

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

5-11-2022

# THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LIFE MEMBERS

Emmalee Holaday  
*Rowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Holaday, Emmalee, "THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LIFE MEMBERS" (2022). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3003.  
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/3003>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact [graduateresearch@rowan.edu](mailto:graduateresearch@rowan.edu).

**THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY  
LIFE MEMBERS**

by

Emmalee Holaday

A Thesis

Submitted to the  
Educational Services & Leadership  
College of Education  
In partial fulfillment of the requirement  
For the degree of  
Master of Arts in Higher Education  
at  
Rowan University  
April 22, 2022

Thesis Chair: Stephanie Lezotte, Ph.D., Assistant Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

Committee Members:

Tyrone McCombs, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Services  
Andrew Tinnin, Ed.D., Associate Vice President of Student Life

© 2022 Emmalee Holaday

## Acknowledgments

Without the support of my family, friends, professors, coworkers, and mentors this thesis and goal would not have been possible. First, I would like to thank my parents, Chris, and Tracy, along with my brother, Liam, and my Aunt Vicky for supporting me and my decision to go back to school.

I would like to acknowledge my amazing coworkers, past and present, Katherine Kealey, Maria Pattison, Gary Baker, Charlie Kuski, and Drew Tinnin who have been great mentors and support during this long process. I would like to acknowledge all of Rowan University's Student Life staff, they have been great to work with during my time as a graduate student here at Rowan and are an asset to Rowans community.

Thank you to Dr. Lezotte and our thesis committee. Without your guidance, support, and most importantly, patience this would not be possible. I want to thank my professors, especially Dr. Dianna Dale, and Dr. Raquel Wright-Mair for helping to support, challenge, and guide me. With the crazy climate of the last two years your guidance and time has been invaluable in my professional development and journey and it means the world. Working with each of you has been a privilege, and I really appreciate the time you have taken to guide us all along the way.

Finally, thank you to all my peers in the Higher Education program here at Rowan. The comradery, and encouragement you have all given me along with our memories are things I will take with me always. I wish you all the best in your professional journeys and can't wait to see where you all go and accomplish in the future. We did it!

## **Abstract**

Emmalee Holaday  
THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LIFE  
MEMBERS  
2021-2022  
Stephanie Lezotte, Ph.D.  
Master of Arts in Higher Education

This study examines the relationship of perceived leadership development opportunities in fraternities and sororities. The study's main goal was to determine if there was a discrepancy in perceived leadership development opportunities in general members, versus executive board members, whether there was a difference in findings for fraternity members versus sorority members, and suggestions on how to improve opportunities on a university level for students in Fraternity and Sorority Life going forward. The study was distributed to all social Fraternity and Sorority members at Rowan University that were in their respective organization for at least one year prior to the survey. The findings suggest that perceived opportunities are on average high and both fraternity and sorority members reported close to or exceeded the mean. Opportunities for executive board members were also perceived to be slightly higher for sorority members versus their general membership, while fraternity members reported more of equal opportunity.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	iv
List of Tables .....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Purpose of the Study .....	1
Limitations .....	2
Assumptions.....	2
Operational Definitions.....	2
Research Questions .....	3
Organization of Study .....	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	5
Introduction.....	5
Role of Greek Life at Universities .....	5
Greek Membership Benefits and Satisfaction.....	7
Greek Leadership and its Benefits .....	10
Benefits of Student Involvement .....	11
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	13
Context of Study .....	13
Purpose of Study .....	14
Population and Sampling .....	14
Data Instrumentation and Collection .....	15
Data Analysis .....	15
Chapter 4: Findings.....	17

**Table of Contents (Continued)**

Profile of Population .....17

Findings .....17

    Survey Question 1 .....17

    Survey Question 2 .....18

    Survey Question 3 .....19

    Survey Question 4 .....19

    Survey Question 5 .....22

    Survey Question 6 .....22

    Table 4.5 .....24

    Table 4.6 .....25

Chapter 5: Summary, Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations .....26

    Summary of the Study .....26

    Discussion of the Findings .....28

        Research Question 1 .....28

        Research Question 2 .....29

        Research Question 3 .....30

    Recommendations for Practice .....30

    Recommendations for Future Research .....31

    Conclusions .....31

References .....33

Appendix A: Leadership Development Opportunities for Fraternity and Sorority  
Members Survey .....35

Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter .....38

## List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 4.1. Semester Student was a New Member in their organization (N=100) .....	18
Table 4.2. Held Leadership Positions in their Organization (N= 66) .....	19
Table 4.3. Opportunities within their Organizations & the University (N=67).....	21
Table 4.4. Disparity of Opportunities for Members vs. Executive Board (N=67) .....	23
Table 4.5 Cross Tabulation of Opportunities for Members Dependent on Organization Type (N= 100).....	24
Table 4.6 Cross Tabulation of Opportunities in Individual Organizations Dependent on Organization Type (N=100).....	25



## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

Leadership development in student organizations is something that should be constantly analyzed and studied. Leadership development offers the opportunity for people and students to more specifically, to develop themselves as students, scholars, and workers. Much of the research of fraternity and sorority life (FSL) and leadership development studies the merit of overall fraternity and sorority membership versus their nonaffiliated counterparts, not on the leadership opportunities given to these students to thrive in their future working environments (Hevel et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2012).

