, many student groups, and most fraternities and sororities have attempted to develop courses and/or programs that enhance students' leadership development. With leadership development established as a common goal, Komives, Dugan, and Segar (2006) suggested, "Research to assess the status of student leadership and how college contributes to that leadership is essential" (p. 5). Unfortunately, although the importance of leadership development in college has been emphasized by numerous scholars, few studies examining the approaches and outcomes of student leadership development initiatives have occurred (Faris, 2005; Vari, 2005).

Often out-of-the-classroom involvement opportunities are classified together as co-curricular programs with little consideration given to the differences between specific student groups. If comparisons are made, it usually is between two divergent groups such
as students involved in a fraternity or sorority and students not involved with a fraternity or sorority. Rarely are comparisons made between students involved in fraternities or sororities and students involved with other student organizations. In addressing leadership development in fraternities and sororities, Harms, Woods, Roberts, Bureau, and Green (2006) noted,

There is not a well-established body of knowledge about outcomes of serving in leadership positions or the organization's ability to aid in the development of leadership skills. Research on leadership development as an outcome of membership in undergraduate fraternal organizations should be prioritized by those who are proponents of these organizations. (p. 87)

Astin (1993) suggested, "The real issue is not the impact of college but the impact of college characteristics or, more precisely, the comparative impact of different collegiate experiences" (p. 7). This study sought to add to the research by analyzing the leadership development outcomes of students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular group; students involved with three or more categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities; students involved with one or two categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities; and students not involved in any student/extracurricular groups.

By better understanding the leadership development differences between student involvement or lack of involvement with various student groups, student affairs practitioners may be able to make better informed decisions when developing learning opportunities and experiences that will contribute to and enhance students' leadership development, a common goal of most institutions of higher education.
Delimitations

This study was limited to a random sample of undergraduate students enrolled at one midwestern public university in the spring of 2006. The reason for this delimitation resulted from the university's participation in a national leadership study, the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, which was administered from January to March 2006. The study has not been repeated since its administration in 2006.

Definitions

Several definitions are provided to help the reader understand terms and abbreviations used in this study.

Fraternity and/or sorority. For purposes of this study, a fraternity and/or sorority is a social Greek-letter organization, not to be confused with academic Greek-letter organizations such as Phi Beta Kappa.

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership or MSL. A study conducted from January through March 2006 with the purpose of examining leadership "with specific attention paid to environmental factors that influence leadership development" (Komives & Dugan, 2006).

Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The theoretical framework used in developing the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development was developed specifically for college students and addresses eight leadership development values: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change.

Socially Responsible Leadership Scale. An instrument designed to measure leadership development across the eight leadership values/constructs of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. A revised version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale was used in creating the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument.
Student group. Extracurricular student clubs and organizations. For purposes of this study, student groups are classified into twenty-one student group categories. The classifications of student groups in this study align with the classifications provided on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument.

Assumptions

This study was based on assumptions common to most research endeavors.

1. Participants completing the instrument responded honestly.
2. Participants completing the instrument were able to answer questions in quantifiable terms.
3. Participants completing the instrument understood the questions being asked.

Summary

Leadership development is a goal common of most institutions of higher education and of many of the groups that engage students outside the classroom on college and university campuses, including fraternities and sororities. The purpose of this study was to use the Social Change Model of Leadership Development and the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale to better understand the leadership development values of fraternity and sorority members, members of other student groups, and students not involved with student groups.

The purpose of the study and the research question, significance, delimitations, definitions, and assumptions were introduced in Chapter I. A review of the literature is provided in Chapter II. Chapter III describes the research methodology applied to this study. Chapter IV presents the data that were analyzed in the study. A summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

A thorough examination of the numerous books, journals, and articles on leadership could produce volumes of text. This chapter provides a review of selected literature and research relative to the specific topic and focus of this study. The evolution of leadership theory is presented to provide context for the study. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development is discussed and each of the eight constructs or values of the model is addressed individually. The development of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale also is reviewed. The history of co-curricular involvement and more specifically fraternity and sorority involvement is explored. An examination of research regarding the outcomes of both co-curricular involvement and fraternity and sorority involvement is presented. Finally, an overview of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership is provided.

Leadership Theory Development

Most colleges and universities provide opportunities for their students both to learn about leadership and to develop leadership skills. Either through course instruction or co-curricular experiences, the development of students as leaders is a goal common to most institutions of higher education (Miller, 2003). Roberts (2007) suggested, "Leadership development has been an implicit commitment of higher education in the United States since the inception of colonial colleges" (p. 33). The topic of leadership has received much attention throughout history and various leadership theories and approaches have evolved over time. Bass (1995) suggested, "The study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders as much as it was shaped by them" (p. 50).
Although leadership has received much attention in the literature, neither a specific definition of leadership nor a single leadership theory has received unanimous support. Northouse (2004) noted, "Despite the abundance of writing on the topic, leadership has presented a major challenge to practitioners and researchers interested in understanding the nature of leadership. It is a highly valued phenomenon that is very complex" (p. 10).

Numerous books have been written on leaders as well as the topic of leadership. James MacGregor Burns (1978) noted, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 2). In order to appreciate the current state of leadership scholarship, it is important that the evolution of leadership development theory be understood. Although the study of leaders and leadership has existed since Biblical times, contemporary leadership research often is classified into two broad paradigms: the industrial paradigm and the postindustrial paradigm (Rost, 1993).

**Industrial Paradigm of Leadership**

The industrial paradigm of leadership includes six movements of leadership: the great man theory (early 1900s), group theory (1930s and 1940s), trait theory (1940s and 1950s), behavior theory (1950s and 1960s), contingency/situational theory (1960s and 1970s), and excellence theory (1980s) (Rost, 1993).

**Great Man Theory.** One of the earliest leadership philosophies to be proposed was the great man theory. The great man theory assumed that leadership was in essence hereditary and that leaders were born with natural abilities to influence followers (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). The great man theory earned its name because research on leaders at that time focused on individuals who had achieved greatness, all of whom were men (Daft, 2002). The great man theory held that leaders were born with certain attributes which allowed them to lead successfully regardless of the situation (Gardner, 1990).
**Trait Theory.** Although the great man theory focused on specific individuals as leaders, the trait approach attempted to identify specific attributes or personality characteristics of leaders (Daft, 2002; Northouse, 2004). "It was assumed that leaders had particular traits or characteristics, such as intelligence, height, and self-confidence, that differentiated them from non-leaders and thus made them successful" (Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 2007, p. 46).

The trait theory had strengths. It was easily understood, because it held that leaders were different from non-leaders, and it focused solely on leaders and their personality characteristics in the leadership process (Northouse, 2004). The major criticism of the trait theory was that it was nearly impossible to identify the specific characteristics or traits necessary to be a successful leader (Daft, 2002). The inability of researchers to identify and agree upon a specific set of essential leadership traits led to the rise of the behavior theory (Rost, 1993).

**Behavior Theory.** Although the trait theory attempted to identify fixed or innate leadership characteristics, the behavior theory focused on skills or behaviors that leaders could learn and develop. Two seminal research projects on the behavior theory were conducted at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan (Daft, 2002; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Northouse, 2004).

In the Ohio State Studies, researchers examined more than 1,800 leader actions and, through various surveys and analyses, identified two broad categories of leader behaviors: consideration and initiating structure (Daft, 2002; Northouse, 2004). Consideration was described as "the degree to which a leader acts in a friendly and supportive manner, shows concern for subordinates, and looks out for their welfare" (Yukl, 1994, p.54). Initiating structure was defined as "the degree to which a leader defines and
structures his or her own role and the roles of subordinates toward attainment of the

group's formal goals” (Yukl, p. 54).

The University of Michigan Studies addressed the impact of leaders' behaviors on the
effectiveness of the subordinate group. Two types of leadership behaviors were identified:
employee orientation and production orientation (Northouse, 2004). Employee orientation
behaviors focused on the needs of subordinates, while production orientation behaviors
were concerned with job tasks and efficiency (Daft, 2002; Northouse). Although the Ohio
State University and the University of Michigan Studies advanced the scholarship of
leadership, the behavior theory did not identify definitive behaviors necessary for leaders to
be successful.

Situational/Contingency Theory. Situational/contingency theory suggests that to be
successful, leaders must vary their approach depending on the situation (Daft, 2002;
Komives, Lucas, McMahon, 2007; Northouse, 2004). Situational/contingency theory has
been very popular in organizational leadership training and continues to be used in business
and industry (Northouse). Situational/contingency theory recognizes that leadership does
not occur within a vacuum, but rather the ability of leaders to be successful is contingent on
the variables of a particular situation.

Within the situational/contingency theory, two styles of leadership are recognized:
task motivated, in which leaders are most concerned with goal attainment, and relationship
motivated, in which leaders concentrate on developing interpersonal relationships
(Northouse, 2004). Situational/contingency theory also characterizes situations based on
three key elements: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power (Daft,
2002; Northouse). Leader-member relations are concerned with the attitudes group
members have toward the leader and the degree to which the leader is accepted by his or
her subordinates. The task structure of the situation addresses the level of understanding


group members have regarding the requirements or expectations of a specific task. Position

power refers to the degree of formal authority a leader has over his or her subordinates.

The most favorable leadership situations consist of good leader-member relations, high task

structure, and strong leader position power (Northouse).

Situational/contingency theory acknowledges that not all leaders will be effective or

successful in all situations. Even though situational/contingency theory advances the

evolution of leadership scholarship by taking into consideration the many variables affecting

leaders in particular situations, criticisms of the theory remain. The theory does not explain

why some leadership styles are successful in certain situations and others are not

(Northouse, 2004). In addition, “most contingency theories are ambiguous, making it
difficult to formulate specific, testable propositions” (Komives, Lucas, McMahon, 2007, p.

48).

Excellence Theory. Excellence theory is not recognized as widely as the other

movements (Rost, 1993). In describing excellence theory, Rost suggests that “leadership is

simply doing the right thing to achieve excellence” (p. 22). In excellence theory, researchers

seek to identify the traits, behavior patterns, and situation practices of companies and CEOs

that are recognized as excellent (Rost).

Postindustrial Paradigm of Leadership

Leadership theories within the industrial paradigm focus on the individual leader and

concepts such as competition, control, stability, structure, and management (Daft, 2002;

Rost, 1993). Given the complexity of the modern world, many industrial paradigm

leadership theories are no longer as accepted as they once were given various changes in

societal values (Rost). The postindustrial paradigm of leadership addresses concepts such as
collaboration, relationships, people, and change (Daft). Many leadership theories of the postindustrial paradigm still are emerging and as such they are not yet conceptualized or classified as succinctly as are the theories of the industrial paradigm.

**Transforming Leadership.** James MacGregor Burns often is credited with re-conceptualizing leadership (Couto, 1995; Rost, 1993). In his seminal work, *Leadership*, Burns (1978) suggested that leadership is a transforming process and that "leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20).

Bass (1985) expanded on Burns's work by focusing attention on the role of followers in leadership. Bass suggested the following about transformational leadership:

Transformational leadership motivates followers to do more than the expected by doing the following: (a) raising followers' levels of consciousness about the importance and value of specified and idealized goals, (b) getting followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team or organization, and (c) moving followers to address higher-level needs. (p. 20)

Building on the work of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) and expanding the postindustrial paradigm of leadership, Rost (1993) proposed the following definition of leadership: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 102). Rost's definition of leadership is in direct contrast with the various theories of the industrial paradigm. First, while theories in the industrial paradigm focus exclusively on the individual leader, Rost describes leadership as a relationship between leaders and followers. Second, Rost addresses a purpose in leadership centered on intentional change, which is a contrast to the industrial paradigm in which purpose and change are not addressed as factors.
Charismatic Leadership. Expanding on the concepts of transformational leadership, Van Seters and Field (1990) noted that charismatic leadership takes into consideration "leader traits, behaviors, influence, and situational factors that combine to increase subordinate receptivity to ideological appeals" (p. 38). Like transforming leadership and other emerging theories of the postindustrial leadership paradigm, charismatic leadership addresses more than just the personality or behaviors of leaders. "Charismatic leaders can raise people's consciousness about new possibilities and motivate them to transcend their own interests for the sake of the team, department, or organization" (Daft, 2002, pp. 142-143).

