Journal of Sorority and Fraternity Life Research and Practice

Volume 18 | Issue 1 Article 4

5-8-2023

Validation of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Core Competency Model

Dev K. Dalal
University at Albany, State University of New York

Dan Wrona
RISE Partnerships

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle

Part of the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Dalal, Dev K. and Wrona, Dan (2023) "Validation of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Core Competency Model," *Journal of Sorority and Fraternity Life Research and Practice*: Vol. 18: Iss. 1, Article 4.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808
Available at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Sorority and Fraternity Life Research and Practice by an authorized editor of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

VALIDATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FRATERNITY/SORORITY ADVISORS CORE COMPETENCY MODEL

Dev K. Dalal, Ph.D., Dan Wrona

Despite its utility, the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) revised Core Competency model has not been validated; therefore, we conducted two studies to validate the AFA Core Competency Model. First, we developed a performance evaluation tool, applicable across different positions. We then linked Core Competency self-assessment scores to supervisor ratings of performance to assess the extent to which competencies related to job performance. Although not all Core Competencies related to each performance dimension, each Core Competency correlated with at least one dimension of performance. In short, the results suggest that the Core Competencies are, in general, related to job performance, and appropriate to use for personnel development.

Keywords: Competencies, validation, employee development

As the nature of work changes, organizations are moving away from narrowly defining successful performance for each job role individually, to a broader, organization-wide perspective on performance. This shift in focus necessitates a common framework for understanding attributes related to success on the job across organizational levels, and job role definitions (Shippmann et al., 2000). To this end, organizations utilize competency modeling to define attribute clusters related to performance. Specifically, competencies are collections of knowledge areas, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (e.g., personality traits, motives, goals, etc.) that separate superior performers from average or below average performers across an organization, and typically align the attributes of the workers with the larger goals of the organization (Brannick, Pearlman, & Sanchez, 2017). Because of their organization-wide focus, competency models are thought to be applicable across jobs within an organization. This means that those high on an organization's competencies will perform their jobs well, regardless of their specific job responsibilities and/or organizational level (Brannick et al., 2017; Shippmann et al., 2000).

In line with this shift, the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) introduced a revised Core Competency model in 2017. The revised model (1) improves the previous iteration, (2) aligns with previous assessment results, (3) was developed with best practices, and (4) is logically sound (AFA, 2018). The AFA Competency Model divides 11 competencies into two main domains of competence: Foundational Knowledge and Professional Skills. Competencies within the Foundational Knowledge domain emphasize information and concepts that

Published by W&M ScholarWorks, 2023

are unique and essential for serving as a fraternity/sorority professional. Competencies within this domain include Governance, Fraternity/Sorority Systems, Student Safety, Student Learning, and Program Administration (see Table 1 for competency definitions). Competencies within the Professional Skills domain focus on the practiced acts and abilities needed to perform well in fraternity/sorority life professional positions. Competencies in this domain include Navigating Complexity, Operating Strategically, Driving Results, Working across Differences, Collaborating with Stakeholders, and Driving Vision and Purpose (see Table 2 for definitions; AFA, 2018).[1]

Importantly, competency models support myriad human resource functions including employee selection and training and development (Brannick et al., 2017; Guion, 2011; Sutton & Watson, 2013). Regarding the former, much like other standardized methods of selecting employees (e.g., personality testing), individuals can be assessed on their level of competency to determine if they are likely to be a strong performer (Guion, 2011). With respect to the latter, competencies can often serve as criteria for assessing successful/unsuccessful performance on the job (Guion, 2011; Shippmann et al., 2000); as such, organizations can look to competency ratings to signal training areas for their employees (Sutton & Watson, 2013). In this way, "Competency frameworks are often proposed to provide a practical way for an organisation to integrate its HR practices across the employee life cycle" (Sutton & Watson, 2013, p. 1023).

Since its release, numerous professionals have used the AFA Core Competencies self-assessment instrument to evaluate their standing on the Core Competencies. The self-assessment is a 48-item, self-report measure that asks the respondent to evaluate their proficiency with different behaviors/actions relevant to the 11 competencies. For example, an item for *Governance* asks the respondent to evaluate their proficiency with "Applying relevant federal laws." Respondents rate themselves using a four-point scale: 1-*Unknown,* 2-*Discovery,* 3-*Practice,* and 4-*Proficiency* (see, AFA, 2018). After completing the self-assessment, AFA members get an understanding of their standing on the different competencies and can use the results to build a professional development plan. Furthermore, AFA, as an organization, uses these results to guide the professional development strategies for its membership (AFA, 2018).

When core competency systems are used to guide human resource functions (e.g., training and development), organizations have a legal and ethical responsibility to evaluate the validity of their competency models, especially if the model was developed with the intent of being applicable across organizations (Society for Industrial and Organiza-

1 We note that the development of the AFA Core Competencies were developed, in part, with consideration to competency models from other organizations, including The American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and NASPA. Although full details about the development of the Core Competency model is beyond the scope of this study, specific details are available from AFA (2018).