There is little research to study the difference between fraternity and sorority leadership and their general members. There is also little research about whether the programs and opportunities for sorority women is the same as fraternity men, if they are given the same opportunities, how they differ and how these programs can improve.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to study the benefits and leadership development of membership in a sorority or fraternity in Fraternity and Sorority Life at Rowan University. This study also looks critically to see if there is a difference between members and officers and more specifically between fraternity members and sorority members. The study also looks to see if there is a difference in leadership opportunities for members and leaders of Greek organization, and if this varies between fraternities and sororities.

The study used a quantitative approach to answer my questions. I issued a survey to all members of social fraternities and sororities in the InterFraternity Council(IFC) and National Panhellenic Council (NPC) councils, that have been members for a minimum of a year.

### **Limitations**

This study was only distributed to students at one medium sized, public institution. There was no comprehensive study of all college students involved in fraternities and sororities across the country. There are six NPC sororities and fifteen IFC fraternities at said university. With these limitations the results only show the relationship of leadership development for students in these twenty one total organizations.

### **Assumptions**

Leadership positions of fraternities and sororities are considered any officer position that is a part of their chapter's executive board. This includes but is not limited to: President, Vice Presidents, Secretary, Treasurer, Ritual, New Member Educator, and Sergeant at Arms.

### **Operational Definitions**

- President- The head person in a fraternity or sorority/ the elected leader of the chapter, typically for a year term.
- Vice President- The elected member tasked with supporting the president in their endeavors, representing the chapter, and duties as assigned. Should anything happen to the president, they are also next in succession.

- Secretary- Is tasked with the organizational aspect of the chapter, taking minutes during meetings, and doing attendance.
- Treasurer- In charge of chapter finances.
- Ritual- The member in charge of knowing, running, and educating the rest of the chapter on ritual events.
- New Member Educator- This member oversees education of all new members, is their primary contact and guide through their new member process.
- Sargent at Arms- Typically is the main risk management officer, understands Roberts Rules of order and parliamentary procedure, they maintain order during chapter meetings and voting.
- Active- A member who has been initiated into fraternity or sorority membership.
- InterFraternity Council- the council that oversees social non culturally based fraternities.
- National Panhellenic Conference-the conference that oversees the 26 social non culturally based sororities.

### **Research Questions**

The study asks: To what extent is there a difference in leadership development success and practices for women in sororities and men in fraternities? To what extent is there a difference in leadership development success and practices between executive board members of a sorority or fraternity, and of the general members? How might the university improve the leadership development success and practices of fraternities and sororities?

My hypothesis is that there will be a lack of opportunities for students that are just members of fraternities and sororities, compared to the leaders of their organizations. I also expect to see a significant difference in the opportunities for fraternity members over the sorority members.

### **Organization of Study**

Chapter one introduced the study and the significance of it. Chapter two will be a review of the literature on Fraternity and Sorority life and leadership development in Fraternity and Sorority life. Chapter three will discuss the construction of the study, research questions, limitations, and format of the study. To conclude, chapter four will discuss the findings and offer tables as reference, while chapter five will be connecting the finding to previous literature and analyzing and giving recommendations with the findings.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Literature Review**

#### **Introduction**

Much of the research on fraternity and sorority life (FSL) in colleges and universities studies the overall merits to leadership development versus opportunities offered to non-Greek undergraduate students. Many of these focus on if there is a correlation between leadership development and Greek life, not the opportunities given to these fraternity and sorority members, and if there is a significant difference between female sorority members and male fraternity members experiences. There are also only a few cases in which there is discussion of the benefits in leadership development and opportunities for leaders and officers of a Greek organization, over the general members of their organization.

#### **Role of Greek Life at Universities**

College fraternities go back to 1776, by a group of five men at William and Mary College. It was then that Phi Beta Kappa, and college social fraternities, were born (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Originating from the idea of secret literary societies and debate clubs, fraternities were a way for students to become more involved in college and on their campus, while also providing a social component and opportunity for leadership development for them as well (Dugan, 2008; Torbenson & Parks, 2009). While these literary societies were one of the major extracurricular activities on college campuses before the Civil War, after the war fraternities and sororities began to emerge, and

because of their popularity and growth, governing councils for these organizations emerged soon after (Banks & Archibald, 2020; Joyce, 2018).

Starting in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century fraternities became an important part of the college experience for many students (Syrett, 2009). Women prior to 1830 did not typically go to male dominated colleges, opting for the female seminaries or academies (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). At this time, these male dominated colleges decided to become co-educational, but then the question became if women would be allowed into all activities on campus, including men's fraternities (Torbenson & Parks, 2009) There were few men's fraternities that allowed women at this time, some of the organizations that did included Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Beta Theta Pi, Phi Delta Theta, and Pi Kappa Alpha (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

While this happened at some universities and colleges, this was not the norm. Women's fraternities and sororities were first established at Wesleyan College, which was also the first women's college, in 1851 (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). The organizations that were established in 1851 and 1852 are now known as Alpha Delta Phi and Phi Mu (Donohue, 2012; Torbenson & Parks, 2009). While these were the first established women's fraternities, they remained local organizations into the early 1900s. Pi Beta Phi is recognized as the first national women's fraternity, originating at Monmouth College in Illinois in 1867 (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Women's sororities were not established until 1874, with the establishment of Gamma Phi Beta, using the term sorority to distinguish between the male and female fraternities (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). The term sorority is now the common practice term for a female Greek organization.