Nadler and Tushman (1995) suggested that there are three broad categories of behaviors that characterize charismatic leaders: envisioning, energizing, and enabling. Charismatic leaders have a desire to influence others, are self-confident, and have a thorough understanding of their own values (Northouse, 2004). In addition, charismatic leaders exhibit competence, communicate high expectations, serve as strong role models, and express confidence (Northouse). In charismatic leadership, the combination of a leader's personality characteristics and behaviors affect followers such that they trust in the leader's ideology, show affection toward the leader, identify with the leader, and become emotionally involved in the process (Northouse).

Servant Leadership. The term servant leadership was coined by Robert Greenleaf (1977).

Servant leadership is leadership upside-down. Servant leaders transcend self-interest to serve the needs of others, help others grow and develop, and provide opportunity for others to gain materially and emotionally. The fulfillment of others is the servant leader's principal aim. (Daft, 2002, p. 214)
The desire to serve others is the primary motivation for servant leaders (Greenleaf, 1995). There is a distinct difference between individuals who are motivated to serve others and individuals whose primary motivation is to achieve power or control over people (Daft, 2002). Servant leaders are altruistic in their desire to show care and concern for others, especially their followers. Servant leaders recognize that anyone can serve and value the involvement of others in the leadership process. Personal characteristics such as listening, empathy, and unconditional acceptance of others are common values of servant leaders (Northouse, 2004).

The emerging leadership theories of the postindustrial paradigm, such as transforming leadership, charismatic leadership, and servant leadership, provide new ways of thinking about leaders and the process of leadership. Unlike the theories of the industrial paradigm, concepts in the postindustrial paradigm expand leadership to be a collaborative process in which numerous individuals can engage.

Although the scholarship of leadership often is classified neatly into paradigms or theories as previously addressed, this oversimplifies the study of leadership. The scholarship of leadership has not been an orderly, linear process. "Defining leadership and the characteristics and traits an individual must posses to be considered a leader is a challenge because of the many theories and definitions of leadership that have been developed" (Kelley, 2008). The scholarship of leadership is a complex process in which various scholars have attempted to function as scientists in pursuit of the correct answers regarding leadership (Rost, 1993). The complexity of leadership is such that there is no single correct answer. James MacGregor Burns's (1978) observation about leadership remains accurate, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 2).
Social Change Model of Leadership Development

In 1993 a team of 15 researchers associated with UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute undertook a “project aimed at the development of a model of leadership development for undergraduate college students” (HERI, 1996, p. 10). Led by Helen Astin and Alexander Astin and funded through a grant from the Eisenhower Leadership Development program of the US Department of Education, the researchers developed the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The Social Change Model is “designed to emphasize clarification of values, the development of self-awareness, trust, and the capacity to listen and serve others, and through collaborative work to bring about change for the common good” (HERI, p. 11).

In developing the Social Change Model, the researchers based their work on six key assumptions about leadership:

1. Leadership is concerned with effecting change on behalf of others and society.
2. Leadership is collaborative.
3. Leadership is a process rather than a position.
4. Leadership should be value-based.
5. All students (not just those who hold formal leadership positions) are potential leaders.
6. Service is a powerful vehicle for developing students’ leadership skills. (HERI, 1996, p. 10)

The researchers approached their work by describing leaders as individuals “who are able to effect positive change on behalf of others and society” (HERI, 1996, p. 10). In addition, the research team defined leadership as a process grounded in shared values that results from collaborative relationships and is ultimately about change (HERI). The
researchers also noted the importance of addressing values in relationship to leadership development, both in terms of the value implications of a proposed change as well as the personal values of leaders themselves (HERI).

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development has two major goals:

1. To enhance student learning and development; more specifically, to develop in each student participant greater:
   - Self-knowledge: understanding of one's talents, values, and interests, especially as these relate to the student's capacity to provide effective leadership.
   - Leadership competence: the capacity to mobilize oneself and others to serve and to work collaboratively.

2. To facilitate positive social change at the institution or community. That is, to undertake actions which will help the institution/community to function more effectively and humanely. (HERI, 1996, p. 19)

The Social Change Model also takes into consideration three perspectives of leadership: the individual, the group, and the society/community (HERI, 1996). The three perspectives are interrelated. The personalities, values, and attitudes of individual members have an impact on the group and the collective group has an impact on individual members. The group's attempt to effect positive change has an impact on the society/community, and the response of the society/community has a reciprocal impact on the group. Individuals are directly engaged with the society/community in the change activity and are affected by their involvement.
Constructs of the Social Change Model of Leadership

Within the three perspectives of leadership, i.e. individual, group, and society/community, the Social Change Model addresses seven constructs or values and an eighth overarching value. The values addressed in the individual perspective are consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment. The group perspective includes the values of collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility. Citizenship is the lone value addressed in the society/community perspective. The values of the Social Change Model commonly are referred to as the seven Cs, given each begins with the letter C. The eighth value, change, is considered the value “hub” as making the world and society better for self and others through positive change is the ultimate goal of the leadership process (HERI, 1996).

Consciousness of self. Simply stated, consciousness of self means to be self-aware or to know oneself. In developing the Social Change Model, the researchers defined consciousness of self as “being aware of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action” (HERI, 1996, p. 22). Although no one value within the Social Change Model is any more or less important than the others, consciousness of self is a fundamental value as it is the value through which the other values can be realized. Covey (1989) suggested, ”until we take how we see ourselves (and how we see others) into account, we will be unable to understand how others see and feel about themselves and their world” (p. 67).

Individuals engaged in the process of leadership must have a realistic concept of self in order to understand and engage with others and effect change. Kouzes and Posner (2002) made the following observation regarding self-awareness:
Learning to lead is about discovering what you care about and value. About what inspires you. About what challenges you. About what gives you power and competence. About what encourages you. When you discover these things about yourself, you'll know what it takes to lead those qualities out of others. (p. 391)

In order to enhance one's consciousness of self, an individual must reflect upon his or her individual values, skills, strengths, and talents. As a result of developing a better self awareness, individuals will understand the things they care about and how they can best contribute to the group and to the process of change (HERI, 1996). Individuals who struggle to understand fully their personal values and passions are likely to have difficulty with the other individual and group values of the Social Change Model. The lack of self awareness makes acting with congruence and commitment a challenge and it is difficult to develop a common purpose if individuals do not understand their personal beliefs and values. "Self-awareness is necessary when fully engaging in collaboration with others, finding one's own purpose, and contributing and committing to the group's common purpose" (Haber, 2006, p. 32). A thorough understanding of one's self is imperative in order to realize the other values of the Social Change Model.

**Congruence.** The value of congruence refers to acting in ways that are consistent with one's personal values and beliefs. The Social Change Model defines congruence as "thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty toward others" (HERI, 1996, p. 36). Congruence and consciousness of self are interdependent values because in order to act with congruence it is critical that individuals have a clear understanding of their personal thoughts and feelings or a clear consciousness of self. "Congruent persons are those whose actions are consistent with their most deeply-held beliefs and convictions" (HERI, p. 22).
In *The Leadership Challenge*, Kouzes and Posner (2002) offered five practices for exemplary leadership, one of which is titled *model the way*. In describing the practice of modeling the way, Kouzes and Posner stressed the importance of aligning actions with values. To be effective, leaders must ensure that there is congruency between what they say they will do and what they actually do. Congruency between words and actions allows leaders to establish credibility and to build trusting relationships with others. "Congruence is a basis for living together in a climate of realness" (Rogers, 1980, p. 160).

In developing the Social Change Model, the researchers addressed the value of congruence within the individual perspective, though they also reflected upon group congruence. Group congruence results when individuals in the group share a common purpose and make decisions based on that common purpose. The group cannot be neglected when addressing congruence because it is through group congruence that social change often results (HERI, 1996).

When each individual in a group has an established consciousness of self and acts with congruence, it is possible that conflict can result within the group. In such instances, it is important that individuals do not act passively or incongruently, but that they address their conflicts and concerns early before they negatively impact the change the group seeks to achieve (HERI). Conflict is addressed further within the group perspective.

**Commitment.** The third and final value within the individual perspective is commitment. The Social Change Model suggests the following description of commitment:

Commitment involves the purposive investment of time and physical and psychological energy in the leadership development process: helping the group to find a common purpose and to formulate effective strategies for realizing that
purpose, sustaining the group during times of controversy, and facilitating the actual realization of the group's goals. (HERI, 1996, p. 40)

In *On Leadership*, Gardner (1990) suggested that commitment is not an easy task and that commitment takes hard work and discipline; as such, leaders must be thoughtful in making commitments. Leaders should not make mindless commitments in haste; leaders should take the time necessary to ensure that they are truly dedicated to the things to which they commit because "your identity is what you have committed yourself to . . ." (Gardner, p. 189).

Brickman (1987) defined commitment as "whatever it is that makes a person engage or continue in a course of action when difficulties or positive alternatives influence the person to abandon action" (p. 2). Brickman's definition illustrates the need for individuals to align commitments with their personal values and the need for leaders to be thoughtful in identifying the things to which they are committed. "Our sense of commitments and our chosen paths have a significant effect on the levels of congruence we may experience" (Williams, 1993, p. 77).

By developing consciousness of self, acting with congruence, and being committed, people are able to develop as individuals and leaders and are better prepared to engage with others in the group aspects of the Social Change Model. Without fully understanding one's perspective and values, an individual will find it difficult to make positive contributions to a group or to achieve change.

**Collaboration.** The first value addressed within the group perspective of the Social Change Model is collaboration, defined as "working together toward common goals" (HERI, 1996, p. 48). Collaboration within the Social Change Model is about more than just cooperating or compromising with others. "True collaboration requires that individuals come
together with open minds to better understand and incorporate the ideas and perspectives of others” (HERI, p. 49).

Chrislip and Larson (1994) suggested that successful collaborations involve some key elements. First, there is a clear need for the project or issue on which individuals collaborate. Second, successful collaborations include broad-based involvement from many group participants. Third, the collaboration process is open and credible. Fourth, the collaborative relationship does not include mistrust or skepticism of others. Fifth, as a result of the collaboration, focus shifts from specific, individual interests to broader, group concerns.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) stressed the importance of collaboration over competition in leadership. They argued that performance improves when there is a sense of shared creation and shared responsibility among group members. Kouzes and Posner called this leadership practice *enabling others to act* and stressed the importance of encouraging various stakeholders to be actively engaged in the leadership process. “You simply can't get extraordinary things done by yourself. Collaboration is the master skill that enables teams, partnerships, and other alliances to function effectively” (Kouzes & Posner, pp 265-266).

Although collaboration is addressed within the group perspective, the individual viewpoints members bring to the group process cannot be overlooked. Crislip and Larson (1994) suggested that in order for collaboration to occur, individuals must take time to become acquainted and to explore the opinions and interests each person brings to the group. In addition, basic communication skills such as active listening and clearness of thought and expression become imperative as collaboration can occur only if group members are able to effectively communicate with each other.
Common purpose. Building on collaboration, common purpose means “to work with others within a shared set of aims and values” (HERI, 1996, p. 55). When individuals have a shared vision and are able to engage collaboratively, working toward a common purpose becomes possible. Common purpose is considered a group value and serves as a bridge between the individual values and society/community values as it unifies individual members by a shared vision and connects them to the change they hope to make in the society/community (HERI).

A group’s common purpose can be identified or defined in one of two ways. In one way, a single leader may articulate a vision and then recruit others to join in working toward the stated goal. A second way to identify a common purpose is for a group of individuals to collectively define a task they wish to accomplish. In either circumstance, it is important that all members of the group are involved in discussing, revising, and honing the group’s common purpose (HERI, 1996).

In Leadership and the New Science, Wheatley (1999) suggested that “the work of any team or organization needs to start with a clear sense of what they are trying to accomplish and how they want to behave together” (p. 106). A common purpose assists group members in interpreting information and serves as a compass as it provides the group with an objective or direction for their work. Without a common purpose, a group has little rationale or need to work together.

Burns (1978) addressed collective purpose as a key distinction between transactional and transformational leadership. In transactional leadership, individuals are concerned primarily with achieving their individual interests. In contrast, transformational leadership involves individuals working together in pursuit of goals beyond their own personal interests. Common purpose does not require a distinction between leaders and followers, as
all members of the group are valued for the roles they play in helping to achieve the group's vision.

