

UNCHALLENGED, PROFESSED CORE VALUES Do Undergraduate Fraternity/Sorority Members Actually Benefit in the Areas of Scholarship, Leadership, Service, and Friendship?

Larry D. Long

Michigan State University

Fraternal organizations promote the ideals of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship. Little or no research, however, has demonstrated that college students who join fraternal organizations actually grow in these areas as a result of their fraternal experience. The purpose of this descriptive study was to assess the extent to which fraternity and sorority members experienced gains in the four outcome areas. The researcher analyzed the aggregate results of 15 Southeastern institutions that administered the AFA/EBI Fraternity/Sorority Assessment during the 2008/2009 academic year. The results revealed the respondents did experience gains related to the espoused values of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship. Recommendations for improving the experiences of fraternity and sorority members include encouraging members to spend more time preparing for class and developing the study skills and career-related abilities of members.

About 800 institutions across the United States and Canada host social fraternities and sororities on their campuses (North American Interfraternity Conference, n.d.). These are values-based organizations with the foci of complementing the academic mission of their host institution, developing the character and leadership abilities of their members, serving the community, and developing lifelong friendships (Gregory, 2003). These foci are often summarized as the fraternal ideals of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship

(Pavela, 1995; Torbenson, 2009). While some researchers have associated fraternity/sorority membership with positive benefits such as increased persistence rates (DeBard, Lake, & Binder, 2006; DeBard & Sacks, 2010) and gains in personal development skills (Hayek, Carini, O'Day, & Kuh, 2002; Pike, 2003), other researchers have described fraternal organizations as antithetical to the mission of higher education (e.g., Maisel, 1990). This critique is a result of research that has associated fraternity/sorority membership with

Please direct inquiries about this manuscript to: Larry Long, larrydlong@gmail.com

College Student Affairs Journal, Volume 30(2), 2012, pp. 15–30
Copyright © 2012 Information Age Publishing, Inc.

ISSN 0888-210X
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

alcohol and drug abuse (McCabe, Knight, Teter, & Wechsler, 2005; Pace & McGrath, 2002; Strote, Lee, & Wechsler, 2002; Theall et al., 2009), academic dishonesty (Burrus, McGoldrick, & Schuhmann, 2007; Iyer & Eastman, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2003), and violence (Nuwer, 2001; Sanday, 1990). There appears to be a gap between the espoused and enacted values of fraternities and sororities (Franklin Square Group, 2003; Jelke & Kuh, 2003). Additional research is needed to understand the enacted values of fraternal organizations and the resulting benefits of fraternity/sorority membership. Do fraternity and sorority members actually experience gains pertaining to the ideals of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The research on the outcomes of fraternity/sorority membership is limited and disjointed compared to the larger literature on fraternity/sorority life. Topics that have been studied include academic success (DeBard et al., 2006; DeBard & Sacks, 2010; Grubb, 2006), alcohol and drug use (McCabe et al., 2005; Pace & McGrath, 2002; Strote et al., 2002; Theall et al., 2009), campus involvement (McGuire, 1993; Tripp, 1997), academic dishonesty (Burrus et al., 2007; Iyer & Eastman, 2006; Lambert et al., 2003), and personal development (Antonio, 2001; DiChiara, 2009; Hallenbeck, Dickman, & Fuqua, 2003). Because of the wide-ranging topics that have been studied, this review focuses on the academic, personal development, and social outcomes of fraternity/sorority membership.

Scholarship

Various studies have assessed the relationship between fraternity/sorority membership and academic success measures, such as time spent preparing for class, student learning, academic performance, and persistence. Research on the study habits of fraternity and sorority

members has produced mixed results. Hayek, Carini, O'Day, and Kuh (2002) studied the engagement levels of affiliated and nonaffiliated students. The group of participants consisted of 42,182 first-year students and seniors at 192 institutions across the United States, who completed the National Survey of Student Engagement in 2000. The researchers found a negative relationship between the number of hours students spent preparing for class and fraternity/sorority membership. The effect size, however, was negligible, which indicates the difference was too small to warrant an intervention. In a more recent study, Asel, Seifert, and Pascarella (2009) studied the effect of fraternity/sorority membership on the college experiences of first-year students and seniors at a large, public, research institution in the Midwest. The researchers found no difference in the time respondents spent preparing for class by fraternity/sorority membership. The researchers of the two studies did not provide descriptive results. It is unclear if the number of hours fraternity and sorority members dedicated to studying and preparing for class deviated from the general recommendation of studying two to three hours for every hour spent in class (Rooney & Reardon, 2009).

In terms of student learning, a consistent body of research has shown fraternity/sorority membership has a positive, but modest, impact on the personal gains of college students. In the study by Hayek et al. (2002), the researchers found fraternity/sorority membership was associated with personal-social gains, general education gains, and practical competence gains. These measures represented gains in abilities related to personal and social issues, gains in communication skills and critical thinking, and gains in job-related abilities, respectively. Pike (2000) studied the educational experiences of first-year and senior students at a Midwestern institution and found no difference in the gains in general education by fraternity/sorority membership. However, affiliated students in the study reported greater gains in communication skills, interpersonal skills, and critical thinking.

Despite the positive relationship between student learning and fraternity/sorority membership, research on the impact of joining a fraternal organization on students' academic performance has produced mixed results. In a study of the academic performance of affiliated and nonaffiliated first-year students at a midsized public institution in the Midwest, DeBard et al. (2006) found students who joined a fraternal organization had a propensity to attain lower grade point averages by the end of their first year of college compared to their nonaffiliated peers. In a subsequent study using a multi-institutional dataset, DeBard and Sacks (2010) found a positive relationship between fraternity/sorority membership and the first-year academic performance of college students. The researchers did not provide an explanation for this contradictory finding. Variations in the research design and organizational cultures may explain the different results.

