Fall 12-2016

Leadership Development Among Fraternity Presidents: Can Leadership Be Learned?

Joseph Rosenberg

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AMONG FRATERNITY PRESIDENTS: CAN LEADERSHIP BE LEARNED?

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Joseph Rosenberg

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2016

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Professional Studies in Education

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Joseph Rosenberg

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

_____ _____
David Piper, D.Ed.
Professor of Employment and Labor Relations,
Advisor

_____ _____
Kelli Paquette, Ed.D.
Professor of Professional Studies in Education

_____ _____
Mark Twiest, Ph.D.
Professor of Professional Studies in Education

ACCEPTED

_____ _____
Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Leadership Development Among Fraternity Presidents: Can Leadership Be Learned?

Author: Joseph Rosenberg

Dissertation Chair: Dr. David Piper

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Kelli Paquette
Dr. Mark Twiest

There is an absence of research examining the relationship between the experiences that occurred while holding formal student leadership positions and leadership identity development. This study will investigate if leadership can be learned through the lenses of the leadership experience of men who hold the formal student leadership position of chapter president within their local chapters of their national social fraternal organization. The design of the study is quantitative in nature and will utilize an electronic survey to examine the impact of a college student's leadership identity development from holding a position of leadership within a student organization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I would like to acknowledge my parents Joseph W. Rosenberg and Roseann M. Rosenberg for all of their support. It was due to their hard work and parenting that provided me the environment and opportunities to take on this journey of obtaining my doctorate.

I would like to thank and acknowledge the following National Fraternal Organizations who participated in this study: Alpha Epsilon Pi; Alpha Kappa Lambda; Farmhouse; Kappa Alpha Order; Kappa Delta Rho; Pi Kappa Phi; and Theta Xi.

In this study I discuss the importance of peer to peer interactions. I have been very blessed to have a close group of peers throughout my life and this journey to obtaining my doctorate. At times they have picked me up when I was down, grieved with me when I buried my father, celebrated the joy of the birth of both sons, and been on the other side of the phone or computer screen when I need to talk to someone. Thank you to Matt Lenno; Gene Spencer; Jon Kapell; Scott Bradley; Matt Cieplinski; Kellie Cieplinski; Lori Pearson; Mike Pearson; Rob Lanahan; Theresa Lanahan; Brian Stumm; Shawn Hoke; Jessica Mulvihill; Patrick Mulvihill; Susan Sitter; and Bob Corrie.

Last but not least I need to acknowledge my dissertation committee. Dr. David Piper who has been my guide and mentor on this journey. When there were times that I was doubting myself he would be there to encourage me. At times when I was confused in working with the data he was there to help me make sense of my data. I could not have reached this point in my academic career if it was not for his support and guidance. Dr. Kelli Paquette for her guidance and advising of the writing and qualitative aspect of the study. Dr. Mark Twiest for his insight

on the quantitative aspects and agreeing to complete my dissertation committee since my original third member of the committee retired during the completion of the study.

DEDICATION

Unfortunately, while I was on this journey of obtaining my doctorate my father passed away. He was my first mentor and my first best friend. He was and is the example that Dr. Komives describes for a positive adult role model. As I reflected on my Father' life and how he impacted me during the initial shock of his passing it struck me that everything I have been studying on this journey to obtain my doctorate can be found in the way he lived his life. My Father's nickname was Rosie. I like to think of the lessons learned from his life as Rosie's Laws of Leadership.

1. **Loyalty:** In this case of Family. Family was everything to him. This was demonstrated in my mother and father's marriage of 47 years and being together for 48 years. It was also demonstrated how he worked two or sometimes three jobs to make sure we never wanted for anything and my sister and I had the best education possible. I remember as a child attending my Uncle George's wedding to my Aunt Susan on the Saturday after New Year's in 1977. You may wonder what is so big about that? Well those who knew my father his second love was playing music with his string band. The parade was cancelled that year due to weather. The parade was now the day of my Uncle's wedding. Don't ask me how he did it but he managed to be at the wedding ceremony for my Uncle. After my Uncle and Aunt said "I do" he jumped in a van and literally changed into his costume in the back while my Uncle drove him to the staging area for the parade. Regardless of what was needed he would always be there for the family.

2. **It is all about relationships:** His friends were everything to him. He would say you can never have enough friends. He cherished his friends like Art Shepard who he worked with for more than 20 years at AT&T. He would say it is important to be there for your friends. He was the consummate mentor and role model whether it was on the little league fields of Bridgeport, Scouts at Sacred Heart, or within the Mummers. He was a great role model in understanding that leadership is truly relational.

3. **Perseverance:** There was literally no quit in the man. He believed if a person is going to do a task or take on a project you didn't do it half-ass and you finished it. There are many examples I could point out. However, the best example taking into account brevity and levity for this occasion was his tool box. I think he had two or three of every tool imaginable. He would be in the middle of a project and couldn't find a tool he would just go out and buy a new one to get the job done. I remember a few years ago our garbage disposal broke at the house over Thanksgiving and Victoria was under the sink fixing the disposal and she needed an allen wrench. We couldn't find one so Victoria sent my Father and me out to buy one at Lowes. What does my Father do he buys a set of 50 allen wrenches. I was like Dad what are you doing she only needs one. He was like you never know she might need another one to get the job done. It was only a month after his passing my second son Asher was born and I had to put together his crib and we needed a clamp to hold it all together to allow the glue to set. I didn't go near the tool box because at the time it was too painful to go near his tool box he had at my house. However I need to get the crib ready for Asher and wouldn't you know it he had a brand new unopened c-clamp in his box. I never knew him not to complete something he set out to do.

4. **Passion:** My father always told my sister and me to be passionate about what you do. When my sister Carolann graduated from college and she was contemplating offers his advice was simple if you love what you are doing it is not a job and you will be doing it for a long time so you need to love it. For my Father his passion was playing music. Throughout his life he had a passion for fishing and during his retirement he took up the game of golf.

He was my mentor, coach and friend that guided me along my journey of leadership. I would not be the man, father, leader of a group of honorable men if it was not for him. He was the epitome of an advisor that Komives discusses in her Leadership Identity Development Theory. This dissertation is also dedicated to my beautiful family. It is because of Victoria's steadfast support that I was able to persevere and stick to the task of completing this dissertation. Victoria, Iggy and Asher are my North Star and because of them I strive to be a better man each and every day. They are my passion and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

Table Page

Table Page

Table Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

. . . it is important to develop young men and women during their college years to become future leaders. This is because leadership development encompassing various activities, perspectives, and experiences enhances the ability to make a meaningful difference. (Astin, 1993)

This study investigated if leadership can be learned through the lens of the leadership experience of men who hold the formal student leadership position of Chapter President within their local chapters of their national social fraternal organization. The fraternity system, in particular, whose mission it is to develop and foster leadership development in its members, is an advantageous vehicle for enhancing leadership qualities in college students (Busted, 2014; Brinton, 2010; Matsos, 1997). According to Kouzes and Posner (2002), leadership is a process that can be learned. In their research, Kouzes and Posner discovered that there are five practices commonly displayed by leaders at their personal best. The five practices are: (a) model the way, (b) inspire a shared vision, (c) encourage the heart, (d) enable others to act, and (e) challenge the process. Komives et al. (2006) further defines leadership as a relational and ethical process of people coming together to attempt positive change, which is in line with Burns (1978, p. 26) who posits that leadership is relational, collective, and purposeful. College fraternities provide the experience and a laboratory for men to explore their leadership potential, hone skills acquired in class, and put knowledge learned into practice. According to Kuh (1995), students benefit in many ways from out-of-class experiences, ranging from gains in critical thinking to relational and organizational skills, attributes that are highly correlated with satisfaction and success after college. Membership in national social fraternal organizations provide exposure to community service and philanthropic activities, opportunities to work on committees as a member or as a

chair of a committee, and involvement and interaction with faculty and administrators on campus which enhances the college experience (Astin, 1993). The position of this study is that leadership experience within a national social fraternal organization, in particular the experience of holding the position of Chapter President, has a positive impact on the leadership identity development of male students.

American college fraternities are useful instruments through which colleges and universities are assisted in the personal development of the students despite the fact that the actual contributions of college fraternities have been a point of contention for decades (Busteed, 2014; Hughes & Winston, 1987; Kuh & Lyons, 1990; Tootle, 1981). There is a perception that fraternities are no longer useful, have no value, and are antithetical to the missions of institutions of higher education. The popular press, advertising, and motion pictures, such as the 1978 film *Animal House*, perpetuate the notion that the Greek experience on many campuses involves the largely unfettered use and abuse of alcohol (Flanagan, 2014; Tampke, 1990). Contrary to this perception, college fraternities provide the laboratory for men to explore their leadership potential, hone skills acquired in class, and put knowledge learned into practice. Greeks tend to exert greater academic effort, participate more often in clubs and student professional organizations, and have higher levels of interaction with other students (Busteed, 2014; Pike & Askew, 1990).

The number of leadership and opportunities for involvement are not limitless to college campuses. The presence of fraternities provides additional leadership positions and opportunities for students to embrace and be embraced by a sub-community of their choice (Kuh & Lyons, 1990). The contributions of fraternities within non-campus leadership positions and community involvement is especially true at urban institutions of higher education. Administrators at urban

institutions often nurture the development of Greek organizations because their members become potential leaders for campus activities and, not insignificantly, these organizations provide a readily identifiable affinity group for students (Kuh & Lyons, 1990). According to Kilgannon and Erwin (1992), a preponderance of the research focusing on fraternities has concentrated on the impact of alcohol and hazing on college students. There has been very little research undertaken to measure the impact of membership on one's leadership development (Matsos, 1997).

Leadership has been a field of study since Plato analyzed influences on rulers and the responses of followers (Burns, 1978). Through the course of history, leadership has been defined in various ways, and even today, the definition of leadership and how it is obtained is highly debated and researched. Leadership resonates as the primary outcome for students at many institutions of higher education (Astin & Astin, 2000). In particular, the development of leadership skills among undergraduate students is one of the desired outcomes from the college experience (Adzell, 2010; Lucas, 1994; Roberts, 1981). Since Plato, the study of leadership has evolved from the theory that leadership was genetically produced within specific traits to the belief that leadership is relational and not positional (Komives, 2009).

An inherent mission for most higher education institutions is to provide programs that attend to the personal development and learning of students through extracurricular activities (McIntire, 1989; Roberts & Ullom, 1989). Higher education institutions and nonprofit organizations commit and utilize vast amounts of human and financial resources in trying to develop future leaders. The Lumina Foundation, which is committed to helping student leaders enroll and graduate from college, awarded 100 grants totaling approximately $43,000,000 during the 2010 fiscal year (NICF, 2012). Member organizations of the North-American

Interfraternity Conference Foundation (NICF), which is committed to providing grants for educational leadership experience programs and scholarships, directed more than $44,768,106 in grant funding for leadership education programs (NICF, 2012). Funding for the facilitation of leadership experiences and scholarships is one of many aspects that national social fraternal organizations and institutions of higher education have collaborated throughout the years. In fact, Greek-letter organizations have been connected with higher education in the United States since the very beginning of the higher education system in this country.

The first all-male Greek-letter organization, Phi Beta Kappa, was founded in 1776 on the campus of The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia (Brinton, 2010). The fraternal movement within the American higher education system is 235 years old, only 140 years younger than the American higher education system itself founded with Harvard College in 1636 (Brinton, 2010). Until the birth of the fraternal movement, life on college was myopic and the primary purpose was to prepare men for the ministry (Brinton, 2010; Horowitz, 1987; Whipple & Sullivan 1998). These fraternal organizations provided a social outlet for students, a venue to discuss and debate issues of the day outside of the classroom, provided a social network, furnished additional education resources by way of their extensive libraries, and developed leaders. These early societies were supported by many faculty and were important in the lives of college men outside the classroom (Anson & Marchesani, 1991). These organizations were the seeds of extracurricular activities that have grown into the vast complex of ivy vines that intertwine college campuses and enrich students' educational and leadership experiences today (Busteed, 2014; Brinton, 2010; Horowitz 1987; Matos, 199; Whipple & Sullivan 1998).

In more than 235 years, the American fraternal system has evolved from early secret societies that were exclusively all-white, male organizations to include organizations

representing men of various races, religious faiths, ethnicities, socioeconomic backgrounds, and sexual preferences. As the fraternal movement expanded across the nation, there was a need for a unified voice and venue to discuss issues affecting the movement. In 1909, a majority of the national fraternal societies formed the North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) to be that unified voice and venue to discuss issues affecting the fraternal movement. The NIC is a trade association representing 70 national fraternal organizations with approximately 6,000 chapters located on more than 800 campuses in the United States and Canada with approximately 375,000 undergraduate members (Foran, personal communication, October 21, 2016). At the core of these 70 organizations is the belief in the values of truth, justice, and service, and the mission to develop their members to be leaders on today's college campuses and within society.

Statement of the Problem

If college students do not learn how to become leaders it will have an adverse impact on our society. There is a need for better prepared leaders who can exhibit strong leadership within the corporate sector and government (Akhigbe, Martin, & Whyte, 2005; Bennett, 2007; Elliott, 2002; Hall, Blass, Ferris & Massengale, 2004). Leaders need to be prepared as the United States becomes increasingly diverse (Astin & Astin, 2000; Campbell, Smith, Dugan, & Komives, 2012; Dugan & Komives, 2010;Eich, 2007). Higher education institutions are places where we train the future leaders of our society. A review of institutional mission or value statements reveals that leadership development is a commonly stated outcome of higher education (Ehrlich, 2000; Eich, 2008; Roberts, 2007; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999).If students are not arriving on our campuses doorsteps as leaders then is leadership available to be learned or is it innate?

Purpose of the Study

According to Vaill (1989), leadership in today's culture is like riding permanent white-water rapids with constant change and challenges. It is the experience of this constant change and shifting challenges that creates the crucible where one's leadership identity is born. Does one acquire leadership naturally or is it learned through intentional training sessions and developed from experiences? There is an absence of research examining the relationship between the experiences that occurred while holding formal student leadership positions (e.g., managing a budget, meeting with administrators, preparing a meeting agenda, conducting a fundraising event) and effective leadership behavioral outcomes (Frey, 2011 p. 123). There has been a lack of focus on ways one can build upon leader identity and leader development (Day & Harrison 2007; Frey, 2011). The goal of this study was to add to the research on leader development and how leader identity is built.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

Komives et al. (1998) asserted "leadership is a relational process of people working together to accomplish change or to make a difference that will benefit the common good" (p. ix). Their conceptual model asserted that relational leadership comprised of five key elements: (a) purposeful, (b) process-oriented, (c) inclusive, (d) empowering, and (e) ethical. This model was expanded upon by Komives et al. (2005) in their study that produced the development of a grounded theory in leadership identity development. It is this theoretical framework that this study utilized. Komives determined that there were four properties that influenced the development of a person's leadership identity: (a) adult influences, (b) peer influences, (c) meaningful involvement, and (d) reflective learning. A person progresses through six stages of leadership identity development. The six stages are: (a) awareness, (b) exploration/engagement,

(c) leader identified, (d) leadership differentiated, (e) generativity, and (f) integration/synthesis. The focus of this study was on the stages of leader identified and leadership differentiated with a specific attention to the properties of leadership experiences through meaningful involvement and adult influences.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is that it adds to the research examining the relationship between the experiences that occurred while holding formal student leadership positions and effective leadership behavioral outcomes. This study will also add to the research on leader development and how leader identity is built within the grounded theory of leadership identity development.

This study is also significant because it will add to the research examining the importance of advisors and or mentors to student leaders. Due to increase workloads, research responsibilities, increase of the use of adjunct faculty and competing interests create an environment that makes it more difficult for faculty to develop advisor or mentor relationships with student leaders outside of the classroom (Hale, 2015; Keeling 2004). Students are accessing more alumni as a source of assistance for advising and mentoring (Hale, 2015; Rissmeyer, 2010). This research will add to the research of understanding the dynamic of advising between students and alumni.

Research Design

This study utilized a causal-comparative research study using a pretest and posttest instrument aimed at determining what the impact of holding a position of leadership within a fraternity has on a male college student's leadership development as measured using the revised version of the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI).The pretest instrument consists of

57 items used to identify specific leader behavior skills improved upon as a result from the participants' student leadership experience before holding the position of Chapter President within their chapter. The posttest instrument consists of the same 57 items used in the pretest; however, the posttest instrument identifies the specific leader behavior skills improved upon as a result from the participants' student leadership experience of holding the position of Chapter President within their chapter for a semester. Included in the pretest and the posttest is an additional section (Section III) to obtain information on the interaction between the participants' advisor and the participant. It is critical to study the impact the advisor has on the student, since, according to Komives (2006), adult involvement is critical in the development of a student's leadership identity.

The sample for the study was newly-elected Chapter Presidents from seven national social fraternal organizations who are members of the NIC, which represents 641 students. There are 6,000 chapters with 375,000 undergraduate members of national social fraternal organizations on college campuses in the United States (Foran, personal communication, October 21, 2016). This sample would represent 10.6 percent of the students who are able to have the leadership experience of being a Chapter President in one of the national social fraternal organizations on college campuses today.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this mixed methods study are:

1. What extent can leadership experience influence leadership identity?
2. What is the correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership development?
3. Is there a difference in leadership development due to other demographic variables?

Research Hypotheses

To fully address the research questions presented above, the following hypotheses were created:

Research question 1: What extent can leadership experience influence leadership identity?

H_0: Leadership experience does not significantly influence leadership identity.

Research question 2: What is the correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership development?

$H_{1:}$ There is a correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership identity.

H_0: There is no correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership identity.

Limitations

This study focused only on male students who have had the leadership experience of holding the position of Chapter President within their national social fraternal organization's local chapter. It does not look at the experience of females who have had the leadership experience of holding the position of Chapter President within their national social fraternal organization's local chapter. Additionally, this study investigated the impact of leadership development on one kind of student leader, a Chapter President.

The researcher in this study is an executive director of a national fraternity which is a member of the North American InterFraternity Conference. He is also a member of a Greek-letter organization and a volunteer within the fraternal movement.

While the pretest and the posttest will have several questions to limit the confounding variables in the study, the researcher will not be able to address all of them. This study was not

able to account for the socioeconomic differences, or cultural and institutional differences that may have had an impact on the student.

Definitions of Key Terms

Advisors are adults that provide and assist students a safe environment to reflect and make meaning out of their leadership experiences (Komives, 2005). An advisor can be a member from the community, student affairs administrators, faculty or administrators (Komives, 2006).

Chapter is the local entity of a national social fraternity which is comprised of male students who are fully matriculated students at the host institutions (Matsos, 1997).

Chapter President is the male student within the chapter who was elected by his peers to be the positional leadership authority of the chapter and represent the group to the host institutions community, the national social fraternity, and the greater community (Kelley, 2006).

Cognitive Development is the development of being able to utilize mental events, perceptions, memories, beliefs, and thoughts to be able to improve one's ability to think, learn, and reason (Bass, 2008).

Interpersonal Skills are skills such as empathy, and verbal communication that allows people to obtain the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations, and desires of other people (Vann, 2005).

Leadership is the relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998, p. 68). It means responsibly choosing courses of action toward a desirable future (Komives, 2009).

Leadership Development is the training or development of skills such as: self-awareness; emotional awareness; self-regulation; motivation; conflict management; and change management to assist one to be able to articulate a leadership philosophy, serve in a leadership position in a

student organization, comprehend the dynamics of a group, exhibit democratic principles as a leader, and the ability to visualize a community purpose and community goals (Komives & McMahon, 2007; Miller, 2003).

Leadership Skills are life skills that are applicable and applied to personal relationships as well as work and organizational responsibilities (Komives, Lucas, and McMahon, 2007, p47).

Mentors are adults that assist students by providing a safe environment to reflect and make meaning out of their experiences. Mentors can be a member from the community, student affairs administrators, faculty or administrators (Komives, 2006).

North-American Interfraternity Conference*, (NIC)* was founded in 1909 as a trade association representing 75 international and national men's fraternities. The NIC serves to advocate the needs of its member fraternities through enrichment of the fraternity experience, advancement and growth of the fraternity community, and enhancement of the educational mission of the host institutions. The NIC is also committed to enhancing the benefits of fraternity membership.

Today, the NIC has 70 member organizations with approximately 6,000 chapters located on more than 800 campuses in the United States and Canada with approximately 350,000 undergraduate members. The NIC is led by a Board of Directors comprised of nine volunteers from member fraternities. The headquarters and professional staff are located in Indianapolis, Indiana (http://nicindy.org).

Secret Societies are organizations that predate the founding of the national social fraternities on American college campuses. They helped fill a void in the students' educational needs for wanting to debate and question issues being taught in class. In most cases these organizations owned and maintained libraries that rivaled or surpassed their host institutions (Syrett, 2009).

Student Leadership Experience is an experience where a student assumes leadership and successfully initiates action for themselves, the community or sub-community they belong to within their institution of higher learning. Usually the student is attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good (Downton, 1973; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998).

This list of definitions is not exhaustive. However, these terms are the most prevalent in the study and most likely to require additional explanation to the reader.

This study will add to the discourse on the effects of positional leadership experiences on a student's leadership identity development by providing a longitudinal study that utilizes a revised version of the SLOI instrument. There has been very little research undertaken to measure the impact of membership on one's leadership identity development (Day & Harrison 2007; Frey 201; Matsos, 1997). The goal of this study is to add to the discourse how the leadership experience of holding a position of leadership impacts a student's leadership identity, in particular a student who is a member of the Greek-letter community on college campuses today. In Chapter Two, we will review the literature regarding the study of leadership, development of leadership theory, student leadership development, importance of co-curricular experience, history of college experience, and the history of fraternities as it pertains to leadership experience and its influence on a person's leadership identity.

Expected Findings

The expected findings for this study was include the data would support the hypothesis that leadership experience positively impacts a student's leadership identity development. Also that the data suggested the presence an advisor has a positive impact on a student's leadership identity development.

Study Design

In total this study is comprised of five chapters. The first chapter provides the reader an overview of the study which includes the background information on the problem; statement of the problem; purpose of the study; theoretical framework for the study; significance of the study; research design; research questions and hypotheses; limitations; definitions of terms; and expected findings. In order to provide more clarity to this study, the second chapter will provide a brief overview of the study of leadership; the development of leadership theory; student leadership development; history of higher education as it pertains to the college experience; the history of the fraternal movement; the history of the fraternal debate regarding the benefits of membership; and the importance of experience to a person's leadership development. The third chapter provides an explanation of the methodology utilized while conducting the study. A description of the sample population and how it was selected is provided in chapter three. In addition the reader is provided with a description of procedures; data analysis and the expected findings. An explanation of the results both qualitative and quantitative are provided in chapter four. Chapter five discusses the implication of the results as it relates to the information discussed in chapter two; recommendations for future study; and the limitations of the study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

If people are capable of learning from their experiences they can acquire leadership. (Northhouse, 2010, p 67)

The definition of leadership is a constantly in a state of metamorphosis. It is not an end state, but a complex process that requires effort, initiative, and development (Komives, 2009; Matsos, 1997). The evolution of the study of leadership has its genesis within the notion that leadership was found within great men. The current state of leadership has its foundation in the works of scholars such as, Burns, Chickering, Erickson, House, and Perry. Leadership is no longer considered to be positional, but can be found among any member of an organization. Also, experiences play an important part in the development of a person's identity. Relationships with fellow students and advisors have a significant impact on the development of college students (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Leadership and involvement opportunities are not limitless on today's college campuses. Student organizations, in particular social fraternities, provide additional leadership positions and opportunities for students to embrace and be embraced by a sub-community of their choice (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996).

While the subject of leadership has been studied extensively there has been limited research on the impact on college students' leadership identity and the impact of the experience of holding a position of leadership within a student organization (Day & Harrison, 2007; Frey 2011). Since higher education's departure from operating *in loco parentis*, scholars have been interested in how college affects students, and they have been developing theories and models to describe the effects. One aspect that can have a significant impact on a student in college is the

co-curricular experience. Participating in out-of-class experiences is important to student learning and for achieving a balance between academics and extracurricular activities (Astin, 1977; Kuh 1995). According to Kuh (1982), the most powerful influence on attitudes and behaviors of college students is the peer group. One segment of the co-curricular offerings on a majority of college campuses today is participation in national social fraternal organizations. Fraternities are among the most powerful of such socializing agents and exert considerable influence on their members' academic and social behavior (Kuh, 1982, p 48). There is a need for more research to be undertaken to measure the impact of membership in national fraternities on one's leadership development (Brinton 2011, Mastos 1997). Greek letter organizations' unique history with higher education and the extensive participation by students over two centuries compels the need for further examination on the impact of leadership development within fraternal organizations (Morat, 2003).

In order to provide more clarity to this study, the literature review will provide a brief overview of the study of leadership, the development of leadership theory, student leadership development, history of higher education as it pertains to the college experience, the history of the fraternal movement, the history of the fraternal debate regarding the benefits of membership, and the importance of experience to a person's leadership development.

Study of Leadership

The study of leadership is as old as the study of history (Komives, 2009). According to Bass (2008), principles of leadership were born from philosophers such as Plato, Sun Tzu, and Confucius in their studying of history and philosophy, which led to the development of theories on how leaders should conduct themselves. One of the earliest written documents on the topic of leadership is from 2300 B.C.E, in Egypt in *The Instruction of Ptahhotep* (Bass, 2008). The

earliest effort to define the areas of functional responsibility for the various segments of leadership was in Plato's *The Republic* (Downton, 1973). The study of leadership would eventually evolve from a byproduct of the study of history and philosophy to its own subject of study. Post-World War II scholars began to approach the study of leadership by expanding their focus to include leadership styles and situational theories (Northhouse, 2010).

Over the past century, the study of leadership has evolved from an individual with innate qualities who must be in command to experiencing leadership as a developmental process in a collective and collaborative team-based learning context (Faber, 2002). Currently, leadership scholars are positing that leadership development is an aspect of personal development and there is an intrapersonal complexity with improved ability to do leadership with others (Avolio & Gibbons, 1989; Daloz Parks, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; McCauley, Drath, Palus, O'Connor, & Baker, 2006; Wagner, W, 2011).

Development of Leadership Theory

Development of leadership theory in a formal sense begins with the great man theory. The great man theory explains leadership as being the result of a leader who is bestowed with a unique set of qualities that can captivate a group or greater community (Carlyle, 1841; Northhouse, 2010). Carlyle's theory was further refined by William James (1880) who theorized that leaders are great men who provided direction for a group and prevented other men from leading the group in another direction. At this period in history, the study of leadership was viewed as a subject only pertaining to the male gender, which is interesting since during this time period there are numerous examples of strong and successful women throughout history such as,

Catherine the Great of Russia, Elizabeth I of England, Dolly Madison of the United States, and Eleanor of Aquitaine of England.

Despite the contributions by women in leadership roles, Galton (1869) suggested hereditary was connected to leadership and explained the great *man* theory (Northhouse, 2010). Galton's explanation of the great man theory is the genesis of the belief that leaders are great men with a unique set of skills that are endowed at birth. However, between the late 19th century and the 20th century, there was a paradigm shift within the development of leadership theory from the great man theory to a focus on the unique set of skills or traits being possessed by leaders. This shift marks the development of the theory of leadership referred to as trait theory.

Over the last 100 years, scholars continued this evolution from viewing leadership as an individual with innate qualities who must be in command to a person possessing a unique set of skills to experiencing leadership as a developmental process in a collective and collaborative team-based learning context (Faber, 2002). The first significant leap in this evolution was taken by Ralph M. Stogdill with his study in 1948. Stogdill (1948) suggested that no consistent set of traits differentiated leaders from non-leaders across a variety of situations. This belief was formed after he conducted a meta-analysis of 124 trait studies between 1904 and 1947 (Northhouse, 2011). The study asserted that leaders were not created solely on traits that one possessed, but rather leadership characteristics developed through a combination of the situation and traits that one possessed. Leadership was not passive, but resulted from a working relationship between the leaders and those they led (Northhouse, 2016). The initial study in 1948 was followed by a second study in 1974. This study concluded that the traits were a part of leadership and minimized the role of the situation that was earlier asserted by Stogdill. The initial meta-analysis completed by Stogdill is a significant point within the history of the development

of leadership theory because not only did it challenge the current thought on leadership in regards to traits, but it also asserted for the first time that leadership was possibly relational. A popular label for leadership during the time that Stogdill was completing his studies was "industrial" (Rost, 1993). Leadership was characterized as being done by those in positions of authority or what one person does to a group of others, presumably followers (Rost, 1993). During this industrial period, leadership begins to be defined as a process that is not a trait residing within a leader, but rather a transactional event occurring between leader and followers (Northhouse, 2010, p. 3). Also, the list of traits that were being attributed to leaders grew to such a staggering size that the utility and validity of trait theory became suspect (Downton, 1973).

The period between 1973 and 1978 was a watershed moment for the development of leadership theory. It is during this period that Stogdill's follow-up survey to his original work from 1948 is published, but significant contributions from Downton (1973), House (1976), and Burns (1978) would dramatically change the landscape of how leadership is viewed and create the foundation for scholars such as, Bass (2008); Kouzes and Posner (1987); and Komives (1998) to develop the notion that leadership is relational. While other scholars such as Stogdill (1948) and Weber (1947) made connections to leadership being relational or based on the trait of charisma, the three aforementioned scholars set the standard. Prior to the research done in the 1970s, leadership was viewed as laissez-faire or transactional (Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1998). According to Gill, et al. (1998), laissez-faire leadership is where managers avoid taking a stand, ignore problems, do not follow up, and refrain from intervening (p. 49). The transactional leadership model is where leaders exert influence through quid pro quo methods (Burns, 1978).