Sororities and fraternities experienced three waves of growth between 1776 and present day. These waves were 1824-1874, 1885-1929, and 1975-1999 (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). During the first wave, there was exponential growth in the creation of fraternities and sororities. During this period, there were around sixty total organizations established and many were religious based organizations. Following this first wave, there was a ten year period where no new organizations were created/founded (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). During the second wave the idea of nonsectarian organizations was explored. This time was the start of organizations proposed for their lack of religious restrictions, others being specifically for Catholic or Jewish students (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). During the third wave a large group of multicultural, Asian American, Latino/Latina and Black fraternities and sororities were founded (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

### **Greek Membership Benefits and Satisfaction**

Membership in a fraternity or sorority is believed to have many benefits. Social development, leadership development and a college experience are some of these perceived benefits (Dugan, 2008; Harms et al., 2006; Hayek et al., 2002; Hevel et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2012; Pike, 2000, 2003). Each of these benefits was highlighted in the different literature below. Membership in a sorority or fraternity are not the only benefits to joining. There are many other benefits to becoming a leader or officer in your Greek organization (Gastfield, 2020; Kelley, 2008; Lizza, 2007; Long & Snowden, 2011). Leadership development in fraternities and sororities is listed as a primary outcome of membership and focus of the organizations (Harms et al., 2006). Fraternities and sororities are noted as being unmatched in their opportunities, specifically for leadership

development versus any other organizations on college campuses (*Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities*, 1923).

Martin et. al. (2012) focused on “the effects of fraternity and sorority membership on socially responsible leadership” in an undergraduate student’s first year in college. The students from the 24 different institutions that participated in the study were studied on the eight scales of Socially Responsible Leadership (SRLS). Overall, Martin et. al. (2012) found positive significant difference in three of the eight SRLS for fraternity and sorority members versus non-Greek students, those three being common purpose, citizenship, and change.

Fraternity men showed a propensity for socially responsible leadership in citizenship and change versus their nonaffiliated male peers, while the sorority women showed a propensity for socially responsible leadership in common purpose and citizenship over their nonaffiliated female peers (Martin et al., 2012). Martin et.al.(2012) found that while there were differences in the SRLS that fraternities and sororities scored highest on, there is no significant difference in females and males in sororities and fraternities and their social responsible leadership, but an overall positive effect on socially responsible leadership development for members of fraternities and sororities.

Two years later, Hevel et. al. (2014) did a continuation of their former study, studying the development of responsible leadership for fraternity and sorority members. Using a different sample, they studied the development of the SRLS during a student’s first year of college and during the spring semester of their senior year. This study differed from their previous one, not finding significant difference and improvement in



the socially responsible leadership of senior students compared to the college freshman, where Martin et. al. (2012) found a significant difference between fraternity and sorority students and their non-Greek peers.

Pike (2000) found that from studying data from freshman students, that the benefits of membership in a fraternity or sorority tend to be more about the college experience, rather than the cognitive development gains. Pike (2000) helps to affirm the benefit of sorority and fraternity membership in social development. Pike (2003) built upon his earlier study, studying the relationships between fraternity and sorority membership, educational outcomes and gains, and the student's overall engagement. He found that there was no significant correlation between fraternity or sorority membership and gender as far as amount of students interested and joining organizations, neither fraternities or sororities had larger interest and membership than the other. Pike (2003) also found that there was a significant personal gain for fraternity and sorority members versus the non-Greek students. The evidence that membership in a Greek organization lends positively to the social development, college experience and positive feelings towards their college experience and environment is reinforced by (Pike, 2000; 2003).

Similarly it was found that membership in a Greek organization had significant and positive effects, specifically in co-curricular time, community service, personal social gains, and student-faculty interaction (Hayek et al., 2002). With his study of Greek and non-Greek students, he studied the differences for men and women, with no general difference found between fraternity and sorority members, but does not address the possible differences between fraternity and sorority leaders, and general members (Hayek et al., 2002). As a whole fraternity and sorority membership lends to the opportunity for

more leadership development than other organizations on campus, helping them to develop their leadership skills and knowledge (Posner, 2004; Pugh, 2000)

Sorority and Fraternity leaders also were as a whole more satisfied with their Greek life experience over their fellow members (Long & Snowden, 2011). The lack of satisfaction and educational gains for members lends to the idea that members are not as involved or not given enough opportunities to expand upon this knowledge (Long & Snowden, 2011).

### **Greek Leadership and its Benefits**

Reynolds(2020) studied the definition of leadership for women in Panhellenic sororities. Their definition was that leadership is a growing process, that everyone has the ability to be a leader, and that a leader is someone that inspires others (Reynolds, 2020). Reynolds(2020) findings of the definitions of leadership show the meaning of leadership and the impact of it for women in sororities, both as members and leaders in their own right.

Long & Snowden (2011) studied the differences in experiences and educational gains for leaders and officers of a fraternity or sorority and their general membership. Overall, the students that held leadership positions in their fraternity or sorority showed greater “gains” in all educational gains, such as leadership skills, personal development skills and interpersonal competence.

Long & Snowden (2011) leaders reported the differences, in skills fraternity and sorority members reported gaining from their leadership position and membership. Fraternity leaders reported increased “diverse interactions, interpersonal relationship

skills, interpersonal competence, leadership skills, personal development skills, self-worth, and intrapersonal competence” from their fraternity leadership position experience (Long & Snowden, 2011). Sorority leaders reported gains in different areas such as, “sense of belonging, interpersonal relationship skills, interpersonal competence, leadership skills, personal development skills, self-worth, and intrapersonal competence” (Long & Snowden, 2011).