Much of the research on the academic success of fraternity and sorority members was conducted at single institutions (e.g., Asel et al., 2009; DeBard et al., 2006; Pike, 2000) and focused on first-year students or seniors (e.g., Asel et al., 2009; DeBard et al., 2006; DeBard & Sacks, 2010; Hayek et al., 2002; Pike, 2000). Multi-institutional research that includes all undergraduate class levels is needed to gain a better perspective on the influence of fraternity/sorority membership on students' academic performance. In addition, descriptive research on the amount of time fraternity and sorority members dedicate to studying and preparing for class would illuminate if fraternity and sorority members follow the general rule of studying 2 to 3 hours per week for every hour spent in class (Rooney & Reardon, 2009). This is important, because research outside of the fraternity/sorority context has generally found that students who spend more time studying per week tend to outperform their peers who dedicate less time to their studies (George, Dixon, Stansal, Gelb, & Pheri, 2008; Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2008; Rau & Durand, 2000).

Leadership

Research on the leadership development of fraternity/sorority members has primarily focused on the extent to which members exhibited behaviors that aligned with contemporary leadership frameworks such as *Leadership Challenge* (e.g., Adams & Keim, 2000; DiChiara, 2009; Kelley, 2008) and the social change model (e.g., Dugan, 2008). These studies have generally found there were few differences in the leadership practices of fraternity leaders compared to sorority leaders. Because of the absence of statistical controls for the preaffiliation leadership behaviors of respondents or a comparison group of nonaffiliated peers, the research was not able to demonstrate how joining a fraternal organization influenced the leadership behaviors of the respondents. In an older study, Antonio (2001) used data collected between 1992 and 1996 to study the relationship between interracial interaction and the development of leadership abilities. The researcher found joining a fraternal organization positively influenced the leadership development of respondents with racially homogenous circles of friends, however joining a fraternity or sorority did not influence the gains in leadership abilities of respondents with racially heterogeneous circles of friends. In another older study, Kimbrough (1995) assessed the leadership involvement and perceived gains in leadership abilities of 61 African American students attending a predominantly White institution in the Midwest. Twenty-seven participants were members of a historically Black fraternal organization and the other respondents were nonaffiliated. The researcher found that affiliated and nonaffiliated participants reported similar levels of leadership ability and involvement in a campus or community organization. Affiliated respondents, however, were more likely to be involved in multiple organizations and to hold a leadership position in at least one organization compared to nonaffiliated respondents. The researcher concluded that Black fraternal organizations might serve as a

significant leadership development opportunity for African American students at predominantly White institutions.

Other studies on the experiences of fraternity/sorority chapter officers have focused on alcohol use (Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998; Fairlie et al., 2010; Gurie, 2002), personality traits (Harms, Woods, Roberts, Bureau, & Green, 2006), and locus of control (Hallenbeck et al., 2003). With the exception of the research by Antonio (2001) and Kimbrough (1995), the researcher of the present study did not find any studies that explored the development of leadership skills of fraternity and sorority members. Additional research is needed to understand the degree to which fraternal organizations develop the leadership abilities of members.

Service

Few studies have explored the community service involvement of fraternity and sorority members. Studies that focused on first-year students and seniors found fraternity and sorority members tended to be more engaged in service activities than their non-affiliated peers (Asel et al., 2009; Hayek et al., 2002). Phillips (2009) studied the moral reasoning of sophomore fraternity and sorority members at a large public institution and found that the intensity of involvement in a fraternal organization was positively related to the number of service-hours respondents completed. In an older multi-institutional study, Serow and Dreyden (1990) studied the service involvement of 1,960 students from eleven institutions in a Southeastern state. The researchers found that service involvement was positively associated with fraternity/sorority membership, being female, and academic performance. In a recent multi-institutional study comparing fraternity respondents to sorority respondents, Bureau and McCall (2011) found no difference in the number of hours fraternity and sorority members volunteered per week. On average, fraternity and sorority members in the study

volunteered between one and nine hours per month.

A limitation of the research on the community service involvement of fraternity and sorority members is most of the studies merely assessed the number of hours fraternity and sorority members spent serving others (e.g., Asel et al., 2009; Bureau & McCall, 2011; Phillips, 2009). Since many fraternal organizations require or expect their members to engage in service (National Panhellenic Conference, 2003), a better measure of service involvement may be the degree to which the fraternal experience influenced fraternity and sorority members to commit to serving others. This has not been explored in the extant literature.

Friendship

Despite being social organizations, limited research has explored the social integration of students who join fraternal organizations. Research on minority college students has associated joining a culturally-based fraternal organization with improved social adjustment (Garcia, 2005) and feeling a sense of belonging (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). In terms of interpersonal abilities, a limited body of research has found a positive relationship between fraternity/sorority membership and gains in interpersonal abilities. Hunt and Rentz (1994) studied the psychosocial development of fraternity and sorority members at a public institution in the Midwest and found active fraternity/sorority involvement was positively associated with gains in interpersonal skills. The researchers measured interpersonal skills using a 30-item scale, which assessed respondents' independence in relationships and their ability to respect persons with different backgrounds. In a later study, Pike (2000) researched the second-semester experiences of first-year students who lived in residence halls or fraternity/sorority housing and found joining a fraternal organization had a positive, but modest, impact on gains in interpersonal skills. Pike measured interpersonal skills using a three-item scale that assessed respondents'

abilities to lead, work in groups, and get along with people with different backgrounds. A limitation of these studies is the mono-institutional design, which limits the generalizability of the results. Moreover, the different operational definitions make comparing the results of the studies challenging. Research using a multi-institutional approach would further illuminate the relationship between fraternity/sorority membership and the development of interpersonal abilities.