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

tional Psychology [SIOP], 2018). With respect to the AFA Core Competency model, despite its comprehensive development (AFA, 2018), statistical evidence to support the intended use of the AFA Core Competency self-assessment scores for human resources functions is missing. Given the wide use of the Core Competency model, it is important to ensure that AFA members and leadership are making decisions based on valid inferences of the self-assessment scores.

Table 1

AFA Core Competencies and definitions—Foundational Knowledge

Governance	Collegiate fraternal organizations are subject to various sources of authority, each with their own expectations. Fraternity/sorority professionals must accurately identify, interpret, navigate, and support compliance with these expectations.
Fraternity/Sorority Systems	Collegiate fraternal organizations have many unique operating practices, and they operate across a variety of functional areas. Professionals must be familiar with, provide accurate advice about, and be able to navigate all relevant functional areas and operating practices.
Student Safety	Collegiate fraternal organizations present both challenges and opportunities to enhance student safety on campus. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be familiar with the nature of these issues, the campus partners who work to prevent them, and research-supported strategies for addressing them.
Student Learning	College students make significant gains in learning and development in college, and fraternity/sorority membership influences their outcomes. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be able to explain and apply theory, research, and good practice in student learning and development to their advising, training, and educational efforts.
Program Administration	Fraternity/sorority professionals are responsible for contributing to the core functions of an organizational unit. They must be capable of identifying, managing, planning, and executing the basic duties of a departmental program.

Table 2

AFA Core Competencies and definitions—Professional Skills

Navigating Complexity	Supporting collegiate fraternal organizations involves multiple functional areas and complex issues that have multiple causes and contributors with no perfect or obvious solutions. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be able to acknowledge, navigate, make quality decisions, and lead through these complex issues.
Operating Strategically	There is no shortage of work to be done in supporting collegiate fraternal organizations, and not all work is equal in importance or urgency. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be able to coordinate multiple competing priorities, consider long-term implications of their work, use limited resources intentionally, and organize work in a way that produces the best results.
Driving Results	Universities and fraternal organizations are being called to demonstrate measurable progress in the many issues they face. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be able to deliver on institutional/organizational outcomes and demonstrate effective use of institutional/organizational resources.
Working across Differences	College fraternal organizations serve a diverse population of students and are supported by various stakeholders with contrasting viewpoints. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be able to engage productively with those who have differing experiences and views to create environments where people are valued, respected, treated with dignity, and given the opportunity to participate fully in the community.
Collaborating with Stakeholders	Fraternities and sororities are supported by a network of stakeholders who each have their own authority, perspective, priorities, and interest in the community. Professionals who work with these organizations must take personal responsibility for working collaboratively with each stakeholder group in order to capitalize on shared interests and navigate conflicting priorities.
Driving Vision and Purpose	Facilitating continuous improvement in fraternity/sorority life requires interpersonal skills to align stakeholders around shared aspirations for the future. Fraternity/sorority professionals must be able to dream, create, articulate, design, and champion a vision and milestones for fraternal organizations that support their mission and values.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

Validating Human Resource Management Practices

Legal (e.g., *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures,* Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor, & Department of Justice, 1978) and professional (*Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures,* SIOP, 2018) standards charge organizations to validate their human resource management practices (e.g., selection procedures, training programs, performance evaluation systems). Validity refers to the accuracy of the inferences made based on scores from a measure/an assessment (Guion, 2011; SIOP, 2018). In this regard, the Core Competency self-assessment scores should be validated for their intended use, be it selection into roles and/or creation of training and development plans. Indeed, ensuring valid inferences are made based on the self-assessment scores can mitigate potential concerns regarding adverse impact against protected groups (i.e., disproportionately not selecting one racial group; SIOP, 2018). Likewise, training programs that are developed around self-assessment scores will be more successful if the self-assessment scores are valid, therein pointing to actual areas in need of development (Salas et al., 2012). This latter point is particularly true when the work being undertaken is risky and/or involves the well-being of others (Salas et al., 2012). To be sure, the professionals of AFA have a responsibility to maintain and enhance the welfare and well-being of a larger number of individuals; as such, training programs should be based on valid inferences from self-assessment scores.

Current Studies

Here, we present the results of two studies we undertook to provide initial evidence of the validity of the AFA Core Competencies self-assessment scores. More specifically, we assess if scores on the Core Competency self-assessment relate to performance in jobs for which the competencies apply. Although there are many different approaches to conducting validation studies (see Schmitt et al., 2017), we employed a multi-source, concurrent validation design. Specifically, we linked Core Competency self-assessments scores obtained from AFA members to performance ratings provided by these members' supervisors. To the extent that the Core Competency scores result in valid inferences, we should see Core Competency scores correlate with supervisors' ratings of performance. An initial barrier to this effort, however, is the lack of common metrics/assessments of performance—that is, organizations for which AFA members work (e.g., university campuses, sorority headquarters) are likely to have different methods of evaluating performance. As such, in Study 1 we developed a standardized performance measure applicable across jobs for which the Core Competencies apply. In Study 2, we used this measure to collect performance ratings from AFA members' supervisors and linked these members' self-assessment scores to their supervisors' performance ratings.