**Controversy with Civility.** Differences in thought and opinion are likely to occur when a group of self-confident individuals works toward something about which each is passionate. The Social Change Model acknowledges that disagreements are inevitable in the process of leadership and addresses it through a concept referred to as controversy with civility. If individuals approach controversies and conflicts with civility, it is likely that they will be able to resolve their differences and work together more effectively (HERI, 1996).

Although differences between group members commonly are labeled as conflicts, the Social Change Model makes a distinction between controversy and conflict. Even though conflict often is presented as a negative concept involving winners and losers, controversy is seen as a process in which a positive resolution is possible (HERI, 1996). Controversy with civility stresses that differences between individuals should be discussed and resolved through open and honest communication. By accepting and recognizing that group controversies are unavoidable, group members can engage in civil discussions that produce creative solutions for the group.

Individuals often attempt to avoid conflict either by not offering a conflicting opinion or by ignoring conflicts that might exist. Gardner (1990) suggested that leaders must neither allow conflict to rage openly nor allow it to go underground and remain unresolved. Rather, leaders must be guided by a common purpose, work together, and respect the different and unique perspectives that each individual brings to the leadership process.

Drath (2001) suggested that leaders must change from the mind-set of problem-solving and decision-making to a "sensemaking mind-set" (p. 157). Drath's sensemaking mind-set supports the concept of controversy with civility as it suggests that leaders must
work with others to find a shared understanding or common purpose. Leaders should not feel the need to sacrifice their individual values in order to avoid conflict. Instead leaders should strive to make sense of the diversity of perspectives that people bring to any change process and to focus on commonalities rather than differences of group members.

Citizenship. The lone value addressed in the society/community perspective of the Social Change Model is citizenship. Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (2007) described citizenship as the “civic virtue of knowing that as a member of a community, you have responsibilities to do your part to contribute to the well-being of the group” (p. 134).

Although citizenship can be used in regards to any member of a community, citizenship within the Social Change Model has more significant meaning. Citizenship “implies active engagement of the individual (and the leadership group) in an effort to serve that community, as well as a “citizens mind” – a set of values and beliefs that connects an individual in a responsible manner to others” (HERI, 1996, p. 65).

In Defining a Citizen Leader, Couto (1995) described citizen leaders as individuals who engage in sustained action to bring about change. Citizen leaders “recognize the existence of community, a set of relationships among people forged by some special bond. Sometimes that bond includes residence in a particular place. It always includes the common human condition with all of its aspirations and potentials” (Couto, p. 12). Couto’s description exemplifies the importance of citizenship within the Social Change Model as “citizenship is the value which ‘puts flesh on the bones of social change’” (HERI, p. 67).

Given that college students are the intended audience of the Social Change Model, the inclusion of citizenship as a value is quite appropriate. Preparing students to be active and engaged citizens is a common goal for institutions of higher education. Many colleges
and universities encourage students to be actively involved in their campus and local communities through community service or public service.

While our universities and colleges fulfill many functions and play many roles in American society, their fundamental purpose is to ensure that students are appropriately prepared for their evolving private, public, and professional responsibilities. This means they need to develop the requisite knowledge, skills, tools, and attitudes to become good citizens, good parents and spouses, good neighbors, and good employees. (Astin & Astin, 2000, pp. 30-31)

Change. The Social Change Model highlights change as “the ultimate goal of the creative process of leadership – to make a better world and a better society for self and others” (HERI, 1996, p. 21). In *Leadership*, Burns (1978) described social change as “a transformation to a marked degree in the attitudes, norms, institutions, and behaviors that structure our daily lives” (p. 414). Daft (2002) suggested that change is an essential aspect of leadership as leaders do not set out to maintain the status quo.

Kotter (1995) highlighted change as a key difference between leaders and managers. Whereas managers maintain order and consistency, leaders deal with change. Daft (2002) emphasized that change is not about the agenda of an individual leader. Change reflects the purposes and outcomes shared by group members (Daft, 2002), a viewpoint which aligns with the Social Change Model.

Wheatley (1999) stressed that in order to effect change, it is important to remember the relationships involved in the process. Wheatley discussed the role of self-discovery and relationships in the change process, similar to the role of consciousness of self and collaboration in the Social Change Model. Additionally, Wheatley emphasized that in order for change to occur, the whole system must be involved in the change process. This
concept is similar to the Social Change Model, which stresses that all individuals are leaders, not just those in positional leadership roles.

As evidenced in this literature review, the values addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development have received much attention by scholars. The literature on leadership supports the inclusion of these concepts as values central to the leadership process, especially the literature within the postindustrial paradigm of leadership (Tyree, 1998).

Socially Responsible Leadership Scale

Most leadership development instruments are designed in and for the business industry (Snyder-Nepo, 1993). Recognizing a void in available measures of leadership development applicable to college students, Tyree (1998) developed the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale instrument to measure the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Specifically, the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale instrument measures the process of leadership development defined by the eight leadership values of the Social Change Model.

The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale contains 103 items to which participants respond using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale instrument includes twelve-to-fourteen items for each of the eight constructs of the Social Change Model. Negative response items are reverse scored. Internal reliability results for the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale range from a Cronbach's Alpha score of 0.69 for controversy with civility to 0.92 for citizenship (Tyree, 1998).

Dugan (2006a) utilized the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale to determine if there were differences between male and female students across the eight constructs of the
Social Change Model. The results indicated that the mean scores of females were higher than the mean scores of males on all eight constructs. The differences were statistically significant across six of the eight constructs with no statistical significance in the constructs of collaboration and controversy with civility. Dugan’s study was one of the first empirical studies to use the Social Change Model as a theoretical framework.

Dugan (2006b) also utilized the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale to analyze the differences across the eight constructs of the Social Change Model based on four involvement experiences: community service, positional leadership roles, student organization membership, and formal leadership programming. Dugan found significant mean differences between involved and not involved students across the four involvement experiences. For example, students engaged in community service scored significantly higher than their uninvolved peers on the values of consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, and citizenship.

The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale was revised to an 83 item instrument to shorten the original instrument while maintaining strong reliability for each scale (Appel-Silbaugh, 2005; Haber, 2006). Drop off rates and feedback from a pilot test led to a revision of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale – Revised (Dugan, 2006c; Haber, 2006). The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale – Revised 2 consists of 68 items and each construct of the Social Change Model is comprised of six-to-eleven items. The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale – Revised 2 was used to develop the instrument for the current study. Internal reliability results for the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale – Revised 2 used in this study range from a Cronbach’s Alpha score of 0.77 for controversy with civility and citizenship to 0.83 for commitment (Komives & Dugan, 2006).
There is a scarcity of research that utilizes the Social Change Model as a theoretical foundation (Haber, 2006). With the exception of doctoral dissertations (Faris, 2005; Rubin, 2000; Stenta, 2001; Tyree, 1998), master's theses (Dayton, 2004; Haber, 2006) and two articles (Dugan 2006a, 2006b), little identifiable research exists using the Social Change Model or the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale. The limitations in scholarship regarding the Social Change Model are indicative of larger limitations in research concerning student leadership development. Faris (2005) noted, "While scholars have much to say about the importance of leadership development and theory, disproportionately fewer studies examining the approaches and outcomes of student leadership development efforts have been conducted" (p. 2). This study seeks to help fill this research void.

Co-Curricular Involvement

For many students the learning that results from involvement in various co-curricular activities is as valuable as the learning that occurs in academic courses. Rubin, Bommer, and Baldwin (2002) stated, "Extracurricular activity has long held intuitive appeal as an element in a well-rounded college education" (p. 451). In developing his theory of student departure, Tinto (1993) noted that the college environment consists of two systems, the academic system and the social system, and that the interconnectedness of these two systems has an impact on students' integration to the campus. Just as the social system cannot be overlooked in terms of its impact on student retention, neither can it be overlooked in regards to student learning and development.

With responsibility for most co-curricular initiatives, student affairs administrators have long recognized that involvement in co-curricular programs can have a positive impact on student learning and development (Hernandez, Hogan, Hathaway, & Lovell, 1999). In Making the Most of College, Light (2001), a member of the Harvard faculty, offered support
for what student development practitioners have long believed. Based on findings from ten years of systemic research regarding the undergraduate experience, Light made the following observation regarding student learning:

I assumed that most important and memorable academic learning goes on inside the classroom, while outside activities provide a useful but modest supplement. The evidence shows the opposite is true: learning outside of classes, especially in residential settings and extracurricular activities such as the arts, is vital. When we asked students to think of a specific, critical incident or moment that had changed them profoundly, four-fifths of them chose a situation or event outside of the classroom. (p. 8)

History of Co-Curricular Involvement

Although the first institution of higher education in the United States, Harvard, was founded in 1636, it was not until 1753 that activities outside the classroom began to appear (Rudolph, 1990). Students' dissatisfaction with the traditional, strict curriculum resulted in their creation of debating clubs and literary societies as a means of filling the voids they felt with course instruction (Nuss, 2003; Rudolph, 1990). Thelin (2004) offered the following assessment regarding the creation of co-curricular activities:

Undergraduates created an elaborate world of their own within and alongside the official world of college. For many undergraduates, compliance with the formal curriculum was merely the price of admission into "college life." It was an accommodation that simultaneously enriched the content of campus life and allowed for a precarious coexistence of students with college presidents and professors. (p. 65)

Although student-initiated, co-curricular activities were once interpreted to be incongruent with the academic mission of higher education, today colleges and universities
recognize the important learning outcomes that can be achieved through involvement in activities and organizations outside the classroom. In The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs, Schroeder (1996) suggested that student learning occurs both in and out of the classroom and that student development practitioners must be intentional in supporting and promoting educational experiences that contribute to students' personal development.

Astin's Theory of Involvement

In a longitudinal study of college dropouts, Astin (1975) discovered that the environmental factors that affect student persistence can be explained in terms of the concept of involvement. Simply stated, Astin's (1985) theory suggested that students learn through involvement. Astin (1985) defined involvement as "the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 134). Involvement is not about what students think or feel, but rather it is focused on student behaviors or what students do (Astin, 1999). Involvement includes place of residence, academic involvement, involvement with faculty, involvement with student peers, and involvement in work (Astin, 1993).

Astin's theory of student involvement has become the foundation for research regarding the impact of student involvement on students' personal development and learning (Hernandez et al., 1999). The theory has five basic postulates.

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects. The objects may be highly generalized (the student experience) or highly specific (preparing for a chemistry examination).

2. Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum; that is, different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the
same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.

3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features. The extent of a student’s involvement in academic work, for instance, can be measured quantitatively and qualitatively.

4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.

5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement. (Astin, 1985, pp. 135-136)

This study seeks to add to the literature by comparing the mean scores of students involved in different collegiate experiences across the eight leadership values of the Social Change Model. The collegiate experiences in this study consist of involvement in different student groups. Specifically, comparisons are made between students involved with Greek groups, students involved in other groups (not Greek), and students not involved in any groups.

Outcomes of Co-Curricular Involvement

In an effort to investigate the phenomenon of involvement more thoroughly, Astin (1985) expanded his research beyond college dropouts to include longitudinal data on more than 200,000 students. The results of this extensive analysis suggested “nearly all forms of student involvement are associated with greater-than-average change in the characteristics of entering freshmen” (Astin, 1985, p. 147). Specifically, Astin (1985; 1999) found that environmental factors such as living in a campus residence, joining a fraternity or sorority,
participating in extracurricular activities, and working on campus had a significant impact on student retention.

In *What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited*, Astin (1993) presented the results of a study involving approximately 25,000 students intended to “enhance our understanding of how undergraduate students are affected by their college experience” (p. xix). Astin found that student involvement with peers, through organizations such as student groups, including fraternities and sororities, had the strongest positive correlations with the leadership personality measure and with self-reported growth in leadership abilities. Involvement with student peers also had positive correlations with self-reported growth in public speaking skills, interpersonal skills, and overall academic development (Astin, 1993). Astin suggested “these findings support the continuing efforts of student affairs professionals to find ways to engage students in extracurricular activities and other programs that encourage student-student interaction” (p. 386). Astin’s theory of student involvement and his initial research on the subject has inspired a number of researchers to further analyze the outcomes of student involvement and has become the foundation for much research on this topic (Hernandez et al., 1999).

In *How College Affects Students*, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that extracurricular involvement has a positive impact on educational attainment and on students’ integration into the campus community. Pascarella and Terenzini noted the difficulty in identifying broad outcomes of extracurricular involvement in comparison to other forms of student peer involvement as few studies make a clear distinction between peer involvement and extracurricular involvement.

Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) expanded their discussion regarding the impact of social or extracurricular student involvement in *How College Affects Students: A Third*
Decade of Research. Given the expansion of research on the impact of student involvement in the 1990s, Pascarella and Terenzini found that involvement with peers has a positive impact on learning and self-reported gains in writing and thinking skills. The most influential interactions with peers are those that reinforce the mission of the academic program and extend it to locations outside the classroom.

Hernandez et al. (1999) reviewed the literature addressing the “impact of student involvement on student development and learning” (p. 186). Their literature review looked at specific involvement experiences such as athletics, fraternities and sororities, and general clubs and organizations. A majority of the studies addressed in the literature review indicated that involvement has a positive impact on student development and learning though some studies did suggest negative effects or no measurable effects (Hernandez et al.). From their review of the literature, Hernandez et al. determined that there is not a single experience or set of experiences that has a consistent impact on students. Rather, they suggested, ”The impact of college is a result of the degree to which the student makes use of the people, leadership positions, facilities, and opportunities made available by the college” (Hernandez et al., p. 195).

Hernandez et al. (1999) noted that their literature review lacked any findings regarding excessive involvement. In identifying this void in the literature, Hernandez et al. suggested that further research should consider breadth versus depth of student involvement, quality versus quantity of student involvement, and the impact of such experiences on student development.

Wilson (1999) studied 452 college students, each of whom belonged to an officially recognized student organization. Students completed the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory which produces an intensity of involvement score based on the quality and
quantity of students' involvement. "Students with a higher level of intensity of involvement were more satisfied with the college experience, and they perceived themselves to have developed more personal skills, and experienced more personal change than students with a lower intensity of involvement" (Wilson, p. 69). In terms of leadership, students in the high intensity of involvement group had a higher mean score than students in the low intensity of involvement group (Wilson).

White (1998) conducted a qualitative study regarding the influence of co-curricular experiences on the leadership development of eighteen Caucasian individuals. The individuals in White's study were all college graduates ranging from 27 to 65 years of age and were identified as leaders in their communities. The results of the study suggested "an apparent 'weak link' in higher education's co-curricular activities as a significant factor in leadership development" (White, p. 122). White found that involvement in high school co-curricular activities provided a stronger learning experience than involvement in college co-curricular activities. White suggested that the highly structured nature of high school learning environments may contribute to leaders identifying those experiences as having a stronger impact on their leadership development in comparison to the often less structured experiences in the college co-curricular environment.

In a study involving approximately 300 undergraduate students, Chebator (1995) found that involvement in formal co-curricular activities had a significantly positive impact on students' growth and development. Specifically, students involved in formal co-curricular activities had greater self-confidence, were better able to manage their emotions, and were more successful academically than uninvolved students (Chebator). In addition, students involved in formal co-curricular programs were more satisfied with their overall college experience than were students not involved in formal co-curricular programs (Chebator).
Other studies have identified a positive relationship between co-curricular involvement and student learning and development. In a study of 550 undergraduates, Abrahamowicz (1988) found a positive relationship between students' involvement in student organizations and clubs and their involvement in the overall college community and academic experience. In a meta-analysis of eight studies conducted from 1991-2000, Gellin (2003) found that students involved in co-curricular activities such as clubs, organizations, athletics, and fraternities and sororities experienced a gain in critical thinking skills in comparison to students who were not involved in co-curricular activities. In a study involving 618 advanced undergraduate business students, members of clubs/organizations as well as fraternities/sororities were found to have better interpersonal skills (i.e. decision making, teamwork, communication, and initiative) than students not involved in clubs/organizations or fraternities/sororities (Rubin, Bommer, & Baldwin, 2002).

Although research has addressed the positive impact of co-curricular involvement on student learning and development, little has been written about students not involved with co-curricular groups or organizations. This study seeks to add to the literature by analyzing students' development on the eight leadership values addressed in the Social Change Model and includes students involved in student groups as well as students not involved with student groups.

Student Leadership Development

Many college and university mission statements express a commitment to the development of students as leaders (Boatman, 1999; Miller, 2003). "Helping students develop the integrity and strength of character that prepare them for leadership may be one of the most challenging and important goals of higher education" (King, 1997, p. 87). It is often through involvement in student groups or co-curricular experiences that many
students develop the skills and values associated with leadership. "Co-curricular experiences not only support and augment the students' formal classroom and curricular experience, but can also create powerful learning opportunities for leadership development through collaborative group projects that serve the institution or the community" (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 3). Research suggests that involvement with student peers in co-curricular programs has a positive impact on various learning outcomes, including students' leadership skills development (Astin, 1993). "Despite the importance of leadership development as an outcome of the college experience, scholars and observers of higher education note the challenges and failures of contemporary higher education to prepare citizen leaders for the future" (Vari, 2005, p. 68).

Guided by the values addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development in *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change* Astin and Astin (2000) challenged colleges and universities to examine and reconsider their role in developing students as leaders. Astin and Astin stressed the need for higher education to take a more active approach in the leadership development of students as leadership is an essential life skill that all students need to have to be "appropriately prepared for their evolving private, public, and professional responsibilities" (pp. 30–31).

Although the need for higher education to address students' leadership development is obvious (Astin & Astin, 2000), "few studies focus on the development of college students' leadership ability" (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001, p. 15). Researchers often use general measures of leadership development rather than measures tied to specific models or theories, contributing to the scarcity of empirical studies regarding student leadership development (Posner, 2004).
In their landmark book, *How College Affects Students*, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) examined twenty years of scholarship on the college experience but did not mention leadership development in the index of their book consisting of 894 pages. In 2005, Pascarella and Terenzini authored an update to their original work titled *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research* and noted that their review of the research consistently indicated that students' leadership skills improve during college. In addition, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) noted that studies indicate the influence of college on students' leadership skill development is measurable five and fifteen years after graduation.

Using data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, Kezar and Moriarty (2000) examined the factors influencing leadership development among 9,731 college students enrolled across 352 four-year institutions. The results of the study indicated that involvement in student organizations has a positive impact on students' self-perception of leadership ability and students' development of leadership-related skills such as public speaking ability, social self-confidence, and ability to influence others.

Although a variety of researchers have examined leadership development among college students, "student leadership research is still not a well-defined field of inquiry" (Komives & Schoper, 2005, p. 12). The studies that have been conducted primarily address the leadership development of students involved with a specific program or organization (Chebator, 1995; Cress et al., 2001; Dayton, 2004; Dugan, 2006b; Wilson, 1999), individuals pre-identified as leaders or serving in a leadership position (Logue, Hutchens, & Hector, 2005; White, 1998), or students of a specific gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation (Dugan, 2006a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005).

Little research has integrated theoretical understandings of the college student leadership phenomena to comprehensively explore how the higher education
environment shapes the development process. A great need exists to understand better the unique nature of college student leadership development as well as how the collegiate experience contributes to that process. (Dugan & Komives, 2007)

This study seeks to add to the literature by including students involved in student groups as well as students not involved with student groups and analyzing students’ development on the eight leadership values addressed in the Social Change Model.

Involvement in Fraternities and Sororities

On many college and university campuses, fraternities and sororities provide students an opportunity for co-curricular involvement.

Fraternities and sororities have been symbols of American institutions of higher education for decades, due in large part to their social standings on campuses, raucous parties, extensive media coverage, loyal alumni bases, and their iconic images in movies such as Animal House. (Mauk, 2006)

Although the first fraternity was not established until 1776, 140 years after the founding of the first institution of higher education in America, fraternities offered one of the first opportunities for students to be engaged in learning experiences outside the formal classroom curriculum.

History of Fraternities and Sororities

Fraternities and sororities have been part of the higher education environment since Phi Beta Kappa was founded at The College of William and Mary in 1776. The structure of the college curriculum at the time focused on rote learning and the mastery of material with little classroom time spent discussing topics or debating ideas. In creating Phi Beta Kappa, students banded together as a brotherhood outside the classroom to engage in dialogues and to debate issues (Binder, 2003).
The fraternities offered an escape from the monotony, dreariness, and unpleasantness of the collegiate regimen which began with prayers before dawn and ended with prayers after dark; escape from the long winters and ingrown college world, from the dormitory with its lack of privacy. (Rudolph, 1990, p. 146–147)

Phi Beta Kappa is credited as the first fraternity as many characteristics of its establishment have remained common to present-day fraternities and sororities. These characteristics include: Greek letters to denote the group, secret proceedings, a ritual, a handshake or grip, a badge for external display, a set of values and principles, and a strong tie of friendship (Binder, 2003; Owen, 1991). Though Phi Beta Kappa is cited as the first fraternity and was created to fill both an academic and social void for students, over time it evolved into a scholarly honor society and differs from modern social fraternities.

Inspired by the founding of Phi Beta Kappa, Kappa Alpha was founded in 1825 at Union College and is credited as the first “social” fraternal organization (Binder, 2003). In 1827, Sigma Phi and Delta Phi were founded at Union College and joined Kappa Alpha in what has become known as the Union Triad (Binder). These three fraternities expanded to other campuses and were joined by other fraternities such that by 1840 fraternities existed on most colleges in New York and New England (Rudolph, 1990).

Student enrollments in the late 1700’s and early 1800’s consisted almost entirely of men and as such the first women’s fraternities did not appear until the early 1850’s. The first women’s fraternal organization, The Adelphean Society, was established in 1851 at Wesleyan Female College in Macon, Georgia and evolved into Alpha Delta Pi (Singer & Hughey, 2003). Two other firsts in women’s fraternities were the creation of Pi Beta Phi in 1867 as the first national organization of college women and Kappa Alpha Theta which was founded in 1870 as the first Greek-letter society for women (Owen, 1991).
The early founders of women's fraternities came together to support one another because female enrollments on college campuses were low and because women were not accepted into male fraternities (Singer & Hughey, 2003). Although female fraternities often are referred to as sororities, almost all women's groups were founded as fraternities (Singer & Hughey). The first group to use the term sorority was Gamma Phi Beta which was founded in 1882 (Owen, 1991; Singer & Hughey). The advisor to Gamma Phi Beta was a professor of Latin and he thought the word fraternity, which translates to brotherhood, was inappropriate for a group of women so he coined the word sorority, which translates to sisterhood (Owen; Singer & Hughey).

Involvement by students of color in fraternities and sororities did not occur until the early 1900's. The first fraternity for African-American men was established by a group of African-American professionals who knew of the experiences their white colleagues had with fraternities during their college years. Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity was established in 1905 as the "first Black Greek-letter organization" (Kimbrough, 2003, p. 78). In 1906 at Cornell University, Alpha Phi Alpha was founded as the first Black collegiate fraternal organization (Kimbrough). Between 1906 and 1922, seven more Black fraternities and sororities were founded, five of which were established at Howard University in Washington, DC (Kimbrough).

The founding of Black fraternities and sororities occurred at a time when most African-Americans were being denied rights and access to services throughout society. Black fraternities and sororities provided an opportunity for college students to develop bonds of brotherhood and sisterhood and "to serve as a conduit by which collective action plans could be coordinated" (Owen, 1991, p. 42).
As the student body on college and university campuses has become more diverse, more fraternities and sororities have organized with a focus on cultural diversity. In addition to traditionally Caucasian fraternities and sororities and historically African-American fraternities and sororities, Asian, Latino, Native American, and Gay and Lesbian fraternities and sororities have become more prevalent on college and university campuses (Johnson & Larabee, 2003). Emerging multicultural fraternities and sororities often "have a very strong focus on cultural awareness and enhancement of the individual and their culture" (Johnson & Larabee, p. 97).

Even though the nature of the fraternity and sorority experience has changed somewhat over time, Greek letter organizations have sought since their founding to provide college students with experiences that complement and enhance their overall university experience. Based on founding principles and values, fraternities and sororities have sought to offer students learning experiences that allow them to grow and develop as individuals and leaders.

... fraternities and sororities offer today's students opportunities for personal development unmatched in most campus organizations. The leadership opportunities alone have caused some to call the American college fraternity a "laboratory" where students can test and develop their skills as organizational leaders, public speakers, community servants and good citizens. (Marchesani, 1991, p. ix)

Outcomes of Fraternity and Sorority Membership

Given that they are an easily identifiable affinity group on most college and university campuses, students involved with fraternities and sororities have been a common research focus. The interest of researchers in the fraternity and sorority experience likely relates to Astin's finding regarding students' peers. "The student's peer group is the single
most potent source of influence on growth and development in the undergraduate years”
(Astin, 1993, p. 398). Few student peer groups are as easily recognized as fraternities and sororities and as such many researchers have sought to better understand and identify the outcomes of membership in social fraternities and sororities.