Downton was the first scholar to be able to identify the transformational leader in his work on rebel leadership (Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1998). According to Downton (1973), the

problem with the study of leadership is coming to a general agreement about the precise meaning of the term. However, in developing his theory of rebel leadership, Downton argued that leadership can be assumed from any member of an organization when the "leader" successfully initiates action for the group. A major influence on Downton's thoughts on leadership was the belief that leadership was either instrumental or expressive. Instrumental leadership refers to the task-oriented roles of leadership that contribute to organizational effectiveness (Downton, 1973, p. 22). Expressive leadership refers to the roles that establish social and emotional ties between the leaders and followers (Downton, 1973, p. 22). Expressive leadership should not to be confused with transactional leadership versus transformational leadership because within both of these paradigms a person can exhibit instrumental or expressive leadership. Downton plants the seed that germinates into the theory of transformational leadership and becomes the roots for the work of Burns, Bass, and Komives. Like his contemporaries Downton (1973) believes that a leader cannot arbitrarily impose a mission on their followers (p. 28). A leader is limited to setting goals by the nature of the organization. Leaders have to not only consider what they want from their organizations but what their organizations will allow.

Similarly, House developed the theory of charismatic leadership. According to House (1976), a leader acts in unique ways that have specific charismatic effects on their followers. Charismatic leadership, when described, is very similar to transformational leadership (Northhouse, 2010). It was not until Burns (1978) published his theory that leadership is transforming in nature that postindustrial conceptualizations predicated on group process, collaboration, and shared goals increased in prominence (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Rost, 1991). According to Burns, leadership can be learned and it is not something that someone is born with or something that is innate (Bailey & Axlerod, 2001). However, leadership can be bred by the

environment the person is raised in (Bailey & Axlerod, 2001; Burns, 1978). A major characteristic of transformational leadership is that it is dynamic. It is a vibrant relationship that is engaging between the leader and the led. Followers are engaged so thoroughly that they feel elevated and become more active within the group that they create a cadre of new leaders (Burns, 1978). Due to the work of Burns, the understanding of leadership evolved from a leader leading from a position of authority with innate traits or skills to everyone engaged within a group.

Leadership is no longer considered positional, but relational and anyone within the group can make an important contribution to the leadership process, not just the positional leaders (Wagner, 2011). Bass (1985) further refined the theory of transformational leadership by modeling the theory empirically. Later in collaboration with Avolio, Bass (1994) would state that transformational leadership had four I's: (a) individualized consideration, (b) intellectual stimulation, (c) inspirational motivation, and (d) idealized influence (Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Northhouse, 2011). The work of these scholars created the foundation of postindustrial thought regarding leadership. Three influences ushered in the era of postindustrial thought regarding leadership: (a) a changed definition of leadership as a process between people rather than the actions of a person with authority; (b) a shift in how organizations and change are understood; and (c) the introduction of adult development theory to the leadership field (Wagner, 2011).

Kouzes and Posner (1987) studied 1,200 managers and their personal best experiences as leaders. The result from this case study was the identification of a pattern of behaviors utilized by people when they were the most effective as leaders. According to Kouzes and Posner (1991) the patterns of behavior discovered in their 1987 study suggested that leaders displayed five leadership practices when they were at their very best. These five leadership practices are (a)

challenge the process; (b) inspire a shared vision; (c) encourage the heart; (d) enable others to act; and (e) model the way. This was a seminal moment in the development of postindustrial leadership theory because leadership is now seen as something that can be learned. Not only can it be learned, but, with the development of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), it can be measured (Kouzes & Posner, 1988). There are three pathways to effective leadership: learning by experience, through others, or by education (Kouzes & Posner, 1991; Matos 1997). Learning through experience is a matter of trial and error and internalizing life lessons from failure and successes. The core of the leadership model created by Kouzes and Posner is relationships. It draws from the work of Burns (1978), and Avolio and Bass (1994) in that leadership is relational and at the core are people who are able to relate to other people and elevate them to a higher level or obtain their stated goal. Education, the third pathway, is vital because with the proper training a person can learn or improve their interpersonal skills or how to appropriately reflect on experiences to grasp the nuances of leadership.

The importance of relationships in regards to leadership cannot be overstated. "Relationships are the connective tissue of the organization. . . . over time, these new relationships, built on trust and integrity, become the glue that holds us together" (Allen & Cherrey, 2000, p. 31). Komives et al. (1998) used the term "relational leadership" to describe this approach to leadership. They asserted "leadership is a relational process of people working together to accomplish change or to make a difference that will benefit the common good" (p. ix). In their conceptual model, Komives et al. (1998) asserted that relational leadership comprised five key elements: (a) purposeful, (b) process-oriented, (c) inclusive, (d) empowering, and (e) ethical. This model was furthered expanded upon by Komives et al. (2005) in their study that produced the development of a grounded theory in leadership identity development. It was a

study that utilized grounded theory methodology. The intent was to discover a theory relating to the leadership developmental experience of college students who demonstrated relational leadership (Komives et al., 2005). The participants in the study described their leadership development as evolving from a leader centric perspective to one that was collaborative and based upon relationships. Komives determined that there were four properties that influenced the development of a person's leadership identity: (a) adult influences, (b) peer influences, (c) meaningful involvement, and (d) reflective learning. The four properties are dynamic and evolve overtime as a person is progressing through the six stages of leadership identity development. The six stages are: (a) awareness, (b) exploration/engagement, (c) leader identified, (d) leadership differentiated, (e) generativity, and (f) integration/synthesis. Experience through meaningful involvement and adult influences are the two of the four aspects that this study will be investigating. The experience being studied is that of a male student holding a position of authority within a student organization on a college campus. Experiences through meaningful involvement are the crucible where a person's leadership identity evolves and is created. These experiences assist in clarifying the personal values and interests, experience diverse peers and perspectives, learn about self, and develop new skills (Komives, et al., 2005). The adult influence for the purpose of this study is that of the organization's advisor. According to Komives, et al. (2006), adults are a meaningful part of each stage of developing students' leadership identity. "The dimensions of adult influences ranged from being affirmers, models, and sponsors in the early stages to being mentors and ultimately to being meaning makers and colleagues or friends (Komives, et al., 2005)."

Student Development and Leadership

The growth of the college student population is staggering. According to Horowitz (1987), in 1980 over 7 million young people attended college or university full time. This constituted roughly half of American youth between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, in contrast to an estimated 2 percent in the early 1800s (Horowitz, 1987, p. xi). Currently, as of 2016, there are 17,487,475 students attending college or university in the United States. (College enrollment statistics, 2016). This accounts for 5.5 percent of the current population of the country attending college (U.S. and World population clock, 2016). This exponential growth in the student population is why providing students with the ability to explore education in a way that enhances character, builds cognitive thinking skills, and develops leadership is more vital today should be the goals of the liberal arts experience (Azdell, 2010; Brown, 1994; Marcy, 2002; Stancil, 2003). The focus on student development has its impetus from this growth of student population, but the genesis is in the field of psychology with the work done by such prominent scholars such as Chickering (1969), Erickson (1959), and Perry (1970). It is through their work in psychology that the scholarly foundation was laid for scholars to establish the field of student development.

In terms of laying the foundation for the study of student development Erickson is the cornerstone because he was one of the first scholars to describe the ever evolving patterns of behavior in college students. Erickson (1959) published *Identity and the Life Cycle* in which he described the development of a person's ego as a sequence of turning points or crises after which a person would either move forward or regress in their development. According to Chickering (1993), Erickson believed that there was a universal sequence of challenges that when resolved

would allow the person to move to the next sequence or stage. Each successive step is a potential crisis because it brings with it a radical change in perspective for the person (Erickson, 1980).

The theory posited by Erickson is comprised of eight stages: (a) trust versus mistrust, (b) autonomy versus shame or doubt, (c) initiative versus guilt, (d) industry versus inferiority, (e) identity and repudiation versus identity diffusion, (f) intimacy and solidarity versus isolation, (g) genrativity versus self absorption, and (h) integrity versus despair. Unlike proceeding theories such as Chickering (1993) or Komives, et al. (2006), Erikson's theory of the development is more static than dynamic. However, Erikson argued that there was a continual process of integration, continual struggle, progress and regress in trying to maintain equilibrium (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 174). The term used by Erikson was favorable ratio. A person is always trying to maintain a balance. A person masters enough skills or knowledge to maintain the current stage they are in until he or she are able to move forward to the next stage (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Erikson concluded that a person reflects the quality of the milieu in which they were raised (Erikson, 1980). This notion of a person's environment impacting development is further developed by Chickering and Reisser (1993) and Komives, et al. (2006) in their discussions on the impact of adults on the leadership development of young adults.

Chickering and Reisser (1969, 1993) proposed looking at the development of college students through the lenses of seven vectors. These vectors are not linear in progression nor does it describe development as a sequence of challenges or crisis to be resolved or mastered. It very much ebbs and flows. It is dynamic and accounts for the impact of external factors on a person's development and behavior. According to Chickering (1993) the seven vectors should be viewed as a map that can assist a person in determining where a student is in their development and the direction of their development. The seven vectors are: (a) developing competence, (b) managing

emotions, (c) moving through autonomy toward interdependence, (d) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (e) establishing identity, (f) developing purpose, and (g) developing integrity. It is asserted that on this path a student has three important resources or tools to support their journey. They are advisors, peer-to-peer interaction, and relationships. Throughout the student's trek using the seven vectors as their map Chickering and Reisser (1993) assert the importance of having an advisor as a guide. Advisors are important because they can help a student to direct their emotions appropriately, reflect on the situation, provide encouragement, and direct or inform the student of resources to assist in obtaining their goals (Chickering, 1993). Additionally, a student's most important teacher is often another student (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 392). It is this peer-to-peer interaction that allows students to make meaning of the messages being communicated to them from society. Relationships with fellow peers or student organizations allow the student to experience a lab where they can learn to communicate, reflect, debate, and empathize with their fellow students (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). These relationships with peers and advisors are most prominent with vector four and five. There is a direct correlation between vector four and five, and the transition period from stage three to stage four in the Leadership Identity Development Theory (Komives, 2006). This is a critical correlation because it is within these theories that adult advisors, peer-to-peer relationships, and experiences have the most impact on the development of college students' identity. It is also important because it illustrates the linkage from Chickering and Reisser's earlier work and how it has had an impact in laying the foundation for the theory of leadership identity development.

One year after Chickering and Reisser (1969) published their groundbreaking work *Education and Identity,* Perry (1970) published *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years,* where he explained his theory of cognitive and intellectual development in

college-aged students. His was a 15-year study comprised of undergraduates from the late 1950s and 1960s who were attending Harvard University and Radcliffe College. It is interesting to note that when the study was published it did not include the data from the women who were interviewed, but only focused on the male student participants. At the end of each school year the participants were interviewed by Perry and his staff. This occurred for the entire four years of the students' undergraduate experience. Like Erickson, Perry's developmental scheme was very linear and had a clear progression accentuated by challenges. However, unlike Erickson (1959), Perry didn't see the transition between stages or levels as a balancing act, but as an entire area upon itself called "positions of deflection." "A position of deflection offers alternatives at critical points in development (Perry, 1970, p. 57)." There are three aspects within a position of deflection: temporizing, escape, and retreat. According to Perry (1970), there are four overarching areas comprised of nine positions. The four areas are simple dualism, complex dualism, relativism, and commitment in relativism. The nine positions are: (a) basic quality; (b) multiplicity pre-legitmate; (c) multiplicity subordinate; (d) multiplicity correlate or relativism subordinate; (e) relativism correlate, competing, or diffuse; (f) commitment forseen; (g) initial commitment; (h) orientation in implications of commitment; and (i) developing commitments.

Those students who arrive on the door step of the ivory towers viewing the world from position one of Perry's scheme are simply replacing their original community with the basic authority of the college. So, it is from within these confines that college faculty, administrators, and the student body provide the experiences that create the pressure for change. It is from this departure point that a student decides whether to surrender to this pressure exerted from the experiences of their new community (Perry, 1970). The decision that needs to be made is either to assimilate and continue their development, or reject these pressures and remove themselves

from their new community and return to the comfort of the previous community. This constant evolution of assimilation or rejection continues throughout the scheme. According to Perry (1970), position five is the fulcrum of the development scheme. It is up until this position that a student's intellectual and ethical development is from an authority-oriented frame of "they want us to think" to movement towards to more independent thought, accepting of diverse opinions, and a readiness to gain knowledge. Perry's scheme demonstrates the basic progression of students' way of thinking during their college experience (Perry, 1970, p. v).

Relationships with peers and advisors along with the experiences encountered during college are the salient point of a person's development. Chickering's (1969) vectors four and five, Komives'(2005) transition from three to four, and Perry's (1970) position five all concur that these experiences are essential to understanding the development of college students. It is at this salient point that students are self-reflective and realize that the leadership experience provided knowledge in realizing what they do not know (Miller, 2016). Leadership experiences are the catalysts in reshaping how students not only view themselves but how they view others, ideas and problems (Miller 2016). This is in sync with Baxter Magdola (2010) theory of self-authorship, which asserts that college students use their leadership experiences to gain a better understanding of leadership and the meaning of the world around them.

Importance of Co-Curricular Experience

Small developmental experiences at an early age can have a profound impact on future development outcomes, given the reinforcing nature of leader development (Murphy & Johnson, 2011, p. 460). Participation in campus activities and student organizations are those small developmental experiences that are referenced by Murphy and Johnson (2011). These experiences are key components of co-curricular experiences offerings on college campuses.

Participating in out-of-class experiences are essential to student learning and to help students achieve a balance between academics and extracurricular activities (Astin, 1991; Kuh, 1995). It is these experiences according to Astin (1993) and Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) that have a significant impact on a student development. Light's study (2001) of Harvard students corroborates this theory on involvement which says that the greatest learning occurs outside the classroom and that among the most important learning areas is the residential setting. Additionally, Astin (1993) linked leadership development to involvement. He defined the linkage as the investment of psychosocial and physical energy in the collegiate environment. Involvement in cocurricular activities lead to students experiencing more positive educational and social experiences overall, increased intellectual and leadership development, success in academic and career goals, and they are more likely to graduate (Astin, 1975, 1977, 1993; Baxtor Magolda, 1992; Kuh, Schuh, & Whitt, 1991; McKaig, 1984; Miller & Jones, 1981; Morrisey, 1991; Webb, 1987, 1987; Williams & Winston, 1985).

Student-to-student interaction has the strongest positive effects for leadership development during college (Astin, 1993). Eich (2007) supports Astin's (1993) belief that experiences such as peer-to-peer interaction and extracurricular student organization involvement are the most positive contributors to student leadership development (p. 18). Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) asserts that college graduates perceived their extracurricular involvement, particularly in leadership roles, as having a substantial impact on their intrapersonal and leadership skills development.

Cocurricular activities have been underappreciated by faculty (Kuh et al., 1991) and because student affairs professionals are being challenged to demonstrate the validity of the services and experiences offered to students outside of the classroom, it is important to continue

to examine and assess the relationship between student involvement and student development (p. 98). According to Adzell (2010), the problem with challenging this perception of the importance of experience or co-curricular involvement is the relative lack of quality assessment tools to help identify and quantify leadership growth, when leadership programming and training is applied (p. 8).

History of the College Experience

Pay, Pray, Study

The genesis of the American higher education system was with the establishment of Harvard College in 1636. At the time and for hundreds of years, life on college campuses was myopic in that the primary purpose was to prepare men for the ministry. The prescribed role of the student up until the late 1800s was to pay, pray, study, and accept (Horowitz, 1987). Students were expected to take what was taught to them at face value and not to question their professors. The first Greek-letter organization, Phi Beta Kappa, founded in 1776, and the early fraternities that followed were primarily literary societies intended to develop oratory and written debate skills while also promoting camaraderie among members (Morat, 2003, p. 12). On college campuses during this time there was a thirst for discourse among the students. College men did not want to just pay, pray, study and accept but they wanted to discuss, observe, challenge, and socialize (Horowitz, 1987). The creation of the fraternal organizations allowed college men the venue to discuss and challenge what was being taught to them in the classroom. This alternative perspective viewpoint, however, did not sit well with the faculty because ultimately faculty viewed it as their authority being questioned. The development of the fraternal social organizations was a key agent of change that has consistently challenged institutions of higher

education in how they view their students, how they perceive student life on campus, and how they manage the co-curricular offerings on campus today.

Beginning the Shift to Discuss, Observe, Challenge, and Socialize

The Morrill Act signed in 1862 by President Abraham Lincoln was one of the quintessential documents of his administration and it forever changed the landscape of the American society (Simon, 1963). Passage of this legislation made possible the creation of the land grant universities, including Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, Iowa State University, and the University of Illinois. The passage of the Morrill Act was the birth of the modern university. When the Morrill Act was signed into law, it not only empowered the working classes of America through the access to free and public higher education, but it became the catalyst that promoted the widespread practice of state supported coeducation (Radke, 2002). Coeducational experience in higher education emerged in March 1869 on the campus of the Iowa Agricultural College, which today is known as Iowa State University (Radke, 2002). The University of Michigan in 1870 and then Cornell University in 1872 followed Iowa Agricultural College by providing coeducational experiences (Horowitz, 1987). Not only did the Morrill Act bring to fruition coeducation among state supported institutions of higher education, but it also created the environment for Land Grant college faculty to create a curriculum without the constraints of the old paradigm prevalent at the eastern colleges (Nienkamp, 2010). Eastern colleges created a paradigm that allowed for a safe environment to nurture higher education. Not unlike a child, the nurturing lasts for distinct amount of time until they want to explore and expand their horizons from the safe confines of their parents' embrace. The freedom in curriculum development and the change in perception of the purpose of an education that was ushered in by the Morrill Act allowed higher education the ability to step boldly away from the

safe environs created by the established eastern colleges in the early 1900s. Society began to view a college education as an investment and a place for students to begin to build social networks that would benefit them after college and in their careers. At this point in the development of the college experience, it is no longer a place to pay, pray, study, and accept, but a place to discuss, observe, challenge, and socialize.

Departure From *In Loco Parentis* to Individual Autonomy

After the Second World War institutions of higher education had to adapt to a drastic shift in the demographics of the student body with an increase in enrollment from veterans taking advantage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Greenberg, 1997). Institutions of higher education experienced a watershed moment at the conclusion of the Second World War due to the passing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This bill, which is commonly known as the GI Bill, forever changed the dynamics on campus and forced colleges to address the needs of these veteran students. The major legacy of the GI Bill was the opening of the academy to all classes of people and turning what had been a limited privilege to a generalized public expectation (Greenberg, 1997, p. B9). At the conclusion of the Second World War, there was a development of offices and staff on college campuses to solicit donations, foundations, corporations, and alumni (Bok, 1982). It was from this point that there was no turning back to an educational system that was squarely anchored in the liberal arts and whose main demographic was white male students. It would become a system that was growing and focusing on providing a diverse group of leaders and highly educated workers to man the factories and to design rooms and office buildings of the military industrial complex. The students now coming to the doors of the ivory tower were no longer children eager to appease their adult mentors, but young men and

women who experienced the scarcity of resources from a major depression, survived the ravages of a world at war, and wanted to obtain an education that would lead to a successful career.

The end of this era was punctuated by the Vietnam War where the power of the student body and consumerism influenced how institutions of higher education conducted business. While the focus shifted from liberal arts to the sciences, there was still a sense among the faculty that a student's purpose was to pay, study, and accept. By this time, the idea of prayer within the college student's life was no longer. The college experience, except for a handful of religiously based institutions of higher education, was now secular. A majority of the students during the 1960s and 1970s understood their role was to pay and study, but they did not agree with the paradigm that they should accept what they are being told at face value. In the 60s, the *in loco parentis* ideology was replaced by a new ideology, demanded by students, focusing on individual autonomy (literally "self-law"), freedom, and a minimum amount of administrative intervention in their lives (Willimon & Naylor, 1995, p. 89) Not only did society see unrest on campuses from students refusing to accept what they saw as an intrusion on their rights by school administrators but the country saw the military firmly entrench themselves into the daily operations of schools by providing lucrative contracts that over time made the colleges dependent on this funding for their mere survival. As an example, in 1965, Columbia received $15,835,000 in Military Prime Contract awards (Bok, 1982). While federal budgets for campus-based research also expanded steadily exceeding $3 billion per year by 1965 (Bok,1982).

Millennial Student College Experience

As colleges entered the 21st century, the college experience in some aspects has undergone a complete reversal from its rejection of *in loco parentis* and questioning of authority. In 2004, a clarion call came for institutions of higher education to self-reflect and begin the

process of reinventing and revising how they educate students. The origin of this call for reform came from NASPA and American College Professional Association when they published *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (Day, et al., 2007). The need to reform the educational system came as a result of a more diverse student population and an increase in non-traditional aged students returning to higher education for additional training to obtain new and better positions within the workforce.

Once again, institutions of higher education are experiencing a watershed moment. This watershed moment was created by several factors coming together to create the perfect storm. Those factors are: two armed conflicts in the Middle East causing the government to revise the GI Bill to spur military enlistments and assist with returning servicemen looking for employment; poor economic conditions creating an unemployment rate of more than 9% for an extended period of time; and the rapid development of technology refocusing and changing how students' pursue their daily activities (Rosen, 2009). On average, a person 18 to 25 years-old spends 18 hours, 40 minutes a day using technology and media which has created a traditional college age population that is very adept to multitasking up to six actions simultaneously (Rosen, 2009, p. 158). No longer is the college age population one that can easily focus on a single task, like listening to a lecture. On average, students are only able to limit their activities to three (Rosen, 2009, p. 159). Economic conditions over the past several years have also caused many students to seek employment while trying to obtain their degrees. Kuh (2011) found "nearly half of full-time first-year students and three quarters of seniors attending four-year colleges and universities responding to the 2008 NSSE reported working for pay" (p. 198). Among first-generation students, one-fifth of full-time first year and two-fifths of full-time seniors worked more than twenty hours per week (Kuh, 2011, p. 198). Balancing a job, attending classes, and

participating in the college co-curricular offerings is the college experience of the millennial generation (Kuh, 2011). This reality is much different than any other generation's college experience (Kuh 2011).

Fraternal Question on Campus

The Early History of the Fraternal Question

American higher education and the American fraternal system have enjoyed a mutual history of development and have significantly impacted each other during the past 235 years. For the past 166 years, there has been a debate within higher education and society about whether or not fraternities are still useful in providing value to host institutions and if they positively contribute to the academic mission of the college.

During the early 1800s and up until the American Civil War, institutions of higher education experienced a turbulent time, including when there was government encroaching upon the autonomy of higher education institutions; the passage of the Morrill Land Grant legislation, which led to the creation of the Land Grant Colleges; and students, primarily those who were members of fraternal organizations, challenging the faculty on their authority and the curriculum they offered. In 1819, a seminal decision led to the development of accreditation in the United States Higher Education system in Dartmouth v. William H. Woodward (Brittingham, 2009). In this decision, the U.S. Supreme Court prevented the State of New Hampshire from taking over Dartmouth, which protected the established rights of private organizations (Brittingham, 2009). Daniel Webster, in defense of Dartmouth College, placed one of the first bricks in the foundation of the ivory tower that led to the protection of academic freedom and the development of the American higher education system as we know it today. It was during this time when colleges began to shift from primarily preparing men for the clergy to creating professionals who would

become leaders within the community. While Dartmouth won the legal battle to establish the right of academic freedom, the establishment of private institutions of higher education began a campaign to suppress students' right of academic freedom and the ability to create private organizations.

In 1825, Union College was growing into the largest college in the nation. In a response to the oppressiveness of the faculty at Union College, students formed literary societies, including the Kappa Alpha Society. The notion of the negative impact of affiliation with Greek letter organizations was first asserted in 1832, President Eliphalet Nott offered this threat from the Union Chapel to students under his charge: "the first young man who joins a secret society shall not remain in college one hour!"(Malaney, 1990). Then later Clarence Cook Little, President of the University of Michigan from 1925 and 1929 (Horowitz, 1987) when he proposed to push affiliation with Greek letter organizations into the sophomore year with strict regulations around the recruitment period because he believed fraternities worked for their own purposes (Horowitz, 1987). Mark Hopkins tried to abolish fraternities at Williams College in 1845?? but his board of trustees overruled him (Horowitz, 1987). The debate was officially initiated in 1845 by college presidents whether Greeks represented the academic goals of the colleges (Horowitz, 1987). Greek organizations provided student members with opportunities to interject their opinions on literature and debate topics of the day. They also instilled a sense of freedom outside the classroom (Rudolph, 1990). Fraternities were originally organized out of student discontent with the lack of free thinking and expression (Kelley, 2006). Due to the persistence of these students, who were members of fraternal organizations, colleges began to evolve from their provincial, religiously orthodox institutions into urban places teaching students the ways of the world (Horowitz, 1987).

Debate Regarding the Value of Fraternal Organizations

There has been a debate taking place within higher education and society whether or not fraternities are still useful in providing value to their host institutions by positively contributing to the academic mission of the college. This debate has been going on since 1845 when college presidents grew concerned about whether Greeks represented the academic goals of the colleges (Malaney, 1990). Instead of enhancing a student's educational experience, the question has been, do they simply distract students from the main purpose of them attending college and negatively contribute to the mission of the college?

While national fraternities assert they have the same objective as institutions of higher education, there is limited research on the positive leadership benefits associated with undergraduate fraternity membership (Kelley, 2006). In fact, research shows that Greek letter involvement negatively influences the academic performance of all students (Baker, 2008). The most critical year for academic success for a college student is the first year. The demands placed on students who decide to affiliate with a Greek letter organization during their first year are great and can negatively impact academic performance. Pascarella, et al. (1996), support the hypothesis that negative learning consequences of Greek affiliation occur primarily when students pledge a fraternity or sorority in the first year of college. Not only does the research demonstrate that affiliation with a Greek letter organization has a negative impact on the academic performance, but that there is also a greater rate of academic dishonesty among members within the Greek Letter community (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). The internal structure and emphasis on performance, in addition to the accessibility to people and learning resources, such as test files, facilitates a culture of cheating behaviors (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Many

have shown that the fraternal movement may in fact be counterproductive to the academic mission of higher education.

An inherent mission for most higher education institutions is to provide programs which attend to the personal development and learning of students through extracurricular activities (Roberts & Ullom,1989). Despite the research that shows negative influences, American college fraternities are useful instruments through which colleges and universities are assisted in the personal development of the students (Hughes & Winston, 1987; Kuh & Lyons, 1990; Tootle, 1981). While there is the perception that fraternities are no longer useful, have no value, and are antithetical to the missions of institutions of higher education perpetuated by the popular press which focuses on the abundance of alcohol use (Tampke, 1990), Greeks tend to exert greater academic effort, participate more often in clubs and student professional organizations, and have higher levels of interaction with other students (Pike & Askew, 1990). Since, the number of leadership and involvement opportunities are not limitless on a college campus, the presence of fraternities provides additional leadership positions and opportunities for students to embrace and be embraced by a sub-community of their choice (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996).

Contrary to the hypotheses of some researchers, membership in fraternities do not negatively impact the academic performance of undergraduate members. Research shows that Greek members are more likely to graduate and have a greater satisfaction with the collegiate experience (Willingham, 1962; Williams & Winston, 1985). In addition, “seniors who belong to Greek letter organizations report making significantly greater gains in their academic development than did independent students, and all Greeks, both first-year students and seniors, reported making significantly greater gains in their personal development than did students who were not members of fraternities or sororities (Pike, 2003, p. 377).” “ In a longitudinal study of

more than 6,000 seniors, Pike and Askew (1990) found that Greek students reported higher levels of academic effort, involvement in organizations, and interaction with other students." Greek affiliation is also connected with increased levels of satisfaction with college (Pennington, Zvonkovic, & Wilson, 1989; Pike & Askew, 1990), continued persistence in college, a higher probability of subsequent degree completion (Astin, 1977), and an increased ability to function in groups (Pike and Askew, 1990). Greek members have a higher level of involvement and gains in cognitive development as a result of involvement in fraternities (Pike, 2000). Not only do fraternity members have a higher level of involvement within the college community, they also tend to be slightly more involved in educationally purposeful activities than their non-Greek counterparts and reported making greater gains in learning than independent students (Pike, 2003).

On today's college campuses, fraternities are often the center of focus and blame for negative behavior that is antithetical to the academic mission of the college, since fraternities and sororities are powerful socializing agents (Strange, 1986). Whether that socialization is positive or negative may depend on the institutional culture within which the Greek system operates. However, fraternities are not the root of all evil on the college campus today. In fact, when given adequate resources and held accountable to living espoused values, fraternities enhance the academic mission by providing an invaluable laboratory to allow students to experiment and grow into leaders. A fraternity is often a safe place to examine and experiment with various facets of one's identity (Kuh & Lyons, 1990). Studies show that when fraternities are geared toward positive moral development through repetition, recruitment, and superior advisement from alumni, they create the positive, advertised, and ritual-based experiences for the students. (Mathiasen, 2003). When properly managed, Greek letter organizations create a positive

experience for their members and contribute positively to the mission of institutions of higher education, as well as contribute to helping fraternity members make good learning choices.

According to Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), undergraduate leadership involvement had modest implications for one's career, but it did enhance interpersonal and leadership skills that were critical to future job success. Compared to non-Greek members, Greek members have higher levels of involvement and gains in cognitive development as a result of Greek involvement (Busteed, 2014; Pike, 2000). Given this fact, this study will investigate if leadership can be learned through experiences and training. In the proceeding chapter, the methodology of this study will be discussed in great detail.

Chapter Summary

The brief review of literature included an examination of the study of leadership; development of leadership theory; student development and leadership; importance of co-curricular experience; history of the college experience; history of the fraternal movement; and the debate regarding the value of fraternal organizations on college campuses today. The study of leadership and the development of leadership theory spans centuries from Plato's republic to the refinement of understanding leadership is relational and it is not necessary positional in the 20th century. During the 20th century leadership development experienced a paradigm shift with the Kouzes & Posner identification of pattern of leadership behaviors and their development of the Leadership Practices Inventory which is the first time that leadership could actually be measured. It is during this time that the focus of leadership shifts to student development and leadership.

