

A COMPARISON OF FRATERNITY ATTITUDES
BETWEEN SELECTED FRATERNITY MEMBERS
AND THEIR ELECTED LEADERS

By

THOMAS MONROE KEYS

Bachelor of Science
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
1967

Master of Education
Northwestern State College of Louisiana
Natchitoches, Louisiana
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1974

MAY 11 1976

A COMPARISON OF FRATERNITY ATTITUDES
BETWEEN SELECTED FRATERNITY MEMBERS
AND THEIR ELECTED LEADERS

Thesis Approved:

Frank E. Vanland
Thesis Adviser

J. B. Schiele
Dan Wesley

Judith E. Dobson

N. N. Dutton
Dean of the Graduate College

938623

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is difficult to express my gratitude to all of the people who have helped make this research effort a reality. Included would be all of the staff and students who were involved from the beginning of the development of the Fraternity Attitude Scale through to those who participated in the actual survey and assisted with the analyses. To Dr. Patrick M. Murphy and W. John Lamberton, I owe special and sincere thanks for the many hours of work and the enthusiasm they offered as teammates while developing the Fraternity Attitude Scale.

I owe a special debt of appreciation to Dr. Frank McFarland, Chairman of the Advisory Committee. His support, suggestions, and guidance have been instrumental in the completion of this study. The advice and statistical guidance of Dr. Douglas Aichele and the support of the other members of the Advisory Committee is most appreciated.

There is doubt that this study could have been completed without the generous and patient assistance given by Dr. Larry Claypool, who devoted many hours to helping me develop and re-develop computer programs for analyzing the data. He provided for me a real learning experience, and for this I am grateful.

To my colleagues and special friends, Kay Kielhorn, Doug Wilson, Rex Finnegan, and Pat Murphy (again), please accept my deepest and warmest appreciation for your constructive "prodding," support, and concern for my "mental health."

I am also grateful to Deans Robert G. Schmalfeld and Zelma Patchin for their support and tolerance of me when, at times, this research took priority over my work.

A very special note of appreciation is due the Oklahoma State University Interfraternity Council who not only funded this project but cooperated beautifully. To the Chapter Presidents who assisted in the initial survey efforts, a special thank you. To the 709 fraternity members who composed the research sample, I express my sincere thanks for their time and interest. I hope the results will prove useful to all of these people in guiding their future efforts.

To my family, Pam, Scott, Mom, and Dad, words cannot express what your support, your sacrifice and your belief in me has meant. I hope that some day I can repay each of you for the contributions you have made to my life. For now, please accept my deepest and warmest thanks and blessings for each of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Nature of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	6
Hypotheses	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Assumptions	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Introduction	12
Aspects of Leadership	12
Fraternity Student Leaders	12
Leadership Theories	14
Aspects of Group Dynamics	20
What Is a Group?	20
Types of Groups	22
Primary and Secondary Groups	23
Sociogroups and Psychegroups	24
Organized and Unorganized Groups	26
Authoritarian and Democratic Groups	27
Characteristics of Greek-Letter Systems and Their Members	32
Characteristics of Fraternity Students	35
Summary	39
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	41
Introduction	41
Survey Procedure	41
Subjects: Population and Sample	41
Survey Method	43
Instrumentation--The Fraternity Attitude Scale	46
Statistical Procedure	52
Summary	53

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS . .	55
Introduction	55
Results of the Analysis of Data For <u>All</u> Fraternity Leaders and Members	56
Results of the Analysis of Data For Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity Surveyed	60
Summary	72
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	75
Introduction	75
Summary of Research	76
Findings and Conclusions	77
Summary of Hypotheses Testing	77
Conclusion	79
Implications	82
Concluding Summary	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDIX A: <u>FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE</u>	93
APPENDIX B: <u>FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE ITEM NUMBERS</u> <u>RELATED TO THE SIX SUBSCALES AND THEIR</u> <u>WEIGHTED DIRECTIONS</u>	101
APPENDIX C: TEXT OF FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE ITEMS BY SUBSCALE	103
APPENDIX D: INSTRUCTIONS TO CHAPTER PRESIDENTS FOR ADMINISTERING THE <u>FRATERNITY ATTITUDE</u> <u>SCALE</u>	110
APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOUND THROUGH ANALYSES OF VARIANCE	112
APPENDIX F: SUMMARY OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE BETWEEN LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF ALL FRATERNITIES FOR EACH FAS SUBSCALE	114

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Description of Oklahoma State University Fraternity Population and Research Sample . .	44
II. Results of Item Analysis on Initial FAS Pilot .	49
III. Results of Item Analysis on Final FAS Statements	50
IV. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance For All Fraternity Officers and Members	57
V. Presentation of Mean Score Values For All Fraternity Officers and Members	59
VI. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Interfraternity Council Subscale	61
VII. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Chapter Cohesion Subscale	63
VIII. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Chapter Programs Subscale	65
IX. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Physical Facilities Subscale	67
X. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Chapter Government Subscale	69
XI. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Rules and Regulations Subscale	71
XII. Results of One Way Analysis of Variance of Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity on the Total Scale	73

TABLE	Page
XIII. The FAS: Item Numbers Related to the Six Subscale Concepts and Weighted Directions . . .	102
XIV. Text of Interfraternity Council Subscale Items	104
XV. Text of Chapter Cohesion Subscale Items	105
XVI. Text of Chapter Programs Subscale Items	106
XVII. Text of Physical Facilities Subscale Items . .	107
XVIII. Text of Chapter Government Subscale Items . . .	108
XIX. Text of Rules and Regulations Subscale Items .	109
XX. Summary of Significant Differences Found Through Analyses of Variance	113
XXI. Summary of Analyses of Variance Between Leaders and Members of All Fraternities for Each FAS Subscale	115

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

One of the prevalent assertions concerning good leaders is that they have superior ability to know what a group is thinking, how it feels concerning issues with which it is confronted, and how it will react or perform under varied circumstances (36). In fact, due to the complexities of most organizations, the estimations of attitudes and opinions of others by leaders is a necessity.

Support for this can be found in democratic governments, corporate businesses and educational institutions. As the student of American history knows, the government of the United States is based upon the hypothesis that men elected by people to represent them have the ability to estimate the wishes of the electorate. Major corporations commit billions of dollars to the design of a product based on the ability of their leaders to accurately perceive the attitudes and needs of a particular market. Through the historical development of institutions of higher education, boards of regents, faculty councils, administrators, advisory groups, and student councils have been developed to expedite decision-making by representative or appointive leadership.

As a subsystem within the total system of higher education the student personnel organization is usually charged with understanding and providing for student needs and for serving as liaison between the formal institution and its students (67). The success of this mission depends considerably on a student personnel worker's accurate assessment of student attitudes, opinions, and values.

Input from elected leaders of active student organizations and clubs is relied upon heavily for making such assessments. Student personnel administrators actively pursue feedback from these sources as a practical and expedient method of determining the 'pulse' of the student body. This is certainly not the only source of insight into student opinion, but observations of the practices on campuses today will provide support for this position.

In recent years, student representation in college and university governance has been a much-discussed topic. Student membership on boards and standing committees has been strongly advocated by deans of students. It is predicted that such student appointments will continue to increase (40).

Implicit throughout this clamor for student opinion and increased representation in the decision-making structure of higher education is the assumption that student leaders can and do accurately represent the attitudes and opinions of the groups they represent. A special College Management survey of deans of students supports this implication by reporting that 68% of those surveyed considered students involved in

collegiate governance either "highly" representative or "moderately but significantly" representative of student opinion (40).

A theoretical basis for making the assumption that student leaders are accurate sources of information concerning the general attitudes of the groups they represent can be implied from the concept of group norms. Through norms, a group sets the roles expected of its members and uses various controls to pressure them to conform to their roles. The members of any enduring group develop similar opinions, attitudes, and behavior patterns because, according to Cartwright and Zanders: (a) group membership largely determines what an individual will see, do, talk about, and learn; (b) the individual finds other group members attractive and strives to be like them; (c) the individual acts like others rather than risk incurring ridicule, punishment, or rejection; (d) whether a member of a group will submit to the conforming norms of the group depends to an extent on the importance of group membership to him (75).

Research literature on the college student indicates that the environmental press of a particular campus will greatly influence student values, attitudes, and behaviors (31). Perhaps the most potent of the molding forces at work is the student's peer group (57). As a student associates himself with members of peer groups he begins to take on characteristics of these groups and of the individuals who comprise them (31).

Based on this discussion, it can be hypothesized that in student groups there exists a similarity in attitudes due to peer pressure. Secondly, one can assume that a person in an elected leadership position submits to the group norms since membership is obviously important to him. Finally, one can contend that a democratic group would not elect as its representative an individual who varied significantly from the norms of the group. Therefore, a tentative conclusion that student leader attitudes are closely related to peer group attitudes may be a correct one for student personnel administrators to make.

However, there are several reasons for not making such a generalization at this point. Waters (75) contends that groups do not exert pressure uniformly on all their members. She states that high-ranking or high-prestige members are often put under less pressure to conform than low-prestige members (76). For example, group members will allow a fraternity president to deviate more from group norms than a person who has just pledged the organization.

Another factor which prevents this generalization from being made concerns the cohesiveness of the group. Group solidarity or cohesiveness is the overall ability of a group to hold the attention, loyalty, and participation of the members, which is compounded out of group attractiveness, peer pressures, and personal motivation (28). The more cohesive a group, the more power it has to influence its members. Therefore, if a student group lacks cohesion, its leader and

members are less likely to express the loyalty necessary to adhere to its norms, and thus, express a variety of opinions.

A third, and probably most important factor, concerns the student leader's position in the college or university structure. Generally, most student organizations are granted permission to exist on a campus by the institution itself. As such, a different type of press is enforced upon the organization. That is, there is an understanding that the group will adhere to certain expectations of the parent institution. Group leaders are usually called upon by administrators and faculty advisers to insure that these expectations are carried out by the members of the organization. Placed in this position, the leader must respond to two sets of presses--one from a superior authority and one from his peers. The dilemma of leadership in a democracy is clearly shown in this excerpt from Gibb:

If an intermediate-level officer is to become a real leader, he has a dual role to play. He must accept the norms and values of superior authority, thus serving as an agent of the impersonal and coercive organization of which he is a part. To the extent that he does this effectively his superiors regard him highly. At the same time, he must win the willing followership of the men under him, so that he wields over them authority which they themselves have given him. He will be rated highly by the men to the extent that he shows "consideration" for them and to the extent that he mingles freely with them, and represents them against the cold machine which is the over-all organization. There can be no doubt that this conflict inheres in the leadership role . . . (26, p. 894, 895).

The possibility of this conflict existing in the student leadership role, coupled with the other factors previously discussed, introduces doubt as to whether university

administrators can rely on generalizing student attitudes from those of student leaders. This doubt was the springboard of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The problem researched concerned the validity of the assumption that attitudes of elected student leaders are representative of the attitudes of their student groups. For purposes of this study the researcher selected a student group that, historically, has been actively involved in the student life of college campuses; has a record of endurance and stability; and has a reputation for being highly organized and cohesive (46). This group was social fraternities at Oklahoma State University.

The major purpose of this research was to assess and compare the attitudes of Oklahoma State University fraternity members and the attitudes of their elected leaders to determine if significant relationships existed between the groups. The attitudes investigated were those expressed toward the following major areas of fraternity operations: (a) the Interfraternity Council, (b) chapter cohesion, (c) chapter programs, (d) chapter physical facilities, (e) chapter government, and (f) rules and regulations.

Definition of Terms

For a better understanding of key concepts and terms presented in the study the following operational definitions are provided:

1. Social Fraternity: Refers to a self-perpetuating, mutually exclusive group which organizes the social life of its members in colleges and universities as a contributing factor to their educational program and draws its membership primarily from the male undergraduate body of the institution. Its purposes are the development of social competence, leadership qualities, scholastic performance, participation in extracurricular activities, and service to the educational institution and the community.

2. Fraternity Chapter: Refers to a single, local governing unit of undergraduate students belonging to the same social fraternity on a college or university campus.

3. Fraternity Chapter House: Refers to all buildings on or around a college or university campus which are used by members of a fraternity as a place of residence or for meetings and activities.

4. Fraternity Student Leader: Refers to any student member of a fraternity who has been elected during the 1973-1974 academic year to any of the following positions in the fraternity system: President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, House Manager, Pledge Trainer, Rush Chairman, Interfraternity Council Representative.

5. Selected Fraternity Member: Refers to all student members and pledges of a fraternity who reside in fraternity housing and who responded to the Fraternity Attitude Scale but were not Fraternity Student Leaders.

6. Attitude: Refers to an existing predisposition to respond to social objects which, in interaction with situational and other dispositional variables, guides and directs the overt behavior of the individual.

7. Interfraternity Council: Refers to a formally organized group of student representatives from each fraternity chapter existing for the purposes of promoting the welfare and cooperation of all fraternities, recommending fraternity rules and regulations, implementing programs and services, and sanctioning member chapters.

8. Chapter Programs: Refers to fraternity-sponsored programs, activities, and services which further the intellectual development and personal growth of students.

9. Chapter Cohesion: Refers to the overall ability of a chapter to hold the attention, loyalty, and participation of the members.

10. Chapter Physical Facilities: Refers to all buildings and internal furniture, fixtures and amenities constructed with the primary function of housing fraternity students while attending an institution of higher education.

11. Chapter Government: Refers to a formally organized system of operating a fraternity chapter which includes recommending rules, regulations, and judicial procedures, implementing chapter programs and services, making decisions about fees and dues, and providing for the general welfare of the members.

12. Rules and Regulations: Refers to written codes of standards and conduct, including policies and procedures, governing fraternity housing and behavior of its members.

13. Fraternity Attitude Scale: Refers to an instrument developed to gather attitude responses to fraternity-related concepts.

Hypotheses

The primary concern of the study was to determine whether or not the attitudes of elected fraternity leaders were representative of the attitudes of the fraternity members they represent. Since the research instrument contained statements relating to six succinct areas of fraternity chapter operations, the hypotheses were grouped into categories accordingly. The hypotheses tested were:

There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of selected fraternity members and the attitudes of their elected fraternity leaders as expressed toward:

- (a) Interfraternity Council
- (b) chapter cohesion
- (c) chapter programs
- (d) chapter physical facilities
- (e) chapter government
- (f) rules and regulations
- (g) total score on Fraternity Attitude Scale

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to a population of fraternity student leaders and members associated with Oklahoma State University, a large, state-supported, co-educational, mid-western university with an enrollment of approximately 18,500. Information regarding this population was limited to that which was collected by the Fraternity Attitude Scale. Therefore, caution was and should be used in generalizing the results to a population found at another campus that differs significantly from Oklahoma State University. The same caution would be in order in attempting generalizations to all national fraternities.

A final caution is that the study investigated only one segment of student leadership. Generalizations made about male social fraternity leadership may not be valid for other student groups or organizations.