Overall, there is an assortment of studies that have linked fraternity/sorority membership with community service involvement, social integration, and gains in interpersonal abilities and academic competencies. Limited research, however, has explored the extent to which fraternal organizations develop the leadership abilities of members. Furthermore, much of the research on the outcomes of fraternity/sorority membership was conducted at a single institution (e.g., Asel et al., 2003; DeBard et al., 2006; Hunt & Rentz, 1994; Kimbrough, 1995; Phillips, 2009; Pike, 2000) or the research focused on specific campus populations, such as first-year students or minority students (e.g., Asel et al., 2009; DeBard et al., 2006; DeBard & Sacks, 2010; Garcia, 2005; Hayek et al., 2002; Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Kimbrough, 1995; Pike, 2000; Pike, 2003). Therefore, this study sought to contribute to the extant literature on the outcomes of fraternity/sorority membership by (1) conducting a multi-institutional study, (2) assessing gains in the areas of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship concurrently, and (3) including all undergraduate class-levels in the analysis.

RESEARCH APPROACH

Data and Participants

Educational Benchmarking, Inc. developed the Fraternity/Sorority Assessment in partnership with the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (Long, 2010). The data in the present study were drawn from the aggregate

results of the Southeastern institutions that administered the assessment during the 2008/2009 academic year. The participants were 9,380 college students representing 15 institutions. Based on the Carnegie classification system, 10 institutions were state-funded, five were private, three were small, three were medium-sized, and nine were large, thus the sample primarily represented large, public institutions. After controlling for missing values using listwise deletion, the final sample consisted of 3,282 (39%) fraternity members and 5,204 (61%) sorority members. About 27% of the respondents identified as freshmen or first-year students, 28% were sophomores, 25% were juniors, and 19% were seniors or older. Approximately 85% of the sample identified as White/Caucasian.

Variables

This study focused on four outcome areas: academic success, service to others, leadership development, and friendship. I measured academic success using four variables. The first variable was a five-item scale ($\alpha = .923$) that measured the extent to which the fraternal environment enhanced the ability of respondents to set academic goals, establish an effective study schedule, and set priorities. The response options for these measures and other scale items ranged from "Not at all" (1) to "Extremely" (7). The second variable was a measure of cognitive growth and consisted of three items ($\alpha = .948$) that asked the extent to which the fraternal experience contributed to respondents' gains in critical thinking and problem-solving skills. The third variable was based on a question that asked respondents to report the number of hours they studied per week. The response categories ranged from "None" (1) to "More than 25" (7). The fourth academic success variable was the self-reported cumulative grade point average of the respondents at the time when the survey was completed. The variable consisted of the following response categories: "Below 2.50" (1), "2.50 to 2.74" (2), "2.75 to 2.99" (3), "3.00 to

3.24" (4), "3.25 to 3.49" (5), "3.50 to 3.74" (6), "3.75 to 4.00" (7).

I measured service to others using two variables: hours engaged in service and commitment to service. The first variable was the reported number of hours respondents engaged in community service per month. The response options ranged from "None" (1) to "More than 25" (7). The second variable was a five-item scale ($\alpha = .790$) that measured the extent to which the fraternal experience influenced respondents' commitment to service. The scale items prompted respondents to report the extent to which the fraternal experience influenced their commitment to service, their interaction with diverse people, and their ability to empathize with others. The scale also included an item that prompted respondents to report their satisfaction with chapter community service programs.

Leadership development consisted of three variables: officer, management skills, and career skills. Officer was measured from a question that prompted respondents to report the highest leadership position they held in their organization. The response options were "Executive board member" (0), "Have not held an officer/committee chair position" (1), "Other officer or committee chair" (2). For analytical purposes, I combined and recoded the first and third response options to produce a dichotomous variable (1 – non-Officer, 2 – Officer). Management skills was a four-item ($\alpha = .908$) measure of gains in administrative abilities, such as organizing events, managing finances, and running meetings. Career skills consisted of four items ($\alpha = .916$) that asked respondents to report the extent to which the fraternal experience improved their time management, oral and written communication, and decision-making skills.

Sermersheim (1996) described friendship in fraternal contexts as feeling a sense of belonging and having the ability to engage in social opportunities. This influenced me to measure friendship using two scales: sense of belonging and peer interaction. Sense of belonging was a five-item ($\alpha = .937$) measure that asked

respondents to report to what extent they were meeting people with similar interests and values. Peer interaction was a 12-item ($\alpha = .954$) measure of gains in interpersonal skills. The scale items asked the respondents to what extent the fraternity/sorority experience contributed to the development of their social abilities such as meeting new people, establishing close friendships, empathizing with others, and managing conflict.

Statistical Approach

I computed the means and standard deviations of all of the measures for fraternity respondents, sorority respondents, and the total sample. Since the variables had skewed distributions and were ordinal in scale, I used a rank-based statistical procedure to assess the differences in the outcomes of the respondents by organization type. Specifically, I employed a macro developed by Hogarty and Kromrey (1999), which uses Cliff's delta to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the distributions of two samples.

Cliff's delta. Cliff's delta, also known as the dominance statistic d , is defined as the probability that scores from one population are higher than the scores of another population, minus the reverse probability (Cliff, 1993, 1996). When sample sizes differ and heterogeneous conditions exist, researchers have found Cliff's delta to be more efficient than some classic parametric statistical methods (Hess & Kromrey, 2004; Kromrey & Hogarty, 1998). Another advantage of using Cliff's delta is that it serves as a measure of effect size, in addition to serving as a test statistic for making inferences about the difference between two populations. As an effect size measure, the statistic represents the degree of nonoverlap between two distributions. The magnitude of d ranges from 0 (distributions are identical) to 1 (distributions are different). The sign of the value indicates the direction of dominance (Cliff, 1993, 1996). For normally distributed samples, the magnitude of Cliff's delta is comparable to Cohen's nonoverlap measure U (Cohen, 1988),

which provides a bridge between Cliff's delta and Cohen's effect size measure d . The commonly used Cohen's d effect sizes of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 represent the Cliff's delta effect sizes of .147, .330, and .474, respectively.