Results of these studies contribute to our understanding of Sorority/Fraternity Life in critical ways. First, we provide empirical support for the

validity of a comprehensive competency model applicable to countless professionals. The results of this study can be used to support future efforts to expand and use the AFA Core Competencies. Second, we provide a nuanced view of how the core competencies related to different aspects of performance. Such nuanced information can help better target training and development efforts. Finally, results of our first study provide a blueprint for a performance evaluation tool to assess the performance of fraternity/sorority life professionals.

Study 1: Performance Evaluation Tool Development

The proposed concurrent, multi-source validation plan requires a measure of job performance for those in roles for which the Core Competencies are applicable. Given that fraternity/sorority professionals work for different universities/organizations, a consistent performance measure is unavailable. Stated differently, given that the AFA professional members are in myriad positions with different formal and informal performance evaluation systems, a common performance evaluation method is needed. Therefore, in Study 1, we developed a measure of performance to use in Study 2. As such, Study 1 addresses two main goals: First, the research team developed a set of performance dimensions associated with the many positions for which the Core Competencies are applicable. Second, we developed a set of items to measure these dimensions.

Method

Performance Dimension Development: Participants and Procedures

The first step in developing a job performance measure is to identify and define the dimensions of job performance. To this end, we reviewed archival information pertaining to positions related to "Greek Life Coordinator."[2] We collected information from Occupational Network (O*NET) – an online database containing detailed information for over 1000 jobs – to identify critical tasks performed in these roles (Rivkin et al., 2017). Following this, we conducted informal interviews with experts on these jobs. These interviews consisted of research team members asking unstructured questions to individuals who are familiar with the jobs for which the AFA Core Competencies are appropriate. This included individuals currently serving in said roles, individuals who used to serve in the roles, and/or individuals who supervise others in those roles. Interview questions typically centered on the key behaviors performed in the jobs for which the AFA Core Competencies are appropriate. From these information sources, we identified and defined an initial list of seven performance domains (Table 3).

Following this, we invited different subject matter experts (SMEs) to evaluate the appropriateness of the dimension and definition. Specifi-

2 Importantly, we did not limit our sampling/search to this specific job title. Rather, we use the term "Greek Life Coordinator" as a general label for all job titles for which the AFA Core Competencies are appropriate. We do this for ease of presentation given that different organizations will likely have different job titles for functionally similar positions.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

cally, these individuals reviewed the dimensions and definitions, and then evaluated, using single-item measures, the (1) accuracy of the performance dimension for jobs within the job family of "Greek Life Coordinator," (2) the importance of the dimension for these jobs, and (3) the accuracy of the definition. They were then asked to provide any suggestions for improving the definition and one or two examples of job behaviors that fall within the category—they also provided some basic demographic information.

We invited 22 SMEs to participate in this online study. Of these, 15 responded (response rate of 68.18%), but six responses were not usable due to significant amounts of missing data (final $N = 9$; effective response rate of 41%). The sample was predominantly female (77.78%), with an average age of 36.66 ($SD = 4.82$), and had, on average, a little over 12 years of experience ($M = 12.33$, $SD = 5.22$) in university Greek Life. Self-reported job titles ranged from Assistant Deans of students to Directors of Fraternity and Sorority Life.

Performance Evaluation Measurement Development: Participants and Procedures

Based on the results of the dimension identification work (described below), the research team developed items within each dimension. These items represented behaviors/tasks within the performance dimension based on the final definitions (Table 3). We developed an initial list of 12 to 15 items per dimension. A different group of SMEs then evaluate the content validity of these items. Content validity refers to the accuracy of the inferences about an item matching the domain of what it intends to measure—that is, does the item match the construct definition (Guion, 2011)?

For each behavior/task (i.e., item), respondents rated (1) the extent to which the behavior/task was representative of the performance dimension as defined, (2) how important the behavior/task was to jobs within the "Greek Life Coordinator" job family, and (3) how clear/understandable was the behavior/task. Basic demographics were also collected.

We contacted a total of 42 SMEs, identified from the second author's professional network, to participate in the online study (see Schmitt et al., 2017). The SMEs we identified held and/or supervised fraternity/sorority life positions and represented a range of institution types and sizes. Of the 42, we received 14 useable responses (effective response rate 33%). The sample was equally male and female, with an average age of 41 ($SD = 6.80$). The sample had, on average, about 16 years of experience ($M = 16.20$, $SD = 5.30$) in university Greek Life. Job titles ranged from Assistant Dean of Students to Assistant Director/Director of Fraternity & Sorority Life.

Study 1 Results and Discussion

Results from the SME evaluations of the performance dimensions suggested that six dimensions were more appropriate than seven (Table 3) with Social Program Support not being considered a neces-

sary dimension of performance. Furthermore, "Human Relations" was changed to "Student Relations," and refinements to the dimension definitions were adopted based on suggestions from the SMEs.

From these revised construct definitions, we wrote and refined items to include in the content validation study utilizing the second group of SMEs.[3] The goal of this phase of the study was to select five items per dimension to represent the performance dimension on a new measure evaluating the performance of individuals in roles within the broad category of "Greek Life Coordinator." To make these determinations, we sorted first on mean importance rating, then mean representativeness, and finally mean clarity. Evaluation progressed across these ratings with ties in one area being resolved by ratings in the next (i.e., two items with the same importance were distinguished based on representativeness of the dimension).