Assumptions

With the measurement of attitudes, certain assumptions were made. These included the assumption that attitudes could be measured, that attitudes could be found to vary along a linear continuum, and that attitudes were held by many people. In addition, it was assumed that attitudes may be temporary and therefore changeable. Attitudes, too, may be subject to rationalization and manipulation (61).

A functional assumption of this study was that each individual responding to the survey was familiar enough with

fraternity life to have formed attitudes toward the subject being researched. In addition, it was assumed that all respondents reacted to the survey in a sincere manner.

A statistical assumption was that the attitudinal responses were distributed on a continuum and thus recorded in appropriate response categories.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Since the basic premise of this study involves key leadership and group concepts, the purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature that will provide an understanding of these concepts as they apply to college fraternities. To accomplish this purpose, the chapter has been organized into three major sections. The first presents an historical perspective of leadership, its theories and their applications to fraternities. The second uses key group concepts to describe fraternities and provide sociological insight into college social organizations. The final section offers an overview of the research and literature written to characterize these organizations and their student members.

Aspects of Leadership

Fraternity Student Leaders

A review of the literature revealed an abundance of research which is descriptive of student leader characteristics. However, such research does not reflect adequately the purpose of this study. Therefore, this section will focus on

those few studies that do directly relate to the comparison of leader and member attitudes.

Hites and Campbell as early as 1949 made an effort to test the assertion that good leaders have superior ability to know what a group is thinking, how it feels concerning issues with which it is confronted, and how it will react or perform under varied circumstances (36). The method used was the percentage estimate, whereby a fraternity leader was requested to estimate the group's response to an attitude questionnaire. Results of the study indicated that elected leaders, appointed leaders, and nonleaders did not differ in ability to estimate fraternity opinions. This held true not only for topics with which the group is vitally concerned but also for opinions about the day-to-day problems such as food, housing, and group dissensions. They speculated that it was possible that the fraternity groups were too homogeneous to allow for great dissension in opinion and that they interact so continuously that nearly everyone knows the opinions held by other members of the group.

Feister, in a study at the University of Iowa, came to a similar conclusion (20). A questionnaire on values was given to a random sample of four fraternities and to their newly elected presidents. All of the presidents showed a high degree of agreement with the views of the members of their respective fraternities. The leaders also had just as much or more agreement with the views of the members of fraternities other than their own. The final conclusion was that

if the criterion for fraternity president depended on values, the officers could be exchanged satisfactorily.

Other attitudinal studies involving fraternities are primarily concerned with attitudes of nonmembers toward fraternities [Atkins (1), Forbes (23), Harp (33), Pekarek (55), Sherman (68)]. Since this approach is not within the scope of this research, no studies of this nature will be cited in this chapter.

Although these studies indicate a lack of literature relating directly to the hypotheses of this study, there is an abundance of information and research concerning leadership theory and concepts. These materials will be used to provide a developmental perspective of leadership as it may apply to college fraternities.

Leadership Theories

Concern of leaders with their behavior and its effect upon followers is no recent phenomenon. Theories of leadership date back to early historical writings and problems of politics and culture (28). Brown traces scientific investigation of leaders' relations to workers back to Paracelsus who published a monograph on the subject in 1567 (7).

From the abundance of information found on this subject, one could conclude that it has been thoroughly investigated; yet, leadership theory still remains a controversial subject (76). Despite the time and energy spent by students of leadership, there is very little agreement on the subject

other than the fact that leadership does exist (48). Since this is the case, attention will be given to various theories that have been developed through the years.

Machiavelli and Carlyle believed in the "Great Man" approach to leadership (7). They held that certain great charismatic men are born and people naturally follow them. Whereas Machiavelli believed that leadership rested upon the power of cunning and force, Carlyle believed that leadership rested upon intuitive insight in relativity (45). John Stuart Mill held that great men gather people around them and create situations of enlightenment and critical thought (45). William James suggested that great men need certain situations in which to use their leadership ability; and, if a great man does not come upon the ideal situation, he might remain unknown (45). Such charismatic leaders have been known throughout civilization, but seldom within the scope of school, community, or industry (28).

This person-oriented type of thinking has greatly influenced the research in leadership (28). The focus, for a long time, has been on the study of personality traits of identified leaders (76). In accordance with this trait theory, leadership has been viewed as a quality of personality. As such, a person is looked upon as a leader if he has certain personality traits such as intelligence, aggressiveness, physical attractiveness, or a strong voice (4). Investigators have failed to show a definitive relationship between leadership and personality due largely to the complexities

of these phenomena, to disagreement regarding how they should be defined and described, and to lack of adequate measuring devices (76).

While the research does not show specific traits uniquely and consistently associated with leadership, it shows that in a variety of situations leaders tend to excel nonleaders in such traits as intelligence, self-confidence, dominance, activity, social participation, and surgency (76). In their attempts to distinguish the personality traits of freshmen involved in student activities, Donovan and Olson found significant differences in self-acceptance, sociability and social pressure, and dominance, as measured by the California Personality Inventory (16). Harville found student leaders to be more group-dependent and controlled than nonleaders. They also scored much higher in verbal skills than nonleaders (34). In a similar study, Flacherty concluded that peer groups have been found to select college leaders who have scored significantly higher on the California Psychological Inventory in dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, and self-acceptance (22).

Reviews of research on fraternity leaders provided similar results in attempting to establish unique and consistent characteristics of leadership. Hodges found fraternity leaders, compared with nonleaders, to be better students, more upwardly mobile, intellectually mature, enthusiastic, aggressive, impartial, energetic, and friendly (37).

Another study concluded that fraternal leaders tended to be more practical, emotionally stable, tough-minded, and group-dependent than other campus leaders (78). Studies by Feister (20), Williamson and Hoyt (77), Hulet (41), and Jensen (43) found no significant personality characteristics or values that would distinguish fraternity leaders from other student leaders or students in general.

Continuing to cite similar research efforts would provide a list of traits that would become meaningless. For example, Gorman cites a study by Bird where 79 traits were identified in 20 different studies, only five of which were common to four or more investigators (30). Gorman provides an adequate summary for this discussion of trait leadership by stating:

It became increasingly evident through experiments in the field that a person might have a great number of these traits and still not be an effective leader. While certain characteristics or combinations of characteristics can be shown to be helpful, they apparently do not decide the issue (30, p. 13).

This feeling among many investigators has led to a third theory which seems to be receiving the most support recently. The theory is labeled the "situational leader." Cattell (10), Gibb (26), and Sanford (63) approach this concept from both a behavioral and situational standpoint. These men write that patterns of behaviors that occur within different group situations are shared by all members of that group. In the situational leadership approach, it is believed that different members of groups will display

different degrees of leadership behavior depending upon the situation.

Stodgill, in a study as early as 1948, supported the concept of situational leadership by concluding:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of interaction of variables which are in constant flux and change

The evidence suggests that leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations

The authors conclude that these findings provide 'devastating evidence' against the concept of the operation of measurable traits in determining social interactions (70, pp. 153-156).

Glanz and Hayes add support to the situational theory by stating: "Most frequently, theory and research have concluded that the environment and the purpose of a group are determining factors in the functioning of a leader" (28, p. 95). They further state:

It is rewarding to note that the newer and perhaps more promising approaches to leadership stress that in a group, everyone leads 'a little.' The leader is like the members of the group and is not on a white horse out in front, charging ahead. Leaders of one group may be followers in another (28, p. 106).

From this discussion of leadership concepts as they relate to fraternities, it becomes evident that little effort has been directed toward the internal evaluation of these organizations. Most studies have been concerned with either identifying the characteristics of these leaders and student

members or with assessing the attitudes others express toward fraternities. Even the initial studies cited as having direct application to the proposed problem leave some doubt as to whether or not fraternity leader attitudes reflect those of their constituents. The application of conclusions drawn in 1949 to today's student leaves some room for question; and the small number of fraternities tested in Feister's study limits the ability to generalize conclusions. The concept of shared leadership would seem to have direct implications for this study. If everyone in a group does lead "a little," as suggested by Glanz and Hayes (28), then it becomes important to understand the attitudes, characteristics, and behaviors of the group. The study of leadership becomes a sociological study of group behavior and needs rather than a singular focus on the importance of one individual. For this reason, the study is not concerned with identifying "great leaders" or leadership traits, but rather it focuses on insight into the impact the environment and purposes of a group have on student leadership.

In order to appreciate this type of approach to leadership, a basic understanding of group dynamics is necessary. Therefore, the following section of this chapter is devoted to a presentation of key concepts regarding the definition and classification of groups and the relationship these concepts have to fraternal organizations.

Aspects of Group Dynamics

Groups differ from one another; and, like individuals, each has its own personality or individuality. Research studies reveal the differences and show that much depends upon the structure of the group, the composition of its members, the psychological character of its most active members, the group's purpose and function, and the way group goals and tasks are performed (76).

What is a Group?

According to Gibb (25), the term group is so well known that few would turn to a dictionary to discover its meaning. However, he contends that attempting to define this concept has not led to an unequivocal connotation. He states:

On the one hand, the word is used to refer to varied relations between objects, while on the other it embraces organizations of such different levels of complexity that it seems incredible that a common set of concepts and methods of study would be applicable to them (25, p. 24).

In consideration of this first source of confusion, objects which are in some sense together--for example, together in a certain place--are frequently said to constitute a group (25). Such togetherness can be called an aggregate or a collection and should be differentiated from a group (25, 61, 49). Units of an aggregate are characterized by complete independence of one another and are of little or no importance to the social scientist since they exclude the facts of interrelation (25). Gibb and others also exclude

a collection of units having qualities in common as being a group for the same reason of no interaction being present (25, 76, 60).

There is a third type of relationship between objects (including persons) for which the term "group" is characterized by the interaction of its members in such a way that each unit is changed by the group membership and each undergoes a change as a result of changes in the group (25). In this case, there is a dependence of each member upon the entire group. Therefore, an aggregate of persons thus becomes a human group when interaction occurs among the units comprising it.

While the concept of interaction between members may serve to differentiate the group from the aggregate, it is not by itself a satisfactory definition of the group (25). Because of this, it is well to consider others who have attempted to reduce the concepts of a functional group to a minimum of criteria.

For Lewin, interdependence of members was the criterion of a group (51). Krech and Crutchfield have accepted this Lewinian point of view and define the group as follows:

A group does not merely mean individuals characterized by similar property. Thus, for example, a collection of Republicans or farmers or Negroes or blind men is not a group. These collections may be called classes of people. The term group, on the other hand, refers to two or more people who bear an explicit psychological relationship to one another. This means that for each member of the group the other members must exist in some more or less immediate psychological way so that their behavior and their characteristics influence him (50, p. 18).

Gilllin and Gillin (27) point to the function of common interests or purposes as the characteristic of a social group. Cattell, in his definition of groups, emphasizes still another characteristic--one of satisfaction of individual needs (10). As such, he defines a group as "an aggregate of organisms in which the existence of all is utilized for the satisfaction of some needs of each" (25, p. 26).

Waters offers a comprehensive summary of these efforts to define groups by stating that functional groups are:

. . . characterized by common goals and interstimulation and response among members, which serve as means for satisfying individual needs, and in which individuals enter into reciprocal relations with other group members, identify themselves with the group, and are changed through membership in the group (76, p. 9).

In summary of this discussion, the list of characterizations by Waters seems to include most of the concepts previously discussed. It includes the essential elements that distinguish a group from an aggregate. In short, these are: common purposes, satisfaction of individual needs, interaction, and interdependence of members. Although the fraternities studied for this research may vary in degree, in general they all met these conditions of a functional group.

Types of Groups

Just as groups have different individuality, so can they be classified in various ways. The types of groups discussed in this section are those that are characteristic of the type of organizations studied in this research. Each type will be

discussed in a two-type arrangement as follows: primary and secondary groups, sociogroups and psychogroups, organized and unorganized groups, and authoritarian and democratic groups.

Primary and Secondary Groups. Groups characterized by more or less continued intimate face-to-face association and cooperation are primary groups (13). Cooley states:

They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes at least, is a common life and purpose of the group (13, p. 23, 24).

A more up-to-date definition by Quinn describes them as

Small . . . intimate, personal, informal, and satisfying in themselves . . . relatively permanent, highly important in satisfying man's needs, and in developing a rich, well-balanced personality (59, p. 398).

The family is the universal primary group and in our culture is the most important and most powerful group to which most people belong (76).

Secondary groups are special-interest groups. These groups do not depend upon face-to-face contact although there may be direct interaction among the members (76). Examples of secondary groups are national, political, religious and professional groups.

The literature is not clear as to where fraternal organizations are classified. Johnson (43) and Bogardus (5) would consider them primary groups. In a dated article, Bogardus stated the fraternity constituted an "unusual type of primary

group" noting that "a human being is more influenced by the pressures of such groups than by any other factor in his environment" (5, p. 457). He explained: "members meet face-to-face and tell each other by word or look what each other thinks of the other; such judgements are hard to ignore." He concluded his article by rating fraternities as being an "excellent social training center," a factor which he sees as a key to primary groups (5, p. 458).

Waters, on the other hand, classifies fraternities as secondary groups (76). She does not, however, disregard the influence such groups may have on individual behavior and attitudinal development. She states:

Many behavior patterns displayed in a secondary group are rooted in the habits, attitudes, and roles developed in a primary group Although attitudes formed in primary groups, . . . , tend to persist in secondary groups, the individual may take on secondary-group attitudes that are different from and even opposed to primary-group attitudes When a secondary group satisfies important motives for group membership (prestige, companionship, activity, and the like), the individual takes on the secondary-group attitudes more readily than he might otherwise (76, p. 10-11).

To the researcher, social fraternities seem to meet the criteria of both classifications of groups. Members may find themselves in an intimate face-to-face association as in the primary group, but they also bring to the group many previous behaviors and attitudes which may become influenced by the mores of the secondary group.

Sociogroups and Psychegroups. Jennings (44) and Coffey (11) distinguish groups as sociogroups on the basis of their

central purpose. In sociogroups the purpose is largely impersonal, the members associating to work on some common objective or problem. For Jennings, the sociogroup might be illustrated by the committee which is seeking to deal with the problem of juvenile delinquency in a community. An example more closely related to this research would be the Interfraternity Council of a fraternity system, whose purpose is to provide overall governance for a fraternity system.

The psychegroup is more personal in nature than the sociogroup. In it the members come together of their own accord primarily for the purpose of intermember association (11). This type of group meets a key criterion of the meaning of social fraternity. Kershner in his discussion of the traditional purposes of social fraternities states:

Thus 'social' meant the development of man's potential for good interpersonal relations and mutual aid, 'Helpful friendship', not mere congeniality, but active, helpful friendship, is the crowning value of college fraternities. The natural 'law of association', the desire to love and help one another, the belief in the basic goodness of mankind, and in the human community, were expected of all prospective applicants for membership (49, p. 7).

This description certainly seems fitting of the concept of a psychegroup.