Student development in the United States spans more than 383 years from the beginning of Harvard University. In this time the focus of student development went from an exclusive

educational experience meant only for white males who owned property with a myopic viewpoint only concerned with prayer and being obedient to the faculty to an inclusive educational experience where education is no longer seen as a privilege but a right. The viewpoint is no longer myopic and concerned with prayer and obedience but one that is panoramic and concerned with preparing students to be leaders within society. There are three catalysts during the evolution of higher education in the United States which were the birth of the Greek-Letter organizations; Morrill Act; and the GI Bill. Higher education in the United States and the American fraternal system have a mutual history of development and have significantly impacted each other during the past 235 years. In the beginning fraternities with their culture and desire for intellectual debate and questioning challenged the norms of the myopic purpose of American higher education during its infancy. The fraternal community would continue to be the precursor for changes within Higher Education from providing housing and the development of student activities on campus. The second catalyst for the evolution of higher education in the United States was the passing of Morrill Act which established the land grant institutions, which were vital to opening higher education to females and expanding the focus of an education from a religious focus to that of agriculture and industry. The third catalyst was the passing of the GI Bill which allowed education people of all ethnicities and social status be able to access a college education.

It is after the passing of the GI Bill and access to a higher education being afforded to people of all ethnicities and socio-economic status that there is emphasis on student development and leadership. Society shifting from being primarily agriculture in nature to that of industry and manufacturing was requiring colleges to develop leaders. This stimulated the emphasis on studying how student develop as leaders. Important scholars during this era were Chickering &

Reisser; Perry; Kouzes & Posner; and Komives. It was the work from these scholars combined with the progress in understanding leadership development that resulted in the understanding that leadership is a relational process of people working together to accomplish change or to make a difference that will benefit the common good. There are five key elements to relational leadership which are: purposeful; process oriented; inclusive; empowering and ethical. As a person is developing their leadership identity within these five elements there are four properties that directly impact this development. They are: adult influences; peer influences; meaningful involvement; and reflective learning.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if leadership can be learned. This study examined the leadership identity development of undergraduate student leaders serving as Greek-letter organization Chapter Presidents. While there are many studies on leadership styles, attributes, and best practices, there is not an established body of research on the process of leadership development among student leaders during their leadership experience. How does this experience impact their leadership identity development? Is there a correlation between the amount of involvement of an advisor and a student leader's leadership development? It is the intent of this study to contribute to the discourse on whether leadership is innate or if it can be taught through instruction and building an environment that is conducive to stepping forward and being a leader in the community (Burns, 1978; Bailey & Axlerod, 2001; Conger & Riggio, 2007; Komives, 2005; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Komives, 2011; Posner, 2004).

The theoretical framework of this study influenced by the work done by Susan Komives and her colleagues on leadership identity. The Leadership Identity Development model (LID) was developed by Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, and Mainelle in 2005. The LID is a model that is comprised of six levels: (a) awareness, (b) exploration and engagement, (c) leader identified, (d) leadership differentiated, (e) generativity, and (f) integration and synthesis. One of the key aspects that weaves its way through all six aspects is the importance of adult involvement. Adults being involved in the advisor role have an impact from being the catalyst for students becoming aware that they are leaders to being a positive reinforcement in encouraging students to become more involved within and outside their college communities (Komives, 2010).

According to Komives et al. (1998), leadership is a relational process of people working together to accomplish change or to make a difference that will benefit the common good. Leadership experiences include holding organizational officer positions that allow students to work collaboratively with their peers to develop their leadership potential. Membership in organizations allows students to begin to become aware of the interdependence of people working together in a group (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). This involvement experience correlates with stage three which is the Leader Differentiated stage of the LID model. It is through this involvement where students begin to understand that leadership is not positional, but can come from anywhere within a group (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, & Mainelle, 2006). This quantitative study will be focusing specifically on the Leader Differentiated stage of a student's leadership identity development.

Komives (2011) asserted that a majority of students arriving on campus are at stage three of developing their leadership identity based on the LID. At these stages, students are just beginning to develop a sense of self and beginning to learn how to interact within a group and usually see leadership as positional (Komives, 2005). The notion of leadership being relational not positional, has not been developed at this time. A majority of students lack the maturity and experience to understand that successful leadership is based on relational leadership. Postindustrial approaches to leadership in the 21st century depend on trusting relationships among people working together toward shared goals (Allen & Cherry, 2000; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998; Pearce & Conger, 2003; Rost, 1993). For a majority of students, this is a different paradigm than what they have been exposed to at this point in their lives.

Statement of Problem

Does one acquire leadership naturally or is it learned through intentional training sessions, developed from experiences, and nurtured by mentoring relationships? There is an absence of research examining this relationship between the experiences that occurred while holding formal student leadership positions (Day & Harrison, 2007; Frey, 2011). This study tried to determine if leadership could be learned through practice, experience, or training.

Research Questions

The following research questions were employed:

1. What extent can leadership experience influence leadership identity?
2. What is the correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership development?
3. Is there a difference in leadership development due to other demographic variables?

Research Hypotheses

To fully address the research questions presented above, the following hypotheses were created:

Research question 1: What extent can leadership experience influence leadership identity?

H_0: Leadership experience does not significantly influence leadership identity.

Research question 2: What is the correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership development?

$H_{1:}$ There is a correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership identity.

H_0: There is no correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership identity.

Research Design

The design of the study is mixed method in nature and will utilize an electronic survey and interviews to examine the impact of a college student's leadership identity development from holding a position of leadership within a student organization. The study consisted of a pretest and posttest. The instrument was administered to male students between the ages of 17 and 23 who had been elected to the position of Chapter President within their fraternity chapter. The original Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI) instrument and the revised SLOI utilized in this study requires students participating to self-report on the gains they perceived in their leadership development. Self-reporting has been called into question whether the effectiveness of student self-reports adequately measures educational gains. Self-reports are likely to be valid under five conditions: (a) the information requested is known to the respondents, (b) the questions are phrased clearly and unambiguously, (c) the questions refer to recent activities, (d) the respondents think the questions merit a serious and thoughtful response, and (e) answering the questions does not threaten, embarrass, or violate the privacy of the respondent or encourage the respondent to respond in socially desirable ways (Kuh, 2001, p. 9).

All of the Chapter President-elects from the national fraternities participating in the study received a letter and an e-mail correspondence asking them to participate in the study, both of which communicated the importance of the study and how the end results would be used to improve the support for future Chapter Presidents. This communication was sent out to the undergraduates immediately after their elections were held and the election results were communicated to their respective national fraternity.

The pretest survey was administered between December 1, 2014, and January 20, 2015, which was before the start of the spring 2015 semester and the participants began participating in

their respective organization's leadership development programs. Over the course of this time period, the survey was administered via the Internet by using Qualtrics through the Applied Research Lab (ARL) at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP). An invitation, which had the link for the instrument, was sent to all of the identified potential participants for the study through weekly e-mails in coordination with the Applied Research Lab (ARL) at IUP. These e-mails occurred from the third week in December to the third week in January. All participants self-selected to actively participate in the study. Those participants who self-selected to actively participate in the study had to consent to participate in the study by completing the embedded consent form with the study. If the participants did not complete the consent form, they were not granted access to the link for the instrument. The consent form allowed them to signify that they were voluntarily agreeing to participate in the survey, that their information would be kept confidential, and confidentiality would be maintained by assigning a code so that the researcher could compare the difference in the data from the pre-test to the post-test. The consent form also informed the participant that he could withdraw from the study at any time.

During the first week of May, all of the Chapter Presidents from the national fraternities participating in the study received a letter through e-mail correspondence from their respective executive director of their national fraternity, which asked them to continue to participate in the study by completing the post-test. The correspondence reiterated the importance of the study and how the end results would be used to improve the support for future Chapter Presidents.

The posttest was administered between May 15, 2015, and July 3, 2015, which was immediately after the conclusion of their first semester serving as Chapter President. The same format of communication utilized in the pretest was used with the administration of the post-test. Over the course of this time period, the survey was administered via the Internet by using

Qualtrics. An invitation, which had the link for the instrument, was sent to all of the participants for the study through weekly e-mails. All participants self-selected to continue to actively participate in the study. In an effort to ensure the highest completion rate possible, all participants who completed the pre-test and post-test were entered into a raffle to win a $500 VISA gift card.

Instrumentation

The SLOI, developed by Dr. Belinda B. McFeeters and Melinda Vann in 1997 at Virginia Tech, was anchored in Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences. It was initially used in graduate student research, in self-evaluations within the residential life leadership (resident assistants), in Virginia's institution effectiveness measure, and to develop a skills language that was incorporated into the mission of student activities programs (Vann, personal communication, June 12, 2013).

This instrument has been used several times in scholarly research since its development. Most recently, the instrument was used by Grant Adzell (2010) at the University of Virginia in his doctoral dissertation. Adzell revised the instrument in his research to include eight questions from the College Student Inventory (Adzell, 2010). The College Student Inventory (CSI) questions were included in his study because they were administered to the population being studied during the freshmen year. Adzell was testing to see if colleges can aid in and contribute to the leadership development of their students. Use of the CSI questions was a pretest and posttest component since this study involved seniors at the participating institutions. The original administration of this instrument by McFeeters and Vann and the adaptation from Adzell was done as a single-use instrument. This study used a revised version of the instrument as a pretest and posttest tool.

The SLOI was chosen as the instrument for this study because in a pre-test and post-test format it can measure the difference in the following leadership skills: self-management; interpersonal skills; cognitive development; organizational skills; self-confidence; and multicultural competencies that are necessary to lead from a relational perspective. It also measures the level of interaction with the student and their respective advisor. While the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) by Kouzes and Posner (1988) has proven that it can measure a person's leadership capabilities, it does not look at the level of advising they have received nor the level of leadership skills obtained over a given period of time during a formal leadership experience of holding a position of leadership. The obtaining or learning of leadership skills through experience and adult involvement are key aspects of the Leadership Identity Development model (Komives, Owens, Longerbeam, & Mainella, 2005).

The instrument in this study has been revised from the original instrument by McFeeters and Vann. The pretest was administered before the student began the experience of holding the fraternity chapter's leadership position of Chapter President. The questions inquire about their experiences before taking the position of Chapter President. The other significant change was revising the six-point Likert scale to a five-point Likert scale in both instruments. A five-point Likert scale has been well-tested and illustrates a scale with theoretically equal intervals among responses (Creswell, 2011). The Student Outcomes Leadership Inventory has four sections: Section I (Demographics); Section II (Student Leadership Skills); Section III (Advisement); and Section IV (Leadership Development). The data obtained from Section I enabled the researcher to obtain a clear picture of the Chapter President which included age, class year, ethnicity, most significant leadership experience, time on task within the most significant leadership experience as reported by the participant, academic information, and amount of time the participants were

engaged in all university affiliated extra-curricular activities. Section II (Student Leadership Skills) has seven subsections: Self-Management; Interpersonal Skills; Problem-Solving/Decision Making; Cognitive Development/Critical Analysis; Organization and Planning Skills; Self Confidence; and Multicultural Competencies. Among these seven subsections, there are 57 leadership traits that the participants rate themselves on with a Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) for a total possible score of 285 points. Section III (Advisement) asks the participants to self-report their involvement with a person they identified the most as their advisor or mentor before becoming Chapter President and after becoming Chapter President. Section IV (Leadership Development) obtains information on the training programs that the participants believe were important to them during their college career.

In order to acquire face validity, McFeeters and Van had employers, organization advisors, and Virginia Tech alumni in the workplace review the instrument. For this study, content validity was established by soliciting feedback from the pilot participants. In addition to the pilot sample population, the instrument was distributed among an intentionally select group of senior vice presidents of student affairs, director of fraternity and sorority affairs, and executive directors of national social Greek-letter organizations.

The reliability of the original instrument was tested and a Chronbach's alpha score of a .98 was obtained (Vann 2005). According to Pallant (2010), a score of .98 suggests that this instrument has very good internal consistency reliability. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the instrument was revised to utilize a five point Likert scale instead of the original format that utilized a six point Likert scale to increase the ease of use of the instrument by the participant in this study (Preston & Colman, 2000). Since the instrument was revised, the researcher had concerns of internal consistency among the scales, which was satisfied by obtaining Cronbach's

alpha coefficient for each independent factor within the pre-test and the post-test instrument. This data was then compared to the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each independent factor obtained by Adzell in his doctoral study in 2010. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients obtained can be found in the following table:

Table 1

Internal Reliability Measures for Factors

Independent Variables	Question	Adzell Study	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Multicultural Competency	3	0.837	0.844	0.918
Problem Solving	5	0.762	0.782	0.911
Self Confidence	5	0.823	0.823	0.890
Cognitive Development	6	0.796	0.796	0.914
Self-Management	8	0.824	0.817	0.931
Interpersonal Skills	15	0.875	0.857	0.945
Organization and Planning	15	0.920	0.897	0.959

The second subsection of Section Three also utilizes Likert scales to answer the seven questions concerning the involvement and how the Advisor communicated with the participant. In order to ensure there were no concerns of internal consistency among the scales within this section the researcher obtained the Cronbach's alpha coefficient within the pre-test and the post-test instrument. The results can be found within this table:

Table 2

Internal Reliability Measures for Advisement

Independent Variables	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Advisor Interaction	0.972	0.898

According to Pallant (2010), Cronbach's alpha coefficient values above a .7 are acceptable and values above .8 are preferable. The values obtained in this study met these standards and affirms that internal reliability was achieved within the revised instrument. When

this instrument was utilized by Adzell, it was not done in a repeated measures study. This study's pre-test values for Cronbach's alpha coefficient are either exactly the same obtained from Adzell or slightly under the coefficients he obtained. However, when comparing the values obtained from Adzell to the values obtained in this study's post-test, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient values were much higher than obtained from Adzell. It is possible that the participants were very excited and confident in what they perceived to be their level of comfort within the 57 traits that are surveyed within this instrument but after holding the position of Chapter President for six months they had a better understanding and more realistic view of their abilities. This also accounts for the lower mean scores among the post-test data which will be discussed later in Chapter Five.

A pilot study was utilized to determine the reliability of the revised instrument. The response rate for the pilot was 32 percent with 11 respondents, which is in line with the expected 30 to 40 percent expected response rate for internal surveys (Survey response rates). When the participants were asked to indicate their most significant leadership experience since becoming their chapter's Chapter President, 79 percent of the participants indicated that being their chapter's Chapter President was the most significant leadership experience. Results from the pilot were consistent with the results obtained in the actual study.

Study Participants

For this study, nine national fraternal organizations which were members of the North-American InterFraternity Conference (NIC) were selected. The NIC was founded in 1909, it is the trade association representing 70 International and National Men's Fraternities. The purpose of the NIC is to advocate the needs of its member fraternities through enrichment of the fraternity experience, advancement and growth of the fraternity community, and enhancement of

the educational mission of the host institutions (NIC). Currently, the NIC has 70 member organizations with approximately 6,000 chapters located on 800+ campuses in the United States and Canada with approximately 375,000 undergraduate members (NIC).

While these seven national organizations differ in membership size, they all have in common a required leadership program for all undergraduate students elected to the position of Chapter President and have chapter advisors. These leadership programs have the objective of preparing their participants for the challenges of leading their respective chapters for the next calendar year. Chapter advisors are volunteers who serve as a mentor to the Chapter President and chapter membership.

The total possible number of participants for this study is 872 male college students. Collectively, these organizations reach more than 800 campus and provide additional human, educational, and financial resources than what their Chapter Presidents are provided with by their host institutions. There are 6,000 chapters existing on college campuses today with 327,260 student members of national social fraternal organizations (Foran, 2016). The sample would represent 10.6 percent of the national student leaders within the male Greek-letter community on college campuses today.

Sample Population

The participants were male and between the ages of 17 and 23. All participants will start their term as Chapter President in the spring semester of the 2014-2015 academic year. By using students from these nine organizations that are members of the NIC, it ensures that the student organizations are operating under similar national standards and that the basic support from the national organization is similar for all participants. There are two main attributes that these organizations have in common. They are mandated to have advisors, which increases the amount

of time that these participants are involved with an adult acting in a role as advisor and mentor. Also, the requirement that their Chapter Presidents-elect must attend a leadership development program facilitated by their respective organizations before beginning their term of office as Chapter President.

According to Kelly (2008), serving as a fraternity Chapter President provides unique leadership benefits which are not available to other students on the college campus. Depending on the size of the chapter a Chapter President can be responsible for leading anywhere from 20 to 100 undergraduate students, manage an organization budget from $4,000 to more than $100,000 within any given academic year and if the chapter is housed, the Chapter President would be responsible for the financial management of the building which can have a budget that exceeds a million dollars (Stumm, 2014).

Traditionally, the Chapter Presidents of the chapters, like a majority of student organizations on college campuses today, originate from students who are from the senior and junior class. Typically, a student would join the organization during their freshmen or sophomore year in college, establish themselves and gradually develop their leadership skills by assuming lesser roles of leadership such as committee chairs. This provides students the opportunity to experience more leadership opportunities so during their junior or senior year they could draw from a well-defined tool box of resources to assist them in their leadership roles. It is these experiences that provide inherent positive impact on a student's leadership potential (Kelley, 2006; Tootle, 1981). According to Kelley (2006), serving as a fraternity Chapter President provides a positive experience that is beneficial to students' growth and development and useful in their professional careers.

Pilot Procedure

Since the instrument utilized in this study was slightly modified piloting is necessary to establish reliability and validity. In the pilot study, a nonprobability sample will be used. A nonprobability sample is being employed because the researcher has access to 40 male student leaders who are Chapter Presidents within a national fraternal organization. They represent the main characteristic of the sample being used for the study, which are male students who hold leadership positions within local chapters of a national social fraternal organization on a college campus.

The participants in the pilot would have completed their first semester as Chapter President which provided them a unique leadership benefits not available to other students on the college campus (Kelley, 2008). The average size of a chapter at the pilot location was 59 members. They managed an organization budget from $30,000 to more than $80,000 within any given academic year. However, none of them were housed so they did not have the experience or responsibility of financial management of a chapter house.

Like the participants that participated in the study, their national organization is a member of the NIC which ensures that they are operating under similar national standards and that the basic support from the national organization is similar for all participants. All of these students, like the study participants, have in common the involvement of advisors.

The pilot participants received an e-mail from a member of the staff of the national fraternal organization which informed them that the organization would be participating in this study as the pilot group and was hoping to use the information obtained to improve the services and leadership education to them in the upcoming semester for future Chapter Presidents. The e-

mail communication stressed that participation in the study was not mandatory and their identities remained confidential.

On August 5, the pilot participants were sent an e-mail that contained the agreement to participate in the study which informed them that participation was voluntary and all of the information was kept confidential. It also contained the link providing them access to complete the SLOI for this study. All of the data collected was analyzed using Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS). Any issues regarding the instrument that came to light in the pilot was addressed by the researcher prior to sending the survey to study participants.

Study Procedure

All of the participants volunteering in the study received an e-mail from their National Organizations asking them to participate in the study, communicating the importance of the study, and how the end results would be used to improve the support for future Chapter Presidents. This communication was sent to the participants immediately after their elections results were communicated to their respective National Fraternity.

The pretest survey was administered between December 1, 2014, and January 20, 2015, which was prior to the commencement of classes of the spring 2015 semester and the participants participating in their respective organization's leadership development programs. The survey was administered via the Internet by using Qualtrics. An invitation, which had the link for the instrument, was sent to all of the identified potential participants for the study through weekly e-mails in coordination with the Applied Research Lab (ARL). These e-mails occurred from the third week in December to the third week in January. All participants self-selected to actively participate in the study. Those participants consented to participate in the study by completing the embedded consent form. If the participants did not complete the consent

form, they were not granted access to the link for the instrument. The consent form allowed them to signify that they were voluntarily agreeing to participate in the survey, that their information was kept confidential, their name would be kept confidential by assigning a code the pre-test and post-test data. The consent form informed the participant that they could withdrawal from the study at any time.

During the first week of May, the participants participating in the study received a letter through e-mail correspondence from their respective executive director of their national fraternity asking them to continue to participate in the study by completing the post-test. The correspondence reiterated the importance of the study and how the end results would be used to improve the support for future Chapter Presidents.

The posttest was administered between May 15, 2015, and July 3, 2015, which was immediately after the conclusion of the participants' first semester serving as Chapter President. The same format of communication utilized in the pretest was used with the administration of the post-test. The post-test was administered via the Internet by using Qualtrics. The invitation, which had the link for the instrument, was sent to all of the participants for the study through weekly e-mails in coordination with the Applied Research Lab (ARL). All participants self-selected to continue to actively participate in the study. In an effort to ensure the highest completion rate possible, all participants who completed the pre-test and post-test were entered into a raffle to win a $500 VISA gift card.

Analysis of Data

SPSS was utilized to analyze the data and determine if there was an impact on a person's leadership identity development due to being a Chapter President of an organization.

Data from question one was analyzed using a paired-sample t-test. The data from question two were analyzed using Pearson's Correlation coefficient which is also referred to as Pearson's r (Kendrick, 2005). "Correlation analysis is used to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables (Pallant, 2010, p. 128)." The closer the value to zero the weaker the association (Kendrick, 2005). A Pearson's r value equal or more than .82 can be interpreted as a strong positive association (Rea & Park, 2005). In the first question, the dependent variable is the participants' leadership development score on the instrument and the independent variable would be the participant's participation as a Chapter President. The dependent variable in the second question is the leadership development score on the instrument and the independent variable is the amount of involvement and interaction by the advisor with the participant.

Data from question three were analyzed using One-Way ANOVA. The use of One-Way ANOVA was used to analyze single nominal independent variable affect a dependent variable measured at the interval level (Kenny, 1987). One-Way ANOVA is commonly used in data analysis in education (Kenny, 1987). The analysis of variance in this study was used to compare the variability in scores between the various class year in question three and age in question four (Pallant, 2010). The dependent variable for question three and four is the score on the SLOI. The independent variable in Question three is class year. It has five levels: freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, and fifth-year senior. The researcher examined the variance between the various class years to answer the question, does class ranking make a difference in the level of leadership development acquired? Question four's independent variable is age. It has four levels: under 18, 19, 20, and 21 and over. The researcher will be looking at the variance between the various age groups to answer does age make a difference in the level of leadership development acquired.

Chapter Summary

This study utilized a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data was obtained by students participating in a repeated measures study. They completed the Student Leadership Outcomes Inventory before they started their term as Chapter President and then after the conclusion of their first semester as Chapter President. The quantitative data obtained for the three questions were examined with a paired-samples t-test; Pearson's Correlation coefficient and One-Way ANOVA. The 120 students who participated in the study were asked if they would be interested in volunteering to participate in a 30 minute interview to discuss their thoughts on their leadership experience and the importance of an advisor in their development as a leader. Nine students volunteered to be interviewed and provide their insights in how the experience of holding the position of Chapter President impacted their development as a leader.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study utilized mixed methods. The research questions were examined using quantitative data gathered from an instrument that was facilitated twice to the participants once at the beginning of their term of office as Chapter President and then again at the conclusion of their first semester as Chapter President. Qualitative data were collected from nine participants who participated in an interview via a phone conversation.

In using mixed methods, it allows for triangulation of the data but more importantly the qualitative data provides a voice to the quantitative data (Tashakkori, 2010). As the researcher reflected on his personal history and the influences of being an undergraduate leader within the Fraternal Community himself, he decided it was important to capture the personal story of a few of the participants to provide a texture or depth to the research. According to Lieber and Weisner (2010), having various types of evidence at hand enhances the researcher's ability to discover, understand, and communicate findings to a wide range of audiences, which will produce meaningful results that can be communicated in clear and compelling ways.

First, the researcher examined closely the demographics of the sample. After discussing the data collected regarding the demographics, the researcher examined the data collected to answer three of the research questions. Finally, the researcher, in an effort to triangulate, examined the data collected from the open ended questions within the survey and the information communicated in the nine phone interviews.

The purpose of the study was to determine if leadership can be learned, which was examined by asking the following three questions:

1. Is there impact on students' leadership identity from serving as Chapter President?

2. Is there a correlation between the level of involvement of an advisor and the fraternity Chapter President's leadership development?
3. Is there a difference in leadership development due to other demographic variables?

In answering these three questions examined was the total score of the instrument, the total score for each independent factor and finally each individual leadership trait that comprises each independent factor.

Description of Sample

At the outset of the study there were 230 participants who completed the pre-test. However, there were 120 undergraduate leaders who successfully completed this study by completing the pre and post-test. This represents 13.7% percent of the total population eligible to participate.

The examination of the age of the participants (see Table 3) indicates more than half of the participants (63) who completed the study were between the ages of 19 and 20 years old.

Table 3

Frequency of the Age of the Survey Participants

Age	Frequency	Valid %
19	13	11.1
20	50	41.7
21 & Over	54	45.0
Subtotal	117	100.0
Missing	3	
Total	120	

The examination of the class years represented within the study (see Table 4) indicates men who are in their junior year of school are the largest percentage (62.4) participating in the study. However, those participants who were Chapter President during their sophomore year

almost equal the number of participants who were Chapter President during their senior year and fifth year.

Table 4

Breakdown of Class Year Among the Participants

Class Year	Frequency	Valid %
Sophomore	22	18.8
Junior	73	62.4
Senior	19	16.2
5th or 6th year	3	2.6
Subtotal	117	100.0
Missing	3	
Total	120	

The examination of racial or ethnic identity the population of the participants (see Table 5) indicate the participants are homogenous with 92.3 percent self-identifying as Caucasian/white.

Table 5

Frequency of Ethnic and/or Racial Identity of Participants

Ethnic/Racial Identity	Frequency	Valid %
African American	1	0.9
Asian	3	2.6
Caucasian-White	108	92.3
Hispanic	2	1.7
Native American	1	0.9
Other	2	1.7
Subtotal	117	
Missing	3	4.4
Total	120	100

The examination of leadership experience before becoming Chapter President (see Table 6) indicated a majority of the participants, 52.1 percent, had a year or more of leadership

experience before becoming their Chapter President. This number compares to 13.7 percent (16) of the participants that had less than a year experience serving in a leadership position prior to being elected their Chapter President.

Table 6

Leadership Experience of Participant Prior to Being Elected Chapter President

Years of Experience	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
Less than 1	16	13.7
1 to 3	61	52.1
More than 3	40	34.2
Subtotal	117	100
Missing	3	
Total	120	

The examination of the participants' involvement in co-curricular activities before becoming Chapter President (see Table 7) indicate they are highly engaged within the campus community. Participants for this questions were allowed to provide more than one response to the question.

Table 7

Student Organization Involvement of Participant Before Becoming Chapter President

Activity	Frequency	Valid %
Fraternity Chapter Officer	108	90
Committee Chair in a student organization or university committee/task force	54	45
Committee member in a student organization or university committee/task force	53	44.2
Intramural Sports Team Leader	34	28.3
Student Organization Officer	35	29.2
Work Study Position	22	18.3
Orientation Leader	15	12.5
Judicial Officer	14	11.7
Student Employee/Supervisor	10	8.3
Varsity Sports Leader	14	11.7
University Budget Board/Committee member	11	9.2
Peer Educator	15	12.5
Other*	8	6.7
Resident Advisor	8	6.7
Residence Life Student Employee	6	5.0
ROTC	2	1.7
Honor System Committee Member	2	1.3

Note. Student Involvement mentioned within the other category are undergraduate researcher; tutor; teachers assistant; Research Team Leader; Intramural Referee; IFC Representative; and manager at place of employment.

There was 90 percent (108) of the participants serving as an officer within their fraternal organization before becoming Chapter President. 29.2 percent (35) served as an officer in another student organization on campus. Also, the men who were being elected to Chapter Presidents were doing so with considerable leadership experience within their host institutions community with more than 89.2 percent (87) serving on a university committee.

Participants Demographic Data as Chapter President

When the post-test was facilitated, the participants were asked specific questions to examine the impact of being a Chapter President on various aspects of their college experience. These questions were:

- "What is your approximate grade point average?"
- "What is the average number of hours you spend per week on class work outside of class?"
- "Indicate your most significant student leadership experience since becoming your Chapter's President."
- "Estimate the average number of hours you spend per week in your single most important student leadership experience?"
- "What is the average number of hours you spend per week on all university-affiliated extra-curricular activities this year?"

Academic Demographic Information

Grade point average. The examination of the grade point average of the participants (see Table 8) indicated that 72.3 percent of the participants obtained a 3.1 grade point average or higher of which 16.8 percent reported obtaining a 3.7 to 4.0 grade point average. In addition to asking the participants to self-report on the grade point averages they achieved, they were asked how much time they spent on classwork outside of the class.

Table 8

Grade Point Average (GPA) of the Participants

	Post-test	
GPA	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
3.7 to 4.0	20	16.8
3.4 to 3.69	34	28.6
3.1 to 3.39	32	26.9
2.8 to 3.09	26	21.8
2.5 to 2.79	7	5.9
Subtotal	119	100
Missing	1	
Total	120	

Time spent on classwork. The examination of hours spent on classwork outside of the classroom (see Table 9) indicated that 60.9 percent of the participants spent 11 hours or more preparing for class.

Table 9

Average Number of Hours Spent per Week by Participant on Classwork Outside of the Classroom

	Post-test	
Hours	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
1 to 5	9	7.6
6 to 10	38	31.9
11 to 15	32	26.9
16 to 20	24	20.2
21 to 25	9	7.6
Greater than 25	7	5.9
Subtotal	119	100
Missing	1	
Total	120	

Extracurricular Demographic Information

Most important leadership experience. An examination of what the participants considered their most significant leadership experience (see Table 10) indicated that more than half of the participants, 79.8 percent (95), stated the most significant leadership position was being Chapter President.