Gastfield (2020) focused on the relationships between leadership opportunities for women in Panhellenic sororities and their levels of self-efficacy. Gastfield (2020) was able to show a correlation between women in leadership positions, their leadership opportunities, and their levels of self-efficacy. These findings help to show leadership development opportunities lead to positive outcomes for women in sororities, especially women in leadership positions.

There has been some research on the perceived effectiveness of leaders in Greek organizations and the differences in leaders comparatively for men versus women, showing women’s leadership effectiveness was rated higher (Adams & Kiem, 2000). While this was shown to be a noticeable difference, they found no other noticeable differences in scores. (Adams & Kiem, 2000) specifically studied other’s perception of leadership effectiveness, not the individual student’s perception of their leadership abilities or opportunities for leadership development.

### **Benefits of Student Involvement**

Lizza (2007) studied seventy five undergraduate students, their perceived benefits of membership in organizations, and the impact of their involvement. Lizza (2007) found

that leaders of fraternities and sororities found leadership, running a meeting, problem solving and time management to be the benefits of being involved in their organization and leaders of said organization. These same Greek leaders overwhelmingly believed that the leadership they gained by being leaders of their organizations and heavily involved provided both educational and very helpful skills to use in the future (Lizza, 2007). This is another example of how leadership development is positively impacted by membership and leadership in Greek organizations.

## Chapter 3

### Methodology

#### Context of Study

This study was conducted at Rowan University, a four-year university in Glassboro, New Jersey. Rowan is a Carnegie classified R2 institution. Rowan has around 19,600 total students, and 15,900 undergraduate students (*Rowan University Fast Facts*, 2020). Specifically, this study focused on the leadership development opportunities available to students through their organization and the Fraternity and Sorority Life office at Rowan, as well as if they had any perceived disparity in opportunities for executive board members versus general members.

Rowan University's Glassboro campus has a flourishing Fraternity and Sorority Life, with 39 active Greek organizations and 5 Greek councils (*Greek Councils*, 2020). Rowan's Greek Councils include: Greek Cultural Organizations Council (GCOC), National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), National Panhellenic Conference (NPC), InterFraternity Council (IFC), and the Inter Greek Council (IGC) which oversees all social Greek-lettered organizations on Rowan University's campus (*Greek Councils*, 2020). There are currently 10 active chapters that are a part of the Greek Cultural Organizations Council, 9 active Pan-Hellenic Council chapters, 6 active Panhellenic Conference chapters, and 15 active InterFraternity Council chapters on Rowan's campus (*Greek Councils*, 2020). There are about 1200 active members of Fraternity and Sorority at Rowan University, with about 560 NPC members and 660 IFC members of social Greek organizations (Personal Communication, April 14, 2021). This study used a

quantitative approach, utilizing a survey with a final question to feed the suggested best practices and improvements.

### **Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to study the benefits and leadership development of membership in a sorority or fraternity in Greek life at Rowan University. This study will also study if there is a difference between members and officers and more specifically between fraternity members and sorority members.

The study specifically asks: To what extent is there a difference in leadership development success and practices for women in sororities and men in fraternities? To what extent is there a difference in leadership development success and practices between members of a sorority or fraternity, and of the general members? How might the university improve the leadership development success and practices of fraternities and sororities?

### **Population and Sampling**

The target population of this study was social Greek sorority and fraternity members and officers of specifically NPC and IFC at Rowan University using a purposeful sampling method (McMillan, 2016). There are about 550 active NPC members and about 523 IFC members at Rowan University, totaling 1073 students; the survey was sent out to each of them. After IRB approval, the desired response rate is 284 responses. The study will exclude all new members and members that have been active for less than one year to be able to show the benefits of membership. This study will also

be excluding Alpha Phi Omega from the IFC specifically because it is a Co-ed National Service Fraternity and not a social based fraternity.

### **Data Instrumentation and Collection**

This study used a survey to collect the data. The data instrument that is used in this study is an attitude, value, and interest questionnaire with a Likert scale based responses (McMillan, 2016). Questions focused mostly on the availability of leadership development programs and materials, opportunities for growth and leadership development within their Greek organization, and if there are any programs, ideas, or areas of focus they would like the organization to offer for leadership development. The questionnaire was distributed through the Fraternity and Sorority Life office to all members of active social Greek IFC organizations and active social Greek NPC organization members excluding first year students via email. Data was collected during the early Spring 2022 semester at Rowan University. The survey was open for February 2022.

### **Data Analysis**

The data from the attitude, value, and interest questionnaire was analyzed using a Simple Frequency Distribution. The responses were individually analyzed after collection on Qualtrics. Some of the information was cross tabbed on Qualtrics to study the relationship of membership in a fraternity or sorority to the opportunities offered to those students and how which kind of organization you were involved in affected your experience. The validity of the study is maintained by evidence based on internal structure (McMillan, 2016). The structure of the questions is used to directly measure the

frequency in which leadership opportunities are offered and the quality of these programs on a Likert scale (McMillan, 2016). Using the Likert scale for questions allowed me to look at the quality of the current programs and where they are lacking.