In the psychegroup there is no visualized goal, while in the sociogroup that is an essential characteristic. In the psychegroup there is an informal structure, with little in the way of rules or regulations. The members of a psychegroup are usually voluntary and the group has a high degree of homogeneity. In the sociogroup there are both voluntary

and involuntary members (involuntary in the sense that they may be there less by their own inclinations than as representatives of some other organization). Usually the sociogroup is more heterogeneous with respect to age, status, vocation, etc. The purpose of the psychegroup is to satisfy the emotional needs of the group members, whereas the purpose of the sociogroup is to reach the visualized goal of the group. These types of groups do not present a true dichotomy, but rather separate ends of a continuum of group process. They rarely exist in pure forms for most groups are a mixture of these two elements (11).

Organized and Unorganized Groups. Groups may also be classified as organized and unorganized. The degree of organization may vary from a very loose, informal organization to a highly complex, formal one.

In unorganized groups each member functions more or less independently of the others, whereas in highly organized groups each plays a specialized role and knows what the others are expected to do. The highly organized group lacks flexibility because group interaction is predetermined; but, if the interdependence implied in such organizations is accepted without resentment, solidarity and feelings of cohesion are important by-products. The sharing of functions increases opportunity for equality of participation and thereby increases feelings of belonging. There is, however, little place for individuality in the highly formal organizations in which all members are expected to behave in a

prescribed manner and strong pressure is exerted to force conformity if a member deviates from expectancy (76).

The preceding discussion of organized groups offers an adequate description of fraternities as organizations. Etzioni (19) classifies them as highly complex organizations. They do in fact operate under considerable structure and shared leadership, which, according to Stogdill (71), qualifies them as an organization. He states that if a group has a leader, it is an organization for at least some of the members are thereby differentiated from the others as to responsibility or role expectation in relation to some common purpose. As previously mentioned, there is considerable pressure for conformity in fraternities. Etzioni (19) supports this by stating that in such organizations discipline problems seldom arise and social power is exercised mainly through the withdrawal of approval. Disapproval is either potent enough to generate conformity or it abolishes the very motivation for belonging since the gregarious needs remain unsatisfied (19).

Authoritarian and Democratic Groups. Among the many criticisms of college social fraternities is that they are undemocratic. Johnson (46) states that such criticism may be the most damning "since it strikes so near the hearts of loyalties and sentiments about our country and at the very core of its values and traditions . . ." (46, p. 96).

Yet, rather curiously, he continues to defend them by contending that:

. . . it is on the basis of their positive contribution to democratic values, particularly in their potential and practical help in preparing men and women for responsible citizenship in our kind of society, that the most significant single argument can be marshalled on behalf of these organizations. There is a legitimate rationale for the continuing emphatic assertion . . . that the inculcation of democratic principles is a basic tenet of these organizations . . . (46, p. 96).

Van Riper also supports this view by declaring:

I believe that the type of organizational practice and understanding which is crucial in democratic civic training has been more thoroughly promoted by the fraternity system than by any other educational device now existing--or being generally promoted--on American campuses (73, p. 208).

The purpose of this review of literature is not, however, to argue the question of democratic fraternities from a political or civic basis, but to provide some insight into these groups from a group concepts viewpoint. Hopkins (38) provides some interesting information from which authoritarian and democratic groups can be contrasted.

The authoritarian group is classified by Hopkins (38) as a lower form group in terms of operating quality. By its very nature it indicates a dominant internal structure. He considers the authoritarian group an aggregate, which is technically not a group since a group is based upon we-ness or unity or morale. This form of aggregate is characterized by Hopkins in the following manner:

1. The source of origin lies outside the group.
2. The group has a status person designated by the outside source of origin to control it from within.

This person is known as a status leader and is to be distinguished from the real or emergent leader.

3. The group is managed around, through, or by the person who is the status leader.
4. The organization of the group depends upon the ability and purpose of the status control; therefore, there is no opportunity for group members to influence the structure or the unity of the organization.
5. The intelligence of the aggregate is the intelligence of the status control.
6. The communication within the group is direct from the status control to each member. Each person reacts to the control but does not interact with it or with other members of the group.
7. All major decisions are made for the members by external individuals through the status control.
8. The success of the group rests with the status control (38).

This type of group situation leaves little opportunity for members to interact with others, to develop a sense of group identity, to use the collective abilities of the membership, to determine a group direction, or to satisfy the individual and collective needs of the members. Although there is some external control and influence on college fraternities from national officers and university officials, for the most part these organizations are basically self-governing and many of the characteristics of the

authoritarian group previously discussed are not found in these organizations.

Perhaps the characteristics that better describe a single fraternity chapter would be those Hopkins (38) uses to describe the democratic or organic group. Some of the functional characteristics of such a group are:

1. The group originates when members come together to resolve common needs.
2. Leadership emerges from within and continues so long as it functions to achieve group purposes through cooperative action.
3. Unity and functional organization are developed internally around the group's own purposes in relation to its own need.
4. The planning and decision-making processes are made by the group itself.
5. The work is delegated by the group as a whole and is carried on by individuals and small groups. The whole group holds subgroups accountable for the adequate performance of their duties. Individual initiative and creativeness are encouraged at all times.
6. The group as a whole sets the esprit de corps or climate of opinion or psychological atmosphere of the organization.

7. The group as a whole helps each individual member clarify his own concept of need and grow through his experiences and contributions to the group.
8. Responsibility for the success of the total group enterprise is assumed by everyone.
9. The group performs cooperative and continuous evaluation of its own decisions and actions (39).

Certainly not all college fraternities function at such an organic level at all times; however, the cooperative and interactive nature of these organizations places them closer toward this end of the continuum than toward the authoritarian extreme previously discussed.

This portion of the review of literature has been devoted to providing insight into fraternities as a group. The presentation has been organized not around a direct review of fraternities themselves, but through a review of key group concepts to which these organizations are related. In summary, fraternities were found to fit the definition of a group and not the aggregate; they are classified by authors as having both primary and secondary group qualities. Other characteristic classifications of fraternity groups were psyche, organized, and democratic.

Using again the concept of shared leadership and the premise that the study of leadership becomes a sociological study of group behavior, attention will be directed in the next section toward the groups under an overview of the

efforts to characterize fraternities and the students who comprise their membership.

Characteristics of Greek-Letter Systems and Their Members

Without exception, every fraternity founded before 1914 declared that the real object of its existence was the social, intellectual, and moral improvement of its members (49). To quote one specific statement:

The mission of the fraternity . . . is three-fold: to cultivate the higher social nature, to secure a high grade of scholarship and to fortify aspirations and ambitions toward nobility of purpose and purity of heart (14, p. 7).

To these founders of fraternities, "social" meant the development of man's potential for good interpersonal relations and mutual assistance; it did not mean parties and socializing (49). To quote another source, "Helpful friendship, not mere congeniality, but active, helpful friendship, is the crowning value of college fraternities" (58, p. 7).

Since most fraternities were founded by students who were also in Phi Beta Kappa, the old Greek system took scholarship very seriously. Until the 1920's the weekly chapter meetings focused upon debates, papers, and discussions of political and cultural events. Though intellectual development meant a great deal to yesterday's fraternity men, they thought of it only as a supplement of what came from the classroom, not as a substitute for college education itself (49).

Important as social and educational aspects were, fraternity founders put character above everything else. The best standard of behavior rather than the lowest acceptable minimum was sought. As Goodwin put it, the founders:

. . . placed the emphasis on character and this must ever be done in any fraternity All else is but paraphernalia, the fashion of the hour, useful enough in its way, if not suffered to hide the essential principles of true fraternity life (35, p. 8).

Although the actual means of practicing have changed, these purposes of fraternity are still professed in today's fraternities. According to Feldman and Newcomb, other positive aspects of fraternities include the following:

. . . assistance to students in their transition from home to university (by providing a sense of security and belonging); protection against feelings of 'disintegration' stemming from the many factors in the college environment that make students feel insecure and unworthy; informal training in leadership together with the development of skills needed in certain occupations; provision of opportunities for cooperation, helpfulness, and responsibility; assistance in achieving heterosexuality; creation of an environment conducive to relaxation and the sharing of leisure-time activities; training in getting along with people, encouragement of feelings of mutual interest among members, and the fostering of lasting friendships; and encouragement of service to the college as well as to the fraternity, and the instillment of a better spirit within the college (21, p. 214, 215).

Even though this discussion of the purposes and positive contributions of fraternities seems noble and most constructive, these organizations have not gone without severe criticism even from their very beginning. No review of this subject would be complete without reference to some of the negative aspects of fraternities. According to Feldman and

Newcomb, some of the charges against college fraternities have been:

. . . encouragement of superficiality in interpersonal relationships and the blunting of social perceptions; fostering attitudes of social superiority, snobbishness, and prejudice toward a variety of 'out-groups'; demands for excessive group participation and conformity; discouragement of openness to novelty and change-inducing experiences; promotion of aggressive and regressive behavior (including the acting out of primitive aggressive and sexual impulses); encouragement of simplistic concepts of masculinity and femininity; and creation of an atmosphere favorable to heavy, even excessive, drinking (27, p. 215).

With respect to scholarship and intellectuality, Weir makes the following indictment:

Too often fraternities . . . have failed to come to terms with the central aim of a university; the development and dissemination of knowledge; the time-wasting propensities of fraternities demonstrate sheer genius in the art of organizing trivia; the rigid separation between the academic and the social, which fraternities . . . tend to insist upon, empties both phases of life of meaning; too often the fraternity system encourages the complacent acceptance of pious platitudes for gospel truth and pursues surface values . . . (65, p. 514).

From these statements it is clear that the purposes and contributions of fraternities have received mixed acceptance. The purpose of this review is not to argue the merits of such organizations, but to provide insight into their purposes so that the group as a whole and its leadership can better be understood. From such a review it can be concluded that, as far as purposes and actual benefits are concerned, the potential of such groups far exceed actuality.

Characteristics of Fraternity Students

During the past twenty years there have been considerable efforts made through research to characterize college students and to determine empirical differences between various groups on college campuses. According to Feldman and Newcomb, there are differences in these groups but not always to the degree that stereotypes of "folk wisdom" would imply (21). This section will present a review of some of this research to provide a better understanding of the types of students affiliated with fraternities.

Dollar (15) in an earlier study of Oklahoma State University students indicated that those students pledging or already fully affiliated with fraternities typically come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds (as indicated by parental income, education of parents, or father's occupation) as compared to residence hall or off-campus resident students.

Other studies have shown fraternity students to be more socially and activity inclined than other students (21). Measures of these aspects have been many: personality scales measuring sociability, extraversion, gregariousness; both self ratings and judgments by others of emphasis on developing social skills, being popular, having fun; amount of social life and dating; and interest in campus activities. Without regard to the actual method used or characteristics measured, fraternity affiliates typically score higher on the characteristics just listed (3).

According to various personality indices, fraternity members in comparison with other students typically have more self-confidence and are more self-assertive (6, 15, 42). In another personality area, studies by Bohrnstedt (6) and Stone (72) report that Greeks score higher on scales measuring psychological well-being and emotional stability. The study by Dollar (15) does not support such findings, however.

Students affiliated with Greek-letter organizations typically score lower than non-Greeks on scales measuring politico-economic, social, and religious liberalism and higher on scales measuring authoritarianism, ethnocentrism, and prejudice (21). Miller studied differences between male Greeks and Independents at a number of colleges and universities regarding their attitudes toward civil rights, labor, and political-economic issues. He found that Independents were more liberal than Greeks in each of these three areas (53). Miller found that not only were fraternity members typically less pro-civil rights than Independents, but that the differences between the two groups became greater as they were compared according to the classifications of freshmen through senior classes (53). Goldsen and others have shown a similar accentuation of initial differences in political and economic liberalism and conclude with, ". . . they (Fraternities) insulate their conservative members against change and socialize their liberal members away from liberalism" (29, p. 121).

Scott (66), Wallace (75) and Bohrnstedt (6) have made three-way comparisons among students pledging fraternities, those not pledging, and those who are active members of Greek groups. All three researchers report that not only did pledges differ from nonpledges on certain values and orientations, but that these differences were invariably in the direction of the attributes of the active members. In his study, Scott found that not only is there this kind of selection of students with life values into the Greek system as a whole, but also that there is further selection into each of the chapter houses according to its distinctive value pattern. On the average, each of the houses participating in his study tended to recruit from the total pledge population those pledges whose values were similar to its own (66).

A study by Schmidt indicates that pledges enter a fraternity with values similar to those of its members and that they retain these values during their career as members (64). She concludes her research by stating that the belief that Greek groups have a differential effect in changing attitudes and values of their members is not supported by this study.

With only a few exceptions, most studies show that students affiliated with fraternities are less likely to withdraw from college than are unaffiliated students (47). This suggests that: (1) fraternities help students keep up their grades so that it is not necessary to withdraw from college for academic reasons, and (2) these organizations provide

various kinds of emotional support and satisfaction as well as steadying social influences for their members so that they are less likely to withdraw from a given college because of personal or social dissatisfaction (21). Baur (3) cites possible aids available to members for support of the first suggestion, such as: appeals by members to intrinsic motivation for academic competence; general mutual help and support in the academic area; tutorial assistance; systems of reward and punishment to insure at least minimally satisfactory performance; access to course notes and past examinations; assistance in selecting easy courses; and even covert and overt encouragement of cheating. Collins and Whetstone (12) have another means of support for this assumption in their discovery that Greek-letter affiliates had higher scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) of the College Entrance Examination Board battery than Independents, thus suggesting that perhaps they were better prepared academically.

There is some support for the suggestion that members of fraternities are less likely to withdraw from college for reasons of personal and social dissatisfaction. As shown in studies by Gamble (24), Goldsen et al. (29), Rossi and Coleman (62), Greeks typically are more satisfied with their college and living conditions than are Independents. As a group, affiliated students are highly satisfied with and deeply attached to the general Greek system as well as to their particular chapter and are quick to defend both against criticism.

In this section of the review of literature, an attempt has been made to study briefly the purposes and contributions of fraternities, both pro and con. In addition, attention has been given to the characteristics of the students who are affiliated with these organizations. Most clearly shown in the research is the tendency for members of Greek-letter groups, in comparison with other student groups, to come from higher social and economic backgrounds, to be more gregarious personally and active in campus affairs, and to be more self-confident and self-assertive. In some studies Greeks have been found to be more socially, politically, and economically conservative, more authoritarian, and more prejudiced. In addition, fraternities are apt to attract or recruit members with values and attitudes similar to those of present affiliates.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to glean from the literature those writings and research studies which would provide insight into the leadership and group concepts directly and indirectly related to this research study. Such a review indicated an acute lack of previous research directly related to the internal representation of attitudes within organizations. Therefore, a considerable effort was made to pursue the development of leadership theories and the concept of shared leadership. Such an approach to leadership requires an understanding not only of the individual leader

and his characteristics, but of the total group as a sociological entity. As such, fraternities were compared with key group concepts and were found to fit the definition of a group and to be characteristic of the primary and secondary groups, the psychegroup, and the organized and democratic groups. Since the shared leadership concept is influenced by the purposes of the group and the make-up of its members, attention was also focused on the early and modern functions of Greek-letter organizations and on those research findings that best describe the members of modern fraternities.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the method used in collecting comparative data, the instrument used to assemble such data, and the statistical procedures used in responding to the research hypotheses stated in Chapter I.