Table 3

Performance Dimensions and Definitions

1. Stakeholder Relationships	Effectively serve as a representative of the institutions' values and goals to stakeholders such as alumni and other employees.
2. Educational Program Development	Organize and develop educational programs for fraternity and sorority members such as leadership development, risk reduction, and personal development.
3. Administration	Effective management of operations, people, and resources to meet the objectives of one's department and university.
4. Student Development	Provide guidance to students about co-curricular involvement (i.e., elements of university life outside of classes), and personal, social, and behavioral issues (relevant to Fraternity/Sorority Life).
5. Student Relations[2]	Maintain a supportive, effective, and developmental relationship with students.
6. Risk Management	Developing, interpreting, and administering systems, policies, and programming related to mitigating and preventing risk, as well as promoting student safety with fraternity/sorority life.
7. Social Program Support[1]	Monitor and assist with events related to social aspects of Fraternity/Sorority life such as homecoming, awards ceremonies, etc., developed by students and/or other departments.

Notes. 1—not included in final performance dimensions. 2—original label was "Human Relations."

3 All items are available from the corresponding author.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

The final performance evaluation measure included the 30 items identified based on the above criteria as well as six single-item general performance items for each performance dimension (e.g., "Effectively develops, interprets, and administers systems, policies, and programming related to mitigating and preventing risk, and promoting student safety with fraternity/sorority life"), and a single overall performance item (i.e. "Overall, how would you rate the performance of this employee across his/her different responsibilities?"). Table 4 shows the final items. From these results, we proceeded with validating the AFA Core Competencies in Study 2.

Study 2: Core Competency Self-Assessment Validation

To conduct Study 2, we linked AFA Core Competency self-assessments to AFA members' supervisor ratings of performance using the measure developed in Study 1.

Method

Participants and Procedures

To obtain Core Competency self-assessment scores, we contacted all members of AFA who completed the Core Competency self-assessment. From this initial reach out, 97 members volunteered to release their self-assessment scores for research purposes—we obtained their responses from AFA directly. Importantly, these likely included AFA members who worked on campuses, but also fraternity/sorority life professionals who did not work on a higher education campus (e.g., fraternity/sorority headquarter staff; professional consultants). We did not collect this information about the respondents to protect respondent confidentiality. We then contacted these 97 individuals to request the name and e-mail address of a supervisor familiar with their work to provide an evaluation of their performance. Of these, 71 responded with a name and valid e-mail address of a supervisor (response rate of 72.45%). We then contacted these 71 supervisors requesting performance evaluations of the AFA member; we received 42 performance evaluations (effect response rate of 59.15%). Both the supervisor and supervisee received a $10 gift card to Amazon.com for participating in the study.

The sample of AFA member participants was predominantly female (61.90%) with an average age of about 32.14 years (*SD* = 7.01). Member participants had about 7.05 years of experience in their current role (*SD* = 4.69) with slightly higher average total years of experience (*M* = 8.09, *SD* = 6.02). Job titles for AFA participants ranged from Assistant Dean of Students to Assistant Director/Director of Fraternity & Sorority Life.

The sample of supervisors was likewise predominantly female (64.29%) with an average age of 40.95 years old (*SD* = 9.36). Supervisors had an average of 11.57 years working in Greek life (*SD* = 5.62) and just over two years supervising the AFA participants (*M* = 2.74, *SD* = 2.22). Job titles of supervisors ranged from Vice President of Student Affairs to Dean of Students to Associate Director of Fraternity/Sorority life.

Table 4

Final performance measure items

Stakeholder Relationships (α = .81)
Demonstrates an understanding of institutions' needs, values, and goals.
Recognizes current and emergent needs that arise within the organization.
Communicates current and emergent needs to the appropriate stakeholders.
Communicates with organization leadership to gain understanding of needs.
Effectively communicates needs, values, and goals of institutions to stakeholders.
Educational Program Development (α = .84)
Develops relevant educational programs for fraternity/sorority members.
Develops programs in response to new issues or trends.
Promotes programming to support skill development (e.g., budget management, problem-solving, managing relationships).
Conducts evaluations of programs to ensure compliance with standards and goals.
Creates improvement plans for educational programs.
Administration (α = .86)
Ensures compliance with University policies.
Prepares reports and provides data as needed (e.g., conduct, GPA, membership).
Responsibly allocates/spends funds.
Tracks data for reporting (e.g., GPA, conduct, membership).
Compiles data for reporting (e.g., GPA, conduct, membership).
Student Development (α = .83)
Mentors council leaders.
Provides information to assist chapter presidents in making decisions.
Collaborates with other campus departments on programs that support student development (e.g., community-building, wellness).
Assists students in goal setting.
Meets with students as needed for feedback.
Student Relations (α = .87)
Develops trusting relationship with students.
Regularly meets with student leaders.
Communicates frequently with students.
Intervenes when student behavior is potentially harmful.
Provides resources (e.g., recommendations for services/programs) for students in distress.
Risk Management (α = .84)
Demonstrates an understanding of risk management policies.
Collaborates with other student life offices in designing educational efforts regarding University risk-management policy (e.g., sexual violence, alcohol and drugs).
Demonstrates an understanding of risks to safety and well-being of students.
Collaborates with other student life offices as appropriate to address conduct violations.
Ensures members receive hazing prevention training.