Membership in a fraternity or sorority often is assumed to be synonymous with characteristics such as alcohol abuse, low grades, wealth, conservatism, and exclusivity. Although some people may assume that fraternities and sororities were the first to introduce such negative characteristics to the college environment, Rudolph (1990) noted in *The American College & University: A History* that such behaviors existed prior to the establishment of fraternities and sororities.

"Fraternities institutionalized various escapes – drinking, smoking, card playing, singing, and seducing – but they did not introduce these diversions, which long antedated their founding. By introducing traditional means of escape into a brotherhood of devoted men, the fraternity gave new meaning to a cigar, a drink, a girl, a song, and in time it was not really possible to distinguish purpose from manifestation. (Rudolph, 1990, pp. 146-147)

Today the value of membership in social fraternities and sororities often is debated in light of research studies that address the positive and negative impact such involvement has on student achievement and development. Critics of fraternities and sororities cite research that suggests in comparison to non-members, fraternity members are more likely to abuse alcohol, have lower grade point averages, have less developed critical thinking skills, and to be more homogeneous and less open to topics of diversity than non-Greeks (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996).
The role of alcohol in the Greek experience has received much research focus. In an examination of the literature regarding the relationship between fraternities and sororities and alcohol, Danielson, Himbeault-Taylor, and Hartford (2001) noted, “the findings alert us to a campus subculture that is significantly different from the general college student population in which drinking attitudes and behaviors are embedded in the physical, cognitive, emotional, and cultural aspects of students’ lives” (p. 461). O’Connor, Cooper, and Thiel (1996) found a “relationship between precollege levels of alcohol consumption and the likelihood that a freshman would pledge a fraternity” (p. 672).

In a study of 25,411 students from 61 institutions who completed the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey, Cashin, Presley, and Meilman (1998) found that “students in the Greek system averaged significantly more drinks per week, engaged in heavy drinking more often and, with minor exceptions, suffered more negative consequences than non-Greeks” (p. 63).

Utilizing the responses of 321 undergraduate students to the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey at one campus, Pace and McGrath (2002) compared the results of students involved with fraternities and sororities to the results of students involved with the primary volunteer organization on campus. The results indicated that “alcohol consumption appears to be a normative experience among students who are active on campus including Greek organizations. Heavier drinking may be associated with students who get involved with organizations, even if the organizations are service- or volunteer-based” (Pace & McGrath, p. 228). Although alcohol certainly is a concern for members of fraternities and sororities, it appears that the concern may not be exclusive to members of Greek-letter organizations.

Research regarding the impact of fraternity and sorority membership on students’ academic achievement is mixed. In a study regarding the impact of first-year fraternity or
sorority membership on students' academic performance, DeBard, Lake, and Binder (2006) compared the predicted and actual GPAs of first year students. They found “Greeks who joined during their first semester of college underperformed, while the Greeks who joined in their second semester overperformed as compared to their predicted GPA” (p. 59). In addition, the researchers found Greek men and women were retained from their first year to their second year at more significant rates than non-Greek men and women (DeBard, Lake, & Binder).

Building on a study (Pascarella, Edison, Whitt, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996) which found negative impacts in the cognitive development of students who joined a fraternity or sorority during their first year of college, Pascarella, Flowers, and Whitt (2001) sought to assess the impact of Greek affiliation on students’ cognitive growth beyond their first year of college. The researchers “found the negative effects of fraternity or sorority membership were much less pronounced during the second or third years of college” (Pascarella, Flowers, & Whitt, p. 297). The findings suggest that the demands of joining a fraternity or sorority combined with the adjustment to the academic challenges of college may have a negative impact on students’ cognitive development (Pascarella, Flowers, and Whitt).

Scholars also have examined the impact of Greek affiliation on moral development. In a study involving 190 entering freshmen, Marlowe and Auvenshine (1982) found no significant differences in the development of principled moral reasoning between Greek members and non-members during their freshman year. Kilgannon and Erwin (1992) studied the moral reasoning and identity development of Greek and non-Greek men and women. In the area of identity development, Greek men had lower scores in confidence than Greek women, non-Greek men, and non-Greek women. In regards to moral
development, non-Greek women had a higher principled moral reasoning mean score than did Greek women, non-Greek men, and Greek men. The results of the study suggest, "Greek affiliation may be restricting the development of moral reasoning abilities in both men and women" (Kilgannon & Erwin, p. 257).

In a study comparing the values and attitudes of Greeks to independents (non-Greek students) on one campus, students involved with fraternities and sororities were found to be more dependent on peers and family members than independent students (Baier & Whipple, 1990). In addition, Baier and Whipple found Greek members to be less aware of and concerned about social issues than non-Greeks, though Greek members were found to be more active in campus extracurricular activities than independent students.

Given the amount of research that suggests negative outcomes from membership in a fraternity or sorority, some people may wonder if any positive outcomes exist. In a comparison of fraternity and sorority members to independent students, Baier and Whipple (1990) found fraternity and sorority members to be "much more actively involved in campus extracurricular activities than Independents" (p. 48).

Utilizing data from the National Survey of Student Engagement, Hayek, Carini, O'Day, and Kuh (2002) found members of fraternities and sororities to be "equally and sometimes more engaged in academically challenging tasks, active learning, student-faculty interaction, community service, diversity satisfaction, and on learning and personal development gains" than non-Greek students (p. 643).

In a study of 6,782 undergraduates at fifteen public universities, Pike (2003) found that both first year and senior Greek members reported significantly higher gains in personal development than did students not involved in fraternities or sororities. In addition, Greek members in their senior year of college reported making significantly greater gains in their
academic development than did non-Greek students (Pike). Overall, the results of Pike's study suggested that the positive effects of Greek membership are greater for seniors than for first-year students.

Many fraternities and sororities espouse the development of leadership skills as a benefit of membership. Astin (1993) found membership in a social fraternity or sorority has positive effects on self-reported growth in leadership abilities. In addition, Astin found membership in a social fraternity or sorority has positive effects on self-reported growth in status striving, hedonism, and alcohol consumption, and a negative effect on liberalism.

Posner and Brodsky (1992) administered the Student Leadership Practices Inventory to chapter presidents and executive officers of one national fraternity at 100 campuses. The Student Leadership Practices Inventory was adapted for use with college students from the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 1987) which was developed primarily for leadership development in business and industry. The Student Leadership Practices Inventory rates the effectiveness of leaders in five areas: modeling the way, challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. Posner and Brodsky concluded that effective fraternity presidents differed from less effective fraternity presidents in their use of the five leadership practices measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory.

Posner and Brodsky (1994) expanded their research to look at the differences between fraternity chapter presidents and sorority chapter presidents as measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory. One national fraternity and one national sorority participated in the study. As with their earlier study (Posner & Brodsky, 1992), the researchers found that more effective chapter presidents engaged in the five leadership aspects measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory more frequently than did
less effective chapter presidents. In addition, the researchers found no significant differences between the leadership practices of fraternity presidents and sorority presidents (Posner & Brodsky, 1994).

Utilizing the Student Leadership Practices Inventory and Leadership Effectiveness Survey (Posner & Brodsky, 1992), Adams and Keim (2000) examined the leadership practices of Greek student leaders on three campuses and measured their effectiveness as determined by presidents, executive council members, and general chapter members. On the five leadership aspects measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory, female student leaders averaged higher scores than male student leaders (Adams & Keim), which differs from Posner and Brodsky's (1994) research involving fraternity and sorority chapter presidents which found no significant differences between genders. In regards to leadership effectiveness, the mean scores of women were higher than the mean scores of men (Adams & Keim).

Posner (2004) used a revised version of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory with more than 604 chapter officers of a single national fraternity on more than 200 college campuses, the same national fraternity that was involved in the study that led to the initial development of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Brodsky, 1992). The results of the study indicated that chapter presidents engaged in the five leadership practices (i.e., modeling the way, challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart) more frequently than did other officers (Posner). Differences in the leadership practices of modeling the way, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart were found to be statistically significant (Posner). Posner also found that chapter officers who viewed themselves as more effective reported more
frequent engagement in the five leadership practices than did officers who identified themselves as being less effective.

Kelley (2008) surveyed former chapter presidents of three international fraternities from 105 different colleges and universities to assess the impact of serving as a fraternity chapter president on an individual's leadership development ten years after the experience. A total of 134 participants completed the Student Leadership Practices Inventory and the Leadership Acquisitions Form and “the results of the study showed that respondents perceived having served as a fraternity chapter president did have a positive impact on their leadership skills” (Kelley, p. 5).

In light of research and events that suggest negative outcomes of fraternity and/or sorority membership and cause some to question the value of the fraternity and sorority experience, it is important that leadership development becomes a priority for fraternities and sororities (Roberts & Rogers, 2003). Topics such as alcohol consumption and cognitive development have received much research focus, but there is a scarcity of studies regarding leadership development among fraternity and sorority members (Kao, 2002). A review of research published from Fall 1994 through Summer 2004 in the two major journals of the student affairs profession, the Journal of College Student Development and the NASPA Journal, indicated that fraternities and sororities were underrepresented and leadership development was not identified as a focus in any of the articles (Molasso, 2005).

The research that has been conducted regarding leadership development of fraternity and sorority members (Adams & Keim, 2000; Kelley, 2008; Posner & Brodsky, 1992; 1994) has primarily addressed chapter presidents. Little is known about the leadership development of chapter members who may not necessarily serve in a formal position of leadership. In addition, the previously mentioned studies have primarily utilized
the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Brodsky, 1992). Except for one master’s thesis (Dayton, 2004), studies utilizing the Social Change Model as a theoretical foundation with members of fraternities and/or sororities as the research subjects were not able to be identified by this researcher.

In an effort to help fill this void, this study uses the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as its theoretical foundation. In addition, this study includes various categories of students, including students involved with social fraternities or sororities and other student groups, students involved with student groups that do not include fraternities and sororities, and students not involved with any student groups. This study also looks at the leadership development of fraternity and sorority members beyond chapter presidents or other positional leaders.

**Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership**

Various trends in the area of student leadership development suggest an “institutional, and societal, mandate that calls for institutions of higher education to purposefully develop socially responsible leaders” (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Recognizing the need to better understand the status of college student leadership, a nineteen-member research team consisting of representatives from student affairs and academic affairs was established at the University of Maryland, College Park in the summer of 2005 to conduct the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006).

The purpose of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership was to enhance knowledge regarding the development of college student leadership in an effort to improve the ability of colleges and universities to develop the leadership skills necessary for today’s students (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Komives & Dugan, 2006). In their discussion of the rationale for the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, Komives and Dugan (2006) noted
three overarching problems regarding the scholarship of student leadership development: “a significant gap between theory and practice, an unclear picture of the leadership development needs of college students, and uncertainty regarding the influence of the college environment on leadership development outcomes” (pp. 7-8)

With the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as its theoretical foundation, many of the questions on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument were taken from a revised version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1998). The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale was “designed to measure leadership outcomes across the eight critical values associated with the social change model” (Komives & Dugan, 2006, p. 9). Each of the eight leadership values of the Social Change Model consists of six-to-eleven items on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument.

From more than 150 colleges and universities that indicated interest, 55 institutions of higher education were selected to participate in the study, including the institution in this study (Dugan & Komives, 2007). The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument was administered on-line early in the spring of 2006 and all data were collected via the internet. Survey Sciences Group, a company based in Ann Arbor, Michigan that is focused on social science survey research, provided data management services (Komives & Dugan, 2006). The national sample included approximately 165,000 students and yielded more than 63,000 responses, for a response rate of 37% (Dugan & Komives). Institutions participating in the study received a copy of their institutional data set along with a report that summarized major themes from the national data set (Dugan & Komives).
Summary of Literature Review

Leadership development is an integral aspect of higher education's mission, and opportunities for students to acquire skills and knowledge are spread throughout the academic and co-curricular programs of most colleges and universities (Posner, 2004). Although leadership development has been identified as an important outcome of the college experience, research on the subject remains relatively limited. As Faris (2005) noted, "While scholars have much to say about the importance of leadership development and theory, disproportionately fewer studies examining the approaches and outcomes of student leadership development efforts have been conducted" (p. 2).