This investigation of fraternity attitudes was completed with the cooperation and support of the Oklahoma State University Interfraternity Council (IFC). In the Fall Semester of 1971 this organization authorized funds for the development and evaluation of the Fraternity Attitude Scale (FAS). IFC granted additional funds in 1973 for the FAS to be used in assessing the attitudes of fraternity members as part of a self-evaluation of the OSU fraternity system. The data collected from this phase of the self-study were used in this investigation to provide insight into the hypotheses discussed in Chapter I.

Survey Procedure

Subjects: Population and Sample

Two groups were studied in this research: elected fraternity student leaders and resident fraternity members.

Samples of each of these groups were drawn from students who were listed on the membership roles as living in housing provided by 23 national social fraternities recognized by Oklahoma State University during the 1973-74 academic year.

The first group, fraternity student leaders, consisted of student members of fraternities who had been elected during the 1973-74 academic year to any of the following positions in a chapter: President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, House Manager, Pledge Trainer, Rush Chairman, Interfraternity Council Representative. Records kept by the Oklahoma State University Student Affairs Office indicated a total of 368 students who had been elected as fraternity student leaders; of that number, 256 were surveyed for this research. This number represents approximately 70% of the total number of elected fraternity student leaders who served the chapters during the 1973-74 academic year.

The second group, fraternity members, was composed of the members and pledges who resided in the 23 social fraternities and who had not served as elected officers within the year the study was conducted. Oklahoma State University Student Affairs records indicated that 586 resident fraternity students met the non-officer criteria in the 1973-74 term. For purposes of this research, 453 were surveyed for their attitudes toward fraternities. This sample represents approximately 77% of the total non-officer resident population.

Table I provides a description, by fraternity, of the number of students in each of the two groups surveyed for this study. In total, 709 of the 954 students listed on the membership rolls of the 23 fraternities responded to the survey effort. This sample represents 74% of the entire fraternity population residing in chapter housing.

The population described for this research was restricted by design to fraternity members and leaders who reside in housing operated by the 23 social fraternities recognized by Oklahoma State University. By tradition, these students were the most actively involved in the chapters and were the most concerned with the operation of fraternities as student organizations.

Survey Method

Fraternity chapter presidents were trained in the proper administration of the Fraternity Attitude Scale (FAS) and served as surveyors for this research. To avoid possible bias, each surveyor was previously informed that the FAS was being used as a part of a self-evaluation of the Oklahoma State University fraternity system. Because they were actual participants in the study, they were not informed until after the study had been completed that their responses would be compared with other members of their respective chapters.

Each surveyor was given explicit information on how the FAS was developed to provide valuable informational feedback for his fraternity. The proper method for administering the

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
FRATERNITY POPULATION AND
RESEARCH SAMPLE

Fraternity	Total Resident Members & Leaders	Total FAS Responses	Student Leader Responses	Student Member Responses	Per Cent of Population Surveyed
Acacia	27	23	10	13	.85
Alpha Gamma Rho	55	37	13	24	.67
Alpha Phi Alpha	11	7	5	2	.63
Beta Theta Pi	61	31	15	16	.50
Beta Sigma Psi	10	9	7	2	.80
Delta Chi	39	31	13	17	.79
Delta Tau Delta	45	38	12	25	.84
Delta Upsilon	38	35	13	22	.92
Farmhouse	50	45	18	27	.90
Kappa Sigma	35	33	10	23	.94
Lambda Chi Alpha	53	34	9	25	.64
Phi Delta Theta	60	39	15	25	.65
Phi Gamma Delta	47	30	12	19	.63
Phi Kappa Psi	25	25	9	16	1.00
Phi Kappa Tau	50	41	15	26	.82
Phi Kappa Theta	20	20	7	13	1.00
Pi Kappa Alpha	22	22	14	8	1.00
Pi Kappa Phi	20	19	9	10	.95
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	71	54	15	39	.76
Sigma Chi	70	36	9	27	.50
Sigma Nu	83	56	20	36	.67
Sigma Phi Epsilon	39	28	3	25	.71
Triangle	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>.69</u>
	954*	709	261**	448***	.74

*368 of the 954 total population were elected leaders

**261 represents 70.9% of the total population of resident leaders

***448 represents 76.5% of the total population of resident members

instrument was presented in detail. In order to develop a clear working knowledge of the instrument, each was requested to complete the FAS under the supervision of the researcher. Their responses were collected and used as part of the actual data. This provided another method of avoiding a bias in the survey method.

At the end of the training session, each chapter president (surveyor) was provided a packet of materials containing detailed instructions for administering the FAS, FAS booklets, Optical Mark Reader cards, and soft lead pencils in sufficient quantities to survey the members of his respective fraternity. Special meetings were held in each chapter house so that resident members would have a convenient opportunity to respond to the FAS. Each surveyor was given an additional week following the initial data collection effort to survey the resident members not in attendance at the special meeting. All materials were then returned to the researcher. A follow-up was conducted by the researcher and student surveyors on all chapters until at least 50% of the residents in each chapter had responded to the FAS.

In order to avoid suspicion and response bias, no effort was made during the initial survey to distinguish between member and leader respondents. The elected leaders were later distinguished from the other members by their appropriate response to item eight in the FAS. This item clearly identified those respondents who met the leader criterion. The follow-up conducted assured a representative response

from fraternity officers. As indicated in Table I, 70.9% of the total population of leaders responded to the survey.

Instrumentation--The Fraternity

Attitude Scale

As previously mentioned, the survey instrument used for the research project was the Fraternity Attitude Scale (FAS). It was developed in 1971 by Dr. Patrick M. Murphy, W. John Lamberton, and Thomas M. Keys for the purpose of measuring existing attitudes toward fraternities. The FAS can provide additional information on six areas of fraternity operations: (a) the Interfraternity Council, (b) chapter cohesion, (c) chapter programs, (d) chapter physical facilities, (e) chapter government, and (f) rules and regulations.

The instrument is a summated rating attitude scale of the type designed by Likert (51). The Likert technique, developed by Rensis Likert in 1932, is based upon direct responses of agreement or disagreement with attitude statements. The respondents are asked to indicate the intensity of their agreement or disagreement with respect to each item by reference to five categories ranging from strong disagreement through neutral to strong agreement. These categories are then assigned the respective weights of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and each respondent is given a score consisting of the sum of the item weights. For favorable statements, the "strongly agree" response is given the highest weight, "5," on a declining rated continuum to the "strongly disagree" response

which is rated "1." The scoring system is reversed for unfavorable statements (54). The score values were assigned by the researcher.

From a review of the literature relating to fraternities, the previously mentioned six basic areas of attitudinal interest emerged as main variables concerning a fraternity member's experience in a chapter house. On the basis of these six areas, statements relating either favorably or unfavorably to fraternities were gathered from the literature, adapted from similar attitude scales, or written by the authors of the FAS.

Edwards' criteria for editing statements to be used in the construction of attitude scales were adhered to as much as possible. They include:

- (1) Avoiding statements that refer to the past rather than the present.
- (2) Avoiding statements which are factual or capable of being interpreted as factual.
- (3) Avoiding statements that can be interpreted in more than one way.
- (4) Avoiding statements that are irrelevant to the psychological object under consideration.
- (5) Avoiding statements that are likely to be endorsed by almost everyone or by almost no one.
- (6) Selecting statements that are believed to cover the entire range of the affective scale of interest.
- (7) Keeping the language of the statements simple, clear, and direct.
- (8) Writing the statements so they are short, rarely exceeding 20 words.
- (9) Including only one, but complete, thought in each statement.
- (10) Avoiding the use of universals like all, always, and never.
- (11) Whenever possible, statements should be in the form of simple sentences rather than in the form of compound or complex sentences.

- (12) Avoiding the use of double negatives.
- (13) Avoiding the use of words that may not be understood by those who are to be given the completed scale (18, p. 13-14).

The pool of statements selected by the authors was judged by a panel according to the Edwards' criteria. The judges organized the statements into the six categories previously listed and indicated whether each related positively or negatively toward fraternities. Those items that were not clearly distinguishable or that did not meet the criteria were eliminated from further consideration.

The remaining 137 items were then organized and administered to a pilot group composed of students living in fraternity houses at Oklahoma State University in the fall of 1971. A stratified random sampling technique was used to gather data for the pilot project. The OSU fraternities were divided into three categories: small, 49 members or less; medium, 50-75 members; and large, 76 members or more. A random sample was taken from each of the groupings, with two chapters from the large category, two from the medium category, and two from the small category. In each chapter, a random sample of seven members and three pledges was selected to participate in the pilot study.

Because of incomplete data, ten of the 70 questionnaires were discarded. An item analysis using a computer program from Veldman's Fortran Programming for Behavioral Sciences (73) was performed on the responses from the remaining sample of 60 students. From the computer analysis, the values for each subscale were obtained.

Table II indicates that these values of alpha, a coefficient of internal consistency reflecting the degree of reliability among the items of a scale (18), are low. Therefore, the authors, using the Pearson Point Biserial Correlation of an item to its subscale and the percentage choice distribution (both computed in the Veldman Item Analysis program), selected items that would provide the best alpha value for a subscale with approximately ten questions per subscale. Table III represents the internal consistency of the remaining FAS items.

TABLE II
RESULTS OF ITEM ANALYSIS ON
INITIAL FAS PILOT

Subscale	Number of Items	Alpha
Interfraternity Council	21	.1733
Chapter Cohesion	29	.3854
Chapter Programs	24	.2071
Physical Facilities	18	.1445
Chapter Government	21	.0630
Rules and Regulations	24	.0725
Overall	137	.3291

TABLE III
RESULTS OF ITEM ANALYSIS ON
FINAL FAS STATEMENTS

Subscale	Number of Items	Alpha
Interfraternity Council	7	.7974
Chapter Cohesion	10	.8505
Chapter Programs	10	.6364
Physical Facilities	9	.6938
Chapter Government	7	.5780
Rules and Regulations	10	.7949
Overall	53	.8324

According to statistical tables in Edwards' Statistical Analysis, the critical limit for an alpha value with a population of 60 is .325 at the .01 level of significance (7). Therefore, each alpha value in Table III was accepted as significant. The relationships existing among the items included in each subscale are not likely due to chance.

In addition to the statistical analysis, content validity is assumed on the basis of: (1) the stringent requirements placed on the selection of the statements; (b) the judgment of the pool items by the panel; (c) the incorporation of statements based on the pilot study conducted at Oklahoma State University; and (d) the selection of items based on conditions and concerns related in the literature about fraternities.

The FAS was printed in booklet form with complete directions for its administration contained within. Items one through eight, which provide data for a variety of analyses of the attitudinal data collected, were concerned with basic demographic information related to the respondent. For purposes of this research, however, only item eight was considered for demographic analysis. Responses to items nine through 61 were made using the Likert response system: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly disagree. Responses to the statements were marked on Optical Mark Reader (OMR) cards which eliminated the necessity for coding and key punching the data. The complete FAS can be found in Appendix A.

Statistical Procedure

Statistical analysis of the data was performed by the investigator utilizing the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (2) provided by the University Computer Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. The statistical treatment selected for the examination of the data was the one way analysis of variance, resulting in the F ratio. This statistic is particularly well suited for research when comparison among groups is of prime consideration. As a procedure, one way analysis of variance compares the variance of values of group means around the mean of the total score. This method is described in Popham (56) and Bruning and Kintz (8). The statistical decision to use this procedure was based on the data satisfying the following required assumptions:

- (1) That the sampling is such that the observations are mutually independent and have equal opportunity to occur.
- (2) That the variances from within the various sets are approximately equal.
- (3) That the observations within the sets are from normally distributed populations.
- (4) That the variables involved are measurable in internal scale, so that it is possible to use the operations of arithmetic on the scores.
- (5) That the means of these normal and homoscedastic populations are additive, that is linear combinations of effects due to columns and/or rows (32, p. 234 and 68, p. 19).

To allow the most detailed analysis of the data, the SAS computer package was used to convert each response to the FAS items to a positive direction and assign an appropriate numerical value to each of the 53 attitude statements. The

entire data set was then sorted into leader and member subsets. For each subset a mean was calculated, by fraternity, for each of the following FAS subscales: (a) Interfraternity Council, (b) Chapter Cohesion, (c) Chapter Programs, (d) Physical Facilities, (e) Chapter Government, (f) Rules and Regulations, and (g) Total. From each of these mean scores, further calculations were completed to develop an F ratio between the leaders and members of each chapter for each FAS subscale. Similar analyses of the data were made to compare the total response of the two groups (leaders and members). From the F ratios computed, each hypothesis discussed in Chapter I was tested to determine if a relationship between leaders and members existed at the .05 level of significance.

Although computer programs previously written and developed by SAS were used for computational analysis, actual procedural steps for using the F ratio form of analysis of variance are available in most textbooks on statistics (8, 32, 68).

It should be noted that although Optical Mark Reader cards were used for the initial data collection, each response had to be eventually key punched to meet the machinery requirements of the SAS program.

Summary

This chapter has considered the design and methodology used in the completion of this research study. Mention was made of the selection and grouping of the subjects, the

survey method, the form and construction of the Fraternity Attitude Scale, the reliability and validity of the instrument, and the statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter IV will present, analyze, and discuss the data obtained in this investigation in relationship to the hypotheses developed in Chapter I.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION
OF RESULTS

Introduction

This study was conducted to determine whether or not the expressed attitudes of elected fraternity leaders were representative of those attitudes expressed by fraternity members at Oklahoma State University. The Fraternity Attitude Scale (FAS) was administered to assess attitudes of these leaders and members toward six fundamental aspects of fraternity operations. The analyses of data and presentation of results for this investigation will be reported in this chapter as they relate to the following hypotheses:

There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of selected fraternity members and the attitudes of their elected fraternity leaders as expressed toward:

- (a) Interfraternity Council
- (b) Chapter Cohesion
- (c) Chapter Programs
- (d) Chapter Physical Facilities
- (e) Chapter Government
- (f) Rules and Regulations
- (g) Total Score on Fraternity Attitude Scale

As stated in Chapter III, the data were analyzed by employing the one way analysis of variance developed in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computer package. The data were further interpreted by using group means as a measure of the degree of positive or negative attitudes towards the concepts listed in the hypotheses.

The format for this chapter will be to present the results in tabular form and to discuss their analyses as they relate to all fraternity leaders and all members surveyed. Following this presentation the data will be presented and analyzed by individual fraternity to indicate the relationship that existed between the attitudes of the leaders and members of single chapters.

Results of the Analysis of Data for All Fraternity Leaders and Members

Table IV presents the results of the one way analysis of variance applied to two groups: (1) all fraternity leaders surveyed and (2) all fraternity members surveyed. The table is a composite of the analysis of variance obtained from the statistical procedure applied to each of the six subscales and the total score of the FAS.