Table 10

Most Significant Leadership Experience of Participant

	Post-test	
Experience	Freq.	Valid %
Valid		
Fraternity Chapter President	95	79.8
Fraternity Chapter Officer	7	5.8
Varsity Sports Team Leader	1	0.8
Committee Chair for a Student Organization or University Committee/Task Force	3	2.5
Student Government Association Officer	1	.8
Interfraternity Council Officer	3	2.5
Student Organization Officer	5	4.2
Orientation Leader	1	0.8
ROTC Officer	1	0.8
Resident Advisor	1	0.8
Subtotal	119	100
Missing	1	
Total	120	

Note. Freq = frequency.

Time spent on single most important leadership experience. An examination of the average number of hours spent by the participants in their single most important leadership experience (see Table 11) indicates that the post-test largest frequency was 78 participants, which comprises 65.5 percent of the participants spending more than six hours a week in their single most leadership experience.

Table 11

Average Number of Hours Spent per Week in Participants' Single Most Important Student Leadership Experience

	Post-test	
Hours	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
0 to 2	5	4.2
3 to 6	36	30.3
Greater than 6	78	65.5
Subtotal	119	100
Missing	1	
Total	120	

Time spent on all extracurricular activities Participants were asked how much time a week they were involved in extracurricular activities on campus. Upon examination of how much time participants were involved on campus through extracurricular activity (see Table 12), 10.9 percent of participants spent less than five hours on extracurricular activities during the week. Conversely more than 33.6 percent spent more than 16 hours a week on extracurricular activities. There is significant evidence that those men becoming Chapter Presidents of their respective chapters are highly engaged in their respective college community.

Table 12

Average Number of Hours Spent per Week by Participant on all University Affiliated Extracurricular Activities

	Post-test	
Hours	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
1 to 5	13	10.9
6 to 10	24	20.2
11 to 15	42	35.3
16 to 20	21	17.6
21 to 25	7	5.9
More than 25	12	10.1
Subtotal	119	100
Missing	1	
Total	120	

The data show that the participants in this study are highly engaged within the classroom and the host institutions community.

Data Analysis

Leadership Experience Influencing Leadership Identity

The first question examined if there was an impact on participants' leadership identity from serving as Chapter President and participating in their respective organization's presidents' leadership educational programming. A paired-samples t-test was utilized to analyze the data. Analyzing the data obtained from Section II of the instrument using this method allowed the mean scores from the pre-test and post-test to be compared to see if there was a significant difference; positive or negative in the scores obtained. This analysis was done on three levels: overall score of Section II; the score of each subsection within Section II; and then for each individual trait within each subsection of Section II. A total score of 285 points could be obtained by a participant with Section II of the instrument. As mentioned earlier Section II is broken down into seven sub-sections and they are:

- Self-Management contains eight questions for 40 points
- Interpersonal Skills contains 15 questions for 75 points
- Problem Solving contains five questions for 25 points
- Cognitive Development contains six questions for 30 points
- Organization and Planning contains 15 questions for 75 points
- Self Confidence contains five questions for 25 points
- Multicultural Competency contains three questions for 15 points

Details of Analysis and Results

Data Pertaining to Question One

Overall instrument paired-samples t-test results. The mean score in the post-test dropped by 10.48 points for a total of 226.24 points (see Table 13). While not statistically significant, it is important to point out because it is possible that after holding the position of leadership for six months the participants changed their perceptions or understandings of their leadership skills. This is supported by the drastic change in the standard deviation. While the mean score saw a decrease the standard deviation experienced a 28.84 increase in size. This may suggest that the students after six months being in a position of leadership learned about their capabilities. During the interviews with the nine students this was a reoccurring theme. They also learned the demands a position of leadership places on a person and where they need to focus on improving their leadership skills. One student stated "they gained a better understanding on how to look at and approach a situation."

Table 13

Overall Mean Scores

Test	M	N	SD	SEM
Pre	236.723	112	34.676	3.277
Post	226.241	112	63.525	6.003

Note. SEM = standard error mean.

After reviewing the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test, the results of the paired samples t-test results were examined. There was no significant difference (see Table 14); positive or negative, in the overall scores of the participants; t(111), = -1.67, $p < .05$. However, the standard deviation shows a positive increase of 66.52.

Table 14

Paired Samples T-Test of Overall Score

	Paired Differences							
				95 % CI				
Pair	M	SD	SEM	LL	UL	t	df	Sig.
1	-10.482	66.526	6.286	-1.974	22.938	-1.668	111	0.098

Note. SEM = standard error mean; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; t = ratio of the mean of the difference to the standard error difference; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Seven subsections paired-samples t-test results. By examining the mean scores of the seven subsections (see Table 15), it was observed that two of the independent factors, cognitive development and self-confidence, showed a slight increase in their mean scores. Five of the independent factors interpersonal skills, self-management skills, problem solving, organization and planning, and multicultural competency showed a decrease in the mean score which is similar to the results from the pair-samples t-test for the entire population.

Table 15

Overall Mean Scores of the Subset

Independent Variables	Mean	N	SD	SEM
Self-Management				
Pre-test	33.892	112	3.960	0.374
Post-test	33.339	112	6.366	0.601
Interpersonal Skills				
Pre-test	63.342	105	7.069	0.689
Post-test	62.657	105	9.923	0.968
Problem Solving				
Pre-test	21.445	101	2.586	0.257
Post-test	21.079	101	3.242	0.322
Cognitive Development				
Pre-test	25.100	100	3.227	0.322
Post-test	25.130	100	4.152	0.415
Organization and Planning				
Pre-test	63.294	102	7.990	0.791
Post-test	63.009	102	9.492	0.939
Self Confidence				
Pre-test	21.539	102	2.913	0.288
Post-test	21.598	102	3.156	0.312
Multicultural Competency				
Pre-test	12.872	102	2.132	0.211
Post-test	12.833	102	2.220	0.219

Note. SEM = standard error mean.

Each of the seven independent factors was tested utilizing a paired-sample t-test to examine if the difference between the pre score on the independent factor and the post score on the independent factor had changed significantly as a result of a semester of actual leadership experience and leadership training. Upon examining the results of the paired-samples t-test on each of the seven independent factors that comprised section two of the instrument, there was no statistical significant difference; positive or negative on each of the leadership subsets (see Table 16). However, the subsections of cognitive development and self-confidence showed there was an overall increase in the mean scores. Both subsections experienced increases in the mean scores of several individual traits (see table 17).

Table 16

Paired-Samples T-Test of the Subset Scores

	Paired Differences					
Independent Variables	M	SD	SEM	t	df	Sig.
Self Management	-0.553	6.913	0.653	-0.847	111	0.399
Interpersonal Skills	-0.685	11.15	1.088	-0.630	104	0.530
Problem Solving	-0.366	3.384	0.336	-1.088	100	0.279
Cognitive Development	0.030	4.234	0.423	0.071	99	0.944
Organization and Planning	-0.284	9.096	0.900	-0.316	101	0.753
Self Confidence	0.058	3.236	0.320	0.184	101	0.855
Multicultural Competency	-0.039	2.233	0.221	-0.177	101	0.860

Note. SEM = standard error mean; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; t = ratio of the mean of the difference to the standard error difference; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Individual leadership traits paired-samples t-test results. A paired-samples t-test was used to examine the 57 individual traits that comprise the seven subsections within section II of the instrument. This step was facilitated to look at the leadership identity development on a micro-level. The individual traits within five of the seven subsections showed no significant difference; positive or negative. One leadership trait, creative problem solving, within the problem solving skills, showed significant difference. Among the leadership traits within the organization and planning skills there was one trait that showed a significant difference and another trait that was close enough to being significant to discuss.

Problem solving leadership traits paired-samples t-test results. When examining the mean scores (see Table 17) within the various traits within the problem solving subsection, only one of the five traits indicated an increase in the mean scores. However, the results are similar to the results seen in the overall mean scores. Where there is a decrease in the mean scores there is an increase in the standard deviation.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics for Problem Solving Traits

Pair	Problem Solving Traits	Mean	N	SD	SEM
1	Diplomatic conflict resolution				
	Pre-test	4.17	101	0.649	0.065
	Post-test	4.23	101	0.786	0.078
2	Negotiating for a desires outcome				
	Pre-test	4.34	101	0.652	0.065
	Post-test	4.18	101	0.740	0.074
3	Creative problem solving				
	Pre-test	4.34	101	0.682	0.068
	Post-test	4.15	101	0.788	0.079
4	Ethical decision making				
	Pre-test	4.31	100	0.734	0.073
	Post-test	4.19	100	0.849	0.085
5	Development of good judgement				
	Pre-test	4.34	101	0.652	0.065
	Post-test	4.34	101	0.697	0.069

Note. SEM = standard error mean.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the pre-test scores of the five traits within the problem solving subsection with the post-test scores of the five traits within the problem solving section (see Table 18). Four of the five traits showed no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores. However, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-test creative problem solving (M=4.34, SD = .682) and post-test creative problem solving (M=4.15, SD=.788); t (100) = -2.095, p = .039. The mean decrease in creative problem solving was .190 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -.366 to -.010. The eta squared statistic (.04) indicated a small effect size.

Table 18

Paired Sample T-Test Scores for Traits Within Problem Solving Subsection

		Paired Differences					
Pair	Problem Solving Traits	M	SD	SEM	t	df	Sig.
1	Diplomatic conflict resolution	0.059	0.892	0.089	0.669	100	0.505
2	Negotiating for a desires outcome	-0.158	0.977	0.097	-1.629	100	0.106
3	Creative problem Solving	-0.188	0.902	0.090	-2.095	100	0.039
4	Ethical decision Making	-0.120	0.977	0.098	-1.228	99	0.222
5	Development of good judgement	0.000	0.762	0.076	0.000	100	1.000

Note. SEM = standard error mean; t = ratio of the mean of the difference to the standard error difference; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Organization and planning leadership traits paired-samples t-test results. When examining the mean scores (see Table 20) within the various traits within the organization and planning subsection, four out of 15 traits indicated an increase in the mean scores. Promoting and marketing events had an increase in the mean score of 0.108. However, there was not a significant difference since p = 0.307. Planning activities and events had an increase in the mean score of 0.078. Similar to promoting and marketing events, there was not a significant difference since p = 0.397. Managing organization finances had an increase of the mean score of 0.088. The results of managing the organization's finances within the Organization and Planning subsection while not statistically significant were close enough to bring to the reader's attention. The scores for the pre-test managing the organization finances were (M=3.91, SD=.966) and the post-test managing the organization finances were (M=4.12, SD=.937); t (101) = 1.842, p=.068.

Understanding of organization politics was the last trait that showed an increase in the mean score. The mean score for the trait of understanding of organizations politics increased by 0.088. However, like the other three traits, the change was not significant with the $p = 0.348$. The pattern of decrease mean scores and an increase in the standard deviation reoccurs within these traits. This finding is in line with the data obtained from the interviews with the students. One student stated that the experience of being Chapter President opens your eyes to what you know and what you do not know.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Organization and Planning Traits

Pair	Organization and Planning Traits	Mean	N	SD	SEM
1	Building consensus with a group				
	Pre-test	4.25	102	0.624	0.062
	Post-test	4.17	102	0.902	0.089
2	Delegation of tasks to others				
	Pre-test	4.16	102	0.887	0.088
	Post-test	4.12	102	0.926	0.092
3	Promoting/marketing events				
	Pre-test	3.89	102	0.855	0.085
	Post-test	4.00	102	0.933	0.092
4	Planning activities/events				
	Pre-test	4.11	102	0.767	0.076
	Post-test	4.19	102	0.782	0.077
5	Developing organization agendas				
	Pre-test	4.25	102	0.817	0.081
	Post-test	4.21	102	0.762	0.075
6	Setting deadlines				
	Pre-test	4.21	102	0.775	0.077
	Post-test	4.08	102	0.829	0.082
7	Ability to run effective meetings				
	Pre-test	4.31	102	0.785	0.081
	Post-test	4.27	102	0.780	0.078
8	Managing organization finances				
	Pre-test	3.91	102	0.966	0.096
	Post-test	4.12	102	0.937	0.093
9	Managing multiple tasks				
	Pre-test	4.41	102	0.680	0.067

	Post-test	4.31	102	0.731	0.072
10	Ability to form a team to accomplish a Goal				
	Pre-test	4.44	101	0.654	0.065
	Post-test	4.27	101	0.786	0.078
11	Leading a group of people				
	Pre-test	4.46	100	0.593	0.059
	Post-test	4.38	100	0.693	0.069
12	Organizing tasks				
	Pre-test	4.30	102	0.672	0.067
	Post-test	4.27	102	0.798	0.079
13	Long term goal setting				
	Pre-test	4.25	102	0.838	0.083
	Post-test	4.19	102	0.909	0.090
14	Meeting deadlines				
	Pre-test	4.24	102	0.677	0.067
	Post-test	4.15	102	0.883	0.087
15	Understanding of organization politics				
	Pre-test	4.24	102	0.773	0.077
	Post-test	4.32	100	0.773	0.077

Note. SEM = standard error mean.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the scores of the 15 traits within pre-test Organization and planning subsection with the scores of the 15 traits within the post-test Organization and Planning subsection (see Table 20). The results from the paired samples test for the 15 traits showed that 13 of the traits showed no statistical difference; positive or negative. However one trait showed a statistically significant difference and another trait was close to being statistically significant. There was a statistical difference in the scores for the pre-test ability to form a team to accomplish a goal (M=4.44, SD=.654) and the post-test ability to form a team to accomplish a goal (M=4.27, SD=.786); t (101) = -2.146, p=.034. The mean decrease in ability to form a team to accomplish a goal was .170 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .013 to .327. The eta squared statistic (.04) indicated a small effect size. The significant difference was negative.

Table 20

Paired Sample T-Test Scores for Traits Within Organization and Planning Subsection

Pair	Organization and Planning Traits	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig.
		M	SD	SEM			
1	Building consensus with a group	-0.088	0.924	0.091	-0.965	101	0.337
2	Delegation of tasks to others	-0.039	0.964	0.095	-0.411	101	0.682
3	Promoting/ Marketing Events	0.108	1.062	0.107	1.026	101	0.307
4	Planning activities/ events	0.078	0.919	0.091	0.862	101	0.391
5	Developing organization agendas	-0.049	0.948	0.094	-0.522	101	0.603
6	Setting deadlines	-0.127	0.886	0.088	-1.452	101	0.150
7	Ability to run effective meetings	-0.039	0.943	0.093	-0.420	101	0.675
8	Managing organization finances	0.206	1.129	0.112	1.842	101	0.068
9	Managing multiple tasks	-0.098	0.873	0.086	-1.134	101	0.260
10	Ability to form a team to accomplish a goal	-0.168	0.788	0.078	-2.146	100	0.034
11	Leading a group of people	-0.080	0.748	0.075	-1.070	99	0.287
12	Organizing tasks	-0.029	0.850	0.084	-0.350	101	0.727
13	Long term goal Setting	-0.059	1.070	0.106	-0.555	101	0.580
14	Meeting deadlines	-0.088	0.935	0.093	-0.954	101	0.343
15	Understanding of organization politics	0.088	0.945	0.094	0.943	101	0.348

Note. SEM = standard error mean; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; t = ratio of the mean of the difference to the standard error difference; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

There was no statistical difference after examining the impact that a leadership experience has on participants' leadership identity development. However, there were several individual leadership traits that showed a statistical difference. The experience of holding a position of Chapter President impacts a person's leadership identity development.

While the results from the paired-sample t-test produced few statistically significant differences overall, the data suggest that the participants experienced an impact. The decrease in the post-test mean scores from the pre-test scores and the higher Cronbach Alpha results within the post-test suggest that the students' experiences of being Chapter President enabled them to learn more about themselves. In addition every trait that exhibited a decrease in the mean score exhibited an increase in the standard deviation. Also, there were 22 leadership identity traits of the 57 leadership identity traits identified that showed an increase in the post-test mean scores suggesting that through this experience the participant learned and refined various leadership skills.

Second Question: Advisors' Impact on Participants' Leadership Identity Development

A major component of person's leadership development is the amount and quality of mentoring and or advising they receive during their lifetime (Komives, 2010). Cognizant of this fact this study examined the impact an advisor's communication method and frequency of communication had on the participants' leadership development. This section will first review the demographics of the advisors' advising the participants within this study. Then, will discuss the correlation between advisors' involvement and participants' leadership development utilizing Pearson product-moment correlation test. After examining the correlation between advisors' involvement and participants' leadership development, this study examined the frequency of communication methods between advisors and the participants using a One Way ANOVA. This

step was important to ascertain if there was a more impactful method of communication. Also was there a frequency of communication between the advisors and participants that was more impactful than another on leadership identity development traits of the participants.

Demographics regarding the participants' advisors. In section three of the instrument the participants are asked who they considered their most important advisor while being Chapter President. There were 111 participants who completed the question that identified who was serving as their advisor. The results are shown in the following table:

Table 21

Participants' Perception of Who Was the Most Important Advisor to Them

	Post-test	
Advisor	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
Alumni Advisor	52	46.9
Academic Faculty/Staff	27	24.3
Student Affairs Staff	10	9
No Advisor	9	8.1
Athletic Department Coach	3	2.7
Other	10	9
Total	111	100

According to the participants, the advisor who was associated with the organization was the most important leadership opportunities after becoming the chapter's Chapter President was their local alumni advisor at 46.9% (52). Advisors who were among the faculty ranked second in frequency at 24.3% (27). Advisors who were from the Student Affairs Staff ranked third at 9% (10). Advisors within this group would be the staff who are hired by the institution to serve as the administrator for the students participating in their Greek-Letter organizations. The preference of an alumni advisor over faculty and or student affairs staff person is corroborated

with the interviews of the nine students. One student stated their alumni advisor was more important to him than any other relationship because the alumni had similar experiences to draw from to provide advice.

Individual methods of advisors' communication with participants. In order to examine the correlation between the level of advisor involvement with the participants and the participants' leadership identity development, this study viewed involvement with the participants through the lens of communication methods. Six questions within Section II of the instrument were based on a Likert scale concerning the involvement and how the advisor communicated with the participants. The communication methods examined were phone or text messaging, social media, E-mail; impromptu meetings, scheduled one on one meetings; and contact at chapter events.

Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was no correlation, positive or negative, within the overall perspective or within the total score of each of the seven subsections. However, when looking at the traits individually within each subsection there were significant correlations in several of the 57 individual leadership identity traits versus phone communication, social media, impromptu meetings, scheduled one on one meetings, and contact at chapter events. There was no correlation of significance with the 57 leadership traits versus the communication method of e-mails and contact at chapter events by the advisor to the participants. All of the correlation tables can be found in appendices. Table 22 shows the descriptive statistics for the advisors interactions through the six communication methods identified by this study.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for Advisor Interactions With Participants

Advisor Interaction	Variables	N	M	SD
Phone or text message		96	2.00	1.353
	Interpersonal Skills			
	Active listening	96	4.21	0.845
	Providing constructive criticism	96	4.15	0.846
	Receiving constructive criticism	96	4.19	0.898
	Expressing disagreement tactfully	96	4.25	0.781
	Understanding what is important to others	96	4.20	0.803
	Influencing others	96	4.23	0.864
	Motivating others	96	4.13	0.965
	Supervisory skills	96	4.26	0.811
	Professional working relationship with the opposite gender	96	4.00	1.095
	Public speaking skills	96	4.33	0.867
	Written communication	96	4.16	0.886
	Ability to work as part of a group	96	4.30	0.884
	Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others	96	4.35	0.858
	Making formal presentations	96	4.05	0.966
	Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed)	96	4.27	0.864
	Organizational Skills			
	Building consensus with a group	96	4.20	0.936
	Delegation of tasks to others	96	4.10	1.000
	Promoting/marketing events	96	4.01	1.000
	Planning activities/events	96	4.21	0.857
	Developing organization agendas	96	4.22	0.836
	Setting deadlines	96	4.07	0.885
	Ability to run effective meetings	96	4.28	0.855
	Managing organization finances	96	4.10	1.010
	Managing multiple tasks	96	4.30	0.809
	Ability to form a team to accomplish a Goal	96	4.25	0.871
	Leading a group of people	96	4.38	0.785
	Organizing tasks	96	4.26	0.837
	Long term goal setting	96	4.21	0.962
	Meeting deadlines	96	4.20	0.913

	Understanding of organization politics	96	4.36	0.822
Social media		76	1.55	1.193
	Interpersonal Skills			
	Active listening	76	4.14	0.905
	Providing constructive criticism	76	4.08	0.891
	Receiving constructive criticism	76	4.18	0.890
	Expressing disagreement tactfully	76	4.21	0.822
	Understanding what is important to others	76	4.17	0.839
	Influencing others	76	4.18	0.890
	Motivating others	76	4.13	0.998
	Supervisory skills	76	4.22	0.842
	Professional working relationship with the opposite gender	76	4.07	1.063
	Public speaking skills	76	4.26	0.929
	Written communication	76	4.11	0.918
	Ability to work as part of a group	76	4.24	0.936
	Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others	76	4.28	0.918
	Making formal presentations	76	4.00	0.993
	Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed)	76	4.18	0.890
	Problem Solving Skills			
	Diplomatic conflict resolution	76	4.20	0.910
	Negotiating for a desired outcome	76	4.16	0.849
	Creative problem-solving	76	4.16	0.910
	Ethical decision making	76	4.18	0.934
	Development of good judgement	76	4.28	0.826
Impromptu meetings		93	2.16	1.378
	Interpersonal Skills			
	Active listening	93	4.22	0.858
	Providing constructive criticism	93	4.15	0.846
	Receiving constructive criticism	93	4.23	0.849
	Expressing disagreement tactfully	93	4.24	0.799
	Understanding what is important to others	93	4.20	0.802
	Influencing others	93	4.20	0.867
	Motivating others	93	4.12	0.976
	Supervisory skills	93	4.25	0.816
	Professional working relationship with the	93	4.02	1.083

	opposite gender			
	Public speaking skills	93	4.31	0.872
	Written communication	93	4.15	0.884
	Ability to work as part of a group	93	4.30	0.894
	Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others	93	4.34	0.866
	Making formal presentations	93	4.01	0.972
	Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed)	93	4.25	0.868
	Organization and Planning Skills			
	Building consensus with a group	93	4.17	0.940
	Delegation of tasks to others	93	4.11	1.005
	Promoting/marketing events	93	4.03	0.994
	Planning activities/events	93	4.19	0.863
	Developing organization agendas	93	4.18	0.833
	Setting deadlines	93	4.06	0.882
	Ability to run effective meetings	93	4.27	0.849
	Managing organization finances	93	4.08	1.013
	Managing multiple tasks	93	4.28	0.812
	Ability to form a team to accomplish a Goal	93	4.23	0.874
	Leading a group of people	93	4.34	0.787
	Organizing tasks	93	4.25	0.843
	Long term goal setting	93	4.20	0.962
	Meeting deadlines	93	4.18	0.920
	Understanding of organization politics	93	4.35	0.816
	Self-Confidence Skills			
	Self-confidence in my social skills	93	4.19	0.888
	Self-confidence in my abilities	93	4.33	0.864
	Assertiveness in my interactions with others	93	4.32	0.862
	Clarification of my personal values	93	4.31	0.794
	Establishment of my personal code of ethics	93	4.35	0.829
Scheduled one-on-one meetings		91	1.97	1.027
	Self-Confidence Skills			
	Self-confidence in my social skills	91	4.18	0.902
	Self-confidence in my abilities	91	4.34	0.872
	Assertiveness in my interactions with others	91	4.30	0.863
	Clarification of my personal values	91	4.29	0.807

	Establishment of my personal code of ethics	91	4.33	0.844

Note. N=Number; M = Mean; SD=Standard Deviation.

Phone communication with participants. The relationship between the advisors' phone communication with participants and the 57 leadership identity traits was investigated. Upon examination (See Table 88), there was significance found within the correlation between leadership identity development traits within the interpersonal skills and organization and planning skills subsection. This finding is also supported by the students interviewed. One student stated that being able to talk to their advisor on the phone was beneficial to him because it provided insight that his peers would not be able to provide.

Interpersonal skills. There was a significant correlation in two of the 15 traits within the Interpersonal Skills section. Upon examination (Table 88), there was a positive correlation between the advisors' phone communication with participants and their professional working relationships with the opposite gender $r = .270$, $n= 96$, $p < .008$. The more the advisor communicated with the student leader by phone, the more likely the student leader would have a positive professional working relationship with the opposite gender. The coefficient of determination was 7.29%, which means the dependent variable of professional working relationship with the opposite gender is predicted by the independent variable of phone communication of the advisor with the participant. Also upon examination (See Table 90) there was a positive correlation between the advisors' phone communication with participants and making formal presentations $r = .241$, $n= 96$, $p < .018$. The more the advisor communicated with the student leader by phone, the more likely the student leader would be more confident in making formal presentations. The coefficient of determination was 5.8%, which means the

dependent variable of making formal presentations is predicted by the independent variable of the advisors communication with the student leader by phone.

Organizational skills. Similar to the Interpersonal Skills, there was a significant correlation among two of the 15 traits within the Organization Skills. Upon examination (See Table 91) there was a positive correlation between the advisors' phone communication with participants' ability to promote and market events $r = .280$, $n= 96$, $p < .006$. The more the advisor communicated with the student leader by phone, the more likely the student would be better at promoting and marketing events. The coefficient of determination was 7.84%, which means the dependent variable of promoting and marketing events was predicted by the independent variable of advisors communication with the student leader by phone. Also upon examination (See Table 91) there was a positive correlation between the advisors' phone communication with participants' ability to setting deadlines $r = .220$, $n= 96$, $p < .032$. The more the advisor communicated with the student leader by phone, the more likely the student leader would be better at having the ability in setting deadlines. The coefficient of determination was 4.84%, which means the dependent variable of the ability to setting deadlines was predicted by the independent variable of the advisor communicating with the student leader by phone.

Social media communication with participants. The relationship between the advisors' social media communication with participants and the 57 leadership identity traits was investigated. There was significance found within the correlation between leadership identity development traits within the interpersonal skills and problem solving skills subsection.

Interpersonal skills. There were 15 leadership identity traits within the Interpersonal section and only one showed significance, making formal presentations, when examining if there was any correlation between the Advisors contact with social media. There was a positive

correlation between the advisors' social media communication with participants' ability to make formal presentations r = .236, n= 76, p < .040. The more the advisor communicated with the student leader with the use of social media, the more likely they would improve their ability to make formal presentations. The coefficient of determination was 5.56%, which means the dependent variable of the student leader's ability to make formal presentations was predicted by the independent variable of the advisor communicating with the student leader through social media.

Problem solving skills. There are five leadership identity behavior skills within the problem solving skills section of the instrument and only one skill showed significance; ability to negotiate for a desired outcome. Upon examination (See Table 88), there was a negative correlation between the advisors' social media communication with participants' ability to negotiate for a desired outcome r = -.245, n= 76, p < .033. The more the advisor communicated through social media with the student leader, the more likely the student leader saw a decrease in the ability to negotiate for a desired outcome. The coefficient of determination was 6%, which means the dependent variable of a student's ability to negotiate for a desired outcome was predicted by the independent variable of the advisor communicating with the student leader through social media.

Impromptu meetings with participants. The relationship between the advisors' impromptu meetings with participants and the 57 leadership identity traits was investigated. There was significance found within the correlation between leadership identity development traits within the interpersonal skills, organization and planning skills, and self-confidence subsection.

Interpersonal skills. Only two out of the 15 leadership identity traits showed a significant correlation; written communications and making formal presentations. There was a positive correlation between the advisors' impromptu meeting with participants' written communication r = .230, n= 93, p < .027. The more the advisor communicated with the student leader through impromptu meetings, the more likely the student leader would be more confident in their written communications. The coefficient of determination was 5.29%, which means the dependent variable of the student leader's written communications was predicted by the independent variable of the advisor communicating through impromptu meetings. There was a positive correlation between the advisors' impromptu meeting with participants' ability to make formal presentations r = .291, n= 93, p < .005. This means the more the advisor communicated with the student leader through impromptu meetings, the more likely the student was better at the ability to make formal presentations. The coefficient of determination was 8.46%, which means the dependent variable of the ability to make formal presentations is predicted by the independent variable of the advisor communicating with the student leader through impromptu meetings. Due to the size of the correlation table you will find the table in the appendices.

Organization and planning skill. Only one of the 15 leadership identity traits within the organization and planning skills showed a significant correlation. There was a positive correlation between the advisors' impromptu meetings with participants' ability to develop agendas r = .277, n= 93, p < .007. This means the more the advisor communicated with the student leader through impromptu meetings, the more likely the student leader would have a better ability to develop agendas. The coefficient of determination was 7.67%, which means the dependent variable of ability to develop agendas is predicted by the independent variable of the

advisor communicating through the impromptu meetings. Due to the size of the correlation table you will find the table in the appendices.

Self-confidence skills. Only one of the five leadership identity traits within self-confidence skills showed a significant correlation. There was a positive correlation between the advisors' impromptu meetings with participants' ability to establish a personal code of ethics $r = .206$, $n = 93$, $p < .047$. This means the more the advisor communicated with the student leader through impromptu meetings, the more likely the student leader would be better in having the ability to establish a personal code of ethics. The coefficient of determination was 4.24%, which means the dependent variable of the student leader to have the ability to establish a personal code of ethics is predicted by the independent variable of the advisor communicating with the student leader through impromptu meetings.