## **Chapter 4**

### **Findings**

#### **Profile of Population**

The subjects of this study consisted of 1073 undergraduate students at Rowan University in the Spring of 2022. Of the 1073 undergraduate students in the population 106 opened the survey, 100 starting the questions of the survey, with 67 completing it. This did not quite reach the desired 284 responses sample size. Of the responses received 44 (44.0%) students were members of a fraternity and 56 (56.0%) students were members of a sorority.

#### **Findings**

##### ***Survey Question 1***

What semester were you a new member in your Fraternity/Sorority?

Table 4.1 shows the semester each student joined their Greek organizations. Thirty six percent reporting having joined their fraternity or sorority in Spring 2020. There were also three students reported that started the survey that had joined in the Fall of 2021, which were taken out of the survey after this question.

**Table 4.1**

*Semester Student was a New Member in their Organization (N=100)*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Spring 2021	23	23
Fall 2020	7	7
Spring 2020	36	36
Fall 2019	7	7
Spring 2019	22	22
Fall 2018	2	2
Spring 2018	0	0
Fall 2017	0	0
Fall 2021	3	3

***Survey Question 2***

As a member of your sorority/fraternity have you held and executive board position previously or do currently in your organization?

Table 4.2 details who has been in a leadership position in their organization either in the past, currently, both, or never at all. The majority of people have or had held some kind of leadership position with ten (15.15%) currently holding a leadership position, 11 (16.67%) previously holding a leadership position, and 16 (24.24%) both previously and currently having held leadership positions within their respective chapters.

**Table 4.2***Held Leadership Positions in their Organization (N= 66)*

Variable	<i>f</i>	%
Currently	10	15.15%
Previously	11	16.67%
Both previously and currently	16	24.24%
held an executive board position		
I have never held an executive	29	43.94%
board (leadership) position		

***Survey Question 3***

Do you feel there is proper leadership development opportunities for you in your organization?

***Survey Question 4***

Were there ample leadership opportunities for you through the university?

Table 4.3 details how students felt about leadership opportunities in their respective organizations as well as through the university. The majority of students reported they feel there is lots of opportunities within their individual organizations for leadership development. Only two (2.99%) students reported little to no opportunities, while 50 (74.63%) of students reported lots of opportunities. On the other side, the majority of students felt there were lots of opportunities for their leadership development through the university, but at a smaller number with only 24 (35.82%) of students reporting that to be the case. The same number of students reported little to no

opportunities as within their own organizations with two (2.99%) students reporting this, with most either being neutral or somewhere in the middle.

**Table 4.3***Opportunities within their Organizations & the University (N=67)*

Variable	Little to no opportunities		few opportunities		neither little opportunity nor lots of opportunity		some opportunities		lots of opportunities	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
within their organizations	2	2.99	1	1.49	1	1.49	13	19.40	50	74.63
M= 4.61 SD= 0.85										
through the university	2	2.99	9	13.43	11	16.42	21	31.34	24	35.82
M=3.84 SD= 1.1										

*Survey Question 5*

Do you feel like there was a disparity in the opportunities for leadership development for members versus executive board members?

*Survey Question 6*

Did you feel there were more opportunities for leadership development for you as an executive board member versus a general member of your organization?

Table 4.4 contains data showing the perceived benefits for members versus executive board members. In both survey questions students reported the majority or almost the majority as neutral, with 31 (46.27%) students reporting no feeling of disparity of opportunities, and 25 (37.31%) students feeling there were not more or less opportunities for general members in comparison them as executive board members.

**Table 4.4***Disparity of Opportunities for Members vs. Executive Board (N=67)*

Variable	Equal opportunities		Neutral		More opportunities for Board members	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Disparity in opportunities for members versus executive board M= 2.06 SD= 0.73	16	23.88	31	46.27	20	29.85
More opportunities them as executive board members versus a general member M= 2.15 SD= 0.78	16	23.88	25	37.31	26	38.81

The final survey question was open ended. The students were asked “What are some things you think the university can do to offer more opportunities for leadership programming and development for you as a fraternity/sorority member?” Some of the suggestions included offering seminars, workshops, and leadership development programs. These were the overwhelmingly largest group of responses asking specifically for workshops and seminars for leadership development specifically for fraternity and sorority life, specific majors or on specific positions within organizations and organizations in general. Other suggestions included providing more funding, instituting mandatory workshops, institutional and organizational opportunities, more positions of

leadership other than just the Inter Greek Council, more events with the school, foster better alumni relationships to work on funding, and a yearly meeting with Glassboro police to discuss best practices to protect the fraternities and sororities and working with law enforcement.

**Table 4.5**

The findings were then analyzed with a Cross Tabulation using Qualtrics. Table 4.5 contains the data of the membership of the student in a fraternity or sorority, and their perceived opportunities for leadership development for members versus executive board members.

**Table 4.5**

*Cross Tabulation of Opportunities for Members Dependent on Organization Type (N=100)*

Variable	Total	Fraternity	Sorority
	%	%	%
Equal opportunities	16.0	25.0	8.9
Neutral	31.0	25.0	35.7
More opportunities	20.0	18.2	21.4
For executive board members			

*Note.* This Cross Tabulation studies the question Do you feel like there was a Disparity in the Opportunities for Leadership Development for members versus Executive Board Members? and the results for Fraternity Members vs. Sorority Members.



**Table 4.6**

The findings were analyzed with a Cross Tabulation of fraternity or sorority membership with perceived leadership development opportunities for members in their respective organizations. Table 4.6 contains this cross tabulation data.