The significance of the data is reported in F ratios. Rather than reporting actual critical F values, the table indicates the probability of obtaining a value greater than F (Prob. > F) for each of the FAS subscales. If such a

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FOR ALL FRATERNITY OFFICERS
AND MEMBERS

FAS Subscale	Number of Leaders**	Number of Members***	Mean Score of Officers	Mean Score of Members	F Value	Prob. > F
Interfraternity Council	261	448	19.429	19.0045	2.3705	0.1200
Chapter Cohesion	261	448	24.4368	24.6540	0.3310	0.5724
Chapter Programs	261	448	24.0805	24.7790	4.0496	0.0419*
Physical Facilities	261	448	23.7203	23.5625	0.4392	0.5150
Chapter Government	261	448	18.0421	18.3147	0.9711	0.6743
Rules and Regulations	261	448	26.0575	26.0625	0.0002	0.9856
Total	261	448	135.7663	136.3772	0.2631	0.6146

*Significant at .05 level of confidence

**261 represents 70.9% of the total population of resident leaders

***448 represents 76.5% of the total population of resident members

probability was less than .05, then a significant difference existed for the two groups.

A significant difference did exist between fraternity leaders and members in their attitudes expressed toward Chapter Programs; thus, hypothesis (c) was rejected. Therefore, the conclusion was that, based on information collected from the participants surveyed, the attitudes expressed by fraternity leaders toward chapter programs did not represent those expressed by fraternity members.

All other subscale F values, as well as the Total FAS F values, indicated that significant differences did not exist between the attitudes of the responding elected fraternity leaders and selected members. Therefore, hypotheses (a), (b), (d), (e), (f), and (g) were not rejected. It was concluded that the attitudes of these leaders collectively represented those expressed by the total membership surveyed toward the subscales Interfraternity Council, Chapter Cohesion, Physical Facilities, Chapter Government, Rules and Regulations, and the Total Scores on the Fraternity Attitude Scale.

Table V presents the mean score values for the leaders relative to their positive or negative valence toward the key fraternity concepts studied. These mean scores are shown in reference to negative, neutral, and positive mean values attainable for each subscale.

As indicated by this table, a clear pattern of the leaders expressing more positive attitudes than members did

TABLE V
PRESENTATION OF MEAN SCORE VALUES FOR
ALL FRATERNITY OFFICERS AND MEMBERS

FAS Subscale	Strongly Negative Attitude	Negative Attitude	Undecided	Positive Attitude	Strongly Positive Attitude
Interfraternity Council	7.00	14.00	21.00	28.00	35.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	19.429			
	\bar{x} Members	19.005			
Chapter Cohesion	10.00	20.00	30.00	40.00	50.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	24.437			
	\bar{x} Members	24.654			
Chapter Programs	10.00	20.00	30.00	40.00	50.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	24.081			
	\bar{x} Members	24.779			
Physical Facilities	9.00	18.00	27.00	36.00	45.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	23.720			
	\bar{x} Members	23.563			
Chapter Government	7.00	14.00	21.00	28.00	35.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	18.042			
	\bar{x} Members	18.315			
Rules and Regulations	9.00	18.00	27.00	36.00	45.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	26.056			
	\bar{x} Members	26.063			
Total FAS	52.00	104.00	156.00	208.00	260.00
	\bar{x} Leaders	135.766			
	\bar{x} Members	136.377			

not exist. Nor was there a pattern for a reverse trend. However, the total FAS mean value for each group did show that the members surveyed were more positive than the officers ($\bar{x}_L = 135.7666$; $\bar{x}_M = 136.377$). However, this difference was not significant.

Table V does, however, depict a consistent pattern concerning the valence of attitudes expressed by the two groups studied. Both fraternity leader and member mean values indicated a less than positive valence toward each concept studied, as well as toward the total FAS. Each mean value fell between the scores reported for a "negative" attitude and the "undecided" or "neutral" category.

Results of the Analysis of Data for Leaders and Members of Each Fraternity Surveyed

This section will present and discuss the results of the one way analyses of variance between individual chapter leaders and their respective members for each of the concepts under study. As in the previous discussion, the significance of the data is reported in F ratios and in the probability of obtaining values greater than the obtained F ratios (Prob. > F). If such a probability was less than .05, then a significant difference existed between the leaders and members of the fraternity in question.

Table VI reflects the analysis of variance results for all of the 23 fraternities on the Interfraternity Council

TABLE VI
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH FRATERNITY
ON THE INTERFRATERNITY
COUNCIL SUBSCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Members	F Value	Prob. > F	*
Acacia	10	13	23.500(4.453)	20.538(2.696)	3.9176	0.0582	
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	17.385(2.434)	17.292(2.510)	0.0118	0.9104	
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	16.800(2.168)	19.000(0.0)	1.8389	0.2324	
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	20.067(3.3327)	19.313(3.894)	0.3340	0.5744	
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	18.429(4.541)	24.000(0.0)	2.7321	0.1403	
Delta Chi	13	17	22.154(2.230)	21.353(3.639)	0.4872	0.5023	
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	19.250(3.571)	18.720(3.889)	0.1584	0.6952	
Delta Upsilon	13	22	19.462(3.126)	18.864(3.482)	0.2593	0.6198	
Farmhouse	18	27	17.722(3.495)	18.074(3.088)	0.1262	0.7244	
Kappa Sigma	10	23	15.500(2.953)	17.434(2.921)	3.0389	0.0877	
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	19.444(3.844)	18.760(2.919)	0.3073	0.5896	
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	18.400(3.680)	18.400(3.279)	0.0000	1.0000	
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	21.250(4.025)	21.158(4.388)	0.0035	0.9523	
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	17.111(4.076)	20.063(3.108)	4.1537	0.0506	
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	19.933(3.3327)	18.280(2.208)	3.9311	0.0516	
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	17.286(4.192)	19.462(3.357)	1.6111	0.2186	
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	22.357(2.169)	20.625(4.438)	1.5344	0.2280	
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	21.222(6.379)	17.600(2.319)	2.8253	0.1078	
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	20.133(3.378)	18.872(3.404)	1.4940	0.2250	
Sigma Chi	9	27	19.889(4.014)	19.308(3.284)	0.1776	0.6792	
Sigma Nu	20	36	18.300(3.389)	17.743(2.715)	0.4479	0.5132	
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	20.000(1.732)	20.520(1.558)	0.2931	0.5990	
Triangle	8	8	19.875(2.696)	21.500(5.099)	0.6350	0.5558	

*Significant at .05 level of confidence

Subscale. In no chapter did the attitudes of the leaders differ significantly, at the .05 confidence level, from those of the members. Phi Kappa Psi and Phi Kappa Tau fraternities recorded the greatest degree of variance with F values of 4.1537 and 3.9311, with a probability greater than F of .0506 and .0516, respectively. Phi Gamma Delta recorded the least degree of variance between their leaders and members with an F value of 0.0035 (Prob. > F = 0.9523). Hypothesis (a) was not rejected in the null form for all chapters, indicating that attitudes expressed toward the Interfraternity Council by each group of chapter officers surveyed were representative of their constituents.

In analyzing the results, it was observed that the leaders of Acacia and the members of Beta Sigma Psi held the most favorable attitudes toward the Interfraternity Council with mean scores of 23.500 (Std. Dev. = 4.453) and 24.00 (Std. Dev. = 0.0), respectively. These values represented attitudes that were classified as only moderately positive toward this aspect of fraternity life, according to Table V. The least favorable attitudes of the two groups were held by the leaders of Kappa Sigma (\bar{x} = 15.500; Std. Dev. = 2.953) and the members of Alpha Gamma Rho (\bar{x} = 17.292; Std. Dev. = 2.510).

Table VII reports the F values for each of the fraternities surveyed on the Chapter Cohesion Subscale. The analysis of variance results indicated that the leaders and members of the following three chapters differed significantly

TABLE VII
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH
FRATERNITY ON THE CHAPTER
COHESION SUBSCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & Std. Dev.) of Members	F Value	Prob. > F	*
Acacia	10	13	25.100(6.262)	25.462(4.960)	0.0239	0.8730	
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	24.077(4.192)	22.625(2.990)	1.4936	0.2279	
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	26.600(4.827)	25.500(3.536)	0.0818	0.7810	
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	22.800(4.229)	23.813(5.879)	0.2994	0.5948	
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	24.000(5.627)	24.000(2.828)	0.0000	1.0000	
Delta Chi	13	17	23.000(4.453)	24.824(4.433)	1.2415	0.2742	
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	25.167(3.973)	23.880(5.395)	0.5385	0.5255	
Delta Upsilon	13	22	24.692(3.376)	28.045(5.314)	4.1549	0.0470	*
Farmhouse	18	27	25.722(5.131)	23.370(5.300)	2.1807	0.1434	
Kappa Sigma	10	23	22.000(6.733)	25.522(4.294)	3.2931	0.0759	
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	24.222(4.295)	22.800(5.083)	0.5581	0.5331	
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	25.067(5.625)	24.120(4.531)	0.3413	0.5693	
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	24.500(4.145)	26.684(5.588)	1.3548	0.2528	
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	25.556(3.468)	21.750(3.924)	5.8633	0.0225	*
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	24.800(4.057)	25.440(4.583)	0.2731	0.6103	
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	20.143(3.436)	21.154(4.845)	0.2374	0.6367	
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	27.786(5.977)	26.625(4.470)	0.2270	0.6435	
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	26.889(4.986)	26.700(4.244)	0.0080	0.9274	
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	23.467(3.701)	24.103(4.723)	0.2192	0.6466	
Sigma Chi	9	27	28.444(5.101)	26.923(4.399)	0.8703	0.6399	
Sigma Nu	20	36	21.150(3.376)	25.571(5.049)	12.058	0.0014	*
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	24.000(1.000)	24.800(3.926)	0.1198	0.7315	
Triangle	8	8	25.125(2.295)	23.500(4.567)	0.8086	0.6128	

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

in their attitudes toward this aspect of chapter operations: Delta Upsilon ($F = 4.1549$; Prob. $> F = 0.0470$), Phi Kappa Psi ($F = 5.8633$; Prob. $> F = 0.0225$), and Sigma Nu ($F = 12.058$; Prob. $> F = 0.0014$). Therefore, for these chapters, hypothesis (b) was rejected; and it was concluded that the attitudes of their officers toward chapter cohesion were not representative of the attitudes expressed by their members surveyed. In all other fraternities, a significant difference did not exist; therefore, hypothesis (b) was not rejected as it applied to the remaining 20 chapters. Beta Sigma Psi indicated no variance between the responses of the members and leaders.

The leaders of Sigma Chi and the members of Delta Upsilon recorded the most favorable attitudes toward the concepts related to chapter cohesion with mean scores of 28.444 (Std. Dev. = 5.101) and 28.045 (Std. Dev. = 5.314), respectively. The mean values of these chapters were classified, however, as representing attitudes that were between "undecided" and "negative" on the valence scale represented in Table V. The least favorable attitudes of the two groups were expressed by the leaders of Phi Kappa Theta ($\bar{x} = 20.143$; Std. Dev. = 3.436) and the members of the same chapter ($\bar{x} = 21.154$; Std. Dev. = 4.845).

The analysis of variance of the leader and member attitudes toward chapter programs is reported by fraternities in Table VIII. The results indicated that in only one fraternity, Kappa Sigma, did the leaders differ significantly from

TABLE VIII
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH
FRATERNITY ON THE CHAPTER
PROGRAMS SUBSCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Members	F Value	Prob. > F *
Acacia	10	13	25.000(5.793)	28.231(4.226)	2.3400	0.1330
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	22.000(4.778)	23.625(4.372)	1.0921	0.3037
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	24.200(3.114)	25.000(1.414)	0.1120	0.7479
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	23.400(3.795)	25.625(5.886)	1.5409	0.2224
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	24.429(2.820)	21.000(1.414)	2.5747	0.1506
Delta Chi	13	17	23.462(4.371)	24.824(3.909)	0.8077	0.6201
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	23.833(4.914)	24.480(4.779)	0.1458	0.7063
Delta Upsilon	13	22	24.000(3.559)	26.318(4.765)	2.3046	0.1349
Farmhouse	18	27	25.056(4.844)	22.667(4.332)	2.9881	0.0874
Kappa Sigma	10	23	20.400(4.248)	24.870(4.930)	6.1925	0.0175 *
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	23.667(3.202)	23.400(2.500)	0.0649	0.7960
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	24.133(4.033)	25.080(3.402)	0.6315	0.5625
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	24.500(4.123)	26.368(5.079)	1.1430	0.2940
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	23.556(3.575)	23.750(5.273)	0.0097	0.9195
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	25.133(3.998)	24.760(4.294)	0.0456	0.8264
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	24.286(3.817)	22.308(3.425)	1.4042	0.2503
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	24.000(5.174)	26.000(4.811)	0.7986	0.6142
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	27.333(9.605)	27.100(4.841)	0.0046	0.9451
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	23.800(4.144)	24.256(4.417)	0.1195	0.7308
Sigma Chi	9	27	25.333(4.950)	26.462(4.245)	0.4678	0.5055
Sigma Nu	20	36	24.500(6.152)	25.143(3.362)	0.3729	0.5510
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	26.333(2.082)	23.920(2.361)	2.8463	0.1000
Triangle	8	8	23.000(1.512)	23.875(4.643)	0.2569	0.6250

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

the members in their attitudes toward this topic ($F = 6.1925$; Prob. $> F = 0.0175$). The null form of hypothesis (c) was not rejected for all other chapters surveyed. Pi Kappa Phi fraternity recorded the least degree of variance between members and leaders with an F value of 0.0046 (Prob. $> F = 0.9451$). When compared to all other fraternity leaders, the leaders of this chapter indicated the most positive attitude toward chapter programs ($\bar{x} = 27.333$; Std. Dev. = 9.605). The Acacia members, however, recorded the highest mean value of all groups surveyed ($\bar{x} = 28.231$; Std. Dev. = 4.226). When compared with the valence index in Table V, these mean scores were classified between "negative" and "undecided" attitudes. The least favorable attitudes toward chapter programs were recorded by the leaders of Kappa Sigma ($\bar{x} = 20.400$; Std. Dev. = 4.248) and the members of Beta Sigma Psi ($\bar{x} = 21.000$; Std. Dev. = 1.414).