Scheduled one-on-one-meetings with participants. The relationship between advisors' scheduled one on one meetings with participants and the 57 leadership identity traits was investigated. There was significance found within the correlation between leadership identity development traits within the self-confidence subsection. There was a positive correlation (see Table 23) between the advisors' scheduled one on one meetings with participants' self confidence in their abilities $r = .236$, $n = 91$, $p < .024$. This means the more the advisor communicated with the student leader through scheduled one-on-one-meetings, the more likely the students would have more self-confidence in their abilities. The coefficient of determination was 5.56%, which means the dependent variable of self confidence in their abilities is predicted by the independent variable of the advisors communicating with the student leaders through scheduled one-on-one-meetings.

Table 23

Correlations for Advisor Contact With Schedule One-on-One Meetings vs Self-Confidence Skills

	CS	SS	MA	AI	PV	EC
MA						
Corr.	0.236*	0.714**	1			
Sig.	0.024	0.000				

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. CS = Contact with scheduled one-on-one meetings; SS = Self-confidence in my social skills; MA = Self-confidence in my abilities; AI = Assertiveness in my interactions with others; PV = Clarification of my personal values; EC = Establishment of my personal code of ethics.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 91

Advisor availability to the participants. When examining the impact that an advisor has on leadership identity development of the participants, it was important to not only focus on how they communicated with the participants but also to examine their accessibility. This step was accomplished by asking how readily available the advisor is accessible to the participants and how frequent do they attend their chapter meetings. The instrument surveyed the participants on the availability of the advisors to the participants using a Likert scale one through seven. Availability of advisors were divided into seven groups (Group 1: Less than once a month; Group 2: Once a month; Group 3: 2-3 times a month; Group 4: Once a week; Group 5: 2-3 times a week; Group 6: Daily). A one-way ANOVA test was utilized in examining if there was significant difference between the frequency that the advisor was available and the leadership identity trait. The following table is the frequency that the advisors are available to the participants.

Table 24

Frequency of Participants' Advisors Availability to Readily Meet

Advisor	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
Daily	27	27.0
2-3 times a week	25	25.0
Once a week	18	18.0
2-3 times a month	17	17.0
Once a month	7	7.0
Less than once a month	5	5.0
Never	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

When examining the data, there were leadership identity traits that showed a significant difference within six of the seven subsections. The only subsection to not show any significant difference among its leadership identity traits was Multicultural Competencies.

Self-management. In the subsection of self-management, there are eight leadership identity development traits. Only the trait of being able to identify personal strengths and weakness versus the various level of advisor availability showed a significant difference. The following table is the descriptive statistics for identification of personal strengths and weakness versus advisor availability.

Table 25

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Identification of Personal Strengths and Weaknesses Versus Advisor Availability

Total Time	N	M	SD	SE	Min.	Max.
Less than once a month	5	4.40	0.548	0.245	4	5
Once a month	7	3.57	1.397	0.528	1	5
2-3 times a month	17	3.82	0.883	0.214	2	5
Once a x week	18	4.50	0.985	0.232	1	5
2-3 times a week	25	4.48	0.653	0.131	3	5
Daily	27	4.52	0.643	0.124	3	5
Total	99	4.31	0.865	0.087	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination of the homogeneity of variance table (see Table 26), all of the values for the Levene Statistic were greater than .05 which means the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated.

Table 26

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Self-Management Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Self-Management Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Ability to perform under Pressure	1.171	5	93	0.329
Ability to learn from mistakes	1.449	5	93	0.214
Personal stress management	1.447	5	93	0.215
Ability to balance personal, academic and professional life	1.321	5	93	0.262
Personal time management	2.239	5	93	0.057
Establishing priorities	0.814	5	93	0.542
Identification of personal strengths and weaknesses	1.519	5	93	0.192
Understanding the consequence of my actions	1.044	5	93	0.397

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of availability of advisors versus the identification of personal strength and weakness, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (10.427, 73.293) = 3.085$, $p = .013$ (see Table 27). There was a large effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .14, which suggests large practical significance.

Table 27

One-way ANOVA for Self-Management Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Self-Management Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Ability to perform under pressure					
Between groups	5.640	5	1.128	1.692	0.144
Within groups	61.996	93	0.667		
Total	67.636	98			
Ability to learn from mistakes					
Between groups	6.017	5	1.203	1.909	0.100
Within groups	58.609	93	0.630		
Total	64.626	98			
Personal stress management					
Between groups	4.584	5	0.917	0.944	0.456
Within groups	90.325	93	0.971		
Total	94.909	98			
Ability to balance personal, academic and professional life					
Between groups	6.752	5	1.350	1.527	0.189
Within groups	82.238	93	0.884		
Total	88.990	98			
Personal time management					
Between groups	6.021	5	1.204	1.194	0.318
Within groups	93.817	93	1.009		
Total	99.838	98			
Establishing priorities					
Between groups	2.855	5	0.571	0.988	0.430
Within groups	53.771	93	0.578		
Total	56.626	98			
Identification of personal strengths and weaknesses					
Between groups	10.427	5	2.085	3.085	0.013
Within groups	62.866	93	0.676		
Total	73.293	98			
Understanding the consequence of my actions					
Between groups	5.925	5	1.185	1.852	0.110
Within groups	59.489	93	0.640		
Total	65.414	98			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The data show there is no significance between six availability groups for the advisor versus the identification of personal strengths and weakness (see Table 28). However, overall the data shows there is significance with p = .013.

Table 28

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Identification of Personal Strengths and Weaknesses Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	0.829	0.481	0.522	-0.57	2.23
2-3 times a month	0.576	0.418	0.740	-0.64	1.79
Once a week	-0.100	0.416	1.000	-1.31	1.11
2-3 times a week	-0.080	0.403	1.000	-1.25	1.09
Daily	-0.119	0.400	1.000	-1.28	1.05
Once a month					
Less than once a month	-0.829	0.481	0.522	-2.23	0.57
2-3 times a month	-0.252	0.369	0.983	-1.33	0.82
Once a week	-0.929	0.366	0.125	-1.99	0.14
2-3 times a week	-0.909	0.352	0.111	-1.93	0.11
Daily	-0.947	0.349	0.082	-1.96	0.07
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-0.576	0.418	0.740	-1.79	0.64
Once a month	0.252	0.369	0.983	-0.82	1.33
Once a week	-0.676	0.278	0.156	-1.49	0.13
2-3 times a week	-0.656	0.258	0.123	-1.41	0.10
Daily	-0.695	0.255	0.079	-1.44	0.05
Once a week					
Less than once a month	0.100	0.416	1.000	-1.11	1.31
Once a month	0.929	0.366	0.125	-0.14	1.99
2-3 times a month	0.676	0.278	0.156	-0.13	1.49
2-3 times a week	0.020	0.254	1.000	-0.72	0.76
Daily	-0.019	0.250	1.000	-0.75	0.71
2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	0.080	0.403	1.000	-1.09	1.25
Once a month	0.909	0.352	0.111	-0.11	1.93
2-3 times a month	0.656	0.258	0.123	-0.10	1.41
Once a week	-0.020	0.254	1.000	-0.76	0.72
Daily	-0.039	0.228	1.000	-0.70	0.63
Daily					
Less than once a month	0.119	0.400	1.000	-1.05	1.28

Once a month	0.947	0.349	0.082	-0.07	1.96
2-3 times a month	0.695	0.255	0.079	-0.05	1.44
Once a week	0.019	0.250	1.000	-0.71	0.75
2-3 times a week	0.039	0.228	1.000	-0.63	0.70

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

Cognitive development. In the subsection of cognitive development, there are six leadership identity development traits. Two traits of calculated risk taking and critical examination of mistakes versus the various level of advisor availability showed a significant difference. The other four leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Upon examination there was a significant difference with the leadership identity development trait of calculated risk taking and critical examination of my mistakes. The mean score for calculated risk taking ranged (see Table 29) from 4.60 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.29 (Once a month) with a total score of 4.21. The mean score for critical examination of my mistakes ranged (Table 29) from 4.80 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.00 (Once a month) with a total score of 4.17. Overall, there were 99 participants providing data regarding these leadership traits and how it correlates with advisor availability.

Table 29

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive Development Versus Advisor Availability

Leadership Identity Trait	Total Time	N	M	SD	SE	Min.	Max.
Calculated Risk Taking							
	Less than once a month	5	4.60	0.548	0.245	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.29	1.113	0.421	1	4
	2-3 times a month	17	4.00	1.061	0.257	1	5
	Once a week	18	4.28	0.958	0.226	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.20	0.764	0.153	3	5
	Daily	27	4.48	0.700	0.135	2	5
	Total	99	4.21	0.895	0.090	1	5
Critical Exam of Mistakes							
	Less than once a month	5	4.80	0.447	0.200	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.00	1.291	0.488	1	4
	2-3 times a month	17	3.76	0.903	0.219	2	5
	Once a week	18	4.28	1.018	0.240	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.20	0.645	0.129	3	5
	Daily	27	4.52	0.753	0.145	2	5
	Total	99	4.17	0.926	0.093	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Examining the homogeneity of variance the traits of critical examination of my mistakes and assessing the politics associated with issues have p values that are less than .05 which requires an examination of the Robust Tests of Equality of Means (see Table 30).

Table 30

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Cognitive Development Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Cognitive Development Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Calculated risk taking	0.351	5	93	0.881
Critical examination of my mistakes	2.358	5	93	0.046
Practical application of knowledge/information	0.319	5	93	0.901
Developing compromises	0.850	5	93	0.518
Assessing the politics associated with issues	4.022	5	93	0.002
Critical thinking skills	0.558	5	93	0.732

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

After examining the robust tests of equality of means, the leadership identity development trait critical examination of my mistakes has a p value for the Welch test of .009 and a p value for the Brown-Forsythe test of .003. This result showed there is a significant difference. Assessing the politics associated with issues did not show a significant difference.

Table 31

One-way ANOVA Robust Test of Equality of Means for Cognitive Development Traits Versus Advisor Availability[a]

Cognitive Development Traits	Statistic[a]	df1	df2	Sig.
Critical examination of my mistakes				
Welch	4.003	5	24.456	0.009
Brown-Forsythe	4.483	5	32.412	0.003
Assessing the politics associated with Issues				
Welch	1.048	5	23.525	0.414
Brown-Forsythe	1.098	5	25.860	0.385

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.
[a] Asymptotically F distributed.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (see Table 31) to explore the impact of availability of advisors versus calculated risk taking and critical exam of my

mistakes, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference with calculated risk taking at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (9.565, 78.545) = 2.579$, $p = .031$ (see Table 32). Other than the exception of the less than once a month, this statistic shows the more the advisor is available to the student leader the more the student leader feels comfortable with calculated risk taking. There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, of .12, which means there is practical significance. Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference with critical exam of my mistakes at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (17.87, 84.081) = 5.02$, $p = .000$ (see Table 32). Other than the exception of the less than once a month, this statistic shows the more the advisor is available to the student leader the more the student leader feels comfortable with critical exam of their mistakes. There was a large effect size, calculated using eta squared, of .21, which means the significance is large enough that it is noticeable without critical examination.

Table 32

One-way ANOVA for Cognitive Development Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Self-Management Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Calculated risk taking					
Between groups	9.565	5	1.913	2.579	0.031
Within groups	68.980	93	0.742		
Total	78.545	98			
Critical examination of my mistakes					
Between groups	17.870	5	3.574	5.020	0.000
Within groups	66.211	93	0.712		
Total	84.081	98			
Practical application of knowledge/information					
Between groups	7.610	5	1.522	2.053	0.078
Within groups	68.935	93	0.741		
Total	76.545	98			
Developing compromises					
Between groups	3.978	5	0.796	0.947	0.454
Within groups	78.103	93	0.840		
Total	82.081	98			
Assessing the politics associated with issues					
Between groups	6.005	5	1.201	1.362	0.246
Within groups	82.015	93	0.882		
Total	88.020	98			
Critical thinking skills					
Between groups	2.871	5	0.574	0.704	0.622
Within groups	75.816	93	0.815		
Total	78.687	98			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Calculated risk taking post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 33) indicated that the mean score for Daily contact (M = 4.48, SD = .700) was significantly different from contact once a month (M= 3.29, SD = 1.113). Less than once a month (M = 4.4, SD = .548), two to three times a month (M= 4, SD = 1.061), once a week (M = 4.28, SD .958), two to three times a week (M = 4.2, SD = .764) did not differ significantly from daily contact.

Table 33

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Calculated Risk Taking Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	1.314	0.504	0.106	-0.15	2.78
2-3 times a month	0.600	0.438	0.745	-0.68	1.88
Once a week	0.322	0.435	0.976	-0.94	1.59
2-3 times a week	0.400	0.422	0.933	-0.83	1.63
Daily	0.119	0.419	1.000	-1.10	1.34
Once a month					
Less than once a month	-1.314	0.504	0.106	-2.78	0.15
2-3 times a month	-0.714	0.387	0.441	-1.84	0.41
Once a week	-0.992	0.384	0.111	-2.11	0.12
2-3 times a week	-0.914	0.368	0.140	-1.99	0.16
Daily	-1.196*	0.365	0.018	-2.26	-0.13
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-0.600	0.438	0.745	-1.88	0.68
Once a month	0.714	0.387	0.441	-0.41	1.84
Once a week	-0.278	0.291	0.931	-1.13	0.57
2-3 times a week	-0.200	0.271	0.977	-0.99	0.59
Daily	-0.481	0.267	0.467	-1.26	0.29
Once a week					
Less than once a month	-0.322	0.435	0.976	-1.59	0.94
Once a month	0.992	0.384	0.111	-0.12	2.11
2-3 times a month	0.278	0.291	0.931	-0.57	1.13
2-3 times a week	0.078	0.266	1.000	-0.70	0.85
Daily	-0.204	0.262	0.971	-0.97	0.56
2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	-0.400	0.422	0.933	-1.63	0.83
Once a month	0.914	0.368	0.140	-0.16	1.99
2-3 times a month	0.200	0.271	0.977	-0.59	0.99
Once a week	-0.078	0.266	1.000	-0.85	0.70
Daily	-0.281	0.239	0.846	-0.98	0.41
Daily					
Less than once a month	-0.119	0.419	1.000	-1.34	1.10
Once a month	1.196*	0.365	0.018	0.13	2.26
2-3 times a month	0.481	0.267	0.467	-0.29	1.26
Once a week	0.204	0.262	0.971	-0.56	0.97
2-3 times a week	0.281	0.239	0.846	-0.41	0.98

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Critical examination of mistakes post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 34) indicated significant difference among several of the groups. The results showed contact less than once a month (M= 4.8, SD = .447) was significantly different from contact once a month (M = 3, SD = 1.291) at p = .006. Contact once a month (M=4.8, SD = .447) was significantly different from once a week (M = 4.28, SD = 1.018) with the p =.012, significantly different form contact that is two to three times a week (M = 3.76, SD = .903) with the p = .016, significantly different from daily contact (M = 4.52, SD = .753) with p = .001. Contact two to three times a month showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 34

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Critical Examination of Mistakes Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	1.800*	0.494	0.006	0.36	3.24
2-3 times a month	1.035	0.429	0.163	-0.21	2.28
Once a week	0.522	0.427	0.824	-0.72	1.76
2-3 times a week	0.600	0.413	0.696	-0.60	1.80
Daily	0.281	0.411	0.983	-0.91	1.48
Once a month					
Less than once a month	1.800*	0.494	0.006	-3.24	-0.36
2-3 times a month	-0.765	0.379	0.340	-1.87	0.34
Once a week	-1.278*	0.376	0.012	-2.37	-0.18
2-3 times a week	-1.200*	0.361	0.016	-2.25	-0.15
Daily	-1.519*	0.358	0.001	-2.56	-0.48
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-1.035	0.429	0.163	-2.28	0.21
Once a month	0.765	0.379	0.340	-0.34	1.87
Once a week	-0.513	0.285	0.472	-1.34	0.32
2-3 times a week	-0.435	0.265	0.574	-1.21	0.34
Daily	-0.754	0.261	0.053	-1.51	0.01
Once a week					
Less than once a month	-0.522	0.427	0.824	-1.76	0.72
Once a month	1.278*	0.376	0.012	0.18	2.37

2-3 times a month	0.513	0.285	0.472	-0.32	1.34
2-3 times a week	0.078	0.261	1.000	-0.68	0.84
Daily	-0.241	0.257	0.936	-0.99	0.51
2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	-0.600	0.413	0.696	-1.80	0.60
Once a month	1.200*	0.361	0.016	0.15	2.25
2-3 times a month	0.435	0.265	0.574	-0.34	1.21
Once a week	-0.078	0.261	1.000	-0.84	0.68
Daily	-0.319	0.234	0.750	-1.00	0.36
Daily					
Less than once a month	-0.281	0.411	0.983	-1.48	0.91
Once a month	1.519*	0.358	0.001	0.48	2.56
2-3 times a month	0.754	0.261	0.053	-0.01	1.51
Once a week	0.241	0.257	0.936	-0.51	0.99
2-3 times a week	0.319	0.234	0.750	-0.36	1.00

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Interpersonal skills. In the subsection of interpersonal skills, there are 15 leadership identity development traits. Three traits: understanding what is important to others; supervisory skills; and making formal presentations versus the various level of advisor availability showed a significant difference. The other 12 leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait understanding what is important to others (see Table 35) ranges from a high of 4.60 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.57 (Once a month) and the overall mean score is 4.20. The Mean scores for supervisory skills (see Table 35) ranges from a high of 4.80 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.71 (Once a month) and the overall mean score is 4.25 for a total of 99 participants. Mean scores for making formal presentations (see Table 35) ranges from a high of 4.60 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.65 (2-3 times a month) and the overall mean score is 4.03. There were 99 participants who answered all of the questions within these sections. The following table is the descriptive

statistics for understanding what is important to others; supervisory skills; and making formal presentations.

Table 35

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Interpersonal Skills

Leadership Identity Trait	Total Time	N	M	SD	SE	Min.	Max.
UWIO							
	Less than once a month	5	4.60	0.548	0.245	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.57	0.976	0.369	2	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.94	0.899	0.218	2	5
	Once a week	18	4.17	0.924	0.218	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.20	0.707	0.141	3	5
	Daily	27	4.48	0.580	0.112	3	5
	Total	99	4.20	0.795	0.080	1	5
Supervisory Skills							
	Less than once a month	5	4.80	0.447	0.200	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.71	0.951	0.360	2	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.88	0.928	0.225	2	5
	Once a week	18	4.22	1.003	0.236	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.28	0.678	0.136	3	5
	Daily	27	4.52	0.580	0.112	3	5
	Total	99	4.25	0.812	0.082	1	5
MFP							
	Less than once a month	5	4.60	0.548	0.245	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.71	1.113	0.421	2	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.65	1.057	0.256	2	5
	Once a week	18	3.83	1.150	0.271	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	3.92	0.997	0.199	2	5
	Daily	27	4.48	0.643	0.124	3	5
	Total	99	4.03	0.984	0.099	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum; MFP = Making Formal Presentations; and UWIO = Understanding what is important to others.

Upon examination (see Table 36) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values for the three leadership identity traits showed a significance value above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 36

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Interpersonal Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Interpersonal Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Understanding what is important to others	0.467	5	93	0.800
Supervisory skills	1.034	5	93	0.403
Making formal presentations	1.672	5	93	0.149

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Since there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance, further examination of the data is required to investigate the significance with these three traits. The leadership trait understanding what is important to others has a p value of .050, which indicates significance. The leadership trait of supervisory skills has a p value of .033, which indicates significance. The leadership trait of making formal presentations has a p value of .035, which indicates significance.

Table 37

One-way ANOVA for Interpersonal Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Interpersonal Skill Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Understanding what is important to others					
Between groups	6.863	5	1.373	2.317	0.050
Within groups	55.096	93	0.592		
Total	61.960	98			
Supervisory skills					
Between groups	7.802	5	1.560	2.551	0.033
Within groups	56.885	93	0.612		
Total	64.687	98			
Making formal presentations					
Between groups	11.317	5	2.263	2.518	0.035
Within groups	83.592	93	0.899		
Total	94.909	98			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The data suggest there is significance. Other than the exception of the less than once a month, the statistic shows the more the advisor was available to the student leader the more the student leader understands better what is important to others; is more confident in their supervisory skills; and is comfortable in making formal presentations.

***Organization and planning skills*.** In the subsection of interpersonal skills, there are 15 leadership identity development traits. Two traits managing organization finances and meeting deadlines versus the various level of advisor availability showed a significant difference. The other 13 leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait managing organization finances (see Table 38) ranges from a high of 4.80 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.29 (Once a month) and the overall mean score is 4.12. The mean scores for the leadership trait meeting deadlines (see Table 38) ranges from a high of 4.60 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.71 (Once a month) and the overall mean score is 4.20. There were a total of 99 participants. The following table (see Table 38) is the descriptive statistics for managing organization finances and meeting deadlines versus advisor availability.

Table 38

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Organization and Planning

Leadership Identity Trait	Total Time	N	M	SD	SE	Min.	Max.
MOF							
	Less than once a month	5	4.80	0.447	0.200	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.29	1.496	0.565	1	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.94	1.029	0.250	1	5
	Once a week	18	3.94	1.056	0.249	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.16	0.898	0.180	3	5
	Daily	27	4.41	0.844	0.162	2	5
	Total	99	4.12	1.003	0.101	1	5
Meeting Deadlines							
	Less than once a month	5	4.60	0.548	0.245	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.71	1.113	0.421	2	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.76	0.903	0.219	2	5
	Once a week	18	4.39	1.037	0.244	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.00	0.913	0.183	2	5
	Daily	27	4.59	0.636	0.122	3	5
	Total	99	4.20	0.915	0.092	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum; MOF = Managing Organization Finances.

Upon examination (see Table 39) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values for the two leadership identity traits that showed a significance value above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 39

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Organization and Planning Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Managing organization Finances	1.519	5	93	0.191
Meeting deadlines	0.862	5	93	0.510

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Since there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance, further examination of the data is required to investigate the significance with these three traits. The leadership trait managing organization finances has a p value of .058, which indicates significance. The leadership trait of meeting deadline has a p value of .014, which indicates significance.

Table 40

One-way ANOVA for Organization and Planning Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Managing organization finances					
Between groups	10.553	5	2.111	2.231	0.058
Within groups	87.993	93	0.946		
Total	98.545	98			
Meeting deadlines					
Between groups	11.476	5	2.295	3.028	0.014
Within groups	70.484	93	0.758		
Total	81.960	98			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The data suggest there is significance within managing organization finances with a p value of .058. Other than the exception of the less than once a month, the statistic shows the more the advisor is available to the student leader the more the student leader is comfortable in managing organization finances.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 41) to explore the impact of availability of advisors versus meeting deadlines, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (11.476, 81.960) = 3.028$, $p = .014$ (see Table 41). There was a large effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .14. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 41) indicated significant difference among two

groups at p = .032. The results showed contact two to three times a month (M= 3.76, SD = .903) was significantly different from daily contact (M = 4.59, SD = .636). Contact less than once a month (M = 4.6, SD = .548); contact once a month (M = 3.71, SD = 1.113); contact once a week (M = 4.39, SD = 1.037); and contact two to three times a week (M = 4, SD = .913) showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 41

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Meeting Deadlines Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor Availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	0.886	0.510	0.511	-0.60	2.37
2-3 times a month	0.835	0.443	0.417	-0.45	2.12
Once a week	0.211	0.440	0.997	-1.07	1.49
2-3 times a week	0.600	0.426	0.723	-0.64	1.84
Daily	0.007	0.424	1.000	-1.23	1.24
Once a month					
Less than once a month	-0.886	0.510	0.511	-2.37	0.60
2-3 times a month	-0.050	0.391	1.000	-1.19	1.09
Once a week	-0.675	0.388	0.510	-1.80	0.45
2-3 times a week	-0.286	0.372	0.972	-1.37	0.80
Daily	-0.878	0.369	0.175	-1.95	0.20
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-0.835	0.443	0.417	-2.12	0.45
Once a month	0.050	0.391	1.000	-1.09	1.19
Once a week	-0.624	0.294	0.286	-1.48	0.23
2-3 times a week	-0.235	0.274	0.955	-1.03	0.56
Daily	-0.828*	0.270	0.032	-1.61	-0.04
Once a week					
Less than once a month	-0.211	0.440	0.997	-1.49	1.07
Once a month	0.675	0.388	0.510	-0.45	1.80
2-3 times a month	0.624	0.294	0.286	-0.23	1.48
2-3 times a week	0.389	0.269	0.700	-0.39	1.17
Daily	-0.204	0.265	0.972	-0.97	0.57
2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	-0.600	0.426	0.723	-1.84	0.64
Once a month	0.286	0.372	0.972	-0.80	1.37
2-3 times a month	0.235	0.274	0.955	-0.56	1.03
Once a week	-0.389	0.269	0.700	-1.17	0.39
Daily	-0.593	0.242	0.149	-1.30	0.11
Daily					
Less than once a month	-0.007	0.424	1.000	-1.24	1.23
Once a month	0.878	0.369	0.175	-0.20	1.95
2-3 times a month	0.828*	0.270	0.032	0.04	1.61
Once a week	0.204	0.265	0.972	-0.57	0.97
2-3 times a week	0.593	0.242	0.149	-0.11	1.30

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Problem solving skills. In the subsection of interpersonal skills, there are five leadership identity development traits. Two traits managing diplomatic conflict resolution and ethical decision making versus the various level of advisor availability showed a significant difference. The other three leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait diplomatic conflict resolution (see Table 42) ranges from a high of 4.59 (Daily) to a low of 3.57 (Once a month) and the overall mean score is 4.23. The mean scores for the leadership trait of ethical decision making (see Table 42) ranges from a high of 4.60 (Less than once a month) to a low of 3.76 (2-3 times a month) and the overall mean score is 4.21. There were 99 participants for both leadership identity traits. The following table (see Table 42) displays the descriptive statistics for diplomatic conflict resolution and ethical decision making versus advisor availability.

Table 42

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Problem Solving Skills

	Total Time	N	M	SD	SE	Min.	Max.
MDCR							
	Less than once a month	5	4.20	0.837	0.374	3	5
	Once a month	7	3.57	1.272	0.481	1	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.94	1.029	0.250	1	5
	Once a week	18	4.22	1.003	0.236	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.24	0.597	1.119	3	5
	Daily	27	4.59	0.501	0.096	4	5
	Total	99	4.23	0.843	0.085	1	5
EDM							
	Less than once a month	5	4.60	0.548	0.245	4	5
	Once a month	7	3.86	1.069	0.404	2	5
	2-3 times a month	17	3.76	1.147	0.278	1	5
	Once a week	18	4.28	1.074	0.253	1	5
	2-3 times a week	25	4.08	0.759	0.152	3	5
	Daily	27	4.59	0.501	0.096	4	5
	Total	99	4.21	0.895	0.090	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum; EDM = Ethical Decision Making; and MDCR = Managing Diplomatic Conflict Resolution.

Upon examination (see Table 43) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within both problem solving skills leadership identity behavioral skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 43

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Problem Solving Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Problem Solving Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Diplomatic conflict resolution	1.154	5	93	0.338
Ethical decision making	1.981	5	93	0.089

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Since there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance, further examination of the data is required to investigate the significance with these two traits. The leadership trait of diplomatic conflict resolution has a p value of .042, which indicates significance. The leadership trait of ethical decision making has a p value of .033, which indicates significance.