Controlling for false discoveries. When conducting statistical analyses, large sample sizes may lead to false discoveries, thus statisticians recommend the use of effect sizes in addition to p -values when assessing group differences (Kirk, 1996; Stout & Ruble, 1995). Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991) recommended a minimum threshold of 0.1 when evaluating the magnitude of Cohen's d . To control for Type I errors, I chose thresholds that were slightly more conservative than the recommendation by Rosenthal and Rosnow and the commonly used alpha-level of .05. I set statistical significance at the $\alpha = .01$ level and I considered Cliff's delta effect sizes greater than .10 practically significant.

Interpretation of Means

EBI provided seven performance descriptions for interpreting factor means (Long, 2010). The descriptions and the ranges for the means were: "Extremely Poor" (1.00 - 1.29); "Very Poor" (1.30 - 2.37); "Poor" (2.38 - 3.45); "Fair" (3.46 - 4.53); "Good" (4.54 - 5.61); "Excellent" (5.62 - 6.69); and "Superior" (6.70 - 7.00). I used these descriptions to interpret the magnitude of the scale scores.

RESULTS

Overall, the respondents rated their fraternity/sorority experience as excellent ($5.62 \geq \text{mean} \leq 6.69$) in producing gains in their sense of belonging ($M = 6.07, SD = 1.06$) and peer interaction ($M = 5.92, SD = 0.98$) as shown in Table 1. Their fraternity/sorority involvement was good ($4.54 \geq \text{mean} \leq 5.61$) at developing their study skills ($M = 5.35, SD = 1.34$), critical thinking ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.41$), commitment to service ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.66$), management skills ($M = 5.49, SD = 1.33$), and career skills

($M = 5.41, SD = 1.37$). The average respondent studied between 6 and 15 hours per week, engaged in up to 10 hours of service per month, and earned a cumulative GPA between 3.00 and 3.50. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents indicated they served as a chapter officer.

The dominance analyses revealed significant differences in the experiences of respondents by organization membership. Fraternity respondents reported greater gains in critical thinking ($d = -.151, p < .001$), management skills ($d = -.120, p < .001$), and career skills ($d = -.120, p < .001$) compared to sorority respondents. Sorority respondents had a tendency to spend more hours studying per week ($d = .101, p < .001$) and reported greater GPAs ($d = .203, p < .001$) than fraternity respondents. I found no significant differences for both measures of service to others and friendship by organization membership. There were statistically significant differences in study skills and officer, but the differences had negligible effect sizes ($d < .10$).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which fraternity and sorority members benefitted in the areas of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship as a result of their fraternal experience. The results revealed the fraternity/sorority experience was "excellent" at producing gains in sense of belonging and peer interaction and "good" at developing respondents' study skills, critical thinking, commitment to service, management skills, and career skills. Despite these positive findings, the experience of fraternity/sorority members can be improved by encouraging members of fraternal organizations to spend more time preparing for class and by developing the study skills and career-related abilities of members. Campus-based professionals, organization staff, and volunteers (hereafter referred to as advisors) can be integral in ensuring fraternal organizations foster environments where college students can succeed.

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Dominance Analyses by Organization Membership

Measure	Overall (N = 8,486)		Fraternity (n = 3,282)		Sorority (n = 5,204)		d	Z	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
<i>Academic Success</i>									
Study skills	5.35	1.34	5.51	1.18	5.25	1.42	-.082	-6.50	<.001
Cognitive growth	5.42	1.41	5.68	1.19	5.25	1.50	-.151	-12.29	<.001
Hours studied per week	3.88	1.38	3.73	1.34	3.98	1.39	.101	8.15	<.001
GPA	4.65	1.66	4.28	1.69	4.89	1.59	.203	16.33	<.001
<i>Service to Others</i>									
Hours engaged in service	2.68	1.26	2.69	1.36	2.68	1.19	.020	1.61	.109
Commitment to service	5.51	1.05	5.48	1.06	5.52	1.04	.027	2.09	.037
<i>Leadership Experience</i>									
Officer	1.59	0.49	1.63	0.48	1.56	0.50	-.065	-5.98	<.001
Management skills	5.49	1.33	5.69	1.15	5.36	1.42	-.120	-9.65	<.001
Career skills	5.41	1.37	5.62	1.17	5.27	1.46	-.120	-9.61	<.001
<i>Friendship</i>									
Sense of belonging	6.07	1.06	6.09	1.02	6.06	1.09	-.004	-0.39	.700
Peer interaction	5.92	0.98	5.96	0.93	5.89	1.01	-.029	-2.30	.021

Note: Positive values of *d* (Cliff's delta) correspond to higher ratings for fraternity respondents and negative values correspond to higher ratings for sorority respondents. Statistical significance and practical significance were set at the .01 and .10 levels, respectively. Differences that are both statistically and practically significant are in **bold**.

A discussion of each outcome area and implications for practice follows.

Friendship

Previous research indicated fraternity and sorority members sought membership in a fraternal organization to meet people and to feel a sense of belonging on campus (Case, Hesp, & Eberly, 2005; Fouts, 2010). Mono-institutional research also indicated fraternity/sorority membership positively influenced the sense of belonging of minority college students (Hurtado & Carter, 1997) and was associated with modest gains in the interpersonal skills of members (Hunt & Rentz, 1994; Pike, 2000). The results of the current multi-institutional study confirm these findings. Specifically, fraternity and sorority members reported a high sense of belonging and peer interaction as a result of their fraternal experience. The non-significant difference by organization type indicated fraternity and sorority respondents experienced comparable gains. The results support the conclusion that fraternal organizations promote and enact the value of friendship. This is significant because social integration is associated with persistence (Allen, Robbins, Casillas, & Oh, 2008; Lohfink & Paulsen, 2005) and strong interpersonal abilities are associated with career success (Myers & Larson, 2005; Sermersheim, 1996). Fraternal organizations may promote these outcomes by providing members with a small, intimate community within the larger campus context and by providing opportunities for members to meet new people, establish close friendships, empathize with others, and resolve interpersonal conflicts, respectively. When promoting the value of fraternity/sorority membership to potential members, parents, faculty/staff, and other constituents, advisors should emphasize how fraternal organizations can support the social integration and develop the interpersonal abilities of members. Advisors could relay this message during conversations and group discussions with constituents and in the form of informational materials.