**Table 4.6**

*Cross Tabulation of Opportunities in Individual Organizations Dependent on Organization Type (N=100)*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Fraternity</i>	<i>Sorority</i>
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Little to no Opportunities	2.0	2.3	1.8
Few opportunities	1.0	2.3	0.0
Neither little Opportunity nor lots of opportunity	1.0	2.3	0.0
some opportunities	13.0	11.4	14.3
lots of opportunities	50.0	50.0	50.0

*Note.* This Cross Tabulation studies the perceived leadership development opportunities offered to members in their organizations to membership in a fraternity or sorority.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Summary, Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations**

#### **Summary of the Study**

This study was conducted at Rowan University in Glassboro, NJ on the Fraternity and Sorority Life population in the Spring semester of the 2021-2022 academic year. The purpose of this study was to analyze the present opportunities given to students in Fraternity and Sorority Life and how those opportunities vary depending on their length of involvement in the organization, if they have been and executive board member for their chapter, and if they are a part of a Fraternity or Sorority. All subjects of this study were members of social NPC sororities or IFC fraternities that and have been in their respective organizations for at least one year.

This study used a survey to collect the data, with the survey instrument used being an attitude, value, and interest questionnaire with a Likert scale based responses (McMillan, 2016, pp. 182–183). Questions focused mostly on the availability of leadership development programs and materials, opportunities for growth and leadership development within their Greek organization, and if there are any programs, ideas, or areas of focus you would like the organization to offer for leadership development. The questionnaire was distributed through the Fraternity and Sorority Life office to all members of active social Greek IFC organizations and active social Greek NPC organization members excluding first year student members via email. The survey also started off with the opening page being the consent for the survey, notifying students again that taking the survey was voluntary, they would not be penalized for not taking it,

that the results would be anonymous and that they were consenting that they were at least 18 years of age to be taking the survey.

The survey (Appendix A) consisted of 8 questions. The first asked students about how long they have been in their organizations, if they have held positions, and their thoughts on leadership opportunities presented to them. Second, the survey asked them if they were in a fraternity or sorority, and the semester they were new members in their chapter to help determine how long they have been active members of said organization. Then the students were asked if they are currently, have been, are currently and have been in the past, or never been in an executive position for their respective chapter. The next two questions asked if the members believed there were leadership development opportunities available to them as well as the extent of opportunities in their organization, and through the university and the Fraternity and Sorority Life office. The next two questions asked students if they believed there was a disparity between their perceived opportunities as members versus executive board members and if executive board members felt this disparity as well. This study was distributed to all 1073 students that fit the criteria of the study and had 103 students start the survey being about 9.59% of the population, but 67 complete responses, yielding a 6.24% return on the survey, not completely meeting the desired 284 student response sample size.

The study was collected on Qualtrics with the results being reviewed and processed. No other information was collected or stored anywhere else. Some of the findings were cross tabulated to answer different research questions, those findings are also noted in Table 4.5 and Table 4.6.

## **Discussion of the Findings**

This section will compare the findings in this study with the previous literature on leadership development opportunities and Fraternity and Sorority life. We were not able to meet the 284 student desired sample size, which could partly have to do with survey exhaustion and partially with Covid 19 and that burnout.

### ***Research Question 1***

To what extent is there a difference in leadership development success and practices for women in sororities and men in fraternities?

In the findings collected, a cross tabulation was used between the students perceived leadership development opportunities and their membership in a fraternity or sorority on Rowans campus. In this cross tab, fraternity and sorority members were in equal to the mean in lots of opportunities (50.0%). The differences occurred with sororities being above the mean (13.0%) at 14.3% stating they had some opportunities, while fraternities were below the mean responses with 11.4% of fraternity members stating they feel there some opportunities. With this large number of students feeling that there are lots or some opportunities for them, it reinforced that leadership development was a major goal in the founding and establishment of fraternities and sororities (Dugan, 2008; Harms et al., 2006). Fraternity members reported above mean (2.0%) percentages for little to no opportunities at 2.3%, while sorority members reported below mean (1.8%).

## ***Research Question 2***

To what extent is there a difference in leadership development success and practices between executive board members of a sorority or fraternity, and of the general members?

In the finding collected, there was also a cross tabulation done with fraternity or sorority membership and the perceived amount of opportunities for leadership development for general members versus executive board members. In this cross tab there was a much more drastic difference between the fraternity members perceived opportunities and the sorority members perceived opportunities for members versus executive board members. The fraternity members were above the mean (16.0%) for perceived equal opportunities with 25.0% while women were below the mean with 8.9% for equal opportunities. Sorority members reported the greatest feeling of disparity in opportunities for executive board members, reporting above mean (20.0%) for more opportunities with 21.4%, while fraternity members only reported 18.4%. most respondents felt neutral about the question with even the mean being 31.0%. Fraternity members reported slightly below mean for neutral with 25.0% and sorority members slightly above, at 35.7%. Overall sorority members reported higher discrepancies in opportunities than fraternity members did.

Long & Snowden (2011) found that there was a discrepancy in executive board members opportunities in comparison to general membership. Members believed there were not enough opportunities for their leadership development in comparison to

executive board members (Long & Snowden, 2011). These findings did not compare fraternity members and sorority members findings however.

### ***Research Question 3***

How might the university improve the leadership development success and practices of fraternities and sororities?

Findings from research question 3 are used to help guide our recommendations for the future. Unlike the previous questions, this question was left open ended on the survey for suggestions from the students.