Table 44

One-way ANOVA for Problem Solving Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Problem Solving Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Diplomatic conflict resolution					
Between groups	8.011	5	1.602	2.417	0.042
Within groups	61.645	93	0.663		
Total	69.657	98			
Ethical decision making					
Between groups	9.460	5	1.892	2.547	0.033
Within groups	69.086	93	0.743		
Total	78.545	98			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The homogeneity of variance data for diplomatic conflict resolution (see Table 43) was greater than .05 which means we refer to the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 44) and that value was .042 indicating there is a significant difference. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (see Table 45) to explore the impact of availability of advisors versus diplomatic conflict resolution, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (8.011, 69.657) = 2.417$, $p = .042$ (see Table 45). There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .11. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 45) indicated significant difference among two groups at $p = .044$. The results showed contact once a month ($M= 3.57$, $SD = 1.272$) was significantly different from

daily contact (M = 4.59, SD = .501). Contact less than once a month (M = 4.2, SD = .837); contact two to three times a month (M = 3.94, SD = 1.029); Group 4 (M = 4.22, SD = 1.003); and contact two to three times a month (M = 4.24, SD = .597) showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 45

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Diplomatic Conflict Resolution Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor Availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	0.629	0.477	0.774	-0.76	2.02
2-3 times a month	0.259	0.414	0.989	-0.95	1.46
Once a week	-0.22	0.412	1.000	-1.22	1.18
2-3 times a week	-0.40	0.399	1.000	-1.20	1.12
Daily	-0.393	0.396	0.920	-1.55	0.76
Once a month					
Less than once a month	-0.629	0.477	0.774	-2.02	0.76
2-3 times a month	-0.370	0.366	0.913	-1.43	0.69
Once a week	-0.651	0.363	0.474	-1.71	0.40
2-3 times a week	-0.669	0.348	0.396	-1.68	0.34
Daily	-1.021*	0.345	0.044	-2.03	-0.02
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-0.259	0.414	0.989	-1.46	0.95
Once a month	0.370	0.366	0.913	-0.69	1.43
Once a week	-0.281	0.275	0.910	-1.08	0.52
2-3 times a week	-0.299	0.256	0.851	-1.04	0.45
Daily	-0.651	0.252	0.111	-1.38	0.08
Once a week					
Less than once a month	0.022	0.412	1.000	-1.18	1.22
Once a month	0.651	0.363	0.474	-0.40	1.71
2-3 times a month	0.281	0.275	0.910	-0.52	1.08
2-3 times a week	-0.018	0.252	1.000	-0.75	0.71
Daily	-0.370	0.248	0.668	-1.09	0.35
2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	0.040	0.399	1.000	-1.12	1.20
Once a month	0.669	0.348	0.396	-0.34	1.68
2-3 times a month	0.299	0.256	0.851	-0.45	1.04
Once a week	0.018	0.252	1.000	-0.71	0.75
Daily	-0.353	0.226	0.626	-1.01	0.30

Daily					
Less than once a month	0.393	0.396	0.920	-0.76	1.55
Once a month	1.021*	0.345	0.044	0.02	2.03
2-3 times a month	0.651	0.252	0.111	-0.08	1.38
Once a week	0.370	0.248	0.668	-0.35	1.09
2-3 times a week	0.353	0.226	0.626	-0.30	1.01

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 42) to explore the impact of availability of advisors versus ethical decision making, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (9.460, 78.545) = 2.547$, $p = .033$ (See Table 44). There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .12. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 46) indicated significant difference among two groups at $p = .03$. The results showed contact two to three times a month ($M= 3.76$, $SD = 1.147$) was significantly different from daily contact ($M = 4.59$, $SD = .501$). Contact less than once a month ($M = 4.6$, $SD = .548$); contact once a month ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.069$); contact once a week ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.074$); and contact two to three times a week ($M = 4.08$, $SD = .759$) showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 46

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Ethical Decision Making Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor Availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	0.743	0.505	0.683	-0.73	2.21
2-3 times a month	0.835	0.438	0.406	-0.44	2.11
Once a week	0.322	0.436	0.976	-0.95	1.59
2-3 times a week	0.520	0.422	0.820	-0.71	1.75
Daily	0.007	0.420	1.000	-1.21	1.23
Once a month					
Less than once a month	-0.743	0.505	0.683	-2.21	0.73
2-3 times a month	0.092	0.387	1.000	-1.03	1.22
Once a week	-0.421	0.384	0.882	-1.54	0.70
2-3 times a week	-0.223	0.369	0.990	-1.30	0.85
Daily	-0.735	0.366	0.344	-1.80	0.33
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-0.835	0.438	0.406	-2.11	0.44
Once a month	-0.092	0.387	1.000	-1.22	1.03
Once a week	-0.513	0.291	0.496	-1.36	0.34
2-3 times a week	-0.315	0.271	0.853	-1.10	0.47
Daily	-0.828*	0.267	0.030	-1.60	-0.05
Once a week					
Less than once a month	-0.322	0.436	0.976	-1.59	0.95
Once a month	0.421	0.384	0.882	-0.70	1.54
2-3 times a month	0.513	0.291	0.496	-0.34	1.36
2-3 times a week	0.198	0.266	0.976	-0.58	0.97
Daily	-0.315	0.262	0.836	-1.08	0.45
2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	-0.520	0.422	0.820	-1.75	0.71
Once a month	0.223	0.369	0.990	-0.85	1.30
2-3 times a month	0.315	0.271	0.853	-0.47	1.10
Once a week	-0.198	0.266	0.976	-0.97	0.58
Daily	-0.513	0.239	0.275	-1.21	0.18
Daily					
Less than once a month	-0.007	0.420	1.000	-1.23	1.21
Once a month	0.735	0.366	0.344	-0.33	1.80
2-3 times a month	0.828*	0.267	0.030	0.05	1.60
Once a week	0.315	0.262	0.836	-0.45	1.08
2-3 times a week	0.513	0.239	0.275	-0.18	1.21

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Self-confidence skills. In the subsection of interpersonal skills there are five leadership identity development traits. One trait of establishing personal code of ethics versus the various level of advisor availability showed a significant difference at p = .006 (see Table 47). The other four leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait establishing a personal code of ethics (see Table 47) ranges from a high of 4.80 (less than once a month) to a low of 3.94 (2-3 times a month) and the overall mean score is 4.36 for a total of 99 participants. The following table (see Table 47) displays the descriptive statistics for establishing a personal code of ethics versus advisor availability.

Table 47

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Establishing Personal Code of Ethics Versus Advisor Availability

					95 % CI			
Total Time	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
Less than once a month	5	4.80	0.447	0.200	4.24	5.36	4	5
Once a month	7	4.14	1.069	0.404	3.15	5.13	2	5
2-3 times a month	17	3.94	0.827	0.201	3.52	4.37	2	5
Once a week	18	4.61	0.979	0.231	4.12	5.10	1	5
2-3 times a week	25	4.08	0.812	0.162	3.74	4.42	2	5
Daily	27	4.70	0.465	0.090	4.52	4.89	4	5
Total	99	4.36	0.826	0.083	4.20	4.53	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 48) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within problem solving skills leadership identity behavioral skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 48

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Self-Confidence Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Self-Confidence Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Self-confidence in my social Skills	0.496	5	93	0.778
Self-confidence in my abilities	1.037	5	93	0.400
Assertiveness in my interactions with others	0.666	5	93	0.650
Clarification of my personal Values	0.989	5	93	0.429
Establishment of my personal code of ethics	0.735	5	93	0.599

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The homogeneity of variance data (see Table 48) was greater than .05 which means we refer to the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 49) and that value was .006 indicating there is a significant difference.

Table 49

One-way ANOVA for Self-Confidence Skills Traits Versus Advisor Availability

Self-Confidence Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Establishment of my personal code of ethics					
Between groups	10.563	5	2.113	3.487	0.006
Within groups	56.346	93	0.606		
Total	66.909	98			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 50) to explore the impact of availability of advisors versus establishing a personal code of ethics, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: F (10.563, 66.909) =

3.487, p = .006 (See Table 49). There was a large effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .14. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 50) indicated significant difference among two groups at p = .025. The results showed contact two to three times a month (M= 3.94, SD = .827) was significantly different from daily contact (M = 4.70, SD = .465). Contact less than once a month (M = 4.8, SD = .447); contact once a month (M = 4.14, SD = 1.069); contact once a week (M = 4.61, SD = .979); and contact two to three times a week (M = 4.08, SD = .812) showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 50

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Establishment of My Personal Code of Ethics Versus Advisor Availability

				95 % CI	
Advisor Availability	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
Less than once a month					
Once a month	0.657	0.456	0.702	-0.67	1.98
2-3 times a month	0.859	0.396	0.262	-0.29	2.01
Once a week	0.189	0.393	0.997	-0.96	1.33
2-3 times a week	0.720	0.381	0.416	-0.39	1.83
Daily	0.096	0.379	1.000	-1.01	1.20
Once a month					
Less than once a month	-0.657	0.456	0.702	-1.98	0.67
2-3 times a month	0.202	0.350	0.992	-0.82	1.22
Once a week	-0.468	0.347	0.756	-1.48	0.54
2-3 times a week	0.063	0.333	1.000	-0.91	1.03
Daily	-0.561	0.330	0.536	-1.52	0.40
2-3 times a month					
Less than once a month	-0.859	0.396	0.262	-2.01	0.29
Once a month	-0.202	0.350	0.992	-1.22	0.82
Once a week	-0.670	0.263	0.122	-1.44	0.10
2-3 times a week	-0.139	0.245	0.993	-0.85	0.57
Daily	-0.763*	0.241	0.025	-1.46	-0.06
Once a week					
Less than once a month	-0.189	0.393	0.997	-1.33	0.96
Once a month	0.468	0.347	0.756	-0.54	1.48
2-3 times a month	0.670	0.263	0.122	-0.10	1.44
2-3 times a week	0.531	0.241	0.244	-0.17	1.23
Daily	-0.093	0.237	0.999	-0.78	0.60

2-3 times a week					
Less than once a month	-0.720	0.381	0.416	-1.83	0.39
Once a month	-0.063	0.333	1.000	-1.03	0.91
2-3 times a month	0.139	0.245	0.993	-0.57	0.85
Once a week	-0.531	0.241	0.244	-1.23	0.17
Daily	-0.624	0.216	0.053	-1.25	0.00
Daily					
Less than once a month	-0.096	0.379	1.000	-1.20	1.01
Once a month	0.561	0.330	0.536	-0.40	1.52
2-3 times a month	-0.763*	0.241	0.025	0.06	1.46
Once a week	0.093	0.237	0.999	-0.60	0.78
2-3 times a week	0.624	0.216	0.053	0.00	1.25

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Advisors attendance at meetings. In addition to examining the impact that advisors' availability has on leadership identity development of the participants, it was important to examine the impact that their presence at their respective chapter meetings could have on the participants' leadership identity development. Data was obtained by asking how frequent the advisor were in attendance at the organizations meetings (See Table 51). Then the data was examined to ascertain if there was a significant difference between the various amounts of time the advisors were present at the organization meetings using one-way between-groups ANOVA. The instrument surveyed the participants on the attendance of the advisors at the chapter's meetings using a Likert scale one through five. The frequency ranged from a high of 48 (1-25% of the time) to a low of 13 (51-75% of the time) for the advisors' attendance at chapter meetings.

Table 51

Frequency of Chapter Advisor Being in Attendance at Chapter Meetings

Advisor	Frequency	Valid %
Valid		
76-100% of the time	19	19.0
51-75% of the time	13	13.0
26-50% of the time	20	20.0
1-25% of the time	48	48.0
Total	100	100.0

Upon examination leadership identity development traits within the subsections of Interpersonal skills and Organization & Planning skills utilizing one-way analysis of variance showed there was significant difference between the various leadership identity behavioral traits within these two subsections and the frequency the advisor attends the chapter meetings. The other five subsections: Cognitive Development; Multicultural Competencies; Self-Confidence; Self-Management; and Problem Solving did not show any significant difference when utilizing one-way analysis of variance.

Interpersonal skills. In the subsection of interpersonal skills, there are 15 leadership identity development traits. One trait of written communications versus the various frequency of the advisor attending meetings showed a significant difference at $p = .015$ (see Table 52). The other 14 leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait written communications (see Table 52) ranges from a high of 4.47 (76-100% of the time)) to a low of 3.65 (26-50% of the time) and the overall mean score is 4.16 for a total of 100 participants. The descriptive statistics for written communications versus advisor attendance at organizational meetings is on Table 52.

Table 52

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Written Communication Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

					95 % CI			
Advisor Attendance	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
1-25% of the time	48	4.19	0.915	0.132	3.92	4.45	1	5
26-50% of the time	20	3.65	0.813	0.182	3.27	4.03	2	5
51-75% of the time	13	4.38	0.650	0.180	3.99	4.78	3	5
76-100% of the time	19	4.47	0.772	0.177	4.10	4.85	3	5
Total	100	4.16	0.873	0.087	3.99	4.33	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 53) of the homogeneity of variances all of the values within interpersonal leadership identity behavioral skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 53

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Interpersonal Skills Traits Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

Interpersonal Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Active listening	0.577	3	96	0.631
Providing constructive criticism	0.397	3	96	0.756
Receiving constructive criticism	2.445	3	96	0.069
Expressing disagreement tactfully	0.405	3	96	0.750
Understanding what is important to others	0.906	3	96	0.441
Influencing others	1.073	3	96	0.364
Motivating others	0.814	3	96	0.489
Supervisory skills	0.329	3	96	0.805
Professional working relationship with the opposite gender	1.449	3	96	0.233
Public speaking skills	0.553	3	96	0.647
Written communication	0.319	3	96	0.812
Ability to work as part of a group	1.129	3	96	0.341
Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others	1.342	3	96	0.265
Making formal presentations	1.050	3	96	0.374
Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed)	1.606	3	96	0.193

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The homogeneity of variance data (see Table 53) was greater than .05 which means we can look at the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 54) and that value was .015 indicating there is a significant difference.

Table 54

One-way ANOVA for Written Communication Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

Interpersonal Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Written communication					
Between groups	7.764	3	2.588	3.671	0.015
Within groups	67.676	96	0.705		
Total	75.440	99			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (see Table 55) to explore the impact the frequency of the advisors attending meetings versus written communication, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). Availability of advisors were divided into four groups (Group 1: 1-25% of the time; Group 2: 25-50% of the time; Group 3: 51-75% of the time; Group 4: 76 – 100% of the time). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the four frequency of attendance at meeting groups: $F (7.764, 75.440) = 3.671$, $p = .015$ (see Table 55). There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .102. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 55) indicated significant difference among two groups at $p = .015$. The results showed that participants' written communication with advisors who attended 26% to 50% of the chapter meetings ($M= 3.65$, $SD = .813$) was significantly different from participants' written communication with advisors who attended 76% to 100% of the chapter meetings ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .772$). Advisors who attend chapter meetings 1% to 25% of the time ($M = 4.19$, $SD = .915$), and advisors who attend 51% to 75% of the chapter meetings ($M = 4.38$, $SD = .650$) showed participants' written communication experienced no significance difference between the groups.

Table 55

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Written Communication Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

				95 % CI	
Advisor Attendance	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
1-25% of the time					
26-50% of the time	0.538	0.223	0.083	-0.05	1.12
51-75% of the time	-0.197	0.263	0.876	-0.88	0.49
76-100% of the time	-0.286	0.228	0.592	-0.88	0.31
26-50% of the time					
1-25% of the time	-0.538	0.223	0.083	-1.12	0.05
51-75% of the time	-0.735	0.299	0.074	-1.52	0.05
76-100% of the time	-0.824*	0.269	0.015	-1.53	-0.12
51-75% of the time					
1-25% of the time	0.197	0.263	0.876	-0.49	0.88
26-50% of the time	0.735	0.299	0.074	-0.05	1.52
76-100% of the time	-0.089	0.302	0.991	-0.88	0.70
76-100% of the time					
1-25% of the time	0.286	0.228	0.592	-0.31	0.88
26-50% of the time	0.824*	0.269	0.015	0.12	1.53
51-75% of the time	0.089	0.302	0.991	-0.70	0.88

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Organization and planning skills. In the subsection of organization and planning skills, there are 15 leadership identity development traits. One trait of developing organization agendas versus the various frequency of the advisor attending meetings showed a significant difference at p = .047 (See Table 58). The other 14 leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait developing organization agendas (See Table 56) ranges from a high of 4.63(76-100% of the time)) to a low of 3.95 (26-50% of the time) and the overall mean score is 4.24 for a total of 100 participants. The descriptive statistics for developing organization agendas versus advisor attendance at organizational meetings can be seen on Table 56.

Table 56

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Developing Organization Agendas Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

					95 % CI			
Advisor Attendance	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
1-25% of the time	48	4.27	0.844	0.122	4.03	4.52	1	5
26-50% of the time	20	3.95	0.887	0.198	3.53	4.37	2	5
51-75% of the time	13	4.00	0.816	0.226	3.51	4.49	2	5
76-100% of the time	19	4.63	0.597	0.137	4.34	4.92	3	5
Total	100	4.24	0.830	0.083	4.08	4.40	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 57) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within interpersonal leadership identity behavioral skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 57

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Organization and Planning Skills Traits Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Building consensus with a group	0.119	3	96	0.949
Delegation of tasks to others	0.918	3	96	0.435
Promoting/marketing events	1.680	3	96	0.176
Planning activities/events	0.449	3	96	0.718
Developing organization agendas	0.706	3	96	0.551
Setting deadlines	0.609	3	96	0.611
Ability to run effective meetings	0.625	3	96	0.850
Managing organization finances	0.052	3	96	0.984
Managing multiple tasks	0.583	3	96	0.628
Ability to form a team to accomplish a goal	0.861	3	96	0.464
Leading a group of people	0.860	3	96	0.465
Organizing tasks	1.133	3	96	0.340
Long term goal setting	0.748	3	96	0.526
Meeting deadlines	1.986	3	96	0.121
Understanding of organization politics	0.937	3	96	0.426

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The homogeneity of variance data (see Table 57) was greater than .05 which dictates an examination of the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 58) and the p value was .047 indicating there is a significant difference.

Table 58

One-way ANOVA for Developing Organization Agenda Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Developing organization agendas					
Between groups	5.390	3	1.797	2.744	0.047
Within groups	62.850	96	0.655		
Total	68.240	99			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 59) to explore the impact of frequency of advisors attending the chapter meetings versus developing organization agendas, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the four frequency of attendance at meeting groups: $F (5.39, 68.24) = 2.744$, $p = .047$ (see Table 58). There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .07. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 59) indicated significant difference among two groups at $p = .048$. The results showed the participants ability to develop organization agendas with advisors who attended 26% to 50% of the chapter meetings ($M= 3.95$, $SD = .887$) was significantly different from the participants ability to develop organization agendas with advisors who attended 76% to 100% of the chapter meetings ($M = 4.63$, $SD = .830$). Advisors who attended 1% to 25% of the chapter meetings ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .844$), and advisors who attended 51% to 75% of the chapter meetings ($M = 4$, $SD = .816$) showed participants' ability to develop organization agendas no significance difference between the groups.

Table 59

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Developing Organization Agendas Versus Advisor Attendance at Organizational Meetings

				95 % CI	
Advisor Attendance	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
1-25% of the time					
26-50% of the time	0.321	0.215	0.448	-0.24	0.88
51-75% of the time	0.271	0.253	0.708	-0.39	0.93
76-100% of the time	-0.361	0.219	0.359	-0.93	0.21
26-50% of the time					
1-25% of the time	-0.321	0.215	0.448	-0.88	0.24
51-75% of the time	-0.050	0.288	0.998	-0.80	0.70
76-100% of the time	-0.682*	0.259	0.048	-1.36	0.00
51-75% of the time					
1-25% of the time	-0.271	0.253	0.708	-0.93	0.39
26-50% of the time	0.050	0.288	0.998	-0.70	0.80
76-100% of the time	-0.632	0.291	0.139	-1.39	0.13
76-100% of the time					
1-25% of the time	0.361	0.219	0.359	-0.21	0.93
26-50% of the time	0.682*	0.259	0.048	0.00	1.36
51-75% of the time	0.632	0.291	0.139	-0.13	1.39

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Impact of Demographic Variables on Leadership Identity

The last question examined in this study was, “Is there a difference in leadership development due to other demographic variables?” There were six demographic variables that this study examined to see if they made a difference on the participants’ leadership identity development. They were ethnicity, age of the participants, class year of the participants, grade point average of the participants, leadership experience of the participants, and the amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience

When examining the frequency of the ethnic composition of the group (See Table 5) it was determined that it was too homogenous to conduct a one-way analysis. However, one-way

analysis of variance was used to examine the difference in the leadership identity development due to the other five identified demographic variables. The various groups within the five identified demographic variables is the study's independent variable. The scores obtained from section II of the SLOI are the dependent variables. Class year and grade point average, which are two of the five identified demographic variables examined showed no statistically significant difference. However, after examination the demographic variables of age of participants, leadership experience, and time spent on the leadership experience showed there was statistically significant difference in overall subsections and several individual leadership identity development traits among the various groups within the dependent variables.

Age of the participants. The SLOI asked the participants to self-identify their age from selecting one of four choices: 18 & under, 19, 20, 21 and over. When the frequency data was collected, there was one participant who selected 18 & under from the four choices for age. This one participant was removed from the data set when examining how age may impact the participants' leadership identity development. Only managing organization finances from the organization and planning subsection out of the 57 leadership traits among the seven subsections showed that age made a significant difference.

Organization and planning skill of managing organization finances. In the subsection of organization and planning skills, there are 15 leadership identity development traits. The trait of managing organization finances versus the age of the participant showed a significant difference at $p = .042$ (see Table 60). The other 14 leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the leadership trait for managing organization finances (see Table 60) ranges from a high of 4.67 (19) to a low of 3.92 (21 and over) and the

overall mean score is 4.13 for a total of 108 participants. The following table (see Table 60) shows the descriptive statistics for managing organization finances versus age of the participants.

Table 60

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Managing Organization Finances Versus Age of the Participants

					95 % CI			
Age	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
19	12	4.67	0.492	0.142	4.35	4.98	4	5
20	47	4.21	0.954	0.139	3.93	4.49	1	5
21 and over	49	3.92	1.038	0.148	3.62	4.22	1	5
Total	108	4.13	0.977	0.094	3.94	4.32	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 61) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within the organizational and planning skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 61

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Organization and Planning Skills Traits Versus Age of the Participants

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Building consensus with a group	0.139	2	105	0.871
Delegation of tasks to others	1.261	2	105	0.288
Promoting/marketing events	0.033	2	105	0.968
Planning activities/events	1.828	2	105	0.166
Developing organization Agendas	0.511	2	105	0.601
Setting deadlines	0.951	2	105	0.390
Ability to run effective Meetings	0.542	2	105	0.583
Managing organization Finances	1.963	2	105	0.145
Managing multiple tasks	0.563	2	105	0.571
Ability to form a team to accomplish a goal	0.304	2	105	0.739
Leading a group of people	1.144	2	105	0.322
Organizing tasks	0.835	2	105	0.437
Long term goal setting	0.977	2	105	0.380
Meeting deadlines	0.490	2	105	0.614
Understanding of organization Politics	1.514	2	105	0.225

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Upon examination (see Table 62) of the ANOVA table, there was a significant difference with the leadership identity development trait of managing organization finances, p = .042.

Table 62

One-way ANOVA for Managing Organization Finances Versus Age of the Participants

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Managing organization finances					
Between groups	5.973	2	2.986	3.259	0.042
Within groups	96.212	105	0.916		
Total	102.185	107			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 63) to further explore the impact of age of the participant versus managing organization finances, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). Availability of advisors were divided into three groups (Group 1: 19; Group 2: 20; Group 3: 21 and over). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the four frequency of attendance at meeting groups: $F (5.973, 102.185) = 3.259$, $p = .042$ (see Table 62). There was a small effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .05. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 63) indicated significant difference among two groups at $p = .044$. The results showed participants who were 19 years of age ($M= 4.67$, $SD = .492$) was significantly different from participants who are 21 years of age and over ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .148$). Participants who are 20 years of age ($M = 4.21$, $SD = .954$) showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 63

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Managing Organization Finances Versus Age of the Participants

				95 % CI	
Age of Participant	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
19					
20	0.454	0.310	0.311	-0.28	1.19
21 or over	0.748*	0.308	0.044	0.02	1.48
20					
19	-0.454	0.310	0.311	-1.19	0.28
21 or over	0.294	0.195	0.292	-0.17	0.76
21 or over					
19	-0.748*	0.308	0.044	-1.48	-0.02
20	-0.294	0.195	0.292	-0.76	0.17

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Leadership experience of the participants. One of the hypothesis of this dissertation is that by holding leadership positions, students learn valuable leadership lessons that allows them

to hone their leadership skills and increase their leadership identity development. The instrument asks the participants to self-identify or communicate the number of years of leadership experience they have had by the time they become their chapter's Chapter President. There were four groups to select from Group 1 (no leadership experience); Group 2 (less than 1); Group 3 (1 – 3 years); and Group 4 (More than 3). None of the 57 leadership identity traits among the seven subsections showed significance.

The amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience. Examined so far has been the difference that age might cause on a participants' leadership identity and the difference that a participants' leadership experience might cause on a participants' leadership identity. The last demographic variable to be examined is the amount of time participants' spent at their single most important leadership experience. Does more time on task produce a difference in the leadership identity development? When examining this question, the data suggested there is a difference within three of the 57 leadership identity traits all within three of the six subsections: cognitive development; organization and planning skills; and self-management skill. The amount of time spent on the participants' single most important leadership experience had a difference on the overall cognitive development subsection. This was the first time within the study that an overall subsection showed either a significant change or difference.

Overall cognitive development subsection. In the SLOI there are six subsections and the cognitive development subsection that showed a significant difference at $p = .022$ (see Table 64). The other five subsections did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the overall cognitive development subsection (see Table 64) ranges from a high of 25.78 (Greater than 6) to a low of 20.60 (0 to 2) and the overall mean score is 25.18 for a total of 111 participants. The

following table (see Table 64) outlines the descriptive statistics for the overall cognitive subsection versus amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 64

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Overall Cognitive Development Subsection Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

					95 % CI			
Hours per Week	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
0 to 2	5	20.60	3.209	1.435	16.615	24.585	15.00	23.00
3 to 6	31	24.45	4.646	0.835	22.747	26.156	6.00	30.00
Greater than 6	75	25.78	4.278	0.494	24.802	26.771	6.00	30.00
Total	111	25.18	4.464	0.424	24.340	26.020	6.00	30.00

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 65) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within the cognitive development skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 65

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Overall Subsections Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Overall Subsection Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Self-Management	0.470	2	108	0.626
Interpersonal Skills	0.739	2	108	0.480
Problem Solving	1.107	2	108	0.334
Cognitive Development	0.145	2	108	0.865
Organizational Skills	1.072	2	108	0.346
Self-Confidence	0.888	2	108	0.415
TPOTM	1.079	2	108	0.344
TPOST	0.489	2	108	0.614

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The homogeneity of variance data (see Table 65) was greater than .05 which dictates an examination of the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 66) and that value was .022 indicating there is a significant difference.

Table 66

One-way ANOVA for Overall Subsections Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Overall Subsection Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cognitive Development					
Between groups	148.932	2	74.466	3.936	0.022
Within groups	2043.464	108	18.921		
Total	2192.396	110			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 67) to explore the impact of time spent on participants' most single important leadership experience versus the overall cognitive development skills, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). The time participants spent on their single most important leadership experience was divided into three groups (0 to 2 hours; 3 to 6 hours; Greater than 6 hours). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the time spent on the participants single most important leadership experience groups: F (148,932, 2192.396) = 3.936, p = .022 (see Table 67). There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, of .067. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 67) indicated significant difference among two groups at p = .03. The results showed participants who spent no time to two hours on their most important leadership experience (M= 20.6, SD = .3.209) was significantly different from participants who spent more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience (M = 25.787, SD = 4.278) regarding cognitive development of student leaders. Participants who spent three to six hours on their single most important leadership experience (M = 24.452, SD = .4.646) showed no significance difference between the groups.

Table 67

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Cognitive Development Versus Amount of Time Spent on Single Most Important Leadership Experience

				95 % CI	
Hours per Week	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
0 to 2					
3 to 6	-3.852	2.096	0.162	-8.833	1.130
Greater than 6	-5.187*	2.009	0.030	-9.961	-0.412
3 to 6					
0 to 2	3.852	2.096	0.162	-1.130	8.833
Greater than 6	-1.335	0.929	0.325	-3.542	0.872
Greater than 6					
0 to 2	5.187*	2.009	0.030	0.412	9.961
3 to 6	1.335	0.929	0.325	-0.872	3.542

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Self-management skill of ability to identify personal strength and weakness. In the subsection of self-management skills, there are eight leadership identity development traits. The trait of ability to identify personal strength and weakness versus the amount of time a participant spent on their single most important leadership experience showed a significant difference at p = .029 (See Table 71). The other seven leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the ability to identify personal strength and weakness trait (See Table 68) ranges from a high of 4.43 (Greater than 6) to a low of 3.80 (0 to 2) and the overall mean score is 4.27 for a total of 120 participants. The following table (see Table 68) shows the descriptive statistics for the overall cognitive subsection versus amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 68

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for the Ability to Identify Personal Strengths and Weakness Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

					95 % CI			
Hours per Week	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
0 to 2	5	3.80	0.477	0.200	3.24	4.36	3	4
3 to 6	36	3.97	1.158	0.193	3.58	4.36	1	5
Greater than 6	79	4.43	0.827	0.093	4.25	4.62	1	5
Total	120	4.27	0.950	0.087	4.09	4.44	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

The homogeneity of variance data (see Table 69) for all of the traits, except for the ability to perform under pressure, was greater than .05 which dictates an examination of the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 69) for those traits. Since the ability to perform under pressure has significance with p = 0.046 which is under 0.050, the data from a robust test of equality of means must be examined.

Table 69

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Self-Management Traits Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Self-Management Skills	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Ability to perform under pressure	3.154	2	117	0.046
Ability to learn from mistakes	1.187	2	117	0.309
Personal stress management	1.110	2	117	0.333
Ability to balance personal, academic and professional life	0.975	2	117	0.380
Personal time management	0.102	2	117	0.903
Establishing priorities	2.342	2	117	0.101
Identification of personal strengths and weaknesses	2.948	2	117	0.056
Understanding the consequence of my actions	1.104	2	117	0.335

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A robust test of equality of means could not be performed for the self-management trait of the ability to perform under pressure because within the 0 to 2 hours spent on the most important leadership experience has a zero value for standard deviation and zero value for standard error (see Table 70).

Table 70

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for the Ability to Perform Under Pressure Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

					95 % CI			
Hours per Week	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
0 to 2	5	4.00	0.000	0.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
3 to 6	35	4.26	1.010	0.171	3.91	4.60	1	5
Greater than 6	79	4.42	0.886	0.100	4.22	4.62	1	5
Total	119	4.35	0.907	0.083	4.19	4.52	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination the only self-management trait of the ability to identify personal strengths and weaknesses showed significance at $p = 0.029$ (see Table 71).