Scholarship

Advisors should assist fraternity and sorority members in establishing a culture within fraternal organizations, which supports the academic mission of the host institution. Rooney and Reardon (2009) suggested college students should spend 2 to 3 hours preparing for class for every hour they spend in class (i.e., a minimum of 24 hours per week for full-time students), however only 6% of the respondents in the current study reported they studied more than 25 hours per week. Most of the respondents (31%) dedicated between 6 and 10 hours per week to their studies and less than one percent of the respondents indicated they did not study at all. The results of the current study revealed fraternity and sorority members did not spend as much time preparing for class as they should. Moreover, the measure of gains in study skills received the lowest rating by sorority respondents and the second lowest rating by fraternity respondents. Advisors can be integral in ensuring fraternal organizations promote academic success by reinforcing the importance of studying and preparing for class. Possible interventions include establishing and enforcing quiet hours and creating quiet study spaces in fraternity/sorority chapter houses, informing members with deficient grades about resources to improve their academic standing, and adding workshops on developing study skills to the membership education curriculum. At the local level, campus-based professionals, such as representatives from the tutoring center, could facilitate the workshops. At the organizational level, headquarters staff could offer the workshops in the form of webinars.

The National Panhellenic Conference's (2011) *Academic Excellence: A Resource for College Panhellenics* handbook provides additional ideas for promoting academic success within fraternal organizations. While the handbook focuses on women's organizations, some of the information can be applied to men's organizations. Another useful resource is *The Secrets of College Success* (Jacobs & Hyman,

2010), an easy-to-read guide on strategies for succeeding academically. Advisors might use the book as a reference when recommending effective study strategies to members.

Leadership

The majority (59%) of the respondents served in formal positions of responsibility. This confirms the conclusions of previous research that found fraternal organizations provide many opportunities for students to serve in leadership roles (Hallenbeck et al., 2003). While the design of the current study did not enable me to assess if respondents served in unofficial leadership roles, previous research found fraternity and sorority members tended to view leadership as positional (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Advisors should ensure fraternal organizations promote an environment that teaches members they do not have to serve in an elected or appointed position to have a positive influence within the organization. All members should feel encouraged to contribute to their organization in a positive manner, no matter if they are new members, general members, or officers.

In terms of personal development, previous research found fraternities and sororities have positive, but modest, effects on the personal development gains of members (Hayek et al., 2002; Pike, 2003). Although the present study confirmed this finding, I was surprised the fraternal organizations in the current study were not more effective in developing the management and career skills of the respondents, given that fraternal organizations promote career preparation as a benefit of membership. An examination of the scale items of the career skills scale revealed the fraternity/sorority experience was not as effective in developing the written communication abilities of fraternity ($M = 5.23$, $SD = 1.52$) and sorority members ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 1.78$). In comparison, the means of the other items were relatively greater: time management skills ($M_F = 5.66$, $SD_F = 1.25$; $M_S = 5.37$, $SD_S = 1.62$), decision-making skills ($M_F = 5.76$, $SD_F = 1.31$; $M_S =$

5.33 , $SD_S = 1.61$), oral communication skills ($M_F = 5.84$, $SD_F = 1.22$; $M_S = 5.57$, $SD_S = 1.48$). Research on employer satisfaction with the abilities of newly hired employees revealed college graduates lacked sufficient communication abilities (Stevens, 2005; Wise, 2005). This deficit in the abilities of college graduates presents a great opportunity for fraternal organizations to have a positive impact on the personal development of college students. Advisors should consider adding programs on business writing and effective communication to the membership education curriculum. Advisors might also consider collaborating with campus offices, such as career services, academic services, and the writing center, to assist fraternity and sorority members in developing career-related abilities. Last, advisors may improve the written communication of members by providing members with feedback regarding their writing. Quible and Griffin (2007) suggested college students make fewer sentence-level errors when teachers highlight grammar and punctuation errors in the writings of students. When advisors receive electronic messages, reports, or formal correspondences from members that contain errors, advisors should use that educational opportunity to provide students with feedback and help the members improve their written communication abilities.

Service

Forty-three percent of fraternity respondents and 51% of sorority respondents engaged in service between one and five hours per week. Less than 9% of fraternity and sorority respondents reported they did not engage in service. Moreover, the fraternity/sorority experience was rated as “good” in developing respondents’ commitment to service. These results affirm the conclusion that fraternity/sorority membership promotes service involvement (Asel et al., 2009; Hayek et al., 2002; Phillips, 2009). Unfortunately, the design of the current study did not enable me to examine in which kinds of ser-

vice activities respondents engaged. Rose (2008) suggested some fraternity and sorority members count philanthropic activities as community service. Fraternity/sorority philanthropic activities are oftentimes social competitions, such as chili cook-offs, athletic tournaments, talent shows, and races where an organization pays a registration fee on behalf of the participants from that organization. While these competitions can be fun and may raise money for worthy causes, the competitions may not teach fraternity and sorority members the value of serving others (Rose, 2008). Additional research is needed to understand how fraternity and sorority members divide their time between service and philanthropic opportunities.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

To understand the engagement of fraternity and sorority members further, I assessed the percentage bend correlation (Wilcox, 2003) between the time use measures, GPA, and the leadership experiences of the respondents. As shown in Table 2, there was a positive relationship between the number of hours respondents studied per week and GPA for fraternity respondents ($r_{pb} = .124$, 95% *CI* [.091, .157], $p < .001$) and sorority respondents ($r_{pb} = .135$,

95% *CI* [.109, .161], $p < .001$). This finding reflects the results of research outside of the fraternity/sorority context that has found a positive relationship between time spent studying and academic performance (George et al., 2008; Kuh et al., 2008; Rau & Durand, 2000). Despite the small correlation found in the present study, the finding further emphasizes the importance of encouraging fraternity and sorority members to dedicate more time to studying and preparing for class.