### **Recommendations for Practice**

Based off the findings, my recommendations would be as follows. It would be helpful to change practices and involve this list into the next academic year to help better support Fraternity and Sorority Life students and develop their programs.

- offer seminars, workshops, events geared toward leadership development, having it widely available to all students

- more organizational and individual options to get students involved including expanding IGC.

- work on relationships with fraternity and sorority alumni to help fund more projects

- offering a beginning of the semester meeting partnered with our Off Campus Services Coordinator, the Glassboro police, the Fraternity and Sorority leadership.

## **Recommendations for Future Research**

This study only collected data from members of IFC fraternities and NPC sororities. In addition to these organizations Rowan has 11 multicultural fraternities and sororities that are a part of their Greek Cultural Organizations Council (GCOC) and 9 historically black fraternities and sororities in their National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) (*Greek Councils*, 2020). More research could be done on studying all councils' organizations on Rowans campus, including their students' experiences and feelings. Since these organizations have different backgrounds and experiences than the predominately white organizations in IFC and NPC, it would then be beneficial to examine the differences between the current findings, and the GCOC and NPHC students' data.

## **Conclusions**

Based on the information collected from this survey along with the information previously discussed I believe that overall the University and the organizations do a good job of giving the students within IFC fraternities and NPC sororities good and plentiful opportunities for leadership development. While there were some cases where students felt that there are opportunities for improvement for the university specifically to create more opportunities overall they are a small percentage.

The survey proved that there is still a fair few returning sorority students that believe that they don't have enough opportunities offered to them coming from their individual chapters or as a university. And the opportunities they perceived offered to them as members versus the board members both stayed pretty much mostly neutral with

some students perceiving more opportunities being available for executive board members. Many of the suggestion's students proposed have been attempted new initiatives by the Fraternity and Sorority Life office at Rowan this year, with little response from the fraternity and sorority community. This leads me to believe the biggest issue currently is not so much a lack of opportunities, but rather a lack of knowledge or awareness about said opportunities.



## References

- Adams, T., & Kiem, M. (2000). *Leadership practices and effectiveness among Greek student leaders*. 259–270.
- Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities*. (1923). G. Banta Company.
- Banks, S. A., & Archibald, J. (2020). The State of Fraternity and Sorority Life in Higher Education. *Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs*, 36(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.20429/gcpa.2020.360103>
- Donohue, T. (2012). *An analysis of american Sororities, collegiate culture, and second wave feminism at Duke University in the late twentieth century*. 55.
- Dugan, J. P. (2008). *Exploring Relationships Between Fraternity and Sorority Membership and Socially Responsible Leadership*.  
<https://doi.org/10.25774/TZ8V-5027>
- Gastfield, C. (2020). *Panhellenic Women's Leadership Development and Self-Efficacy*. 89.
- Greek Councils*. (2020). Rowan University.  
<https://sites.rowan.edu/oslp/greekaffairs/councils/index.html>
- Harms, P. D., Woods, D., Roberts, B., Bureau, D., & Green, A. M. (2006). *Perceptions of Leadership in Undergraduate Fraternal Organizations*.  
<https://doi.org/10.25774/MDW5-2106>
- 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(5), 643.
- Hevel, M. S., Martin, G. L., & Pascarella, E. T. (2014). Do Fraternities and Sororities still enhance socially responsible leadership evidence from the fourth year of college. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51(3), 233–245.  
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.rowan.edu/10.1515/jsarp-2014-0025>
- Joyce, S. B. (2018). *Perceptions of Race and Fit in the Recruitment Process of Traditionally, Predominantly White Fraternities*.  
<https://doi.org/10.25774/WDVY-K238>
- Kelley, D. R. (2008). *Leadership Development Through the Fraternity Experience and the Relationship to Career Success After Graduation*.  
<https://doi.org/10.25774/V0VK-9T26>

- Lizza, J. P. (2007). *A study of student involvement at Rowan University*. [Master's thesis, Rowan University]. Rowan Digital Works, <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/817/>.
- Long, L., & Snowden, A. (2011). *The More You Put Into It, the More You Get out of It: The Educational Gains of Fraternity/Sorority Officers*. <https://doi.org/10.25774/1Y3V-RJ75>
- Martin, G. L., Hevel, M. S., & Pascarella, E. T. (2012). Do Fraternities and Sororities enhance socially responsible leadership? *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(3), 267–284. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2012-6245>
- McMillan, J. (2016). *Fundamentals of educational research* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Pike, G. R. (2000). The influence of Fraternity or Sorority membership on students' college experiences and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(1), 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.
- Posner, B. Z. (2004). A Leadership Development Instrument for Students: Updated. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(4), 443–456. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2004.0051>
- Pugh, D. J. (2000). *College student leadership development: Program impact on student participants - ProQuest*. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/2e9ae9406f007354d702afbc42eeb9b9/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Reynolds, K. (2020). *Leadership Development of Women in Panhellenic Organizations*. 77.
- Rowan University Fast Facts*. (2020). Rowan University. <https://sites.rowan.edu/fastfacts/index.html>
- Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The Company He Keeps: A History of White College Fraternities*. Univ of North Carolina Press.
- Torbenson, C. L., & Parks, G. (2009). *Brothers and Sisters: Diversity in College Fraternities and Sororities*. Associated University Presse.