Table 71

One-way ANOVA for Self-Management Traits Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Self-Management Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Ability to perform under pressure					
Between groups	1.154	2	0.577	0.700	0.499
Within groups	96.437	117	0.824		
Total	97.592	119			
Ability to learn from mistakes					
Between groups	3.784	2	1.892	2.401	0.095
Within groups	92.183	117	0.788		
Total	95.967	119			
Personal stress management					
Between groups	2.353	2	1.177	1.148	0.321
Within groups	119.972	117	1.025		
Total	122.325	119			
Ability to balance personal, academic and professional life					
Between groups	0.640	2	0.320	0.317	0.729
Within groups	118.152	117	1.010		
Total	118.792	119			
Personal time management					
Between groups	2.095	2	1.048	0.947	0.391
Within groups	129.372	117	1.106		
Total	131.467	119			
Establishing priorities					
Between groups	1.829	2	0.914	1.202	0.304
Within groups	88.963	117	0.760		
Total	90.792	119			
Identification of personal strengths and weaknesses					
Between groups	6.327	2	3.164	3.660	0.029
Within groups	101.139	117	0.864		
Total	107.467	119			
Understanding the consequence of my actions					
Between groups	3.158	2	1.579	1.901	0.154
Within groups	97.167	117	0.830		
Total	100.325	119			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (See Table 72) to explore the impact the amount of time spent by the participant in their single most important leadership experience versus identification of personal strengths and weaknesses, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). Availability of advisors were divided into three groups (0 to 2 hours; 3 to 6 hours; and Greater than 6 hours). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the six availability groups: $F (6.327, 107.467) = 3.660$, $p = .029$ (see Table 72). Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small. There was a small effect size, calculated using eta squared, of .05. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 72) indicated that the mean score for participants who spent three to six hours on their single most important leadership experience ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.158$) was significantly different from participants who spent more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience ($M= 4.43$, $SD = .827$). Participants who spent no time to two hours on their single most important leadership experience ($M = 3.8$, $SD = .447$) did not differ significantly from participants who spent three to six hours on their single most important leadership experience or participants who spent more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 72

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Ability to Identify Personal Strengths and Weaknesses Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

				95 % CI	
Hours per Week	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
0 to 2					
3 to 6	-0.172	0.444	0.920	-1.23	0.88
Greater than 6	-0.630	0.429	0.309	-1.65	0.39
3 to 6					
0 to 2	0.172	0.444	0.920	-0.88	1.23
Greater than 6	-0.458*	0.187	0.041	-0.90	-0.01
Greater than 6					
0 to 2	0.630	0.429	0.309	-0.39	1.65
3 to 6	0.458*	0.187	0.041	0.01	0.90

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Critical examination of mistakes. In the subsection of critical development skills, there are six leadership identity development traits. The trait of critical examination of participants; mistakes versus the amount of time a participant spent on their single most important leadership experience showed a significant difference at p = .002 (see Table 73). The other five leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the critical examination of my mistakes versus amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience (see Table 73) ranges from a high of 4.32 (Greater than 6) to a low of 3.00 (0 to 2) and the overall mean score is 4.16 for a total of 111 participants. The following table (see Table 73) shows the descriptive statistics for the critical examination of my mistakes versus amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 73

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Critical Examination of My Mistakes Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

					95 % CI			
Hours per Week	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
0 to 2	5	3.00	0.707	0.316	2.12	3.88	2	4
3 to 6	31	3.97	1.080	0.194	3.57	4.36	1	5
Greater than 6	75	4.32	0.774	0.089	4.14	4.50	1	5
Total	111	4.16	0.910	0.086	3.99	4.33	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 74) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within the cognitive development skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 74

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Cognitive Development Traits Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Cognitive Development Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Calculated risk taking	0.526	2	108	0.592
Critical examination of my mistakes	1.216	2	108	0.300
Practical application of knowledge/information	0.054	2	108	0.948
Developing compromises	0.973	2	108	0.381
Assessing the politics associated with issues	0.530	2	108	0.590
Critical thinking skills	1.180	2	108	0.311

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

Upon examination (see Table 75), there was a significant difference with the critical examination of my mistakes, p = .002.

Table 75

One-way ANOVA for Cognitive Development Traits Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Cognitive Development Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Calculated risk taking					
Between groups	4.004	2	2.002	2.695	0.072
Within groups	80.231	108	0.743		
Total	84.234	110			
Critical examination of my mistakes					
Between groups	9.793	2	4.897	6.506	0.002
Within groups	81.288	108	0.753		
Total	91.081	110			
Practical application of knowledge/information					
Between groups	3.447	2	1.723	2.339	0.101
Within groups	79.580	108	0.737		
Total	83.027	110			
Developing compromises					
Between groups	1.793	2	0.897	1.153	0.319
Within groups	83.954	108	0.777		
Total	85.748	110			
Assessing the politics associated with issues					
Between groups	4.682	2	2.341	2.818	0.064
Within groups	89.714	108	0.831		
Total	94.396	110			
Critical thinking skills					
Between groups	3.661	2	1.831	2.464	0.090
Within groups	80.231	108	0.743		
Total	83.892	110			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (see Table 76) to further explore the impact the amount of time spent by the participant in their single most important leadership experience versus critical examination of the participants' mistakes, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). Time spent by the participants on their single most important leadership experience was divided into three groups (0 to 2 hours; 3 to 6 hours; Greater than 6 hours). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI

scores for the three groups: F (9.793, 91.081) = 6.506, p = .002 (See Table 75). There was a medium effect size in the critical examination of mistakes by participants, calculated using eta squared, of .10. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (See Table 76) indicated that the mean score for participants' critical examination of mistakes who spent no time to three hours on their single most important leadership experience (M = 3, SD = .707) was significantly different from those participants' critical examination of mistakes who spent more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience (M= 4.32, SD = .774). Participants who critically examined their mistakes and spent three to six hours on their single most important leadership experience (M = 3.97, SD = 1.080) did not differ significantly from participants who critically examined their mistakes and spent no time to two hours on their single most important leadership experience or participants who critically examined their mistakes who spent more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 76

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Critical Examination of My Mistakes Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

				95 % CI	
Hours per Week	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
0 to 2					
3 to 6	-0.968	0.418	0.058	-1.96	0.03
Greater than 6	-1.320*	0.401	0.004	-2.27	-0.37
3 to 6					
0 to 2	0.968	0.418	0.058	-0.03	1.96
Greater than 6	-0.352	0.185	0.143	-0.79	0.09
Greater than 6					
0 to 2	1.320*	0.401	0.004	0.37	2.27
3 to 6	0.352	0.185	0.143	-0.09	0.79

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Organization and planning skill of running effective meetings. In the subsection of organization and planning skills, there are 15 leadership identity development traits. The trait of running effective meetings versus the amount of time a participant spent on their single most important leadership experience showed a significant difference at p = .026 (see Table 77). The other 14 leadership identity development traits did not show a significant difference. Mean scores for the ability to run effective meetings versus amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience (see Table 77) ranges from a high of 4.37 (Greater than 6) to a low of 3.40 (0 to 2) and the overall mean score is 4.27 for a total of 111 participants. The following table (see Table 77) shows the descriptive statistics for the ability to run effective meetings versus amount of time spent on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 77

One-way ANOVA Descriptive Statistics for Ability to Run Effective Meetings Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

					95 % CI			
Hours per Week	N	M	SD	SE	LL	UL	Min.	Max.
0 to 2	5	3.40	0.548	0.245	2.72	4.08	3	4
3 to 6	31	4.16	0.779	0.140	3.88	4.45	2	5
Greater than 6	75	4.37	0.835	0.096	4.18	4.57	1	5
Total	111	4.27	0.831	0.079	4.11	4.43	1	5

Note. SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; Min. = minimum; Max. = Maximum.

Upon examination (see Table 78) of the homogeneity of variances, all of the values within the organization planning skills have significant values above .05, which indicates there was no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 78

One-way ANOVA Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Organization and Planning Skills Traits Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Building consensus with a group	0.028	2	108	0.972
Delegation of tasks to others	0.777	2	108	0.462
Promoting/marketing events	0.403	2	108	0.669
Planning activities/events	1.026	2	108	0.362
Developing organization Agendas	0.359	2	108	0.699
Setting deadlines	1.631	2	108	0.200
Ability to run effective Meetings	0.536	2	108	0.587
Managing organization Finances	1.790	2	108	0.172
Managing multiple tasks	1.073	2	108	0.346
Ability to form a team to accomplish a goal	0.806	2	108	0.449
Leading a group of people	0.628	2	108	0.535
Organizing tasks	0.618	2	108	0.541
Long term goal setting	1.290	2	108	0.280
Meeting deadlines	1.724	2	108	0.183
Understanding of organization Politics	2.485	2	108	0.088

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

The homogeneity of variance data (see Table 79) was greater than .05 which dictates an examination of the ANOVA table for significance (see Table 79) and that value was .026 indicating there is a significant difference.

Table 79

One-way ANOVA for Ability to Run Effective Meetings Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience, Part 1

Organization and Planning Skills Traits	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Ability to run effective meetings					
Between groups	4.952	2	2.476	3.769	0.026
Within groups	70.940	108	0.657		
Total	75.892	110			

Note. Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted (see Table 80) to explore the impact the amount of time spent by the participant in their single most important leadership experience versus the ability to run effective meetings, as measured by the Student Leadership Outcome Inventory (SLOI). Time spent by the participants on their single most important leadership experience was divided into three groups (0 to 2 hours; 3 to 6 hours; and Greater than 6 hours). There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in SLOI scores for the three groups: $F (4.952, 75.892) = 3.769$, $p = .026$ (see Table 80). There was a medium effect size, calculated using eta squared, of .06. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test (see Table 80) indicated that the mean score for participants' ability to run effective meetings who spend no time to two hours on their single most important leadership experience ($M = 3.4$, $SD = .548$) was significantly different from participants' ability to run effective meetings who spend more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience ($M= 4.37$, $SD = .835$). Participants who spend three to six hours on their single most important leadership experience ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .779$) did not differ significantly from participants who spent more than six hours on their single most important leadership experience.

Table 80

One-way ANOVA Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) for Ability to Run Effective Meetings Versus Amount of Time Spent on Their Single Most Important Leadership Experience

				95 % CI	
Hours per Week	MD	SE	Sig.	LL	UL
0 to 2					
3 to 6	-0.761	0.391	0.130	-1.69	0.17
Greater than 6	-0.973*	0.374	0.028	-1.86	-0.08
3 to 6					
0 to 2	0.761	0.391	0.130	-0.17	1.69
Greater than 6	-0.212	0.173	0.441	-0.62	0.20
Greater than 6					
0 to 2	0.973*	0.374	0.028	0.08	1.86
3 to 6	0.212	0.173	0.441	-0.20	0.62

Note. MD = Mean difference; SE = Standard error; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Qualitative Findings

In order to facilitate triangulation of the data, two open ended questions were posed to the participants. Additionally, the post-test instrument asked the participants if they would be willing to participate in a thirty-minute interview. The purpose of these interviews was to strengthen the triangulation of the quantitative data collected. Responses from the participants further validated the data collected by cross verifying the information obtained from the interviews with the data collected from the instrument.

Open Ended Questions From the Survey

Participants' opinions on the most important ways they can be supported by an advisor. At the conclusion of section III, the participant was asked "what are the three most important ways an advisor can support their organizational leader?" The question was intentionally crafted to be open ended and the participants could state as many ways they believed that an advisor could support a student leader. There were 147 responses in which eight

themes (see Table 81) emerged from the responses of the participants. They were support, provide advice, mentoring; constructive feedback, providing organizational history, assisting with networking within the school community, and accountability.

Table 81

Frequency of the Themes From Question on How Advisors Can Assist Participants

Theme	Frequency
Support	67
Provide Advice	57
Mentoring	40
Feedback	38
Organizational History	31
Network within the College Community	28
Accountability	27
Total	288

The qualitative information obtained from this open-ended question is consistent with the data collected in this study. When examining the data collected to answer the question what impact an advisor can have on a participant's leadership identity development, the theme of support from the advisor's availability and attendance at meetings is consistent. According to the data, students who have more access to an advisor are more likely to excel and or improve the following leadership identity behavioral traits identify personal strengths and weaknesses, calculated risk taking, critical exam of their mistakes, supervisory skills, meeting deadlines, ethical decision making, and establishment of personal code of ethics.

Also according to the data collected, students who have their advisors in attendance at their meetings are more likely to excel or improve their leadership identity behavioral traits written communications, and developing organization agendas

Participants' opinions on the most helpful leadership experience. The second open-ended question allowed participants to state what they believed was the most helpful leadership

experience. Unlike, the first question, the participants could only provide one answer. There were 96 responses from the participants out of the 120 participants who participated in the post test. Seven themes (see Table 82) emerged from the responses of the participants; National organization sponsored leadership education programs; the experience of being Chapter President; peer to peer relationship; mentoring and advising; host institution sponsored leadership education program, and NIC educational programs.

Table 82

Frequency of the Themes From Question on Most Helpful Leadership Experience of Participants

Theme	Frequency
National organization sponsored leadership education program	51
Experience of being Chapter President	17
Peer to peer relationship	12
Mentor/Advising relationship	6
Host institution sponsored leadership education program	6
Academic course on leadership	2
NIC sponsored leadership education program	2
Total	96

There were 51 participants who responded that the most helpful leadership experience was the program they attended which was sponsored by their National Organization. Conversely, only six participants responded that the leadership education program sponsored by their host institution was the most helpful leadership experience. Actually experiencing being Chapter President was the second highest response to the question posed by 17 participants.

Phone Interviews

At the end of the instrument, the participants were asked if they would be willing to participate in a short thirty minute interview either by phone or social media. The purpose of these interviews was to further discuss participants' experiences as Chapter President of their respective chapters and their perceived gains in their leadership abilities during their tenure as

Chapter President. There were 30 participants who agreed to participate in these interviews. However, only nine followed through with the commitment to make themselves available for the 30-minute interview. The following questions were asked:

- What has been the impact on your development as a leader by your relationship with your advisor?
- What was your relationship with your advisor like?
- What has been the impact on your development as a leader by holding the position of Chapter President?
- What experience or relationship had the most impact on your development as a leader up to this point in your term of office?
- What has been the impact on your leadership development by attending your fraternity's leadership training program at the beginning of the spring semester?

What has been the impact on your development as a leader by your relationship with your advisor? During the interview, participants communicated that the biggest impact the relationship with their advisor had on their leadership development was they felt supported (see Table 83).

Table 83

What Has Been the Impact on Your Development as a Leader by Your Relationship With Your Advisor?

Theme	Frequency
Encouraged participants to be a better person	2
Provided a better understanding of institutional knowledge	3
Understanding the importance of having a sounding board	2
Mentor/Advising relationship	4
They felt supported	7
Total	

The overarching theme within all nine interviews was the feeling of being supported. Participants mentioned mentoring, being pushed to be a better person, and an invaluable source to bounce ideas off as the most valuable aspects with their relationships with their respective advisors. This sentiment of support being the biggest impact on the participants' leadership identity development is demonstrated by the results of the data collected for answering the question what impact an advisor has on one's leadership identity development. The data indicated a direct correlation between the improvement in the student's leadership identity behavioral skills and the availability to the student's most significant advisor. The more the advisor is available to the student leader, the more the student understands better what is important to others, more confident in their supervisory skills, and comfortable in making formal presentations. More than 70% of student leaders in this study met and had access to their advisors at a minimum of once a week. Upon examining the mean scores for all of the data obtained from the One-Way ANOVA test, there is consistently an amplification in the mean scores as the availability to the advisor increases.

What was your relationship with your advisor like? A majority of the men interviewed stated that they had a mentoring relationship with their advisors (see Table 84).

Table 84

What Was Your Relationship With Your Advisor Like?

Theme	Frequency
Close relationship	2
Mentoring relationship	3
Good relationship	2
Collegial	5

Overall, the sentiment communicated from the participants was that the relationship with their advisors was supportive which is consistent with the data gathered from the previous

question and examining the impact that advisor availability had on the students' leadership identity development. A mentoring relationship between the advisor and the student leader in this study is demonstrated in the data that indicates more the advisor was available to the student, the more likely they saw an increase in their ability to establish their own personal code, improve their ethical decision making, and improve their diplomatic conflict resolution

What has been the impact on your development as a leader by holding the position of Chapter President? Two of the most frequent responses from the participants (see Table 85) were that their experience of being Chapter President provided them with a better understanding of leadership and were more comfortable with their abilities to lead because of the experience.

Table 85

What Has been the Impact on Your Development as a Leader by Holding the Position of Chapter President?

Theme	Frequency
Made me more responsible	1
Made me more organized	2
Gained the ability to have the hard discussions with peers	1
I have become more comfortable in my abilities	3
Gained a better understanding of leadership	4
Gained the ability to handle stressful situations	1
Become more reflective	1
Gained the ability to lead people to a shared vision	1

Student participants in the interviews stated on a consistent basis that by holding and experiencing the high and lows of being a Chapter President that it had a positive impact on their development as a leader. This sentiment was supported by the fact when examining the data from the pre-test and post-test, the mean scores dropped and not increased. Also, the data collected from the Cronbach Alpha's score were higher in the post-test than the pre-test (see

Table 86) suggesting that the participants had a better understanding of leadership and their capabilities.

What experience or relationship had the most impact on your development as a leader? Peer-to-peer relationship was the most salient point made by the participants when discussing what was the single relationship or experience that impacted them as a leader (see Table 86).

Table 86

What Experience or Relationship Had the Most Impact on Your Development as a Leader up to This Point in Your Term of Office?

Theme	Frequency
Peer to peer relationship	7
The experience of learning how to reflect	1
The actual experience of being Chapter President	1

Some participants did not initially mention peer-to-peer relationships as having the biggest impact on their leadership development but they referred to experiences that dealt with relationships with their peers. This notion of relationships within the leadership experience being crucial consistently comes to the forefront in the discussions and qualitative data. When examining the data, students improved significantly in the behavioral identity traits of understanding what is important to others and diplomatic conflict resolution. The availability of the advisor was key in the mentoring of the students but another important element in this crucible of leadership is the peer to peer relationship.

What was the impact on your leadership development by attending your fraternity's leadership training program? The biggest impact on the leadership development of the participants by attending their respective fraternity's leadership program was the building and reinforcing of peer to peer relationships (see Table 87).

Table 87

What Has Been the Impact on Your Leadership Development by Attending Your Fraternity's Leadership Training Program at the Beginning of the Spring Semester?

Theme	Frequency
Peer to peer relationship	6
Interaction with staff	1
Helped to provide a better understanding of the position	2
Provide confidence in my abilities	1

When discussing the respective leadership programs, the men communicated that the curriculum was not the most important aspect of the weekend. They believed being able to speak with other Brothers who were about to go through the similar experience of being the Chapter President of their respective chapters was most important. It allowed them to share their personal experience of being a brother of their respective fraternity and the challenges they believed lay in front of them. Also, mentioned was the importance of seeing the national staff of the fraternal organizations as people and being able to begin to build a relationship with the staff.

Summary

Overall, the experience of serving as Chapter President had an impact on the participants' leadership identity. Only two of the 57 traits identified within the SLOI (creative problem solving and the ability to form a team to accomplish a goal) showed any significant impact.

The second question examined what impact an advisor's involvement had on a participant's leadership identity development. Alumni advisors (46.9%) were identified by the participants as being the advisor that provided the most important leadership opportunities as Chapter President. There was a positive significant difference in the availability of the advisors to the participants. Involvement of the Advisor positively impacted 18 out of the 57 leadership identity traits. These traits included calculated risk taking, critical examination of mistakes,

developing agendas, diplomatic conflict resolution, establishing a personal code of ethics, ethical decision making, identification of personal strength and weakness, making formal presentations, managing organization finances, meeting deadlines, professional working relationship with the opposite gender, promoting and marketing events, self-confidence, setting deadlines, supervisory skills, and understanding what is important to others.

The third question examined if other demographic variables impacted the participants' leadership identity development. In examining the data the answer to this question is in the affirmative. There was a positive correlation in the demographic of age in regards to managing an organization's finances. There was a positive correlation in the demographic of leadership experience in regards to effectively facilitating a meeting. There was a positive correlation in the demographic of time spent on the leadership experience in regards to identification of personal strength and weakness; critical examination of mistakes; and effectively facilitating a meeting.

According to the data collected both qualitative and quantitative leadership can be learned through experience and the involvement of an advisor does have a positive impact on a student's leadership identity development.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to determine if leadership can be learned. It examined the leadership identity development of undergraduate student leaders serving as Greek-letter organization Chapter Presidents. The focus of the study was on the process of leadership development among student leaders during their leadership experience. There were three questions raised in this study. First, how does a leadership experience impact their leadership identity development? Secondly, is there a correlation between the amount of involvement of an advisor and a student leader's leadership development? The final question was does various demographic variables impact a person's leadership identity development? The findings for each question within the study will add to the research on leadership identity development.

Summary of Research Question Findings

Research Question One: Is There Impact on Students' Leadership Identity From Serving as Chapter President?

In this study, the first question investigated if there was an impact on a student's leadership identity from serving as Chapter President. A paired-samples t-test was used to analyze the data from the results of the pre-test and post-test that measured the change in leadership skills during their first semester serving as Chapter President. When examining the overall score results, the mean score in the post-test dropped by 10.48 points for a total of 226.24 points and the standard deviation increased by 28.85 points. The overall score results were not statistically significant. However, the data provided insight into why there was an overall decrease in the post score and increase in the standard deviation.

The standard deviation almost doubling within the post-test results suggest that after holding the position of leadership for six months the participants changed their perceptions or understandings of their proficiency in the 57 leadership skills tested. This is also reflected with the post-test Cronbach Alpha scores for the independent variables were higher than the pre-test Cronbach scores (See Table 1). Both of these findings are evidence that the student leaders in this study learned from the experience of being Chapter President and through self-reflection begun to refine their leadership skills and develop new leadership skills. (Komives, et. al., 2005)

There were two individual skill sets that showed significant difference: creative problem solving and the ability to form a team to accomplish a goal. The significant statistical difference in the scores for pre-test creative problem solving was (M=4.34, SD = .682) and post-test creative problem solving was (M=4.15, SD=.788); t (100) = -2.095, p = .039. The mean decrease in creative problem solving was .190 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -.366 to -.010. The eta squared statistic (.04) indicated a small effect size which means the difference, while significant, would be barely noticeable to an observer. Significant statistical difference in the scores for the pre-test ability to form a team to accomplish a goal was (M=4.44, SD=.654) and the post-test ability to form a team to accomplish a goal was (M=4.27, SD=.786); t (101) = -2.146, p=.034. The mean decrease in ability to form a team to accomplish a goal was .170 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .013 to .327. The eta squared statistic (.04) indicated a small effect size. The results were similar to creative problem solving that there was significance but the effect size was such that the difference would be barely noticeable to an observer. This finding may suggest that after six months serving in a leadership position the participant obtained a better understanding of self. Since there was significant difference in two dimensions, the null hypothesis is rejected. This result may indicate the participants gained a better understanding of

self and their leadership abilities, which would support that one's leadership skills can be learned and it is not born or innate due to genetics (Bailey & Axlerod, 2001; Burns, 1978). This finding would be consistent with position five of William Perry's (1970) *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years* where the student has moved from an authority-oriented frame of perspective to a state where they are accepting of diverse opinions, more independent in thought allowing them to be able to accept and gain knowledge.

The data allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis that experience doesn't impact a person's leadership identity development. This finding may suggest from the seven overall subsections and the 57 individual leadership skills that leadership can be learned. Leadership experiences do assist in clarifying the personal values and interests, experience diverse peers and perspectives, learn about self, and develop new skills (Komives, et al., 2005). This result would also be consistent with the work of Pascarella and Terenzini (2005, 1991) that undergraduate leadership involvement enhance students interpersonal and leadership skills. After six months, participants showed positive gains in the overall mean scores of the subsets of cognitive development skills and self-confidence skills (see Table 88).

Table 88

Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive Development and Self-Confidence Traits

SS	Trait	Mean	N	SD	SEM
CD					
	Calculated Risk Taking				
	Pre-test	4.15	99	0.813	0.082
	Post-test	4.19	99	0.841	0.085
	Critical Examination of Mistakes				
	Pre-test	4.20	99	0.700	0.070
	Post-test	4.16	99	0.866	0.087
	Practical Application of Knowledge				
	Pre-test	4.13	99	0.778	0.078
	Post-test	4.16	99	0.829	0.083
	Developing Compromises				
	Pre-test	4.23	99	0.726	0.073
	Post-test	4.16	99	0.854	0.086
	Assessing Politics Associated with Issues				
	Pre-test	4.10	99	0.839	0.084
	Post-test	4.15	99	0.896	0.090
	Critical Analysis				
	Pre-test	4.28	99	0.715	0.072
	Post-test	4.25	99	0.837	0.084
SC					
	Self Confidence in Social Skills				
	Pre-Test	4.14	101	.813	.081
	Post-Test	4.21	101	.828	.082
	Self Confidence in Abilities				
	Pre-Test	4.38	101	.798	.079
	Post-Test	4.31	101	.857	.085
	Assertiveness in interactions with others				
	Pre-Test	4.34	101	.725	.072
	Post-Test	4.35	101	.767	.076
	Clarification of My Values				
	Pre-Test	4.38	101	.733	.073
	Post-Test	4.36	101	.729	.073
	Establishment of Personal Code of Ethics				
	Pre-Test	4.36	101	.807	.080
	Post-Test	4.39	101	.761	.076

Note. SS = Subsection; SD = Standard Deviation; SEM = standard error mean; CD = Cognitive Development; SC = Self-Confidence.

There were positive gains on the following traits within the cognitive development skills calculated risk taking, practical application of knowledge, and assessing the politics associated with issues. There were positive gains on the following traits (see table 88) within the self-confidence skills: social skills, assertiveness in my interactions with others, and establishment of a personal code of ethics. These findings are consistent with the findings of Busteed (2014) and Pike (2000) that students in this sample population who are members of Greek-Letter organization exhibit gains in cognitive development. Specifically in this study, gains occurred within the following cognitive development skills: calculated risk taking, practical application of knowledge, and assessing politics associated with issues.

When examining the individual leadership identity skills 22 out of the 57 skills show an increase in the mean scores. However, none of the increase in the 22 leadership identity skills mean scores were statistically significant. There was a change in how the students felt they progressed in the development of the 57 leadership skills. In some instances, the results demonstrated that the participants developed new skills while serving as their organization's Chapter President which is consistent with past research (Astin, 1975, 1977, 1993; Baxtor Magolda, 1992; Busteed, 2014; Eich, 2007; Kuh, Schuh, & Whitt, 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini; 1991; Pike, 2003; Pike, 2000; Pike & Askew, 1990; and Komives, 2005, 2006, and 2011). In addition, the change in the Cronbach Alpha scores (see table 1), along with the decrease in 35 of the mean scores (see table 15), may suggest that the participants may have been over confident in their abilities; and, through this experience, they learned more about their self and their capabilities which is one of the outcomes from leadership being learned through leadership experiences (Burns, 1978; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Komives, 2006; Light, 2001; Murphy & Johnson, 2011; and Perry, 1970). This explanation of the participants being over confident at the

time of the pre-test was substantiated in the interviews with the students. In the interview with Kimball he states:

> *So the experience of being president, really, it, in a sense it opens your eyes, like I said, it opens your eyes to what you know and what you don't know. And it teaches you that maybe you don't know everything.*

Another student Alex (see Appendix G) stated:

> *I think the whole perspective of knowing what needs to be done and not being afraid to do it was much more a part of what I had to do and I wasn't expecting that going in, and so that was, I think that perception of what a leader does and what a good leader ought to do, that paradigm kind of shifted in my imagination.*

The data gathered supports the position that leadership development is an aspect of personal development and there is an intrapersonal complexity with improved ability to facilitate leadership with others (Avolio & Gibbons, 1989; Daloz Parks, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; McCauley, Drath, Palus, O'Connor, & Baker, 2006; Wagner, W, 2011).

Research Question Two: Is There a Correlation Between the Level of Involvement of an Advisor and the Fraternity President's Leadership Development?

The second question examined the impact an advisor's involvement had on a participant's leadership identity development. Involvement of the advisor was analyzed by using Pearson product-moment correlation and One-way analysis of variance. Advisor involvement was measured by the total amount of time the advisor was in communication with the student leader participating in the study through one of six communication methods. The six communication methods examined were phone or text messaging, social media, E-mail,

impromptu meetings, scheduled one on one meetings, and contact at chapter events. According to the participants, they communicated the most with their chapter advisors through impromptu meetings with a mean score of 2.16. The least preferred method of communication was through social media with a mean score of 1.55. This information is interesting considering the average 18 to 25-year old young adult spends 18 hours, 40 minutes per day using technology and media (Rosen, 2009).

The data results in tables 89 through 94 suggest that there is a direct correlation between the level of communication of an advisor and the student leader's leadership development. The more the advisor communicated with the participants, the more likely they experienced an improvement in their leadership identity traits. The following leadership identity traits exhibited a positive significant correlation: professional working relationships with opposite gender, making formal presentations, promote and market events, ability to set deadlines, written communications, ability to develop agendas, ability to set deadlines, ability to establish a personal code of ethics, and self-confidence in their abilities

Communication or lack of communication between the advisor and the student leaders was one facet of how an advisor could impact the student leader's leadership identity development. The other facet was involvement of the Advisor measured by the availability of the advisor to the student leader. The more the advisor interacted with the student leader, the more likely they would exhibit an improvement in their leadership identity traits. There was statistical significance in 18 out of the 57 leadership identity traits (See tables 34 through 54). These traits included and they were calculated risk taking, critical examination of mistakes, developing agendas, diplomatic conflict resolution, establishing a personal code of ethics, ethical decision making, identification of personal strength and weakness, making formal presentations,

managing organization finances, meeting deadlines, professional working relationship with the opposite gender, promoting and marketing events, self-confidence, setting deadlines, supervisory skills, understanding what is important to others, and written communications.

The more an advisor interacts with the student participants, the more likely they will see an improvement in their leadership skills. These findings support the grounded theory of Leadership Identity development posited by Komives (2005, 2006) and the seven vectors discussed by Chickering (1993) contained within his seminal work Education and Identity.