In an older study, Serow and Dreyden (1990) found that fraternity and sorority members who engaged in service more frequently tended to have greater GPAs than their peers who engaged in service less frequently. The present study found no relationship between the number of hours respondents engaged in service per month and GPA. Since some fraternal organizations require their members to engage in service (National Panhellenic Conference, 2003), it is possible that low achieving and high achieving members dedicate comparable numbers of hours to service per month.

There was a positive, but small relationship between serving as a chapter officer and the number of hours sorority respondents engaged in service per month ($r_{pb} = .116$, 95% *CI* [.090, .143], $p < .001$). For fraternity respondents, the relationship between the two measures was positive, but weak ($r_{pb} = .067$, 95% *CI* [.032,

TABLE 2
Bivariate Correlations Among the Time Use Measures, GPA,
and Officer by Organization Type

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Hours studied per week	–	.135*	.119*	–.004
2. GPA	.124*	–	–.027	–.000
3. Hours engaged in service	.121*	.005	–	.116*
4. Officer	–.004	.031	.067*	–

Note: The values represent percentage bend correlation coefficients (r_{pb}). The coefficients in the upper diagonal correspond to sorority respondents and the coefficients in the lower diagonal correspond to fraternity respondents. * $p < .001$.

.100], $p < .001$). The leadership experience of the respondents was not related to the academic performance of the respondents nor the number of hours they studied per week. A possible explanation is that chapter officers may be more inclined to engage in service by virtue of their position of responsibility. An alternative explanation is that some respondents who were inclined to serve others sought positions of responsibility in their organization.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The limitations of the current study should be noted. First, the research design did not include statistical controls. Differences may become diminished or amplified once background characteristics such as gender, race, ability, and previous involvement experiences are taken into account. Second, the study focused on Southeastern institutions and primarily included respondents from large, public universities. The results may not be generalizable to the experiences of fraternity and sorority members at different campus contexts. Last, the participants were primarily White/Caucasian. The results may not reflect the experiences of racial minority fraternity and sorority members.

The limitations of the current study present opportunities for additional research. Future studies on the outcomes of fraternity/sorority membership should explore if regional differences and differences by campus context (e.g., size, funding) exist. Outside of the fraternity/sorority context, student outcome data have shown that average student gains vary by institutional size (Kezar, 2006). The gains that members of fraternal organizations experience may vary by the size of the institution, as well. Additional research on the outcomes of fraternity/sorority membership by race/ethnicity would be beneficial, as well. Do racial minorities experience different gains than their dominant race peers in majority same-race environments? What about mixed-race envi-

ronments? The answers to these questions would assist advisors in supporting students who join fraternal organizations with different racial climates. In terms of student success, researchers should consider studying additional measures of time use. The present study assessed two measures of time use of fraternity and sorority members. Future studies might include time spent sleeping, socializing, and working, as additional measures. This would help contextualize the measures used in the present study and clarify if fraternity and sorority members are dedicating too much time to nonacademic activities. Last, researchers should explore the service involvement of fraternity and sorority members. Previous studies have assessed the overall service hours of fraternity and sorority members, but have not assessed service and philanthropy hours separately. Do members of fraternal organizations spend more time engaged in service or philanthropic opportunities? How do these activities affect other outcomes, such as student learning and character development?

CONCLUSION

Do members of fraternities and sororities experience gains related to the espoused values of scholarship, leadership, service, and friendship? More specifically, do members report a considerable amount of academic success, participation in formal leadership roles, gains in management and career-related abilities, engagement in community service, and social connectedness? The results of the current study revealed members reported gains pertaining to the espoused values. Respondents rated their fraternity/sorority experience as excellent in producing gains in sense of belonging and peer interaction and good in developing study skills, critical thinking, commitment to service, management skills, and career skills. Recommendations for improving the experiences of fraternity and sorority members include encouraging members to spend more time preparing for class and developing