Notes. Single item measures of performance dimensions and general performance excluded. This performance measure should not be used for any purpose other than research until further validated. α based on Study 2 *N* = 42.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

Materials

AFA member participants completed the AFA Core Competency self-assessment prior to the start of the study. As noted above, respondents self-reported to 48 items across the 11 competencies on a four-point scale: 1-*Unknown*, 2-*Discovery*, 3-*Practice*, and 4-*Proficiency* (AFA, 2018). This method of scoring presented an interesting challenge for how to handle responses of 1. On the one hand, it could signify a low standing on that item/competency; on the other hand, it could reflect a not applicable item/competency. As such, the data were analyzed in two ways: (1) responses of 1 treated as the lowest value on a four-point scale, and (2) responses of 1 treated as missing data converting the Core Competency self-assessment to a three-point scale. Regardless of the scoring approach, though, the Core Competency self-assessment scales showed adequate internal consistency reliability (as assessed using Cronbach's α[4]; Table 5).

Table 5

Internal consistency reliability estimates for AFA Core Competency Self-Assessment

Core Competency	Number of Items	α Treating 1 as Missing	α Treating 1 as 1
Governance	7	.84	.89
Fraternity/Sorority Systems	7	.87	.88
Student Safety	5	.79	.86
Student Learning	4	.78	.78
Program Administration	5	.88	.90
Navigating Complexity	3	.91	.92
Operating Strategically	3	.77	.80
Driving Results	3	.84	.82
Working across Differences	3	.81	.80
Collaborating with Stakeholders	5	.90	.91
Driving Vision and Purpose	3	.84	.85

4 Alpha is a measure of internal consistency among a set of items computed as the ratio of common variance among the item-unique variance (Cortina, 1993). Values greater than .70 are generally considered adequate for research purposes, but such rules of thumb can be problematic (see Lance et al., 2006 for a discussion of this related to α).

We contacted supervisors via e-mail to complete the performance evaluation for the AFA participant. The survey contained the name of the participant, so the supervisors knew about whom they were reporting. Supervisors responded to six, five-item scales representing the performance dimensions described in Study 1. They also completed six dimension-specific general performance items, and a single overall performance item. Responses to these items were made on a 1 (*Significantly below expectations*) to 5 (*Significantly above expectations*) rating scale. Table 4 presents the internal consistency reliability estimates for the six performance dimensions.

Study 2 Results and Discussion

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for the AFA Core Competency self-assessment as well as the performance dimensions. In assessing the validity of the self-assessment scores, we are interested in knowing to what extent individuals' scores on the Core Competency Self-Assessment align with their supervisors' assessments of their performance. To do this, we computed Pearson Correlations between self-assessment scores and supervisor ratings of performance. Tables 7 and 8 present the results of these correlations treating responses of 1 as missing data and as valid responses, respectively.[5] As these tables show, by and large the Core Competencies correlate with at least one performance dimension. These results suggest that the Core Competencies show initial validity evidence. Two results of somewhat concern are *Student Learning* and *Working across Differences*. These competencies correlated with only a few performance dimensions. Although this could mean that the performance measurement misses key behaviors associated with this competency, that neither correlated strongly with the single item measure of general performance is somewhat concerning—AFA may want to revisit these competencies to ensure they are capturing important aspects of performance.

General Discussion

Organizations utilize competency modeling to capture important clusters of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other psychological characteristics related to successful performance across jobs within the company (Shippmann et al., 2000). Although broader than traditional "skills required" found in job ads, these competencies still need to be validated to ensure that inferences made from measures of these competencies are accurate (SIOP, 2018). AFA unveiled a revised Core Competency model in 2017, but had not, to date, engaged in a validation of these Core Competencies. As AFA members use the Core Competencies to provide feedback and development plans, it is critical that the inferences drawn about Core Competencies from the self-assessment be valid for such planning. This study conducted a multi-source concurrent validation of the AFA Core Competency self-assessment by cor-

5 For completeness, the intercorrelations among the Core Competency Self-Assessment scores are presented in the Appendix. We thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this omission to our attention.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

Table 6

Descriptive statistics for AFA Core Competency Self-Assessment and performance dimensions