The impact of student involvement has received much attention in the literature since Astin first presented his theory of student involvement. Student involvement encompasses a broad range of student experiences and studies addressing the impact of involvement in specific co-curricular experiences or student groups are limited. Although leadership development has been studied as an outcome of student involvement, the research remains relatively limited given that few instruments have been developed for use with college student populations. Although the Social Change Model of Leadership Development was created specifically for college students, few researchers have used it as a theoretical foundation in their studies.

Although members of fraternities and sororities have been the subject of much research, studies in the area of leadership development have focused primarily on members in positions of leadership (e.g. chapter presidents) with little known about the leadership development outcomes of general members. In addition, studies regarding the Greek experience often compare only fraternity and sorority members to non-members with few
comparisons made between fraternity and sorority members and students involved in other student groups.

Various voids in the literature have been noted. This study contributes to the literature by providing additional research in areas in which gaps in the literature were identified. Specifically, this study utilizes the Social Change Model as its theoretical foundation and the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument to measure leadership development across the eight leadership values of the Social Change Model. Differences in leadership development between students involved in fraternities or sororities, students involved in student groups that do not include fraternities or sororities, and students not involved in student groups are compared.

This chapter has presented a review of the literature associated with leadership theory development, with particular attention paid to various leadership theories within the industrial paradigm and postindustrial paradigm. The development of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development has been reviewed and an overview of each of the eight leadership values addressed within the model has been provided. In addition, a review of the literature regarding the outcomes of co-curricular involvement including Astin's theory of student involvement has been provided. Within the area of co-curricular involvement, fraternity and sorority involvement has been highlighted, including an analysis of research concerning the various outcomes of involvement in fraternities and sororities. Finally, a review of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership was presented.

The next chapter presents a review of the methodology for this study including the design of the study, the population of the study, the instrument used, data collection methods, and methods of data analysis.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The basic research question was: Were there significant differences between student scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument by student involvement or lack of involvement in various student groups?

The four categories of students created are listed below:

1. Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups (student groups);

2. Students involved with three or more categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities;

3. Students involved with one or two categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities; and

4. Students not involved in any student/extracurricular groups (student groups).

In addition, the responses were analyzed based on the gender and the class levels of the respondents in each of the groups.

The specific constructs or values of leadership development analyzed are addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). These values are: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change.
Population

The population for this study consisted of undergraduate students enrolled at one midwestern public university. The institution enrolls approximately 10,400 undergraduate students and 2,500 graduate students and offers degrees in more than 190 fields of study from the baccalaureate through doctoral and professional degrees.

The sample consisted of 3,237 students who were selected to participate in the study. Students were selected through random sampling that was facilitated by the institution’s Department of Institutional Research. A total of 898 students, 388 males and 510 females, completed the on-line survey.

Instrumentation

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument was developed by a team of researchers at the University of Maryland, College Park. Many of the questions asked on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument were taken from a revised version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1998). The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale was “designed to measure leadership outcomes across the eight critical values associated with the social change model” (Komives & Dugan, 2006, p. 9). The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale contains 103 items to which participants respond using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership research team used a revised version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Appel-Silbaugh, 2005) consisting of 83 items in a pilot test (Komives & Dugan). Examination of data from the pilot test led to a further revision resulting in a 68-item version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Dugan, 2006c). This is the version that was used for the current study.
Each leadership value or construct consists of six-to-eleven items on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. Negative items were reverse scored. Table 2 provides selected sample items for each leadership development construct.

Table 2. Selected Sample Items on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Selected Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Consciousness of Self | I am able to articulate my priorities.  
                        | I could describe my personality.  
                        | I am comfortable expressing myself.  |
| Congruence         | My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs.  
                        | My actions are consistent with my values.  
                        | It is easy for me to be truthful.  |
| Commitment         | I stick with others through the difficult times.  
                        | I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to.  
                        | I can be counted on to do my part.  |
| Collaboration      | I am seen as someone who works well with others.  
                        | I am able to trust the people with whom I work.  
                        | I enjoy working with others toward common goals.  |
| Common Purpose     | I have helped to shape the mission of the group.  
                        | I work well when I know the collective values of a group.  
                        | I know the purpose of the group to which I belong.  |
| Controversy with Civility | Creativity can come from conflict.    
                        | I respect opinions other than my own.  
                        | I share my ideas with others.  |
| Citizenship        | I work with others to make my communities better places.  
                        | I participate in activities that contribute to the common good.  
                        | I believe I have responsibilities to my community.  |
| Change             | There is energy in doing something a new way.  
                        | I am open to new ideas.  
                        | I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking at things.  |


Table 3 provides the internal reliability for each of the eight constructs as reported in the *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership: University of North Dakota Final Report*.

(Komives & Dugan, 2006)
Table 3. Internal Reliability for Each of the Eight Constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Data Collection

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument was administered on-line and all data were collected via the internet. Survey Sciences Group, a company based in Ann Arbor, Michigan that is focused on social science survey research, provided data management services. Randomly selected students received an email through their university email address inviting them to participate in a national study regarding leadership development in college. The email provided details for students regarding their participation and indicated participants would be entered automatically into a drawing for numerous prizes such as free movie tickets. Additional details included the approximate length of time to complete the survey, an assurance of confidentiality, and a guarantee that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time. The email also directed students to a website and provided them with a unique, randomly assigned identification number. When students went to the website, they were prompted to enter their unique identification number. The identification number was used to separate students from their email address in order to protect the confidentiality of the respondents. Upon beginning the survey, the students were asked to consent to participating in the survey. The survey took
approximately twenty minutes to complete. If randomly selected participants had not responded, they were sent up to three reminder emails requesting their participation in the survey (Komives & Dugan, 2006).

**Data Analysis**

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The basic research question was: Were there significant differences between student scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument by student involvement or lack of involvement in various student groups?

The four categories of students created are listed below:

1. Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups (student groups);
2. Students involved with three or more categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities;
3. Students involved with one or two categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities; and
4. Students not involved in any student/extracurricular groups (student groups).

In addition, the responses were analyzed based on the gender and the class level of the respondents in each of the groups.

The specific constructs or values of leadership development analyzed are addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996) and measured by a revised version of the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1998). These values
are: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change.

The conceptual framework for the analysis of the MSL instrument mean scores as reported by each of the values and the group memberships of the respondents is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of the MSL Instrument Mean Scores Reported by Values and Group Memberships of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek(^a)</th>
<th>3+(^b)</th>
<th>1-2(^c)</th>
<th>None(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups.

\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^d\) Students not involved with any student/extracurricular groups.
The conceptual framework for the analysis of the M5L instrument mean scores as reported by each of the values, group memberships, and gender of the respondents is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of the MSL Instrument Mean Scores Reported by Values, Group Memberships, and Gender of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Greek\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>3+\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>1-2\textsuperscript{c}</th>
<th>None\textsuperscript{d}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups.

\textsuperscript{b} Students involved with 3 or more categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\textsuperscript{c} Students involved with 1-2 categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\textsuperscript{d} Students not involved with any student/extracurricular groups.

The conceptual framework for the analysis of the MSL instrument mean scores as reported by each of the values, the class levels, and the group memberships of the respondents is shown in Table 6.
Table 6. Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of the MSL Instrument Mean Scores Reported by Values, Class Levels, and Group Memberships of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Greek(^a)</th>
<th>3+(^b)</th>
<th>1-2(^c)</th>
<th>None(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>First Year/Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups.

\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student/extracurricular groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^d\) Students not involved with any student/extracurricular groups.

Summary

This chapter explained the specific statistical methods used to analyze data in this quantitative study. Data were compiled via the internet and were analyzed using SPSS version 15 software. The results of the analyses are presented and discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV
REPORT ON ANALYSES OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The basic research question was: Were there significant differences between student scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument by student involvement or lack of involvement in various student groups?

The four categories of students created are listed below:

1. Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student/extracurricular groups (student groups);
2. Students involved with three or more categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities;
3. Students involved with one or two categories of student/extracurricular groups (student groups), but not with any social fraternities or sororities; and
4. Students not involved in any student/extracurricular groups (student groups).

In addition, the responses were analyzed based on the gender and the class level of the respondents in each of the groups.

The specific constructs or values of leadership development are addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). These values are:
In this chapter, the results of the analyses of one institution's data from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument pertaining to the purpose of this study and the basic research questions are reported. The computer program SPSS version 15 was the principal tool used to calculate the statistical results.

Participant Characteristics

The sample for this study consisted of 3,237 undergraduate students at one midwestern public university. Students were selected through random sampling that was facilitated by the institution's Department of Institutional Research. A total of 898 students, 388 males and 510 females, completed the on-line survey resulting in a 27.7% response rate.

Prior to running statistical tests, the researcher eliminated the responses from 112 participants. Thirty-one participants were removed as they self-identified their enrollment status as less than full-time. Since the focus of this study was on undergraduate students, an additional 62 students over the age of 24 were eliminated. The age range of the eliminated students was 25-48, and this researcher determined that their non-traditional ages provided life experiences dissimilar to traditional-aged undergraduate students. Four students were removed as they marked "other" to identify their class standing. Given that class standing was an independent variable of this study, only participants who identified as first year/freshmen, sophomores, juniors, or seniors were included. Two students were eliminated as they did not respond to the specific questions on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument used to measure the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. An additional 13 students were eliminated because they had too many
missing responses to the questions used to measure the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Following the elimination of outliers, a total of 786 valid participants remained. The valid participants consisted of 330 males and 456 females.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher created four categories of students based on students' levels of involvement within several student groups. The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument included 21 categories of student groups and study participants were instructed to select all categories of student groups in which they had been involved during college. The first category of students consisted of students who had been involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups. The total number of students who indicated that they had been members of a fraternity or sorority and at least one other category of student groups was 131. The second category of students, highly involved students or students who had been involved with three or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities, consisted of 309 students. The third category of students, moderately involved students or students who had been involved in one or two categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities, consisted of 243 students. The fourth category consisted of students who had not been involved with any student groups. The number of students who indicated they had not been involved in any student groups was 103.

The researcher also categorized students by their self-reported class level. The total number of first year/freshmen was 199, sophomores 168, juniors 189, and seniors 230.

Results of the Analyses

The basic research question guiding this study was: Were there significant differences between student scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument by student involvement or lack of involvement in various student groups? In
addition, the responses were analyzed on the basis of the gender and the class levels of the respondents in each of the groups. The report of the data is broken into three sections: (1) differences by level of involvement, (2) differences by gender, and (3) differences by class level.

Differences by Level of Involvement

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine differences by levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. MANOVA results by levels of involvement revealed overall significant differences among the mean scores on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, Wilks’ $\Lambda = .903$, $F(24, 2,237) = 3.34$, $p < .001$. Table 7 provides mean scores and analysis of variance (ANOVA) results by levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

The pairwise Bonferroni post hoc analysis for significant ANOVA comparisons between each level of involvement revealed significant differences between students of certain involvement levels. Table 8 presents results from the pairwise Bonferroni post hoc analysis. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of students involved with social fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of students involved with three or more categories of student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The mean scores of students involved with social fraternities and sororities were significantly higher than the mean scores of students involved with one or two categories of student groups on the values of commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change. Students involved with social fraternities and sororities had significantly higher mean scores than students not involved with any student groups on the values of consciousness of self, commitment, collaboration,
Table 7. Mean Scores and ANOVA Results by Levels of Student Involvement on the Eight Values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 131)</th>
<th>3+&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 309)</th>
<th>1-2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 243)</th>
<th>None&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 103)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

<sup>b</sup> Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

<sup>c</sup> Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

<sup>d</sup> Students not involved with any student groups.

common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change. Students involved with three or more categories of student groups had significantly higher mean scores than students involved with one or two categories of student groups on the values of congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship. Students involved with three or more categories of student groups had significantly higher mean scores than students not involved with any student groups on all
eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of students involved with one or two categories of student groups and the mean scores of students not involved with any student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

Table 8. Pairwise Bonferroni’s Post Hoc Test Results for Significant ANOVA Comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek (^a) - 3(^b)</th>
<th>Greek (^a) - 1-2(^c)</th>
<th>Greek (^a) - none(^d)</th>
<th>3(^b) - 1-2(^c)</th>
<th>3(^b) - none(^d)</th>
<th>1-2(^c) - none(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^d\) Students not involved with any student groups.