Table IX follows the same format as previous tables in this section and presents the results of chapter variance for the Physical Facilities Subscale. The analyses reflected a significant difference between leaders and members in three fraternities: Alpha Phi Alpha ($F = 10.6556$; Prob. $> F = 0.0224$), Phi Delta Theta ($F = 4.1232$; Prob. $> F = 0.0467$), and Sigma Nu ($F = 4.8827$; Prob. $> F = 0.0295$). For these chapters, hypothesis (d) was rejected. For all other fraternities, the null form of the hypothesis was not rejected since a significant difference did not exist between leader and member attitudes. Acacia, Beta Sigma Psi, and Pi Kappa

TABLE IX
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH
FRATERNITY ON THE PHYSICAL
FACILITIES SUBSCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Members	F Value	Prob. * > F
Acacia	10	13	24.000(3.496)	23.769(4.640)	0.0172	0.8923
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	22.385(2.725)	23.125(3.416)	0.4523	0.5125
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	25.800(1.304)	22.500(0.707)	10.6556	0.0224 *
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	23.133(2.532)	23.313(3.701)	0.0244	0.8714
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	23.571(2.699)	23.500(2.121)	0.0012	0.9726
Delta Chi	13	17	23.077(3.278)	24.118(3.371)	0.7191	0.5918
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	24.333(3.085)	23.680(2.641)	0.4452	0.5158
Delta Upsilon	13	22	22.846(2.882)	23.182(2.538)	0.1293	0.7218
Farmhouse	18	27	24.500(2.813)	23.333(2.270)	2.354	0.1285
Kappa Sigma	10	23	22.800(3.120)	23.478(2.952)	0.3558	0.5619
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	22.778(1.563)	22.960(2.354)	0.0461	0.8257
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	25.933(3.693)	24.080(2.100)	4.1232	0.0467 *
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	24.833(3.186)	24.158(3.468)	0.2965	0.5965
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	23.111(2.892)	21.815(2.604)	1.2004	0.2845
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	21.200(3.385)	22.400(2.415)	2.0428	0.1575
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	24.429(1.718)	23.615(3.203)	0.3847	0.5493
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	25.214(2.607)	25.125(3.137)	0.0052	0.9417
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	25.778(6.200)	24.300(4.739)	0.3451	0.5708
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	24.133(3.137)	23.462(2.563)	0.6562	0.5730
Sigma Chi	9	27	27.000(2.872)	25.692(2.923)	1.3791	0.2470
Sigma Nu	20	36	21.900(2.222)	23.7143(3.199)	4.8827	0.0295 *
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	23.333(0.577)	23.160(1.650)	0.0317	0.8542
Triangle	8	8	21.750(2.765)	23.000(2.673)	0.8454	0.6235

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence with one (1) degree of freedom

Alpha indicated a strong agreement between the attitudes of the two groups studied, as expressed toward the living arrangements of their chapters. The leaders and members of Sigma Chi fraternity reflected the most positive attitudes toward the physical facilities of their chapter. However, in terms of a valence, the mean scores of this chapter represent only a "neutral" to "slightly negative" attitude. The leaders of Phi Kappa Tau and the members of Phi Kappa Psi indicated the least favorable attitude on this scale with respective mean values of 21.200 (Std. Dev. = 3.385) and 21.875 (Std. Dev. = 2.604).

Table X reflects the analysis of variance results for each of the 23 participating fraternities on the Chapter Government Subscale. In no chapter did the attitudes of the leaders differ significantly from those of the members; therefore, the null form of hypothesis (c) was not rejected for each chapter. Accordingly, the attitudes expressed by the chapter officers of each group were concluded to be representative of their respective members. Pi Kappa Alpha and Pi Kappa Phi fraternities indicated the least degree of variance between leaders and members with F values of 0.0019 (Prob. > F = 0.9646) and 0.0006 (Prob. > F = 0.9796), respectively. Further analysis of the results determined that the leaders and members of the latter chapter had the most favorable attitudes toward chapter government ($\bar{x}_L = 22.333$; Std. Dev. = 3.674; $\bar{x}_M = 22.300$; Std. Dev. = 2.453). These mean values represented an attitude valence that was only slightly

TABLE X
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH
FRATERNITY ON THE CHAPTER
GOVERNMENT SUBSCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Members	F Value	Prob. * > F
Acacia	10	13	18.300(4.057)	20.000(4.397)	0.9025	0.6448
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	18.615(2.364)	18.333(2.884)	0.0909	0.7624
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	20.400(2.191)	20.000(4.243)	0.0307	0.8613
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	17.200(2.597)	17.625(3.074)	0.1717	0.6844
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	18.286(2.812)	22.000(5.657)	1.8913	0.2101
Delta Chi	13	17	18.154(3.105)	19.235(3.401)	0.8021	0.6184
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	16.333(2.964)	17.160(3.986)	0.4057	0.5352
Delta Upsilon	13	22	17.923(3.968)	20.727(4.344)	3.6229	0.0626
Farmhouse	18	27	18.111(3.833)	17.778(3.665)	0.0948	0.7576
Kappa Sigma	10	23	19.200(3.824)	18.870(2.849)	0.0761	0.7808
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	16.222(2.279)	16.920(3.201)	0.3588	0.5602
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	18.733(4.743)	18.960(3.385)	0.0310	0.8553
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	16.750(3.671)	18.947(4.660)	1.9100	0.1745
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	18.222(2.224)	17.313(2.442)	0.8500	0.6309
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	18.000(3.000)	17.840(2.925)	0.0065	0.9338
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	18.714(1.890)	17.308(2.594)	1.5856	0.2222
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	18.429(3.837)	18.500(3.423)	0.0019	0.9646
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	22.333(3.674)	22.300(2.452)	0.0006	0.9796
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	16.867(3.292)	17.179(3.748)	0.0804	0.7747
Sigma Chi	9	27	21.000(3.640)	18.885(4.702)	1.6060	0.2113
Sigma Nu	20	36	16.250(3.823)	18.000(3.199)	3.2858	0.0713
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	18.667(0.577)	18.200(1.190)	0.5375	0.5208
Triangle	8	8	17.250(4.576)	17.000(3.817)	0.0183	0.8895

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence with one (1) degree of freedom

more positive than the neutral mean value of 21 in Table V. The leaders and members of Lambda Chi Alpha were the least favorable toward the concept in question.

An analysis of the results of the Rules and Regulations Subscale presented in Table XI shows that a significant difference existed between leaders and members of five chapters. Those fraternities were: Beta Theta Pi ($F = 5.0325$; Prob. $> F = 0.0308$), Phi Gamma Delta ($F = 4.2032$; Prob. $> F = 0.0469$), Pi Kappa Phi ($F = 6.1606$; Prob. $> F = 0.0226$), Sigma Nu ($F = 6.1988$; Prob. $> F = 0.0151$), and Sigma Phi Epsilon ($F = 4.4222$; Prob. $> F = 0.0429$). For these chapters the null form of hypothesis (f) was rejected due to this significant difference between two variables. For all other fraternities, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The conclusion was that the attitudes the leaders of these chapters expressed toward rules and regulations of fraternities were representative of their respective members surveyed.

The leaders of Sigma Chi and the members of Delta Upsilon expressed the most positive attitudes toward fraternity rules and regulations. Their group means of 30.111 (Std. Dev. = 5.442) and 29.227 (Std. Dev. = 4.830), respectively, represented attitudes that tended to be only "slightly positive." The leaders of Delta Chi and the members of Acacia were the least positive toward this section of the survey ($\bar{x}_L = 22.846$, Std. Dev. = 3.716; $\bar{x}_M = 23.846$, Std. Dev. = 2.794).

TABLE XI
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH
FRATERNITY ON THE RULES AND
REGULATIONS SUBSCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Members	F Value	Prob. > F *
Acacia	10	13	25.900(4.886)	23.846(2.794)	1.6225	0.2146
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	25.461(4.136)	24.625(3.437)	0.4331	0.5216
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	25.800(2.775)	29.500(4.950)	1.768	0.2404
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	27.067(3.127)	24.250(3.804)	5.0325	0.0308 *
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	26.857(5.146)	25.500(4.950)	0.1094	0.7477
Delta Chi	13	17	22.846(3.716)	25.471(4.389)	2.9977	0.0909
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	28.917(3.872)	26.200(4.406)	3.3200	0.0736
Delta Upsilon	13	22	26.231(4.512)	29.227(4.830)	3.2980	0.0751
Farmhouse	18	27	27.111(4.431)	25.370(4.343)	1.7076	0.1955
Kappa Sigma	10	23	26.000(5.055)	27.217(4.631)	0.4562	0.5112
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	25.778(3.833)	25.440(4.253)	0.0438	0.8299
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	27.800(5.185)	26.960(4.098)	0.3225	0.5801
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	24.167(4.802)	28.000(5.228)	4.2032	0.0469 *
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	26.667(3.354)	23.438(4.618)	3.3699	0.0761
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	26.933(4.605)	25.920(3.639)	0.4762	0.5011
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	24.714(3.904)	23.154(4.259)	0.6451	0.5623
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	27.571(4.363)	24.625(2.669)	2.9732	0.0968
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	23.778(2.587)	28.600(5.275)	6.1606	0.0226 *
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	26.067(3.674)	26.744(4.381)	0.2811	0.6046
Sigma Chi	9	27	30.111(5.442)	29.192(4.391)	0.2955	0.5966
Sigma Nu	20	36	23.800(4.188)	27.057(4.633)	6.1988	0.0151
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	24.000(3.606)	21.360(1.868)	4.4222	0.0429 *
Triangle	8	8	23.625(1.768)	28.000(5.831)	4.1246	0.0592 *

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence with one (1) degree of freedom

The final summary table of this chapter, Table XII, represents the results of one way analyses of variance administered to the entire FAS response for each participating fraternity. In reviewing the total scale, only one chapter--Sigma Nu--recorded a significant difference between the responses of the officers and the members. For this chapter, the null form of hypothesis (g) was rejected. For all other fraternities surveyed, the conclusion was that the overall attitudes expressed by the individual chapter leaders toward those concepts in the FAS were representative of the attitudes of the members.

Further analysis of Table XII indicates that the leaders of Sigma Chi, with a mean value of 151.778 (Std. Dev. = 13.627), recorded the most positive attitudes toward all concepts considered in the total FAS. Although this value was clearly higher than those of other chapters surveyed, it tended toward a "negative" valence. The members of Sigma Chi, Pi Kappa Phi and Delta Upsilon were the most positive of the membership group surveyed; however, their mean values tended to be even more negative than the valence recorded for the Sigma Chi leaders. The leaders of Kappa Sigma and Sigma Nu and the members of Phi Kappa Theta were the least favorable toward the concepts studied by the FAS survey.

Summary

The data that has been presented in this chapter resulted from information obtained through the administration

TABLE XII
RESULTS OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF EACH
FRATERNITY ON THE TOTAL SCALE

Fraternity	No. of Leaders	No. of Members	Mean & (Std. Dev.) of Leaders	Mean & (Std. Dev.) Of Members	F Value	Prob. > F *
Acacia	10	13	141.800(19.871)	141.846(16.673)	0.00004	0.9910
Alpha Gamma Rho	13	24	129.923(13.338)	129.625(9.202)	0.0064	0.9344
Alpha Phi Alpha	5	2	139.600(8.706)	141.500(4.536)	0.0817	0.7811
Beta Theta Pi	15	16	133.667(12.367)	133.938(18.854)	0.002	0.9619
Beta Sigma Psi	7	2	135.571(13.526)	140.000(14.142)	0.1646	0.6974
Delta Chi	13	17	132.692(14.091)	139.824(11.534)	2.3252	0.1350
Delta Tau Delta	12	25	137.833(13.099)	134.120(17.718)	0.4153	0.5303
Delta Upsilon	13	22	135.154(13.069)	146.364(18.112)	3.7908	0.0571
Farmhouse	18	27	138.222(15.098)	130.593(14.170)	2.9721	0.0882
Kappa Sigma	10	23	125.900(19.593)	137.391(14.409)	3.5564	0.0655
Lambda Chi Alpha	9	25	132.111(7.557)	130.280(12.157)	0.1773	0.6796
Phi Delta Theta	15	25	140.067(17.231)	137.600(11.644)	0.2925	0.5982
Phi Gamma Delta	12	19	136.000(9.789)	145.316(18.333)	2.6056	0.1137
Phi Kappa Psi	9	16	134.222(11.256)	128.188(16.294)	0.9657	0.6625
Phi Kappa Tau	15	26	136.000(15.469)	134.640(13.391)	0.0406	0.8355
Phi Kappa Theta	7	13	129.571(13.126)	127.000(14.012)	0.1598	0.6958
Pi Kappa Alpha	14	8	145.357(16.472)	141.500(14.102)	0.3079	0.5912
Pi Kappa Phi	9	10	147.333(28.231)	146.600(12.817)	0.0055	0.9399
Sigma Alpha Epsilon	15	39	134.467(14.706)	134.615(16.047)	0.0010	0.9738
Sigma Chi	9	27	151.778(13.627)	146.462(12.362)	1.2793	0.2651
Sigma Nu	20	36	125.900(14.205)	137.229(14.564)	7.8421	0.0071 *
Sigma Phi Epsilon	3	25	136.333(5.686)	131.960(8.706)	0.7071	0.5872
Triangle	8	8	130.625(5.731)	136.875(18.067)	0.8699	0.6304

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence with one (1) degree of freedom

of the FAS. Hypotheses as stated in Chapter I were tested following one way analyses of variance for each scale of the FAS. The data were interpreted and the hypotheses were tested for the two large groups--fraternity leaders and members. Analysis of variance between these two groups resulted in a significant attitudinal difference in only the Chapter Programs Subscale.

The data were analyzed a second time on a per chapter basis to determine in which fraternities, if any, significant differences existed between attitudes of leaders and members. In the Total FAS Scale, as well as subscales Chapter Cohesion, Chapter Programs, Physical Facilities, and Rules and Regulations, isolated significant differences were found to exist in the attitudes of the groups studied. These isolated cases were the exception rather than the rule, however, since in most fraternities the attitudinal differences between leaders and members were not significant.

The data were also analyzed in an attempt to attach a positive or negative valence to the attitudes expressed by the responding groups. The results suggested that most of the groups responded from an attitudinal set that was less than positive toward the fraternity concepts studied.

The following chapter will present a general summary of the investigation, findings and conclusions, and the implications of this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This study was conducted to determine the reliability of a practical concept and practice of student personnel administrators who work with student organizations. That practice is to make assumptions about student attitudes, opinions, and programs based upon attitudinal information received from student leaders. Specifically, it was conducted to establish attitude similarities and differences between selected elected leaders and members of the Oklahoma State University Fraternity System toward six key college fraternity concepts. The findings were to help determine if the student personnel administrator could rely on the attitudes of fraternity leaders to be representative of those of his members and thus supply some credibility to the concept and practice previously mentioned.

The remainder of this chapter will summarize the entire investigation, offer conclusions based upon the findings of the study, and outline the implications and recommendations resulting from this study.

Summary of Research

The study sample was composed of 709 Oklahoma State University students residing in fraternity housing. This sample represented 74% of the total population and was composed of 256 elected student leaders and 453 resident members of 23 national fraternities recognized by OSU. The Fraternity Attitude Scale was used to survey the sample for this investigation. The data were collected during the Spring Semester, 1974.

The Fraternity Attitude Scale (FAS) employed a Likert-type format. The respondents were asked to state their degree of agreement or disagreement with 53 specific statements related to six fraternity concepts. Content validity for the FAS was assumed on the basis of the solicited expert judgment of a panel of judges and a pilot study of the instrument. Using the Veldman Item Analysis, the coefficients of internal consistency for the six scales were IFC = .7974; Chapter Cohesion = .8505; Chapter Programs = .6364; Physical Facilities = .6938; Chapter Government = .5780; Rules and Regulations = .7949. The overall reliability for the total scale was .8324.