## Appendix A

### Leadership Development Opportunities for Fraternity and Sorority Members Survey

## Leadership Development of Fraternities and Sororities

---

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q1 Are you a member of a Fraternity or Sorority?

- Fraternity (1)
  - Sorority (2)
- 

Q2 What semester were you a new member in your Fraternity/Sorority?

- Spring 2021 (1)
- Fall 2020 (2)
- Spring 2020 (3)
- Fall 2019 (4)
- Spring 2019 (5)
- Fall 2018 (6)
- Spring 2017 (7)
- Fall 2017 (8)
- Fall 2021 (9)

---

*Skip To: End of Survey If What semester were you a new member in your Fraternity/Sorority? = Fall 2021*

---

Q3 As a member of your sorority/fraternity have you held an executive board position previously or do currently in your organization?

- Currently (1)
- Previously (2)
- Both previously and currently held a executive board position (3)
- I have never held an executive board(leadership) position (4)

Q4 Please answer the following questions on the scale of little to no opportunities to lots of opportunities

	Little to no opportunities (1)	few opportunities (2)	neither little opportunity nor lots of opportunity (3)	some opportunities (4)	lots of opportunities (5)
Do you feel there is proper leadership development opportunities for you in your organization? (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Were there ample leadership opportunities for you through the university? (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5 Please answer the following questions on the scale of same opportunities for members to more opportunities for executive board members

	Equal opportunities (1)	neutral (2)	more opportunities for executive board members (3)
Do you feel like there was a disparity in opportunities for leadership development for members versus executive board members? (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did you feel there were more opportunities for leadership development for you as an executive board member versus a general member of your organization? (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

Q6 What are some things you think the university can do to offer more opportunities for leadership programming and development for you as a fraternity/sorority member?

---

End of Block: Default Question Block

---

## Appendix B

### IRB Approval Letter



**DHHS Federal Wide Assurance Identifier:** FWA00007111

**IRB Chair Person:** Dr. Ane Johnson

**IRB Director:** Eric Gregory

**Effective Date:** February 16, 2022

#### Notice of Approval - Initial

**Study ID:** PRO-2021-602

**Title:** The Leadership Development of Fraternity & Sorority Life Members

**Principal Investigator:** Stephanie Lezotte

**Study Coordinator:** Emmalee Holaday

**Co-Investigator(s):** Emmalee Holaday

**Sponsor:** Department Funded

**Submission Type:** Initial

**Submission Status:** Exempt

**Approval Date:** February 16, 2022

**Review Type:** Exempt

**Exempt Category:** Category 2.(ii). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording).

Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation.

**Pregnant Women, Human Fetus, and Neonates Code:** N/A

Pediatric/Children Code: N/A

#### ALL APPROVED INVESTIGATOR(S) MUST COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING:

1. Conduct the research in accordance with the protocol, applicable laws and regulations, and the principles of research ethics as set forth in the Belmont Report.
  - 2a. Continuing Review: Approval is valid until the protocol expiration date shown above. To avoid lapses in approval, submit a continuation application at least eight weeks before the study expiration date.

- 2b. Progress Report: Approval is valid until the protocol expiration date shown above. To avoid lapses, an annual progress report is required at least 21 days prior to the expiration date.
- 3a. Expiration of IRB Approval: If IRB approval expires, effective the date of expiration and until the continuing review approval is issued: All research activities must stop unless the IRB finds that it is in the best interest of individual subjects to continue. (This determination shall be based on a separate written request from the PI to the IRB.) No new subjects may be enrolled and no samples/charts/surveys may be collected, reviewed, and/or analyzed.
- 3b. Human Subjects Research Training: Proper training in the conduct of human subjects research must be current and not expired. It is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator and the investigator to complete training when expired. Any modifications and renewals will not be approved until training is not expired and current.
4. Amendments/Modifications/Revisions: If you wish to change any aspect of this study after the approval date mentioned in this letter, including but not limited to, study procedures, consent form(s), investigators, advertisements, the protocol document, investigator drug brochure, or accrual goals, you are required to obtain IRB review and approval prior to implementation of these changes unless necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects. This policy is also applicable to progress reports.
5. Unanticipated Problems: Unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or others must be reported to the IRB Office (45 CFR 46, 21 CFR 312, 812) as required, in the appropriate time as specified in the attachment online at: <https://research.rowan.edu/officeofresearch/compliance/irb/index.html>
6. Protocol Deviations and Violations: Deviations from/violations of the approved study protocol must be reported to the IRB Office (45 CFR 46, 21 CFR 312, 812) as required, in the appropriate time as specified in the attachment online at: <https://research.rowan.edu/officeofresearch/compliance/irb/index.html>
7. Consent/Assent: The IRB has reviewed and approved the consent and/or assent process, waiver and/or alteration described in this protocol as required by 45 CFR 46 and 21 CFR 50, 56, (if FDA regulated research). Only the versions of the documents included in the approved process may be used to document informed consent and/or assent of study subjects; each subject must receive a copy of the approved form(s); and a copy of each signed form must be filed in a secure place in the subject's medical/patient/research record.
8. Completion of Study: Notify the IRB when your study has been completed or stopped for any reason. Neither study closure by the sponsor nor the investigator removes the obligation for submission of timely continuing review application, progress report or final report.
9. The Investigator(s) did not participate in the review, discussion, or vote of this protocol.
10. Letter Comments: There are no additional comments.

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipients(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.**