Differences by Gender

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine differences by gender on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. MANOVA results by gender revealed overall significant differences between males and females on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, Wilks’ \(\Lambda =.973\), \(F(8, 771) = 2.70\), \(p=.006\). Table 9 provides mean scores and ANOVA results by gender on the eight values of...
the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Analyses of the differences by each of
the eight values indicated that the mean scores of females were significantly higher than
the mean scores of males on the values of collaboration, common purpose, and controversy
with civility.

Table 9. Mean Scores and ANOVA Results by Gender on the Eight Values of the
Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Male (n = 330)</th>
<th>Female (n = 456)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine significant interactions between
gender and levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of
Leadership Development. Results for the interactions revealed no significant interactions
overall between gender and levels of involvement on the eight values of the Social Change
Model of Leadership Development, Wilks' $\Lambda$=.959, $F(24, 2,237) = 1.36$, $p=.114$. However,
the interaction between gender and level of involvement was significant on collaboration.
Table 10 provides mean scores and MANOVA results by levels of involvement and gender on
the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.
Table 10. Mean Scores and MANOVA Results by Levels of Student Involvement and Gender on the Eight Values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greeka</th>
<th>3+b</th>
<th>1-2c</th>
<th>Noned</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.
b Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.
c Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.
d Students not involved with any student groups.

Differences by Class Level Analyses on the basis of the class levels of the respondents in each of the groups were conducted separately for each of the following class levels: first year/freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior.

First Year/Freshman. A MANOVA was conducted to determine differences by levels of first year/freshman student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. MANOVA results by levels of involvement revealed overall significant differences among the mean scores of first year/freshman students on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, Wilks' $\Lambda = .819$, $F(24, 546) = 1.62$, $p = .033$. Table 11 provides first year/freshman mean scores and ANOVA results by
levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

The pairwise Bonferroni post hoc analysis for significant ANOVA comparisons between each level of involvement revealed significant differences between first year/freshman students of certain involvement levels. Table 12 presents results from the pairwise Bonferroni post hoc analysis. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with social fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with three or more categories of student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with social fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with one or two categories of student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with social fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of first year/freshman students not involved with any categories of student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. First year/freshman students involved with three or more categories of student groups had significantly higher mean scores than first year/freshman students involved with one or two categories of student groups on the value of controversy with civility. First year/freshman students involved with three or more categories of student groups had significantly higher mean scores than first year/freshman students not involved with any student groups on the values of commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with one or
two categories of student groups and the mean scores of first year/freshman students not involved with any student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

Table 11. First Year/Freshman Mean Scores and ANOVA Results by Levels of Student Involvement on the Eight Values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek(^a) (n = 29)</th>
<th>3+(^b) (n = 50)</th>
<th>1-2(^c) (n = 73)</th>
<th>None(^d) (n = 47)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^d\) Students not involved with any student groups.

**Sophomores.** A MANOVA was conducted to determine differences by levels of sophomore student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. MANOVA results by levels of involvement revealed no significant differences overall among the mean scores of sophomore students on the eight values of
Table 12. Pairwise Bonferroni's Post Hoc Test for Significant ANOVA Comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek(^a) - 3(^b)</th>
<th>Greek(^a) - 1-2(^c)</th>
<th>Greek(^a) - none(^d)</th>
<th>3(^b) - 1-2(^c)</th>
<th>3(^b) - none(^d)</th>
<th>1-2(^c) - none(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^d\) Students not involved with any student groups.

the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, Wilks' \(\Lambda = .862\), \(F(24, 456) = 1.00, \ p = .471\). However, the difference on the value of citizenship was significant. Table 13 provides sophomore mean scores and ANOVA results by levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.
Table 13. Sophomore Mean Scores and ANOVA Results by Levels of Student Involvement on the Eight Values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek $^a$ $(n = 32)$</th>
<th>3+ $^b$ $(n = 59)$</th>
<th>1-2 $^c$ $(n = 58)$</th>
<th>None $^d$ $(n = 19)$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

$^b$ Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

$^c$ Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

$^d$ Students not involved with any student groups.

Juniors. A MANOVA was conducted to determine differences by levels of junior student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. MANOVA results by levels of involvement revealed no significant differences overall among the mean scores of junior students on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, Wilks' $\Lambda = .841, F(24, 517) = 1.33, p = .138$. However, the differences on the values of consciousness of self, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship were significant. Table 14 provides junior mean
scores and ANOVA results by levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

Table 14. Junior Mean Scores and ANOVA Results by Levels of Student Involvement on the Eight Values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 31)</th>
<th>3+&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 77)</th>
<th>1-2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 60)</th>
<th>None&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 21)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

<sup>b</sup> Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

<sup>c</sup> Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

<sup>d</sup> Students not involved with any student groups.

**Seniors.** A MANOVA was conducted to determine differences by levels of senior student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. MANOVA results by levels of involvement revealed overall significant differences among the mean scores of senior students on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, Wilks’ Λ = .815, \( F(24, 636) = 1.94, p = .005 \). Table
15 provides senior mean scores and ANOVA results by levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

Table 15. Senior Mean Scores and ANOVA Results by Levels of Student Involvement on the Eight Values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek(^a) (n = 39)</th>
<th>3+(^b) (n = 123)</th>
<th>1-2(^c) (n = 52)</th>
<th>None(^d) (n = 16)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.
\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.
\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.
\(^d\) Students not involved with any student groups.

The pairwise Bonferroni post hoc analysis for significant ANOVA comparisons between each level of involvement revealed significant differences between senior students of certain involvement levels. Table 16 presents results from the pairwise Bonferroni post hoc analysis. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of senior students involved with social fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of senior students involved with three or more categories of student groups on any of the eight values.
values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The mean scores of senior students involved with social fraternities and sororities were significantly higher than the mean scores of senior students involved with one or two categories of student groups on the values of consciousness of self, commitment, collaboration, common purpose,

Table 16. Pairwise Bonferroni's Post Hoc Test for Significant ANOVA Comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Greek(^a) - 3+</th>
<th>Greek(^a) - 1-2</th>
<th>Greek(^a) - none</th>
<th>3+ b - 1-2</th>
<th>3+ b - none</th>
<th>1-2 c - none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Students involved with social fraternities or sororities and at least one other category of student groups.

\(^b\) Students involved with 3 or more categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^c\) Students involved with 1-2 categories of student groups but not with any social fraternities or sororities.

\(^d\) Students not involved with any student groups.

controversy with civility, and citizenship. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of senior students involved with social fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of senior students not involved with any student groups on any of the eight values. Senior students involved with three or more categories of student groups had significantly higher mean scores than senior students involved with one or two categories of student groups on the values of commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with
civility, and citizenship. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of senior students involved with three or more categories of student groups and the mean scores of senior students not involved with any student groups on any of the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The mean score of senior students involved with one or two categories of student groups was significantly lower than the mean score of senior students not involved with any student groups on the value of citizenship. These results should be considered with caution given the smaller sizes of the samples for senior students involved with social fraternities and sororities and senior students involved with one or two categories of student groups.

Summary

A report on the analyses of the data pertaining to the research questions of this study was presented in this chapter. A summary and discussion of the findings of this study are provided in Chapter V. Included in Chapter V is a discussion of limitations regarding this study as well as recommendations for researchers and practitioners.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the researcher presents a summary of the literature, procedures, and findings related to this study. In addition, the researcher addresses various limitations of the study and makes recommendations for practitioners and researchers based on the results of the study.

Summary and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. The specific constructs or values of leadership development analyzed in this study are addressed in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). These values are: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship, and change.

Literature

The literature review presented in Chapter II provided an overview of the research and literature related to the topic of leadership theory development and student involvement. Research findings regarding the outcomes of both co-curricular involvement and fraternity and sorority involvement were discussed. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development was addressed in detail along with the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale and Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. The literature review provided a foundation and context for understanding the current study.
Although leadership development is a priority for most institutions of higher education and literature on the topic of leadership is abundant, the number of studies regarding student leadership development is lacking and student leadership development has yet to become a distinct research field (Komives & Schoper, 2005; Posner, 2004). Contributing to the lack of research regarding student leadership development is a scarcity of leadership models and instruments designed specifically for college students. Most leadership development instruments are designed in and for the business industry (Snyder-Nepo, 1993). The Social Change Model of Leadership Development was designed for undergraduate college students “to emphasize clarification of values, the development of self-awareness, trust, and the capacity to listen and serve others, and through collaborative work to bring about change for the common good” (HERI, 1996, p. 11).

The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale instrument was developed to measure the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Tyree, 1998). Specifically, the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale instrument measures the process of leadership development defined by the eight leadership values of the Social Change Model.

Studies focusing on the leadership development of students have addressed students involved with specific programs or organizations (Chebator, 1995; Cress et al., 2001; Dayton, 2004; Dugan, 2006b; Wilson, 1999), individuals pre-identified as leaders or serving in leadership positions (Logue, Hutchens, & Hector, 2005; White, 1998), or students of a specific gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation (Dugan, 2006a; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005).

Although the Social Change Model of Leadership Development was created specifically for college students, few researchers have used it as a theoretical foundation in their studies (Haber, 2006). With the exception of doctoral dissertations (Faris, 2005; Rubin,
2000; Stenta, 2001; Tyree, 1998), master's theses (Dayton, 2004; Haber, 2006) and two articles (Dugan 2006a, 2006b), little identifiable research exists using the Social Change Model or the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale.

There also is a lack of research regarding leadership development of fraternity and sorority members (Kao, 2002). A review of research published from Fall 1994 through Summer 2004 in the two major journals of the student affairs profession, the *Journal of College Student Development* and the *NASPA Journal*, indicated that fraternities and sororities were underrepresented and leadership development of fraternity and sorority members was not identified as a focus in any of the articles (Molasso, 2005). The research that has been conducted regarding leadership development of fraternity and sorority members (Adams & Keim, 2000; Kelley, 2008; Posner, 2004; Posner & Brodsky, 1992; 1994) primarily has addressed chapter presidents. Little is known about the leadership development of chapter members who may not necessarily serve in formal leadership positions.

Studies regarding the Greek experience often compare fraternity and sorority members solely to non-members with few comparisons made between fraternity and sorority members and members of other student groups. In addition, the previously mentioned studies regarding leadership development among fraternity and sorority members primarily have utilized the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Brodsky, 1992). Except for one master's thesis (Dayton, 2004), studies utilizing the Social Change Model as a theoretical foundation with members of fraternities and/or sororities as the research subjects were not able to be identified by this researcher.

Faris (2005) noted, "While scholars have much to say about the importance of leadership development and theory, disproportionately fewer studies examining the
approaches and outcomes of student leadership development efforts have been conducted” (p. 2). This study sought to help fill various voids in the research. Specifically, this study utilized the Social Change Model as its theoretical foundation. Differences in leadership development between students involved with fraternities or sororities, students involved with student groups that do not include fraternities or sororities, and students not involved with any student groups were compared.

Procedures

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument was administered on-line from January to March 2006 to a random sample of undergraduate students enrolled at one midwestern public university. The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument included 68 items from the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale, which was designed to measure the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Komives & Dugan, 2006; Tyree, 1998). Participants responded to the questions using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Students’ mean scores on the eight leadership values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development were compared by students’ levels of involvement, gender, and class level. The computer program SPSS version 15 was the principal tool used to calculate the statistical results.

Findings

A review of the data showed consistency in the rank order of the mean scores of the values from highest to lowest as follows: (1) commitment, (2) congruence, (3) common purpose, (4) collaboration, (5) consciousness of self, (6) citizenship, (7) controversy with civility, and (8) change. The rank order of the mean scores of each of the values remained
relatively consistent across the different levels of analyses and at the various levels of involvement within each level of analysis.

It is interesting that consciousness of self consistently had the fifth highest mean score. Although each value is an independent construct, consciousness of self is the foundation of the Social Change Model as it is the value through which the other values can be realized. Consciousness of self suggests that students must first have a realistic understanding of themselves and their personal beliefs and attitudes in order to evolve as leaders. One might assume that students would have higher mean scores or be more accomplished on the value of consciousness of self than on values such as commitment and congruence because students must first understand their personal beliefs before they can commit to them or act in congruence with them.