For purposes of comparison of expressed attitudes, the investigator divided the student sample into two groups--fraternity elected leaders and fraternity resident members. Since group comparisons were of prime consideration, the analysis of variance statistic was used in analyzing the data. Two such treatments were made on the data:

(a) comparing the total number of student leaders surveyed to the total fraternity members sampled, and (b) comparing the leaders and members of the individual chapters. Whenever statistical tests were employed, it was assumed that differences were not statistically significant unless they were at or above the .05 level of confidence.

Further description of the data was made possible through the use of group mean scores as a relative measure of favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward the concept under consideration. For the six FAS subscales, the following summed scores were held to be neutral: IFC = 21, Cohesion = 30, Programs = 30, Facilities = 27, Government = 21, Rules = 27, and Total = 156. Scores below these pivotal positions tended toward a negative attitude while those above were considered positive.

Findings and Conclusions

Summary of Hypotheses Testing

The first portion of this section will be concerned with the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses presented in Chapter I. These hypotheses and findings were as follows:

There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of selected fraternity members and the attitudes of their elected fraternity leaders as expressed toward:

(a) the Interfraternity Council.

FINDING: The hypothesis could not be rejected either for the comparison of all leaders and

members or for the leaders and members of individual chapters.

(b) Chapter Cohesion.

FINDING: The hypothesis was not rejected when all leaders as a group were compared to all members. However, when tested in individual chapters, the hypothesis was rejected for three fraternities that recorded significant differences between their leaders and members.

(c) Chapter Programs.

FINDING: The hypothesis was rejected on the basis of a significant difference between the expressed attitudes of the total group of leaders and the entire group of members. In the comparison of individual chapters, the hypothesis was rejected for one chapter due to the existence of a significant difference in the attitudes of members and leaders.

(d) Physical Facilities.

FINDING: The hypothesis could not be rejected when all leaders and members were compared as a group. For three individual chapters, the hypothesis was rejected since a significant difference between the leaders and members surveyed existed at the .05 level of confidence.

(e) Chapter Government.

FINDING: The hypothesis was not rejected for the total group comparison and for the individual

chapter comparisons. No significant differences appeared in any of the groups analyzed.

(f) Rules and Regulations.

FINDING: The hypothesis was not rejected when leaders and members were compared as two large groups. However, when analyzed as individual chapters, five fraternities exhibited significant attitudinal differences between their leaders and members; therefore the hypothesis was rejected for these fraternities.

A final hypothesis was concerned with the total response to the FAS. It was as follows:

There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of selected fraternity members and the attitudes of their elected fraternity leaders as expressed toward the total scores on the Fraternity Attitude Scale.

FINDING: This hypothesis was not rejected for the two large groups when compared as total leaders and members. The analysis by individual fraternities indicated the presence of a significant difference between attitudes of leaders and members in one chapter. The hypothesis was rejected as it applied to this particular fraternity.

Conclusion

On the basis of the results of this study, the following conclusions seem valid:

- (1) In answering the question "Do the collective attitudes of fraternity leaders at Oklahoma State University represent the collective membership attitudes?," the conclusion is a conservative affirmative response with the exception of their attitudes toward chapter programs. However, caution must be expressed in attempting to generalize this response for individual fraternities since significant differences did exist in a few chapters toward such concepts as cohesion, programs, facilities, and rules and regulations.
- (2) Of the six important fraternity-related concepts studied, the collective student leader and member attitudes were most consistent with each other toward rules and regulations governing fraternities. Again, however, it is difficult to assume that the conclusion can therefore be generalized for each chapter since five such groups differed significantly.
- (3) Both leaders and members, collectively, were consistently less than positive toward all six fraternity concepts studied. In considering each concept, there was not a clear pattern of members being significantly more positive than their leaders. The one exception was the chapter programs concept, as previously noted. In considering the overall

attitudinal response, however, the members were slightly more positive than the leaders.

- (4) Although neither leaders nor members recorded positive attitudes toward any of the concepts studied, both groups were least negative toward the external influences of rules and regulations governing the chapters and the governing body of the Interfraternity Council. They were most negative toward what are characteristically two of the most internally valuable factors of the operation of a fraternity--cohesion and programs.

In support of research conducted previously and reported in Chapter II and perhaps in indirect support of the democratic and peer-pressure influences on these groups, the overall FAS response warrants a reserved conclusion that the collective attitudes of the leaders of fraternities at Oklahoma State University were representative of those attitudes expressed by their members. It is important to note that isolated significant differences did exist between leaders and members of some individual fraternities. Knowing that such differences existed and being able to locate them provides important information necessary to avoid applying the general findings of the research to those exceptional groups.

Contrary to the expectations of the researcher was the lack of positive support which fraternity members and leaders gave to the concepts judged as important to chapter operation. More support was given to external factors such as

rules and regulations and governing groups than to measures of internal concepts of interpersonal relationships and the educational and social programs being conducted in the fraternities.

Implications

The results of this study have implications for student personnel practitioners, specifically those responsible for decisions and programs affecting fraternities and other student organizations. A number of significant differences were found to exist between the two groups studied. An even larger number of similarities were found to exist. Knowing where these similarities and differences exist and toward which concepts they exist is extremely valuable to one who relies on student information and opinion in making decisions. Programs and policies can be planned with confidence if the staff member is assured that attitudes of student leaders toward key aspects of the organization are representative of their members. Just as important is knowing toward which concepts the opinions are not representative and in which groups the membership attitudes are not consistent with those of their leaders. The results of this study provided this type of information for those administrators responsible for the fraternity system at Oklahoma State University.

Another important implication which this study has for OSU student personnel workers is an overall assessment of

attitudes which fraternity students expressed toward their chapters. Although the primary purpose was not to assess specific attitudes, the results did indicate a less than positive opinion toward each of the concepts studied. Such information has implications for additional study and evaluation of the current fraternity environment to determine the cause for such a generalized attitude.

In addition to the implications this study has for personnel workers, the research results have value for student and alumni members of the fraternities studied. Knowledge of the similarities and differences of the attitudes within the chapters and the valence of these attitudes may provide the catalyst necessary for self-study by the group members.

There are also implications for further research as a result of this study. The results have left several questions unanswered. For example:

- (1) The study provided insight into what relationships existed between leaders and members; but, can it be determined why they were present?
- (2) The research does not cover the question of whether or not the leaders can predict or represent the opinions of their constituents should their own attitudes differ significantly from the membership?
- (3) As mentioned previously, the study did not present an in depth analysis of specific attitudes. Perhaps such information would be valuable for future programming and planning.

(4) Attitudinal information of other subgroups within these organizations--members and pledges, resident and nonresident members, freshmen and seniors--was not provided. The impact of these relationships may provide additional understanding of the sociology of these organizations.

In further research efforts of this nature, it is recommended by the researcher that fewer subjects be used so that the testing atmosphere can be controlled more adequately to insure a more accurate survey response. It is further recommended that an analysis be made to determine if the attitudes within individual chapters differ significantly from those of the general fraternity student body.

One final recommendation for further research is to provide further checks on the validity and reliability of the FAS in investigating the fraternity concepts properly. While the FAS has been shown to be adequate in previous field tests, further experience is needed with the instrument before concluding without reservation that it is valid and reliable.

Concluding Summary

Hopefully, this study has added insight into the attitudes which fraternity leaders and members hold toward their own organizations at Oklahoma State University. More important, it has provided a test for a practical operational procedure of student personnel workers--that of relying on student leader opinion to represent the attitudes of the

larger group. To the administrator, the results may be considered positive reinforcement for continuing such a convenient practice. Caution should be employed, however, in attempting to generalize for all student organizations the conclusion that leader attitudes are representative of those of their members. Nor can a generalization be made for all fraternities studied in this research since differences within the individual groups did exist. In addition, the researcher hopes this study has indicated a need for further research and self-study of the Oklahoma State University fraternity system to determine causes for the less than positive attitudes that prevail among fraternity members.

This study was conducted in an attempt to aid student personnel administrators in their work with fraternities at a specific institution. Any attempt to generalize the findings to other colleges or universities is beyond the scope of the research effort. However, the results do seem to support other research findings and certainly the design and methods have application for other fraternity systems.

It is hoped that the results will be useful to those interested in the area of fraternity advisement. Finally, it is hoped that this study will be an aid to those who conduct future studies in this area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Atkins, A. L. "Own Attitude & Discriminability in Relation to Anchoring Effects in Judgments of Social Stimuli." (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.) Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Sept., 1967), p. 1125-A.
- (2) Barr, James Anthony, and James Howard Goodnight. Statistical Analysis System. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina: Department of Statistics, August, 1972.
- (3) Baur, E. J. "Student Peer Groups and Academic Development." College Student Survey, Vol. 1 (First Quarter, 1967), pp. 22-31.
- (4) Blaesser, Willard W. Digest of a lecture given during 1956 Intermountain Laboratory in Group Development.
- (5) Bogardus, Emory S. "Fraternity as a Primary Group." Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 24 (May, 1940), pp. 456-60.
- (6) Bohrnstedt, G. W. "Processes of Seeking Membership In and Recruitment by Voluntary Social Organizations." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966).
- (7) Brown, J. A. C. The Social Psychology of Industry. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1954.
- (8) Bruning, James L., and B. L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1968.
- (9) Cattell, R. B. "A Mathematical Model for Leadership Role and Other Personality-Role Relations." Emerging Problems in Social Psychology. Edited by: N. Sherif and M. O. Wilson. Norman, Oklahoma: Oklahoma University, 1957.
- (10) Cattell, R. B. "New Concepts for Measuring Leadership in Terms of Group Syntality." Human Relations, IV (1951), p. 161-184.

- (11) Coffey, Hubert Stanley. "Socio and Psyche Group Process: Integrative Concepts." Journal of Social Issues, VIII (Spring, 1952), p. 65-74.
- (12) Collins, W. P., and R. D. Whetstone. "A Comparison of Sorority and Independent Women Based on Retention, Academic Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, Vol. 28 (1965), pp. 177-178.
- (13) Cooley, Charles Horton. Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- (14) Delta Tau Delta Rainbow, July, 1891. From Frederick D. Kershner, Jr. The Meaning of Fraternity: A View for the Seventies. Denver: Operation Greek, 1969, p. 7.
- (15) Dollar, R. J. "A Study of Certain Psychological Differences among Dormitory, Fraternity, and Off Campus Freshmen men at Oklahoma State University." (Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1963).
- (16) Donovan, George L., and Leroy C. Olsen. "Personality Characteristics of Freshman Women Applying for Positions in Activities." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 6, No. 4 (June, 1965), pp. 236-239.
- (17) Edwards, Alen Louis. Statistical Analysis. New York: Rinehart, 1946.
- (18) Edwards, Alen Louis. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts, 1957.
- (19) Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- (20) Feister, William J. "Comparison of Values Between College Fraternity Leaders and Members." Detroit Convention Abstracts. American Personnel and Guidance Association: Washington, D. C., Vol. 1 (April, 1968), pp. 284-285.
- (21) Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore M. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. Vol. I. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc., 1970.
- (22) Flacherty, Sister M. Rita. "Personality Traits of College Leaders." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 60, No. 8 (April, 1967), pp. 377-378.

- (23) Forbes, Ted, et al. "Attitudes of Undergraduate Men Toward Fraternities: A Report of a Survey At The University of Michigan." University of Michigan, October, 1962.
- (24) Gamble, F. P. "Effects of Campus Living Groups on Academic Values and Performance." (Master's Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1961).
- (25) Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership." Perspectives on the Group Process, Chapter I by C. Gratton Kemp. Second Edition. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- (26) Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership." Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II. Edited by G. Lindsey. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- (27) Gillin, J. L., and J. P. Gillin. Introduction to Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946.
- (28) Glanz, Edward C., and Robert W. Hayes. Groups in Guidance, 2nd Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1967.
- (29) Goldsen, R. K., et al. What College Students Think. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1960.
- (30) Gorman, Alfred H. The Leader in a Group--A Conceptual Framework. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.
- (31) Grant, Harold W., and Frederick Eigenbrod, Jr. "Behavioral Changes Influenced by Structured Peer Group Activities." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 11 (July, 1970), pp. 291-295.
- (32) Guilford, J. P., and Benjamin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- (33) Harp, John. Student Life At Cornell University. Ithaca, New York: Cornell Student Life Studies, Cornell University, June, 1963.
- (34) Harville, Dennis L. "Early Identification of Potential Leaders." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10, No. 5 (September, 1969), pp. 333-335.
- (35) History of Phi Delta Theta. From Frederick D. Kershner, Jr. The Meaning of Fraternity: A View for the Seventies. Denver: Operation Greek, 1969.

- (36) Hites, Robert W., and Donald T. Campbell. "A Test of the Ability of Fraternity Leaders to Estimate Group Opinion." The Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 32 (1950), pp. 95-100.
- (37) Hodges, H. M., Jr. "Campus Leaders and Nonleaders." Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 37, No. 4 (March, 1953), pp. 251-255.
- (38) Hopkins, Thomas L. "The Authoritarian Group." Perspectives on the Group Process, Chapter VII by C. Gratton Kemp. Second Edition. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- (39) Hopkins, Thomas L. "The Democratic Group." Perspectives on the Group Process, Chapter VIII by C. Gratton Kemp. Second Edition. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- (40) "How Much Should Students Have To Say?" College Management, Vol. 4, No. 5 (May, 1969), pp. 30-39.
- (41) Hulet, Richard E. "Leadership Behavior In Independent and Fraternity Houses." Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1958, 92 pp (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1958). Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28, No. 9 (March, 1968), p. 1015.
- (42) Jackson, R., and R. C. Winkler. "A Comparison of Pledges and Independents." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43 (December, 1964), pp. 379-382.
- (43) Jensen, David G. "Characteristics of Student Leaders." Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1968, 298 pp (Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.) Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28, No. 9 (March, 1968), p. 3768-A.
- (44) Jennings, Helen H. Leadership and Isolation. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 1950.
- (45) Jennings, Helen H. "Princes, Heroes, and Supermen." An Anatomy of Leadership. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- (46) Johnson, Clyde Sanfred. Fraternities In Our Colleges. New York: National Interfraternity Foundation, 1972.
- (47) Kamens, D. H. "Institutional Stratification and Role Commitment: College Effects on Dropout." (Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1967).