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
Core Competency (Treating 1 as Missing)			
Governance	2.89	.51	2.79
Fraternity/Sorority Systems	2.91	.56	2.71
Student Safety	2.87	.51	2.90
Student Learning	2.95	.54	2.75
Program Administration	2.88	.60	3.00
Navigating Complexity	3.08	.66	3.00
Operating Strategically	2.79	.64	2.67
Driving Results	2.72	.61	2.67
Working across Differences	2.98	.55	3.00
Collaborating with Stakeholders	2.97	.58	3.00
Driving Vision and Purpose	2.95	.62	3.00
Core Competency (Treating 1 as 1)			
Governance	2.84	.59	2.79
Fraternity/Sorority Systems	2.74	.66	2.71
Student Safety	2.71	.68	2.70
Student Learning	2.95	.54	2.75
Program Administration	2.78	.71	2.90
Navigating Complexity	3.06	.69	3.00
Operating Strategically	2.76	.68	2.67
Driving Results	2.65	.67	2.67
Working across Differences	2.97	.56	3.00
Collaborating with Stakeholders	2.96	.61	3.00
Driving Vision and Purpose	2.94	.64	3.00
Performance Dimensions			
Stakeholder Relations	3.72	.56	3.70
Educational Program Development	3.56	.61	3.40
Administration	3.81	.63	3.60
Student Development	3.82	.62	3.80
Student Relations	3.90	.59	4.00
Risk Management	3.85	.60	3.80
General Performance[a]	3.88	.77	4.00
Stakeholder Relations[a]	3.76	.69	4.00
Educational Program Development[a]	3.64	.76	4.00
Administration[a]	3.62	.82	4.00
Student Development[a]	3.93	.71	4.00
Student Relations[a]	3.88	.74	4.00
Risk Management[a]	3.60	.66	4.00

Notes. a—represents single item measures. Core competency rating scale: 1-*Unknown*, 2-*Discovery*, 3-*Practice*, and 4-*Proficiency*. Performance dimensions rating scale: 1-*Significantly below expectations* to 5-*Significantly above expectations*.

Table 7

Correlations of AFA Core Competency Self-Assessments (Treating 1 as Missing) and performance dimensions

	Core Competencies										
Performance Dimensions	Governance	Fraternity/Sorority Systems	Student Safety	Student Learning	Program Administration	Navigating Complexity	Operating Strategically	Driving Results	Working Across Difficulties	Collaborating with Stake-holders	Driving Vision and Purpose
Stakeholder Relations	.34*	.34*	.56**	.34*	.36*	.49**	.44**	.52**	.10	.33*	.50**
Educational Program Devel-opment	.15	.28	.38*	.26	.30	.27	.28	.35*	-.07	.14	.36*
Administration	.38*	.34*	.33*	.02	.36*	.32*	.32*	.26	.18	.22	.34*
Student Devel-opment	.12	.17	.32*	.21	.17	.30	.26	.31*	.26	.19	.29
Student Rela-tions	.19	.12	.29	.05	.25	.28	.26	.14	.34*	.25	.28
Risk Manage-ment	.32*	.32*	.45**	.05	.30	.34*	.28	.22	.13	.27	.31*
General Perfor-mance[a]	.34*	.40**	.43**	.13	.43**	.37*	.34*	.34*	.19	.33*	.36*
Stakeholder Relations[a]	.31*	.29	.46**	.22	.41**	.49**	.47**	.48**	.15	.38*	.52**
Educational Program Devel-opment[a]	.23	.23	.34*	.09	.19	.32*	.29	.07	.09	.17	.34*
Administration[a]	.35*	.44**	.53**	.26	.53**	.51**	.49**	.47**	.26	.34*	.55**
Student Devel-opment[a]	.19	.26	.31*	.09	.40**	.36*	.27	.11	.19	.27	.36*
Student Rela-tions[a]	.22	.19	.35*	.19	.31*	.41**	.27	.23	.34*	.25	.38*
Risk Manage-ment[a]	.24	.38*	.34*	.03	.31*	.21	.19	.02	.12	.17	.29

Notes. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level , **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, a—re-flect single item measures.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

Table 8

Correlations of AFA Core Competency Self-Assessment (Treating 1 as 1) and performance dimensions

	Core Competencies										
Performance Dimensions	Governance	Fraternity/Sorority Systems	Student Safety	Student Learning	Program Administration	Navigating Complexity	Operating Strategically	Driving Results	Working Across Difficulties	Collaborating with Stake-holders	Driving Vision and Purpose
Stakeholder Relations	.34*	.36*	.55**	.34*	.36*	.52**	.45**	.58**	.12	.34*	.52**
Educational Program Development	.16	.28	.34*	.26	.28	.30	.26	.40**	-.06	.13	.38*
Administration	.38*	.35*	.44**	.02	.37*	.34*	.30	.36*	.18	.22	.36*
Student Development	.14	.13	.30	.21	.15	.33*	.22	.36*	.25	.16	.30*
Student Relations	.18	.13	.28	.05	.20	.31*	.24	.20	.32*	.24	.29
Risk Management	.32*	.33*	.48**	.05	.31*	.36*	.28	.30	.14	.28	.32*
General Performance[a]	.34*	.33*	.44**	.13	.40**	.38*	.32*	.40**	.18	.33*	.37*
Stakeholder Relations[a]	.31*	.32*	.50**	.22	.41**	.49**	.45**	.53**	.17	.37*	.52**
Educational Program Development[a]	.23	.22	.40*	.09	.19	.35*	.27	.18	.11	.17	.36*
Administration[a]	.36*	.42**	.55**	.26	.53**	.53**	.49**	.54**	.27	.35*	.56**
Student Development[a]	.17	.20	.37*	.09	.32*	.37*	.23	.20	.22	.25	.37*
Student Relations[a]	.22	.12	.38*	.19	.29	.41**	.25	.29	.32*	.25	.38*
Risk Management[a]	.22	.33*	.38*	.03	.27	.22	.18	.09	.14	.16	.29

Notes. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, a—reflect single item measures.

relating scores on the self-assessment with a measure of performance (Schmitt et al., 2017).