the study skills and career-related abilities of members. Campus-based professionals, organization staff, and alumni/alumnae volunteers can be integral in implementing these recommendations by establishing and enforcing quiet hours and creating quiet study spaces in fraternity/sorority chapter houses, informing members with deficient grades about resources to improve their academic standing, and adding workshops on developing study skills and career-related abilities to the membership education curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Adams, T., & Keim, M. (2000). Leadership practices and effectiveness among Greek student leaders. *College Student Journal, 34*, 259-270.
- Allen, J., Robbins, S. B., Casillas, A., & Oh, I.-S. (2008). Third-year college retention and transfer: Effects of academic performance, motivation, and social connectedness. *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 647-664.
- Antonio, A. L. (2001). The role of interracial interaction in the development of leadership skills and cultural knowledge and understanding. *Research in Higher Education, 42*, 593-617.
- Asel, A. M., Seifert, T. A., & Pascarella, E. T. (2009). The effects of fraternity/sorority membership on college experiences and outcomes: A portrait of complexity. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 1-15.
- Bureau, D., & McCall, F. (2011, Spring). The difference of gender in perceptions of the fraternity/sorority experience. *Perspectives, 34* (3), 10-13.
- Burrus, R., McGoldrick, K., & Schuhmann, P. (2007). Self-reports of student cheating: Does a definition of cheating matter? *Journal of Economic Education, 38*, 3-16.
- Case, D. N., Hesp, G. A., & Eberly, C. G. (2005). An exploratory study of the experiences of gay, lesbian and bisexual fraternity and sorority members revisited. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 1*(1), 15-31.
- Cashin, J. R., Presley, C. A., & Meilman, P. W. (1998). Alcohol use in the Greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 59*, 63-70.
- Cliff, N. (1993). Dominance statistics: Ordinal analyses to answer ordinal questions. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 494-509.
- Cliff, N. (1996). *Ordinal methods for behavioral data analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- DeBard, R., Lake, T., & Binder, R. S. (2006). Greeks and grades: The first-year experience. *NASPA Journal, 43*, 56-68.
- DeBard, R., & Sacks, C. (2010). Fraternity/sorority membership: Good news about first-year impact. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 5*(1), 12-23.
- DiChiara, A. N. (2009). Fraternal leadership: Differences in leadership practices among four governing councils. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 16-29.
- Dugan, J. P. (2008). Exploring relationships between fraternity and sorority membership and socially responsible leadership. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 3*(2), 16-25.
- Fairlie, A. M., DeJong, W., Stevenson, J. F., Lavigne, A. M., & Wood, M. D. (2010). Fraternity and sorority leaders and members: A comparison of alcohol use, attitudes, and policy awareness. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 36*, 187-193. doi:10.3109/00952990.2010.491878
- Fouts, K. S. (2010). Why undergraduates aren't "Going Greek": Attraction, affiliation, and retention in fraternities and sororities. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 5*(1), 24-33.
- Franklin Square Group. (2003). A call for values congruence. Retrieved from <http://www.afa1976.org>
- Garcia, G. A. (2005). *The relationship of perceptions of campus climate and social support to adjustment to college for Latina sorority and non-sorority members* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1426845)
- George, D., Dixon, S., Stansal, E., Gelb, S. L., & Pheri, T. (2008). Time diary and questionnaire assessment of factors associated with academic and personal success among university undergraduates. *Journal of American College Health, 56*, 706-715.

- Gregory, D. (2003). The dilemma facing fraternal organizations at the millennium. In D. E. Gregory (Ed.), *The administration of fraternal organizations on North American campuses: A pattern for the new millennium* (pp. 3-25). Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Grubb, F. (2006). Does going Greek impair undergraduate academic performance? *American Journal of Economics & Sociology*, 65, 1085-1110. doi:10.1111/j.1536-7150.2006.00457.x
- Curie, J. R. (2002). *The relationship between perceived leader behavior and alcohol consumption among university students who are members of social fraternities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://etd.lsu.edu/>
- Hallenbeck, D. A., Dickman, M. M., & Fuqua, D. R. (2003). Dimensions of leadership and motivation in relation to residential setting. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 32(2), 23-31.
- Harms, P. D., Woods, D., Roberts, B., Bureau, D., & Green, A. M. (2006). Perceptions of leadership in undergraduate fraternal organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 2(2), 81-94.
- Hayek, J. C., Carini, R. M., O'Day, P. T., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Triumph or tragedy: Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter organizations and other students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 643-663.
- Hess, M. R., & Kromrey, J. D. (2004, April). *Robust confidence intervals for effect sizes: A comparative study of Cohen's d and Cliff's delta under non-normality and heterogeneous variances*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.
- Hogarty, K. Y., & Kromrey, J. D. (1999, April). *Using SAS to calculate tests of Cliff's delta*. Paper presented at the SAS Users Group International conference, Miami Beach, FL. Retrieved from <http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi24/Posters/p238-24.pdf>
- Hunt, S., & Rentz, A. L. (1994). Greek-letter social group members' involvement and psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 289-295.
- Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, 70, 324-345.
- Iyer, R., & Eastman, J. (2006). Academic dishonesty: Are business students different from other college students? *Journal of Education for Business*, 82, 101-110.
- Jacobs, L. F., & Hyman, J. S. (2010). *The secrets of college success*. The Professors' Guide series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jelke, T., & Kuh, G. (2003). High performing fraternities and sororities. In D. E. Gregory (Ed.), *The administration of fraternal organizations on North American campuses: A pattern for the new millennium* (pp. 275-298). Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Kelley, D. R. (2008). Leadership development through the fraternity experience and the relationship to career success after graduation. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Kezar, A. J. (2006). The impact of institutional size on student engagement. *NASPA Journal*, 43, 87-114.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (1995). Self-assessment, participation, and value of leadership skills, activities, and experiences for Black students relative to their membership in historically Black fraternities and sororities. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 64, 63-74.
- Kirk, R. E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 746-759. doi:10.1177/0013164496056005002
- Kromrey, J. D., & Hogarty, K. Y. (1998). Analysis options for testing group differences on ordered categorical variables: An empirical investigation of Type I error control and statistical power. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints*, 25, 70-82.
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79, 540-563.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2003). Collegiate academic dishonesty revisited: What have they done, how often have they done it, who does it, and why did they do it? *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, 7(4). Retrieved from http://www.sociology.org/content/vol7.4/lambert_etal.html
- Lohfink, M. M., & Paulsen, M. B. (2005). Comparing the determinants of persistence for first-generation and continuing-generation students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 409-428.