Additional findings are summarized in the following three sections based on the specific focus of the data analyses.

Level of involvement. MANOVA results indicated overall significant differences in students’ mean scores by levels of student involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Bonferroni’s post hoc test results revealed significant differences between students of certain involvement levels. The mean scores of students involved with fraternities and sororities and students involved with three or more categories of student groups were significantly higher than the mean scores of students not involved with any student groups.

These findings support Astin’s (1985) theory of student involvement and other research findings regarding the impact of student involvement on leadership development (Astin, 1993, Dugan, 2006b; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000). As Astin and Astin (2000) noted, “Co-curricular experiences not only support and augment the students’ formal classroom and
Curricular experience, but can also create powerful learning opportunities for leadership development through collaborative group projects that serve the institution or the community” (p. 3).

**Gender.** MANOVA results by gender indicated significant differences overall in students' mean scores by gender on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The mean scores of females were significantly higher than the mean scores of males on the values of collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility. There were no significant differences on the remaining five values.

In one of the first empirical studies to use the Social Change Model as a theoretical framework, Dugan (2006a) compared differences between male and female students across the eight values of the Social Change Model. Similar to the results of this study, that study indicated overall significant differences between the mean scores of males and females. In addition, Dugan's study revealed that the mean scores of females were significantly higher than the mean scores of males on six of the eight values with no statistical significance on the values of collaboration and controversy with civility. It is interesting that the overall results of this study and Dugan’s study were similar, but a review of statistical significance by each individual value in this study and in Dugan’s study produced nearly opposite results.

Further data analyses suggested no significant interactions overall between genders and levels of involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Collaboration was the only value in which the interaction was significant.

**Class level.** Data analyses suggested significant differences in overall first year/freshman and senior students' mean scores by levels of involvement on the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The overall differences in sophomore and junior students’ mean scores were not significant.
In their study, Pascarella, Flowers, and Whitt (2001) examined the impact of Greek affiliation on students' cognitive growth beyond their first year of college. While negative effects of membership in a fraternity or sorority were noted regarding the cognitive development of freshmen students, the researchers “found the negative effects of fraternity or sorority membership were much less pronounced during the second or third years of college” (Pascarella, Flowers, & Whitt, p. 297). The findings of this current study were similar. As Pascarella, Flowers, and Whitt noted in their study, the demands of joining a fraternity or sorority combined with the adjustment to the academic rigor and environment of higher education may have a negative impact on the cognitive development of freshmen, but over time the negative effects are less pronounced. The results of this study suggested similar findings in the area of leadership development.

Further analyses of mean scores across class levels and by level of involvement showed that in most instances, mean scores increased from first year/freshman to seniors. The increase in mean scores over class levels is to be expected given students' development and growth over time.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in leadership development among various levels of student involvement within several student groups as measured by self-reported scores on the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument. Data analyses suggested that there are differences among various levels of student involvement and that the differences are significant in some instances.

The results of this study indicated that involvement in student groups, including fraternities and sororities, has a positive impact on students' leadership development. The mean scores of involved students consistently were significantly higher than the mean
scores of students not involved in any student groups. If the development of students as leaders is a priority for colleges and universities, then institutions should be intentional in their efforts to encourage students to become involved in campus student groups.

Students often are encouraged to seek leadership positions as a means of acquiring leadership skills. The results of this study suggested membership in various student groups has a positive impact on students' leadership development. This finding suggests that students may not need to serve in positional leadership roles in order to develop as leaders. In addition, students' leadership development is impacted by involvement in numerous categories of student groups such that students with diverse interests can find groups in which to become involved and to develop as leaders.

Fraternity and sorority members often recruit first year/freshman students on the premise that involvement in their organizations will have a positive impact on students' leadership development. Analyses of the data in this study suggested that there are no significant differences between the mean scores of first year/freshman students involved with fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of first year/freshman students of other involvement levels. This may suggest that the leadership development experiences of first year/freshman fraternity and sorority members are not dissimilar from the leadership development experiences of first year/freshman members of other student groups. The results of this study suggested that the leadership development experiences of first year/freshman members of fraternities and sororities warrant attention. Efforts should be made to engage first year/freshman members of fraternities and sororities in activities and experiences that will contribute positively to their leadership development.

Unlike members of most student groups, members of fraternities and sororities often are expected to engage in structured membership and leadership development programs.
that are designed by professional staff members. In addition, because of their organizational structure, most fraternities and sororities offer more opportunities than other student groups for their members to serve in leadership positions. Given the variety of opportunities available to most members of fraternities and sororities to learn about and engage in leadership activities, one might anticipate significant differences between the mean scores of members of fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of members of other student groups. The results of this study indicated that there were no significant differences between the mean scores of students involved with fraternities and sororities and the mean scores of students involved with three or more student groups overall or at any class level. Although fraternities and sororities may offer structured leadership development programs and experiences for their members, students involved in three or more student groups are able to engage in activities and experiences that contribute to their leadership development in ways that are not significantly different than students involved in fraternities and sororities.

The rank order of the mean scores of the eight values of the Social Change Model suggests areas in which students may need assistance in their leadership development. For example, the mean scores on the value of consciousness of self consistently ranked fifth among the eight values across the different levels of analyses and at the various levels of involvement within each level of analysis. This finding suggests a need for programs and activities that provide opportunities for students to explore further and to understand better their values, beliefs, and attitudes.

Overall the mean scores of the values associated with the group perspective (collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility) consistently ranked below the mean scores of the values associated with the individual perspective (consciousness of
self, congruence, and commitment). This finding indicates a need for students to have more opportunities to engage with others in group tasks and activities that provide them with experiences to develop skills associated with the values of the group perspective.

Females overall had significantly higher mean scores than males on the values of collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility. Deliberate efforts should be made to assist male students in their development as leaders. Programming initiatives and activities which address the values of the Social Change Model should provide male students the opportunity to connect with and to dialogue with their male peers regarding their development as leaders. Female students should be encouraged to continue to participate in organizations and activities that provide them opportunities to develop further as leaders.

Except for one value, there were no significant differences between the mean scores of senior students not involved in any student groups and the mean scores of students at any of the other three levels of involvement. A better understanding of students' cumulative college experiences beyond involvement in student groups is needed to further understand why senior students not involved in any student groups had a significantly higher mean score on the value of citizenship than students involved with one or two categories of student groups.

This study adds to the literature and research regarding students' leadership development. Additional studies are needed using the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as a theoretical foundation. A better understanding also is needed of the differences in students' leadership development based on involvement in specific categories of student groups. Research should continue to explore the impact of environmental factors, such as involvement in student groups, on students' leadership development.
Limitations

As is the case with most studies, consideration should be given to a variety of limitations associated with this study. The data used in this study was gathered at one institution and as such the results may not be applicable to students at other colleges or universities. The fact that the results of this study and the study conducted by Dugan (2006a) produced different results regarding the significant differences between males and females on specific values indicates a need for additional research.

The data analyzed in this study were generated from students’ self-reported responses to questions. In completing the instrument, students were instructed to select from a list of 21 categories of student groups all the categories of student groups in which they had been involved during college. It is possible that students may have forgotten a group in which they had participated and as such failed to select a category that was applicable to their college involvement. Students also may have failed to select a category of student groups because they did not interpret any category listed to be applicable to a particular organization in which they had been involved and “other” was not included as a possible response for them to select. Failing to select a category of student groups that was appropriate based on their involvement during college may have impacted the level of involvement in which students’ responses were analyzed.

In this study the researcher examined the number of categories of student groups in which students had been involved during college but not the number of student groups or organizations in which students had been involved during college. For example, one of the 21 categories of student groups listed was “Sports – Leisure or Intramural (ex: Intramural flag football, Rock Climbing)” (Komives & Dugan, 2006, p. 97). It is possible that students who selected this category had participated in numerous intramural teams during college,
but the category could be selected only once. Attempts to apply the data in this study to questions regarding students’ breadth of involvement are limited as students may have been involved in numerous organizations within any single category of student groups, but this study included only categories of student groups and not individual student groups.

The time of the school year at which the study was administered is another limitation that should be considered. Students were able to respond to the on-line instrument during a six-week period from January to March 2006. First year/freshman students’ responses were based primarily on a single semester of involvement on campus, especially if they responded to the instrument in January rather than in March. It is possible that individuals’ responses may have changed between January and March based on additional involvement experiences.

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership instrument was administered on-line only and all data were collected via the internet. Randomly selected students received an email through their university email address inviting them to participate in a national study regarding leadership development in college. It is possible that students did not utilize or check their university email account during the time period that the survey was administered and as such were not aware that they had been invited to participate in the study. Other data collection methods may have yielded a higher response rate.

This researcher used the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as the theoretical foundation to define and interpret student leadership development. The Social Change Model is one theoretical model or approach to leadership development but it is possible that a different theoretical model may have produced different results.
Recommendations

The researcher makes the following recommendations based on the review of the literature and the results of this study.

Recommendations for Practitioners

Colleges and universities should continue to encourage students to become involved in student groups and organizations. Students learn through involvement (Astin, 1975). The results of this study suggested that students develop as leaders through involvement in student groups as students involved with at least one category of student groups consistently had significantly higher mean scores than students not involved in any student groups.

If institutions of higher education are committed to the development of students as leaders, they should identify a leadership development model to serve as a common foundation in creating programs, developing curriculum, and providing educational experiences for students. By identifying a single leadership development model, staff and faculty can create complementary learning experiences for students in and out of the classroom.

Intentional efforts should be made to educate faculty and staff members who serve as advisors to student organizations on student leadership development theory. Faculty and staff advisors engage with student organization members on a regular basis and as such need to be aware of the theories and research relative to their work with students and student groups. In addition, faculty and staff advisors should be intentional in helping students make meaning of the leadership development that results from their involvement in various student groups.
Low mean scores on certain values suggest areas in which practitioners should be intentional in working with students. For example, change consistently had one of the lowest mean scores at each level of analyses and for each level of involvement. Consistently low mean scores may indicate the need for practitioners to be more active in facilitating opportunities for students to make change and in discussing with students their potential to create change in their communities. In addition, the overall lower mean scores of males may indicate a need for practitioners to be intentional in engaging with males regarding their leadership development.

Recommendations for Researchers

In this study the researcher sought to add to the literature regarding college students’ leadership development. A plethora of questions and opportunities to add to the research on students’ leadership development remain.

This study examined the involvement of students during only college and did not consider the impact of students’ pre-college involvement. It is possible that students who are actively involved in their schools and communities before they begin college are pre-disposed to be leaders in college such that their levels of involvement in college are not as significant to their leadership development as is their pre-college involvement. Further research should examine the differences in leadership development among students based on their pre-college involvement experiences.

Student involvement in various categories of student groups was the only environmental factor or experience considered in this study. Further research should examine different experiences or environmental factors such as employment on-campus or off-campus, location of residence, enrollment in leadership courses, or participation in leadership training experiences and their impact on students’ leadership development.
In this study students involved with fraternities and sororities were classified as one level of involvement. Further research should explore the levels of involvement of fraternity and sorority members. It is possible that there are significant differences within the category of students involved with fraternities and sororities based on the number of other categories of student groups in which students have been involved.

In addition, further research should explore the impact of membership in a fraternity or sorority compared to the impact of membership in other student organizations or groups. Identifying the differences between membership in a fraternity or sorority and membership in other student groups is challenging because fraternity and sorority members often are involved in organizations beyond just their fraternities or sororities and distinguishing the unique outcomes of each involvement experience is difficult.

This study suggested that involvement has a positive impact on students' leadership development, but additional research is needed regarding the specific organizations or categories of student groups in which students are involved. This study looked at the differences in leadership development based on students' levels of involvement with various categories of student groups, but beyond social fraternities or sororities this study did not compare differences between categories of student groups. It is possible that there are significant differences between students involved in student governance groups and other groups such as honor societies.

Further research should examine the leadership development differences between students who are members of student groups and students who serve positional leadership roles within student groups. This study did not distinguish between members of student groups and positional leaders of student groups. The leadership development differences
between members and positional leaders of the same organization or category of student groups are not known.

This study adds to the literature regarding the leadership development of college students. However, although it offers insight into the impact of student involvement on students' leadership development, additional questions remain and further research is needed. It appears that the suggestion by James MacGregor Burns in 1978 that "leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 2) still holds true today.
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