In Study 1, we developed a new performance measure, applicable across the myriad roles under the job family of "Greek Life Coordinator." We identified six dimensions and developed a new 30-item measure to capture performance within this six-dimensions, and demonstrated its content validity based on ratings from SMEs.

In Study 2, we contacted AFA participant members' supervisors to complete the new performance measure for their employee, and we linked supervisor ratings to AFA participant members' Core Competency self-assessment scores. Results of the analyses suggest that all of the Core Competencies correlated with at least one performance dimension, and all but two correlated with a single item measure of general performance. These results provide initial support for the validity of the inferences from the AFA Core Competency self-assessment. Specifically, self-assessment scores are positively related to supervisors' ratings of performance; this provides initial support for the validity of the self-assessment score for developing professional development plans. Two Core Competencies, however, did not show strong validity evidence, and may need to be refined: *Student Learning* and *Working across Differences*.

The results of these studies lead to a few suggestions for AFA and the users of the AFA Core Competency Self-Assessment. First, the results do support the validity of the inferences of the core competency self-assessment scores as predictors of job performance. As such, AFA members can use the self-assessment scores to get a sense of competencies for which they are strong and for which professional development might be needed. Together with their supervisors, then, they can develop individual professional development plans based on the core competency self-assessment results. For AFA as an organization, these results suggest that professional development efforts around the Core Competencies can be valuable for the AFA membership.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although the results of this effort are positive, some limitations should be addressed with future research. First, the sample size for this study was small. Ideally, a validation study would have a sample size above 100 participants; in our study, though, we only had 42. Future research is needed to replicate these results in general, but also in a larger sample. To be sure, the results of this study are encouraging, but should be evaluated in light of the potential for bias due to small samples (Schmitt et al., 2017). In addition, the sample of individuals who volunteered for the study may have higher scores on the Core Competencies and/or performance evaluation than those who did not volunteer; future research should consider employing a random sampling strategy. Second, related to the sample, we noted that we did not collect information about the professional affiliations of the respondents in Study 2 (i.e., campus professionals versus headquarter

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

staff). This precluded testing any differences in the core competency relations among these two groups but raises an important avenue for future studies. Indeed, future studies can investigate if the Core Competencies relate to performance differently for different groups of AFA members.

Third, the performance measure, although content valid (Hinkin, 1998), would benefit from its own validation study. Importantly, this performance measure should not be used in operational settings because of this lack of validity evidence. Although the measure is sufficient for research purposes (Hinkin, 1998), to be used in universities for administrative performance evaluations, further validation is necessary. This study did not have the sample sizes required to undertake additional validity screening such as factor analysis. Future research can validate this measure and make it available to universities to evaluate the performance of their "Greek Life Coordinator" positions. Likewise, future research is needed to fully evaluate the psychometric properties of the AFA Core Competencies Self-Assessment—this can include factor analytic and/or item response theory analyses to not only understand the underlying structure of the self-assessment, but also understand the specific psychometric functioning of the response of 1.

Fourth, future research should be directed specifically at the two core competencies for which limited validity evidence was seen. Importantly, we do not advocate removing either *Student Learning* or *Working Across Differences* from the AFA Core Competencies based on just this study. These results do, however, suggest the need for a targeted study of these core competencies. Specifically, we suggest considering the content domain of these core competencies, and ensure they align with performance in roles for which the AFA Core Competencies are appropriate. Following this, studies exploring the relation between these two competencies and the identified performance dimensions can be undertaken to better understand why these core competencies are important.

Finally, results do *not* support the use of the AFA Core Competency self-assessment for selecting new employees. Although the results suggest that self-assessment scores are related to performance, considerable additional psychometric evaluation and validation is necessary before the self-assessment could be used for selecting new hires. This includes: (1) additional validity evidence, (2) assessment of potential bias in self-assessment items based on protected classes (e.g., race, gender, gender identity), and (3) potential adverse impact against protected classes. Future research should conduct these analyses on the Core Competencies. Until such evidence is presented and documented, the AFA Core Competency self-assessment should be used for professional development only. Results of this study support the use of the self-assessment for this purpose.

Conclusions

Given the changing nature of work, organizations are moving away from specifically identifying knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics needed for specific jobs to defining clusters of attributes needed to be successful across positions, that is, competencies (Brannick et al., 2017; Shippmann et al., 2000). This is no different for fraternity/sorority professionals wherein job responsibilities overlap to some degree but do vary across positions and within the same position across organizations. Recognizing the need for a more broadly applicable training program, AFA developed a Core Competency model, and an accompanying self-assessment. The studies undertaken here provides initial evidence supporting the validity inferences of the AFA Core Competency self-assessment. Though replication and some refinements are needed, results largely support the use of the self-assessment for professional development.

References

Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (2018). *AFA Core Competency Manual.* Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors.