- Long, L. D. (2010). *AFA/EBI fraternity/sorority assessment: Summary report 2009*. Carmel, IN: Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors.
- Maisel, J. P. (1990). Social fraternities and sororities are not conducive to the educational process. *NASPA Journal*, 28, 8-12.
- McCabe, S. E., Knight, J. R., Teter, C. J., & Wechsler, H. (2005). Non-medical use of prescription stimulants among US college students: Prevalence and correlates from a national survey. *Addiction*, 99, 96-106.
- McGuire, J. J. (1993). *The effect of deferring fraternity and sorority rush upon scholastic achievement, satisfaction, and quality and quantity of involvement among students at a small, private liberal arts university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9318033)
- Myers, L. L., & Larson, R. S. (2005). Preparing students for early work conflicts. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 68, 306-317. doi:10.1177/1080569905278967
- National Panhellenic Conference. (2003). *Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.npcwomen.org/about/standards-policies.aspx>
- National Panhellenic Conference. (2011). *Academic excellence: A resource for college panhellenics*. Retrieved from <https://www.npcwomen.org>
- North-American Interfraternity Conference (n.d.). *Fraternity stats at a glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.nicindy.org/press/>
- Nuwer, H. (2001). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Pace, D., & McGrath, P. B. (2002). A comparison of drinking behaviors of students in Greek organizations and students active in a campus volunteer organization. *NASPA Journal*, 39, 217-232.
- Pavela, G. (1995). Greek life: A foundation for the future. *Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education*, 7, 489-508.
- Phillips, III, F. H. (2009). *The relationship between intensity of involvement and community service engagement in the moral development of student members of Greek organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3392574)
- 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, 369-382. doi:10.1353/csd.2003.0031
- Quible, Z. K., & Griffin, F. (2007). Are writing deficiencies creating a lost generation of business writers? *Journal of Education for Business*, 83(1), 32-36.
- Rau, W., & Durand, A. (2000). The academic ethic and college grades: Does hard work help students "make the grade?" *Sociology of Education*, 73(1), 19-38.
- Rooney, J. J., & Reardon, J. F. (2009). *Preparing for college: Practical advice for students and their families*. New York, NY: Ferguson.
- Rose, C. (2008, Winter). Examining philanthropy and community service in sororities and fraternities. *Perspectives*, 31(2), 10-12.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Sanday, P. R. (1990). *Fraternity gang rape: Sex, brotherhood, and privilege on campus*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sermersheim, K. L. (1996). Undergraduate Greek leadership experiences: A proven method for gaining career related and life-long skills. *Campus Activities Programming*, 29(3), 50-60.
- Serow, R., & Dreyden, J. (1990). Community service among college and university students: Individual and institutional relationships. *Adolescence*, 25, 553-566.
- Shertzer, J. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal*, 42, 111-131.
- Stevens, B. (2005, March). What communication skills do employers want? Silicon Valley recruiters respond. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 42(1), 2-9.
- Stout, D. E., & Ruble, T. L. (1995). Assessing the practical significance of empirical results in accounting education research: The use of effect size information. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 13, 281-298.
- Strote, J., Lee, J. E., & Wechsler, H. (2002). Increasing MDMA use among college students: Results of a national survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 30(1), 64-72.
- Theall, K., DeJong, W., Scribner, R., Mason, K., Schneider, S., & Simonsen, N. (2009). Social capital in the college setting: The impact of participation in campus activities on drinking and alcohol-related harms. *Journal of American Col-*

- lege Health*, 58(1), 15-25. doi:10.3200/JACH.58.1.15-25
- Torbenson, C. L. (2009). From the beginning: A history of college fraternities and sororities. In C. L. Torbenson, & G. S. Parks (Eds.), *Brothers and sisters: Diversity in college fraternities and sororities* (pp. 15-45). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.
- Tripp, R. (1997). Greek organizations and student development: A review of the research. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 16(2), 31-39.
- Wilcox, R. R. (2003). *Applying contemporary statistical techniques*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wise, K. (2005). The importance of writing skills. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 50 (2), 37-48.

University of Pennsylvania and a bachelor's degree from Dickinson College. Prior to re-entering graduate study Block served as director of student rights and responsibilities at Gettysburg College and as an assistant director of residential life at Kenyon College. His current research interests center on federal regulation of higher education in the areas of student affairs and distance education, as well as the role of college and university counsel in institutional decision making.

Ellen Eckman is an associate professor of educational administration at Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, where she is chair of the Educational Policy and Leadership Department. Her research has focused on women in leadership position, including examining the co-leadership model for the principalship. She is a co-investigator on a National Science Foundation grant designed to attract and prepare more teachers for the STEM fields.

Michael W. Firmin is professor of psychology at Cedarville University in Cedarville, Ohio. He has published over 90 articles in peer-reviewed journals and presented more than 150 papers at national research conferences. Firmin serves as editor for the *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research (JEQR)* and directs the national Ethnographic & Qualitative Research Conference (EQRC), now in its 25th annual year. He is an Ohio licensed psychologist, National Certified Counselor (NCC), and operates a part-time private practice, conducting psychological evaluations (Miami Valley Assessments).

Janna Foster-Trudel is currently working as an army wife and stay-home mom at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson in Alaska, where her husband is deployed to Afghanistan. Janna received a BA in psychology from Cedarville University in 2007. She also received a MA in clinical psychology from Indiana University of Pennsylvania in 2009. Most recently, she has been studying applied behavior analysis from

the Florida Institute of Technology as she pursues a certificate in behavior analysis.

Larry Long has a varied background in student affairs administration, including experience in residence life, fraternity/sorority life, student activities, study abroad, and institutional research/assessment. He has written extensively on fraternities and sororities. His current research pertains to the impact of social and physical environments on the college student experience. Larry earned graduate degrees in student affairs administration, Educational psychology, and sociology from Ball State University and undergraduate degrees from Kansas State University. Larry currently serves as a community director at Michigan State University. He is a member of the Alpha Tau Omega Fraternity and serves as a recruitment advisor for the Michigan State University chapter of the Beta Theta Pi Fraternity. He can be contacted at larrydlong@gmail.com.

Norma T. Mertz is a professor of higher education administration at the University of Tennessee, where she coordinates the higher education administration doctoral program and the college student personnel master's program. She is author of a chapter on recruiting, hiring and retaining female faculty of color for the recently published *Women of color in higher education*, co-author of a case on mentoring for *Developing successful diversity mentoring programmes*, editor of *Breaking into the all-male club: Female professors of educational administration*, and coeditor of *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*, which is currently being revised for a second edition.

Luke M. Tse is an associate professor of psychology teaching at Cedarville University since 2001. He received his master's of divinity degree with a concentration in psychology and counseling and a PhD degree in psychology and counseling from the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. His teaching assignments have included a variety of courses

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.