The data support the importance of adults serving as mentors, guides, and coaches as an essential part of a student's leadership development. Adult role models are essential throughout the five stages of Komives' Leadership Identity Development. It is between stage three (leader identified) and stage five (Generativity) that the role of the adult mentor transitions from one of supporter or cheerleader to a role of a true mentor. The student not only is seeking support but for a person to assist them in being reflective and process the leadership experiences for deeper understanding. If this is accomplished the student may learn from the experience and apply the knowledge learned effectively next time. This transition between stage three and stage five is illustrated where the students in this sample show significant positive change in their leadership skills in calculated risk taking (see table 33), critical examination of mistakes (See Table 34), understanding what is important to others, diplomatic conflict resolution and ethical decision making (see Table 45), and personal code of ethics (see table 50). This transition between stages is also demonstrated in the data collected from the interviews of the nine students. In the interview with Ratti he stated "having a relationship with the advisor helps develop you as a leader". In another interview with Gino he communicated that his advisor was able to provide unique insight that he couldn't obtained from someone else. In the interview with Chester he

communicated that having his advisor made him more confident in his decisions and more willing to act. These experiences communicated by the students in the interviews emphasize the importance of an advisor in their leadership development. It corroborates the transition of the advisor from supporter at the outset of Stage Three (Leadership Identified) to an advisor that is described in Stage Four (Leadership Differentiated) that provides students' feedback and the opportunity for serious reflection on how to incorporate the feedback into their actions. Also, it supports the transition to Stage Five (Generativity) where the advisor assists the students to process leadership experiences for deeper understanding and to learn how to respond more effectively next time. Relationships with fellow students and advisors have a significant impact on the development of college students (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005).

In *Education and Identity*, Chickering and Reisser (1993) view the development of college students as passing through seven vectors. An important determining factor on how well the student will transition between vectors is the presence of an advisor. The advisor is seen as a guide that can assist students to direct their emotions, reflect on the situation, provide encouragement, and direct or inform the student of resources to assist in obtaining their goals (Chickering, 1993). The data from the sample population in this study suggest that an advisor is a guide that provides support to the student leader that positively impacts their leadership identity. The results of this study show that the more the student spends time and or communicates with their advisor, the more likely they will be better at identifying personal strengths and weaknesses (see Table 42), critically examining of their mistakes (See table 42), establishing a personal code of ethics (See Table 42) and making ethical decisions (see Table 42). This is also demonstrated within the interviews with the nine students. In the interview, Howard communicated that his

advisors provided guidance in situations and was also there for him. It was the support from the advisors that enabled him to have the confidence to make some difficult decisions within the chapter.

The influence of advisors range from being affirmers, models, and sponsors in the early stages to being mentors and ultimately to being meaning makers and colleagues or friends (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Komives, et al., 2005; Perry, 1970). The data allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis that advisors do not impact a student's leadership development. The data suggest advisors do impact a student's leadership identity development and in several of the leadership skill in a significant manner.

Research Question Three: Is There a Difference in Leadership Development Due to Other Demographic Variables?

The third question examined if other demographic variables of class year, grade point average, age of participants, prior leadership experience, and amount of time spent on their leadership position impacted the sample populations' leadership identity development. In regards to the demographic variable of ethnicity the sample population was too homogenous to be examined.

After analyzing the data from the ANOVA for the demographic variables of class year and grade point average, there was no statistical difference within the respective groups therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The findings in this study regarding class year are contrary to the findings of Coressel (2014) where the hypothesis was not rejected and there was significance difference between class years of the students and the impact in their leadership development.

This study's data suggest that those student leaders who are 21 years and older are more likely to better manage an organization's finances than a student leader who is 19 years of age (See Table 60). The null hypothesis of a student's age would not impact the leadership skill of managing an organization's finances is rejected.

When examining the demographic variable of prior leadership experience impacting a person's leadership development, it was found to be in opposition to the results that were found by Leone (2015). In the study conducted by Leone (2015), he found that leadership experience had statistical significance on a student's leadership development. In addition, the finding in this study regarding leadership experience and its impact on a student's leadership development is contrary to Murphy and Johnson (2011) who posited that small developmental experiences can have a profound impact on future development. It is also contrary to the assertions of Pascarella and Terenzini (2005, 1991) that college graduates believed their extracurricular involvement, particularly in leadership roles, as had a substantial impact on their intrapersonal and leadership skills development. In regards to this study, however, the null hypothesis that leadership experience can impact a student's leadership development is not rejected.

There was a positive correlation in the student's leadership development in overall cognitive development (See table 64); ability to identify personal strength and weakness (See table 68); critical examination of mistakes (See table 73); and running effective meetings (See table 77) versus demographic of time invested in the most significant leadership experience and the student's leadership development. These findings are consistent with the findings of Coressel (2014) where that sample population showed that the more time and effort placed in the same leadership experience the student population realized an increase in their leadership development. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected because there is a significant positive

correlation between the student's intensity of involvement in most important leadership experience and the student's leadership development. (Coressel, 2014).

Recommendations for Future Study

The findings in this study suggest that there is a need for better collaboration between all of the stakeholders on a college campus to provide better training to obtain experienced advisors to be positive role models for their respective student leaders. There is the necessity to study the type of training that is required to provide the knowledge base and resources for advisors to improve students' leadership experience so there is a positive impact on their leadership identity development.

According to the sample population within this study, the majority of the students see the Alumni Advisor (46.9%) as the advisor to provide the most important leadership opportunities. In all nine interviews, the participants cited their alumni advisor, and not faculty or the student affairs professional, as the most important person to whom they turn for support and guidance. Relationships with advisors have a significant impact on the leadership development of college students (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Furthermore, according to Kuh (1991), cocurricular activities are underappreciated by faculty and heavy workloads, research responsibilities, and competing personal interests make it difficult for faculty to develop these important relationships with students (Hale, 2014; Keeling, 2004). In order to ensure that students have a positive leadership experience, it is imperative to provide the alumni advisors and mentors the tools to be able to understand a higher education environment an experience that is vastly different from what they may have experienced when they were an undergraduate. What are the perceptions of our advisors and what do they believe they need to be successful? What are the perceptions of our students on what they feel their advisors need to gain a better

understanding of their experience as an undergraduate? Adults are a meaningful part of each stage of developing students' leadership identity. The data suggest advisors have the greatest impact on the students' leadership development. Advisors need to be provided resources and be viewed as a critical partner with our institutions of higher education. Advisors are essential because they help students to direct their emotions, reflect on the situation, provide encouragement, and direct or inform the student of resources to assist in obtaining their goals (Chickering, 1993).

This study identified what advisor in the opinion of the sample population provided them the most important leadership opportunity. The sample population identified mostly with their alumni advisors (46.9%) being the advisor that provided the most important leadership opportunities as Chapter President. Faculty were identified 24.3% of the time being the advisor that provided the most important leadership opportunities. Then, student affairs staff were identified 9.2% of the time being the advisor that provided the most important leadership opportunities as Chapter President. The results are interesting because the student affairs staff who were employed and professionally trained to specifically assist these students to direct their emotions, provide encouragement, and direct and inform the students of resources to assist in obtaining their goals is the least selected person as the advisor who provided the most important leadership opportunities. The data suggests that the sample population experiences are disconnected with the student affairs professionals.

There is a need to study how environments can be provided so that peer to peer interactions are constructive and not destructive. In the interviews with the nine participants, it was communicated that the most important aspect of the leadership programs they attended, regardless of whom was sponsoring the program, was the ability to interact and learn from their

fellow students. Also, several of the students in the interviews communicated that they gained a better understanding of leadership throughout the year from their interactions with their peers than any leadership program in which they participated. This finding would support the need to study how we develop leadership training programs in a college community that allows for meaningful interaction with their peers. There needs to be a delicate balance between a focus on procedures on our college campuses and peer interactions. Peer-to-peer interactions are positive contributors to student leadership development (Astin, 1993; Eich, 2007). These interactions are the most powerful influence on attitudes and behaviors of college students (Kuh, 1982).

This study examined the questions posed for only the initial semester that the student leader held the position of Chapter President. There is a need to examine these questions posed in this longitudinal study for longer duration of time. Specifically, to investigate an entire year experience of holding the position of Chapter President and having the availability of an advisor to see if the results change. By extending the study for an entire academic year, one would be able to examine the impact of the leadership experience over three points in time thus providing a clear picture of the impact on their leadership identity development.

In this study, there were two individual skills: creative problem solving and the ability to form a team to accomplish a goal, both of which showed a negative significant difference. This finding requires further study as to what factors are causing a negative significant difference.

Also, this study examined the three questions as it pertains to male students who are Chapter Presidents within a fraternal organization. There is a need to examine these questions as it pertains to female Chapter Presidents within sororities and how their leadership experience impacts their leadership identity development. This would provide a better understanding of how the leadership experience impacts the leadership identity development of the entire fraternal

community on a college campus. The fraternal community is only one sub-community within the college community. It would be important to examine these questions on other sub-communities within the college community such as athletic team captains, presidents of non-Greek student organizations, and resident assistants.

The sample population in this study is very much homogenous with the majority of the participants being Caucasian males. There is a need to examine these questions among students from different financial backgrounds and ethnicities. These finding from a future study on different financial backgrounds and ethnicities would provide a clearer picture of how leadership experiences impact leadership identity development within the greater student population of a college campus.

Limitations

Due to the small sample size of this study and that it only tested student leaders of Fraternities, generalization of the impact of the leadership experience or the advisor on a student's leadership identity development can be made. It only provides a small snapshot those students' perceptions attending institutions of higher education.

This study explored the questions of whether leadership can be learned; if an advisor has an impact on a person's leadership identity development from the perspective of male students; and what is the impact of various demographic variables on a person's leadership identity development. It does not include the perspective of female students. Furthermore, this study is limited because it only explores these questions through the lenses of males who have had the experience of holding the position of Chapter President within their national social fraternal organization's local chapter. It does not include the perspective of male or female students who

have had the experience of holding leadership positions within other student organizations, athletic teams, or even other leadership positions within fraternal organizations.

The study utilized several questions within the pre-test and post-test to account for confounding variables in the study. This study will not be able to account for the socioeconomic differences or cultural and institutional differences that might have had an impact on the student. It is important to note while ethnicity was examined the population was largely White-Caucasian Non-Hispanic males and other ethnicities were not represented equally within the study.

Duration of the study is another limitation since it only examines the questions through the first semester of the participant's experience of being Chapter President. It does not examine the questions posed through the entire year of the experience. It is possible that by examining the entire period of time that the participant volunteered in the experience of being Chapter President could produce different results. The student leaders experiencing a longer amount of time interacting with their support system could not only impact their leadership identity development but also to whom they identify as the advisor who provided them with the most important leadership opportunities.

Conclusion

The findings in this study suggest that leadership was not innate but was learned. Students participating in co-curricular opportunities within organizations such as fraternities increases the opportunity to interact with Advisors who serve as mentors and meaning makers in their leadership identity development. Adults being involved as an advisor are the catalysts for students becoming aware that they are leaders and a positive reinforcement in encouraging students to becoming more involved within and outside their college communities (Komives, 2010). Leadership is learned through leadership experiences. The leadership experience allows

a student to learn about themselves which allows a better understanding on what they do not know. Adult influences provided by advisors are crucial. The more a student is able to interact with an advisor the more likely they will learn how to improve their leadership identity behavioral traits.

References

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

Adzell, G. L. (2010). *College student leader development: A study of perceptions of leadership skills and abilities of senior students.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3435994)

Akhigbe, A., Martin, A. D., & Whyte, A. M. (2005). Contagion effects of the world's largest bankruptcy: The case of WorldCom, *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 45*, 48-64.

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

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

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

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

Avolio, B., & Gibbons, T. (1989). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J. Conger & R. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276-308). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bailey, J., & Axlerod, R. H. (2001). Leadership lessons from Mount Rushmore: An interview with James MacGregor Burns. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 113-127.

Baker, C. N. (2008). Under-represented college students and extracurricular involvement: The effects of various student organizations on academic performance. *Social Psychology Education, 11*, 273-298. doi:10.1007/s11218-007-9050-y

Bass, B. M. & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*, 4th Edition. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Baxter-Magdola, M. B. (1992). Cocurricular influences on college students' intellectual development. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 203-213.

Bennett, B.R. (2006). *The Influence of Student Interactions on College Student Leader Change in Opinion: Differences by Frequency of Involvement(Doctoral Dissertation).* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3242238)

Bok, D. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brinton, M. C. (2010). *From frat to fraternity: An evolutionary model for the 21st century Greek letter organizations*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1478239)

Brittingham, B. (2009). Accreditation in the United States: How did we get to where we are? *New Directions for Higher Education,* 145, 7-27.

Busteed, B. (2014). Fraternities and sororities: Understanding life outcomes. [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?tab=wm#search/gallup/14668ec7fca9c5fc

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

Campbell, C. M., Smith, M., Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2012). Mentors and college student leadership outcomes: The importance of position and process. *Review of Higher Education, 35*(4), 595-625.

Carlyle, T. (1841). *Heroes and hero worship*. Boston, MA: Adams.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser. L. (1969). *Education and Identity.* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Macmillian.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser. L. (1993). *Education and identity.* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Macmillian.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* (4th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Daloz Parks, S. (2005). *Leadership can be taught*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership*. New York, NY: MacMillian.

Day, D. V., & Harrison, M.M. (2007). A multilevel identity-based approach to leadership development. *Human Resource Management Review, 17,* 360-373.

Day, P., Dungy, G. J., Evans, N., Fried, J., Komives, S., McDonald, W., & Salvador, S. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience.* Washington, DC: American College Professional Association.

Drew, S., & Bingham, R. (1997). *Student skills guide*. Aldershot, England: Gower.

Drout, C. E., & Corsoro, C. L. (2003). Attitudes toward fraternity hazing among fraternity members, sorority members, and non-Greek students. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 31*(6), 535.

Dugan, J. P. & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(5), 525-549.

Ehrlich, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Eich, D. (2007). *A grounded theory of high quality leadership programs: Perspectives from student leadership development programs in higher education.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved by ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3279002)

Elliott, M. (2002). The incredible shrinking businessman. TIME, 159, 26.

Erickson, E. (1959). *Identity and the life* cycle. New York, NY: Norton.

Erickson, E. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Norton.

Faber, E. I. (2002). *Learning leadership: Exploring the development and reflections of undergraduate student leaders.* (Masters thesis), University of California, Davis.

Flanagan, C. (2014, March). The dark power of fraternities: A yearlong investigation of Greek houses reveals their endemic, lurid, and sometimes tragic problems – and a sophisticated system for shifting the blame. *The Atlantic Journal.* Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com

Frey, J. A. (2011). *Exploring the relationships between college student leadership experiences and the practice of effective leadership behaviors.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3482881)

Foran, W. (2016). Personal communication, October 21, 2016.

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius.* New York, NY: Appleton.

Gibbons, M. T. (2006). The idea of fraternity revisited. *Perspectives on Political Science, 35*(4), 205-209.

Gill, R., Levene, N., & Pitt, D. (1998). Leadership and organizations for the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(4), 46-59.

Greenberg, M. (1997). *The GI bill: The law that changed America*. New York, NY: Lickle.

Grubb, F. (2006). Does going Greek impair undergraduate academic performance? *American Journal of Economics & Sociology, 65*(5), 1085-1110. doi:10.1111/j.1536-7150.2006.00457.x

http://convention.myacpa.org/archive/programs/Baltimore11/Handouts/516/LID-ILA_2010.pdf

https://www.boundless.com/management/leadership/trait-approach/leadership-and-honesty-kouzes-and-posner/

http://nicindy.org

http://www.census.gov/popclock

http://www.nicindy.org/about/standards/

http://www.statisticbrain.com/college-enrollment-statistics

Hale, M. (2015). *Measuring the effectiveness of alumni mentoring relationships with members of a national Greek-letter social fraternity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved by ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database (UMI No. 3716233).

Hall, A. T., Blass, F. R., Ferris, G. R. & Massengale, R. (2004). Leader reputation and accountability in organizations: Implications for dysfunctional leader behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 515-536.

Hickman, G. (Ed.). (2010). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

House, R. J. (1976). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hughes, M. J., & Winston, R. B. (1987). Effects of fraternity membership on interpersonal values. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*(5), 405-411.

James, W. (1882). Great men, great thoughts, and their environment. *Atlantic Monthly, 46,* 441-459.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Kelley, D. R. (2006). *The impact of collegiate men's fraternities on leadership development: Perceptions of former chapter presidents.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3241795)

Keeling, R.P. (Ed.). (2004) *Learning Reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and American College Personnel Association.

Kendrick, R. J. (2005). *Social statistics: An introduction using SPSS for Windows.* New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Kenny, D. A. (1987). *Statistics for the social and behavioral sciences.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Kilgannon, S. M., & Erwin, T. D. (1992). A longitudinal study about the identity and moral development of Greek students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33,* 253-259.

Komives, S. R. (2009). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S. R. (2011). *The handbook for student leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (1998). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Komives, S. R., Owens, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., & Mainella, F. C. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 593-611. doi:10.1353/csd.2005.0061

Komives, S. R., Owens, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C. (2006). A leadership identity development model: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(4), 401-418.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1991). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2008). *The student leadership challenge: Five practices for exemplary leaders.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D. (1982). *Enhancing the quality of Greek life*. Bloomington, IN: Center for the Study of College Fraternity.

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

Kuh, G. D. (2001). *The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties*. Bloomington: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning.

Kuh, G. D., & Lyons, J. W. (1990). Fraternities and sororities: Lessons from the college experience study. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal*, *28*(1), 20-29.

Kuh, G. D., Pascarella, E. T., & Wechsler, H. (1996, April 19). The questionable value of fraternities. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (1991). *Involving colleges*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leone, D. (2015). *Effects of undergraduate leadership experiences on leadership efficacy*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved by ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database (UMI No. 3706375).

Light, R. J. (2001). *Making the most of college students: Students speak their minds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education*: A history. New York, NY: St. Martin's/Griffin.

Love, J. (2015). *The impact of living in a fraternity home on the leadership identity of its members* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved by ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database (UMI No. 3708441).

Malaney, G. D. (1990). Student attitudes towards fraternities and sororities. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal*, *28*(1), 37-42.

Mathiasen, R. E. (2003). Moral development of fraternity and sorority members: A research review. *International School Psychology Association Journal*, *14*, 34-50.

Matsos, C. (1997). *Student leadership development as a supplement to college fraternity pledge programs.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 9735730)

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, *38*(3), 379-396.

McCauley, C. D., Drath, W. H., Palus, C. J., O'Connor, P. M. G., & Baker, B. A. (2006). The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 634-653.

McIntire, D. D. (1989). Student leadership development: A student affairs mandate. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal*, *27*(1), 75-79.

McKaig, R. (1984). Involved students are happy students – or are they? *Campus Activities Programming*, *17*(1), 31-33.

Miller, A. K. (2016). Learning and Leading: Transformational Learning Experiences Among College Student Peer Leaders (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 10158939).

Miller, T. K. (2003). *The book of professional standards in higher education*. (3rd ed.) Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

Morat, D.A. (2003). *Fraternity and sorority members versus non-members: A comparative study of undergraduate student engagement, development of values, and connection to campus.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3135508).

Morrisey, A. M. (1991). Student activities: Focus on strengthening community through involvement. *Campus Activities Programming, 24*(6), 45-53.

Murphy, S., & Johnson, S. (2011). The benefits of a long-lens approach to leader development: Understanding the seeds of leadership. *The leadership quarterly, 22,* 459-470.

Nienkamp, P. (2010). Land grant colleges and American engineers: Redefining professional and vocational engineering in the American Midwest, 1862-1917. *American Educational History Journal, 37*(2), 313-330.

North-American Interfraternity Conference Foundation. (2012). Annual Report. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Northhouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Northhouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS.* (4th ed). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Pascrella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students.* San Francisco, CA. Jossey Bass.

Pascrella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: Volume 2, A Third Decade of Research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Whitt, E., Nora. A., Hagedorn, L., & Terenzini, P. (1996). Cognitive effects of Greek affiliation during the first year of college. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal Journal, 33*(4), 242-259.

Pascarella, E. T., Flowers, L., & Whitt, E. J. (2009). Cognitive effects of Greek affiliation in college: Additional evidence. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal*, *46*(3), 447-468.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pennington, D., Zvonkovic, A., & Wilson, S. (1989). Changes in college satisfaction across an academic term. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 528-535.

Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development: In the college years*. New York, NY: Holt.

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

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

Pike, G. R., & Askew, J. W. (1990). The impact of fraternity or sorority membership on academic involvement or learning outcomes. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 28*(1), 13-19.

Posner, B. (2004). A leadership development instrument for students: Updated. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 443-456. doi:10.1353/csd.2004.0051

Posner, B., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(4), 231-237.

Radke, A. G. (2002). "Can she not see and hear, and smell and taste?" Women students at coeducational land-grand universities in the American West, 1868-1917. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved by ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3045531)

Rissmeyer, P.A. (2010). Mentoring revisited: A phenomenological reading of the literature. *Mentoring and Tutoring.* 8(2), 145-170.

Rea, L. M. & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Roberts, D. C. (2007). Deeper learning in leadership: Helping college students find the potential within. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Roberts, D. C. (1981). *Student leadership programs in higher education*. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Roberts, D. C., & Ullom, C. (1989). Student leadership program model. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 27*(1), 67-74.

Rosen, L. (2009). Media savvy children, adolescents, and young adults: Helping independent practicioners understand the net generation and the new iGeneration. *Independent Practicioner,* 157-160.

Rost, J. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rudolph, F. W. (1962). *The American college and university: A history.* New York, NY: Knopf.

Scott, J. (1965). Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities. *American Sociological Review, 30*(6), 971.

Simon, J. Y. (1963). The politics of the Morrill act. *The Journal of Agricultural History, 37*(2) 103-111.

Sirhal, M. (2000). Fraternities on the rocks. *Policy Review*, (99), 55.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 23,* 35-71.

Strange, C. (1986). Greek affiliation and goals of the academy: A commentary. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 27,* 519-523.

Stumm, B. J. (2014). Personal communication, January 9, 2014.

Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of white college fraternities.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Tampke, D. L. (1990). Alcohol behavior, risk perception, and fraternity and sorority membership. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 28*(1), 71-77.

Tootle, B. J. (1981). Fraternity and sorority leaders. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Student leadership programs in higher education* (pp. 131-138). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Vaill, P. B. (1989). *Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vann, M. (2013). Personal communication, June 12, 2013.

Wagner, W. (2011). *Examining developmental stages of leadership for college students: A validation study of the leadership identity development model.* (Doctoral dissertation), Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3479053).

Webb, E. (1987). Retention and excellence through student involvement: A leadership role for student affairs. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 24,* 6-11.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Whipple, E., & Sullivan, E. (1998). Greek-letter organizations: Communities of learners? *New Directions for Student Services, 80,* 7-17.

Williams, M. E., & Winston, R. B. (1985). Participation in organized student activities and work: Differences in development task achievement of traditional aged college students. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 22*(3), 52-59.

Willimon, W. H., & Naylor, T. H. (1995). The abandoned generation: Rethinking higher education. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Willingham, W. W. (1962). College performance of fraternity members and independent students. *Personal and Guidance Journal, 41,* 29-31.

Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). Leadership in the making: A comprehensive examination of the impact of leadership development programs on students. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 6(3-4), 50-66.

Appendix A

Extra Tables

Table 89

Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive Development and Self-Confidence Traits

SS	Trait	Mean	N	SD	SEM
CD					
	Calculated Risk Taking				
	Pre-test	4.15	99	0.813	0.082
	Post-test	4.19	99	0.841	0.085
	Critical Examination of Mistakes				
	Pre-test	4.20	99	0.700	0.070
	Post-test	4.16	99	0.866	0.087
	Practical Application of Knowledge				
	Pre-test	4.13	99	0.778	0.078
	Post-test	4.16	99	0.829	0.083
	Developing Compromises				
	Pre-test	4.23	99	0.726	0.073
	Post-test	4.16	99	0.854	0.086
	Assessing Politics Associated with Issues				
	Pre-test	4.10	99	0.839	0.084
	Post-test	4.15	99	0.896	0.090
	Critical Analysis				
	Pre-test	4.28	99	0.715	0.072
	Post-test	4.25	99	0.837	0.084
SC					
	Self Confidence in Social Skills				
	Pre-Test	4.14	101	.813	.081
	Post-Test	4.21	101	.828	.082
	Self Confidence in Abilities				
	Pre-Test	4.38	101	.798	.079
	Post-Test	4.31	101	.857	.085
	Assertiveness in interactions with others				
	Pre-Test	4.34	101	.725	.072
	Post-Test	4.35	101	.767	.076
	Clarification of My Values				
	Pre-Test	4.38	101	.733	.073
	Post-Test	4.36	101	.729	.073
	Establishment of Personal Code of Ethics				
	Pre-Test	4.36	101	.807	.080
	Post-Test	4.39	101	.761	.076

Note. SS = Subsection; SD = Standard Deviation; SEM = standard error mean; CD = Cognitive Development; SC = Self-Confidence.

Table 90

Correlations for Advisor Contact With Phone vs Interpersonal Skills

		CP	AL	PC	RC	ED	UI	IO	MO	SS	PW	PS	WC	AG	AI	MF	SE
PW																	
	Corr.	0.270**	0.534**	0.534**	0.460**	0.381**	0.443**	0.478**	0.488**	0.616**	1						
	Sig.	0.008	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000							
MF																	
	Corr.	0.241*	0.541**	0.557**	0.389**	0.401**	0.488**	0.527**	0.523**	0.547**	0.686**	0.520**	0.519**	0.610**	0.536**	1	
	Sig.	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. CP = Contact with phone or text message; AL = Active Listening; PC = Providing constructive criticism; RC = Receiving constructive criticism; ED = Expressing disagreement tactfully; UI = Understanding what is important to others; IO = Influencing others; MO = Motivating others; SS = Supervisory skills; PW = Professional working relationship with the opposite gender; PS = Public speaking skills; WC = Written communication; AG = Ability to work as part of a group; AI = Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others; MF = Making formal presentations; SE = Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 96

Table 91

Correlations for Advisor Contact With Phone vs Organizational Skills

		CP	BC	DT	PE	PA	DA	SD	AM	MF	MT	AT	LG	OT	LS	MD	UP
PE																	
	Corr.	0.280**	0.650**	0.494**	1												
	Sig.	0.006	0.000	0.000													
SD																	
	Corr.	0.220*	0.655**	0.645**	0.665**	0.576**	0.718**	1									
	Sig.	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000										

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. CP = Contact with phone or text message; BC = Building consensus; DT = Delegation of tasks to others; PE = Promoting/Marketing events; PA = Planning activities/events; DA = Developing organization agendas; SD = Setting deadlines; AM = Ability to run effective meetings; MF = Managing organization finances; MT = Managing multiple tasks; AT = Ability to form a team to accomplish a goal; LG = Leading a group of people; OT = Organizing tasks; LS = Long term goal setting; MD = Meeting deadlines; UP = Understanding of organizational politics.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 96

Table 91

Correlations for Advisor Contact With Social Media vs Interpersonal Skills

		CS	AL	PC	RC	ED	UI	IO	MO	SS	PW	PS	WC	AG	AI	MF	SE
MF																	
	Corr.	0.236*	0.593**	0.648**	0.498**	0.474**	0.512**	0.573**	0.605**	0.558**	0.796**	0.549**	0.512**	0.645**	0.585**	1	
	Sig.	0.040	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. CS = Contact with social media; AL = Active Listening; PC = Providing constructive criticism; RC = Receiving constructive criticism; ED = Expressing disagreement tactfully; UI = Understanding what is important to others; IO = Influencing others; MO = Motivating others; SS = Supervisory skills; PW = Professional working relationship with the opposite gender; PS = Public speaking skills; WC = Written communication; AG = Ability to work as part of a group; AI = Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others; MF = Making formal presentations; SE = Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 76

Table 92

Correlations for Advisor Contact With Social Media vs Problem Solving Skills

		CS	DC	NO	CP	ED	DJ
NO							
	Corr.	-0.245*	0.770**	1			
	Sig.	0.033	0.000				

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. CS = Contact with social media; DC = Diplomatic conflict resolution; NO = Negotiating for a desired outcome; CP = Creative problem solving; ED = Ethical decision making; DJ = Development of good judgement.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 76

Table 93

Correlations for Advisor contact with Impromptu Meetings vs Interpersonal Skills

		IM	AL	PC	RC	ED	UI	IO	MO	SS	PW	PS	WC	AG	AI	MF	SE
WC																	
	Corr.	0.230*	0.545**	0.507**	0.490**	0.457**	0.447**	0.456**	0.407**	0.535**	0.496**	0.573**	1				
	Sig.	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000					
MF																	
	Corr.	0.291**	0.558**	0.579**	0.445**	0.416**	0.399**	0.500**	0.525**	0.558**	0.763**	0.522**	0.529**	0.621**	0.538**	1	
	Sig.	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. IM = Impromptu meeting; AL = Active Listening; PC = Providing constructive criticism; RC = Receiving constructive criticism; ED = Expressing disagreement tactfully; UI = Understanding what is important to others; IO = Influencing others; MO = Motivating others; SS = Supervisory skills; PW = Professional working relationship with the opposite gender; PS = Public speaking skills; WC = Written communication; AG = Ability to work as part of a group; AI = Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of others; MF = Making formal presentations; SE = Speaking extemporaneously (unrehearsed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 93

Table 94

Correlations for Advisor Contact With Impromptu Meetings vs Organization and Planning Skills

		CI	BC	DT	PE	PA	DA	SD	AM	MF	MT	AT	LG	OT	LS	MD	UP
DA	Corr.	0.277**	0.639**	0.521**	0.570**	0.661**	1										
	Sig.	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000											

Note. Corr. = Pearson Correlation; Sig. = two-tailed p-value computed using the t distribution. CI = Contact with impromptu meetings; BC = Building consensus; DT = Delegation of tasks to others; PE = Promoting/Marketing events; PA = Planning activities/events; DA = Developing organization agendas; SD = Setting deadlines; AM = Ability to run effective meetings; MF = Managing organization finances; MT = Managing multiple tasks; AT = Ability to form a team to accomplish a goal; LG = Leading a group of people; OT = Organizing tasks; LS = Long term goal setting; MD = Meeting deadlines; UP = Understanding of organizational politics.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
b. Listwise N = 93