Brannick, M. T., Pearlman K., & Sanchez, J. I. (2017). Work analysis. In J. L. Farr & N.T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection (2nd ed.)* (pp. 134-161). Routledge.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 98-104.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor, & Department of Justice. (1978). Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. *Federal Register*, *43*, 38290–39315.

Guion, R. M. (2011). *Assessment, measurement, and prediction for personnel decisions, 2nd edition.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, *1*, 104-121.

Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods*, *9*, 202-220.

LeBreton, J. M., Schoen, J. L., & James, L. R. (2017). Situational specificity, validity generalization, and the future of psychometric meta-analysis. In J. L. Farr & N.T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection (2nd ed.)* (pp. 93-114). Routledge.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808

Rivkin, D., Gregory, C. M., Norton, J. J., Craven, D. E., & Lewis, P. M. (2017). Advancing O*NET data, application and uses. In J.L. Farr & N.T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of Employee Selection 2nd edition* (pp. 874-912). Routledge.

Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kraiger, K., & Smith-Jentsch, K. A. (2012). The science of training and development in organizations: What matters in practice. *Psychological Science, 13*, 74-101.

Schmitt, N. W., Arnold, J. D., & Nieminen, L. (2017). Validation strategies for primary studies. In J. L. Farr & N.T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection (2nd ed.)* (pp. 34-55). Routledge.

Shippmann, J. S., Ash, R.A., Batjtsta, M., Carr, L., Eyde, L. D. Hesketh, B., … Sanchez, J. I. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, 703-740.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2018). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (5th Edition). SIOP.

Sutton, A., & Watson, S. (2013). Can competencies at selection predict performance and development needs? *Journal of Management Development*, *32*, 1023-1035.

Author Biographies

Dev K. Dalal, PhD (he/him) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology at University at Albany, State University of New York. His research interests include personnel psychology issues, applied judgment and decision making, research and quantitative methods, and the measurement of psychological variables. His research has been published in *Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management,* and *Personnel Assessment and Decisions,* among others. He is a member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Illinois Alpha-Omega Chapter.

Dan Wrona (he/him) is the CEO of RISE Partnerships, a training and development firm serving fraternal organizations. He has worked in fraternity/sorority life as a university administrator, a national fraternity staff member, and a consultant with the North-American Interfraternity Conference. Dan is a member of Pi Kappa Phi fraternity and has been recognized with several awards for his efforts to elevate the fraternity/sorority profession, including the Jack L. Anson Award.

Appendix

Intercorrelations of AFA Core Competency Self-Assessment Scores. Note, responses of 1 treated as 1's and Missing Data.

Table A1

Core Competency Intercorrelations; 1's as 1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Governance	1.00									
2. Fraternity/Sorority Systems	**0.79**	1.00								
3. Student Safety	**0.83**	**0.83**	1.00							
4. Student Learning	**0.47**	**0.50**	**0.53**	1.00						
5. Program Admin.	**0.75**	**0.82**	**0.82**	**0.54**	1.00					
6. Navigating Complex.	**0.68**	**0.62**	**0.77**	**0.49**	**0.67**	1.00				
7. Operating Strategically	**0.74**	**0.72**	**0.81**	**0.65**	**0.77**	**0.72**	1.00			
8. Driving Results	**0.55**	**0.55**	**0.63**	**0.52**	**0.64**	**0.67**	**0.78**	1.00		
9. Working Across Difs.	0.28	0.15	0.26	0.28	0.24	0.27	**0.40**	0.25	1.00	
10. Collab with Stakeholders	**0.77**	**0.71**	**0.76**	**0.49**	**0.76**	**0.58**	**0.85**	**0.66**	**0.35**	1.00
11. Driving Vision/Purpose	**0.55**	**0.55**	**0.74**	**0.55**	**0.63**	**0.66**	**0.73**	**0.60**	0.25	**0.67**

Notes. N = 42. Bolded Correlations $p < .05$.

Table A2

Core Competency Intercorrelations; 1's as Missing Data.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Governance	1.00									
2. Fraternity/Sorority Systems	**0.78**	1.00								
3. Student Safety	**0.72**	**0.77**	1.00							
4. Student Learning	**0.46**	**0.49**	**0.54**	1.00						
5. Program Admin.	**0.69**	**0.78**	**0.69**	**0.53**	1.00					
6. Navigating Complex.	**0.72**	**0.65**	**0.68**	**0.52**	**0.67**	1.00				
7. Operating Strategically	**0.73**	**0.69**	**0.78**	**0.63**	**0.75**	**0.75**	1.00			
8. Driving Results	**0.48**	**0.45**	**0.61**	**0.54**	**0.59**	**0.56**	**0.76**	1.00		
9. Working Across Difs.	0.26	0.15	0.09	0.26	0.26	0.27	**0.38**	0.19	1.00	
10. Collab with Stakeholders	**0.76**	**0.69**	**0.70**	**0.48**	**0.71**	**0.61**	**0.84**	**0.65**	**0.34**	1.00
11. Driving Vision/Purpose	**0.54**	**0.55**	**0.66**	**0.57**	**0.64**	**0.64**	**0.71**	**0.51**	0.24	**0.68**

Notes. N = 42. Bolded Correlations $p < .05$.

https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle/vol18/iss1/4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25774/10fq-z808