- (48) Kemp, C. Gratton. Perspectives on the Group Process--
A Foundation for Counseling With Groups. Boston:
Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1964.
- (49) Kershner, Frederick D. The Meaning of Fraternity: A
View for the Seventies. Denver: Operation Greek,
1969.
- (50) Krech, D., and R. S. Crutchfield. Theory and Problems
of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book
Company, Inc., 1948.
- (51) Lewin, Kurt. "Field Theory and Experiment in Social
Psychology: Concepts and Methods." American
Journal of Sociology, Vol. XLIV (1939), pp. 868-
896.
- (52) Likert, Rensis A. "A Technique for the Measurement of
Attitudes." Archives of Psychology, Vol. 22, No.
140 (1932), pp. 5-55.
- (53) Miller, Norman. "Social Class and Value Differences
among American College Students." (Doctoral Dis-
sertation, Columbia University, 1958.)
- (54) Murphy, Patrick M. "A National Study of Residence Hall
Student Leader Attitudes Toward College and Univer-
sity Residence Hall Facilities, Programs, Staff,
Rules, and Student Government." (Unpublished Doc-
toral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University),
July 1, 1971.
- (55) Pekarek, Robert C. "Differential Perceptions Held By
Selected Publics of the Fraternity System at
Florida State University." (Doctoral Dissertation,
Purdue University, 1969.) Abstracted in Disserta-
tion Abstracts International, Vol. 30, No. 9
(March, 1970), p. 3735-A.
- (56) Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics: Use and
Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, Pub-
lishers, 1967.
- (57) Prior, J. J. "Peer Group Influences on the College
Climate for Learning." Journal of College Student
Personnel, Vol. 5 (May, 1964), pp. 163-167.
- (58) Psi Upsilon Occasions, 1932. From Frederick D.
Kershner, Jr. The Meaning of Fraternity: A View
for the Seventies. Denver: Operation Greek, 1969.
- (59) Quinn, James A. Sociology: A Systematic Analysis.
Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1963.

- (60) Region 12 Association of College Unions--International Leadership Laboratory. (Workbook). Austin, Texas: Univ. of Texas, Texas Union, 1965.
- (61) Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954.
- (62) Rossi, P. H., and J. S. Coleman (eds.). Determinants and Consequences of College Choice. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1964.
- (63) Sanford, F. H. "Research on Military Leadership, Current Trends." Psychology in the World Emergency. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg, 1953.
- (64) Schmidt, Marlin R. "Relationship Between Sorority Membership and Changes in Selected Personality Variables and Attitudes." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 12, No. 3 (May, 1971), pp. 208-213.
- (65) Scott, J. F. "The American College Sorority: Its Role in Class and Ethnic Endogamy." American Sociological Review, Vol. 30, pp. 514-527.
- (66) Scott, William A. Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- (67) Shaffer, Robert H. "An Emergency Role of Student Personnel--Contributing to Organizational Effectiveness." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 14 (September, 1973), pp. 386-391.
- (68) Sherman, J. R. "Attitudes Towards the Men's Social Fraternities at the University of Colorado." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 8, No. 2 (March, 1967), pp. 75-79.
- (69) Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics For the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- (70) Stogdill, Ralph M., and A. E. Coons. Leader Behavior. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.
- (71) Stogdill, Ralph M. "Leadership, Membership, and Organization." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 47 (1950), p. 3.

- (72) Stone, C. L. "Sorority Status and Personality Adjustment." American Sociological Review, Vol. 16 (June, 1951), pp. 538-541.
- (73) Van Riper, Paul P. "Democracy and the Fraternity System." Banta's Greek Exchange, Vol. 38, No. 3 (July, 1950), p. 208.
- (74) Veldman, Donald J. Fortran Programming for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.
- (75) Wallace, W. L. Peer Groups and Student Achievement: The College Campus and Its Students. Report No. 91. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1963.
- (76) Waters, Jane. Group Guidance Principles and Practices. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- (77) Williamson, E. G., and Donald Hoyt. "Measured Personality Characteristics of Student Leaders." Educational and Psychological Measurements, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spring, 1952), pp. 65-78.
- (78) Winborn, Bob B. "Some Personal Characteristics of Campus Leaders: A Comparison of Social-Political Action Leaders with Four Other Categories of Student Leaders." (Unpublished report, Indiana University, December, 1966). Abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Winter, 1968), pp. 252-253.

APPENDIX A

FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE

FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE

PATRICK M. MURPHY

THOMAS M. KEYS

Wm. JOHN LAMBERTON

Division of Student Affairs, Oklahoma State University

© Patrick M. Murphy, Thomas M. Keys, Wm. John Lamberton, 1972

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire has been developed to explore group attitudes toward fraternity programs, cohesion, government, facilities, rules, and IFC. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers; each person has his own opinions.

Please answer each statement without regard to the others, but do not debate long over any statement.

Be assured that all of your answers will be coded and used for group comparisons only. Under no circumstances will individual responses be reported.

To insure useable information you will need a **STATEMENT BOOKLET, COMPUTER ANSWER CARD, and NO. 2 PENCIL. MARKING INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. Mark only on the computer answer card. Please do not write on the statement booklet; they will be used again.
2. Record your student identification number, testing date (month and year), and the code number of your fraternity in the appropriate spaces on BOTH SIDES OF YOUR ANSWER CARD as directed by the person administering the test.

[illegible]

3. Be sure that the statement number in the booklet corresponds to the number on the answer card.
4. Record your responses for each statement according to:
 - A. **STRONGLY AGREE**, you agree completely.
 - B. **AGREE**, you tend to agree but with some reservations.
 - C. **UNDECIDED**, you are not sure or you do not have an opinion.
 - D. **DISAGREE**, you tend to disagree but with reservations.
 - E. **STRONGLY DISAGREE**, you disagree completely.

FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE

Items 1-8 are concerned with basic information related to you. This information is necessary so that the data gathered in this survey may be fully interpreted. Any items omitted will limit the usefulness of the results.

1. Your age is:

A. 18 or younger	D. 21
B. 19	E. 22 or older
C. 20	

2. You are:

A. member	
B. pledge	

3. Your classification is:

A. freshman	D. senior
B. sophomore	E. graduate student
C. junior	

4. For the purpose of analyzing program deficiencies, group classification is requested:

A. Black/Negro/Afro-American	D. Spanish American/ Mexican American
B. White/Caucasian	E. Other International
C. American Indian	

5. You have lived in a fraternity:

A. one year or less	D. four years or less
B. two years or less	E. more than four years
C. three years or less	

6. Given a free choice, now, would you live in a fraternity house while attending college?

A. yes	B. no
--------	-------

7. Do you hold a job while attending college?

A. yes	B. no
--------	-------

8. Do you now hold or have you held during the current academic year any of the following elected leadership positions in the fraternity system: President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, House Manager, Pledge Trainer, Rush Chairman, Interfraternity Council Representative?

A. yes	B. no
--------	-------

A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Undecided D. Disagree E. Strongly disagree

9. IFC officers should be paid for their services.
10. Too many members consider chapter houses to be only a place to obtain food and shelter.
11. Students in fraternities are seldom included in planning chapter programs.
12. As a student's workshop, the fraternity room, should look like a place to study, dominated by large desk tops and sizable built-in bookshelves.
13. Bluff, pull, and personality usually get students elected to chapter leadership positions.
14. Fraternity rules and regulations force upon the student an unreal environment i. e., students are not being prepared to enter life-roles because of many prohibitions).
15. The IFC handles disciplinary problems as fairly and as equitably as possible.
16. Fraternities today can best be described by words such as "member apathy" and "lack of involvement."
17. An extensive program in fraternities will cause students to desire to remain in the houses.
18. Fraternities are brightly colored barracks with opulent lounges, which can hardly be classified as educational facilities.
19. Too many university administrators are overly concerned with regulating student values and morals.
20. The concept of pledge class unity must not be emphasized to the point whereby chapter unity is hindered.
21. Fraternity houses are not the place for tutorials or honors programs to be held.
22. Most students see their fraternity house room as only a bedroom.
23. Salaries for those serving in fraternity leadership positions should not be paid as these are tools for learning.
24. IFC members are, for the most part, intellectually sharp.
25. Fraternity men are governed by rules that they had no part in formulating, and have no part in enforcing.
26. Usually, the longer one is in a fraternity, the more apathetic he becomes toward it.

A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Undecided D. Disagree E. Strongly disagree

27. A student living in a fraternity will do better scholastically than will one in a residence hall.
28. Fraternity houses on this campus feel themselves threatened by apartment living and luxurious new dorms.
29. Fraternity men are sufficiently involved in the handling of violations of university regulations.
30. Fraternities have a high level of "house loyalty".
31. Fraternity programs should not attempt religious indoctrination.
32. In addition to students' rooms, specifically designated study areas should be available in the fraternities.
33. Chapter officer elections do not usually generate enthusiasm or support.
34. IFC officers are sincere in their desire to do a good job for the people they represent.
35. Chapter membership has boiled down to the question of how many students can be bedded down rather than a concern for quality membership.
36. Students living off-campus are more likely to feel isolated from the academic program and student activities than will students in fraternities.
37. Students feel that in a fraternity house solitude and privacy are virtually non-existent.
38. Even though University administrators go through the motions of working with fraternity government, they permit little real involvement in planning the environment in which the students work and live.
39. Fraternity rules and regulations are geared to the least common denominator of student behavior and aim to destroy individuality.
40. Fraternity members find personal privacy virtually impossible.
41. Chapter government is regarded by some as a nuisance.
42. The IFC should serve as catalysts to bring about interaction of faculty, community citizens, and students, for discussion groups.
43. Students feel that they are overly constrained by rules and regulations in fraternities.
44. Fraternity students are poorly housed, poorly fed, and live in a physical and social environment which is hardly conducive to moral, cultural, or esthetic growth.

A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Undecided D. Disagree E. Strongly disagree

45. The scholarship chairman should consult with faculty regarding causes of residents' academic failure.
46. The ability to be creative in one's fraternity house room is stifled by rules and regulations.
47. The IFC's main goal is to promote the growth and health of all the chapter houses.
48. Fraternity houses are drab, architecturally uninteresting, and less than functional.
49. Fraternities should have entries in the homecoming float and/or house decoration competition.
50. The ever constant irritation of rules listing do's and don'ts has led students to demand and seek housing outside university supervised housing.
51. Too often new initiates become disenchanted after attending a few meetings.
52. The IFC represents a composite of the "strongest" fraternity men available in the system.
53. Fraternity regulations are the primary cause for members to seek living accommodations off campus.
54. Fraternities require too much time from an individual member.
55. Fraternities are conducive to serious intellectual discussions among members.
56. Rules and regulations governing fraternity living causes residents to feel too supervised.
57. Members should avoid involving their fraternity in their personal lives.
58. Fraternity atmosphere is conducive to academic endeavors.
59. Desired changes in fraternity house rules and regulations are lagging behind the students' desires for more liberal freedoms.
60. Fraternity moral codes are no longer meaningful.
61. Students living in residence halls are more likely to feel isolated from the academic program and student activities than will students in fraternities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their gratitude to the following for their support and assistance in the development of this attitude scale:

Interfraternity Council of Oklahoma State University

Student Affairs Research Committee,
Oklahoma State University

Donald E. Allen, Ph. D.
Professor of Sociology,
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX B

FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE ITEM NUMBERS
RELATED TO THE SIX SUBSCALES AND
THEIR WEIGHTED DIRECTIONS

TABLE XIII
THE FAS: ITEM NUMBERS RELATED TO THE
SIX SUBSCALE CONCEPTS AND
WEIGHTED DIRECTIONS

Subscale	Item Numbers	Weighted Direction
Interfraternity Council	15, 24, 34, 42, 47, 52 9	Positive Negative
Chapter Cohesion	10, 20, 30 16, 26, 35, 51, 54, 57, 60	Positive Negative
Chapter Programs	17, 27, 36, 49, 50, 58, 61 11, 31, 21	Positive Negative
Physical Facilities	12, 22, 32, 40 18, 28, 37, 44, 48	Positive Negative
Chapter Government	38, 45 13, 23, 25, 33, 41	Positive Negative
Rules and Regulations	14 19, 29, 39, 43, 46, 50, 53, 56	Positive Negative

APPENDIX C

TEXT OF FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE

ITEMS BY SUBSCALE

TABLE XIV
TEXT OF INTERFRATERNITY COUNCIL
SUBSCALE ITEMS

Item Number	Statement
9	IFC officers should be paid for their services.
15	The IFC handles disciplinary problems as fairly and as equitably as possible.
24	IFC members are, for the most part, intellectually sharp.
34	IFC officers are sincere in their desire to do a good job for the people they represent.
42	The IFC should serve as catalysts to bring about interaction of faculty, community citizens, and students, for discussion groups.
47	The IFC's main goal is to promote the growth and health of all the chapter houses.
52	The IFC represents a composite of the "strongest" fraternity men available in the system.

TABLE XV
TEXT OF CHAPTER COHESION SUBSCALE ITEMS

Item Number	Statement
10	Too many members consider chapter houses to be only a place to obtain food and shelter.
16	Fraternities today can best be described by words such as "member apathy" and "lack of involvement."
20	The concept of pledge class unity must not be emphasized to the point whereby chapter unity is hindered.
26	Usually, the longer one is in a fraternity, the more apathetic he becomes toward it.
30	Fraternities have a high level of "house loyalty."
35	Chapter membership has boiled down to the question of how many students can be bedded down rather than a concern for quality membership.
51	Too often new initiates become disenchanted after attending a few meetings.
54	Fraternities require too much time from an individual member.
57	Members should avoid involving their fraternity in their personal lives.
60	Fraternity moral codes are no longer meaningful.

TABLE XVI
TEXT OF CHAPTER PROGRAMS SUBSCALE ITEMS

Item Number	Statement
11	Students in fraternities are seldom included in planning chapter programs.
17	An extensive program in fraternities will cause students to desire to remain in the houses.
21	Fraternity houses are not the place for tutorials or honors programs to be held.
27	A student living in a fraternity will do better scholastically than will one in a residence hall.
31	Fraternity programs should not attempt religious indoctrination.
36	Students living off-campus are more likely to feel isolated from the academic program and student activities than will students in fraternities.
49	Fraternities should have entries in the homecoming float and/or house decoration competition.
50	The ever constant irritation of rules listing do's and don'ts has led students to demand and seek housing outside university supervised housing.
58	Fraternity atmosphere is conducive to academic endeavors.
61	Students living in residence halls are more likely to feel isolated from the academic program and student activities than will students in fraternities.

TABLE XVII
TEXT OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES SUBSCALE ITEMS

Item Number	Statement
12	As a student's workshop, the fraternity room should look like a place to study, dominated by large desk tops and sizable built-in book shelves.
18	Fraternities are brightly colored barracks with opulent lounges, which can hardly be classified as educational facilities.
22	Most students see their fraternity house room as only a bedroom.
28	Fraternity houses on this campus feel themselves threatened by apartment living and luxurious new dorms.
32	In addition to students' rooms, specifically designated study areas should be available in the fraternities.
37	Students feel that in a fraternity house solitude and privacy are virtually non-existent.
40	Fraternity members find personal privacy virtually impossible.
44	Fraternity students are poorly housed, poorly fed, and live in a physical and social environment which is hardly conducive to moral, cultural, or esthetic growth.
48	Fraternity houses are drab, architecturally uninteresting, and less than functional.

TABLE XVIII
TEXT OF CHAPTER GOVERNMENT SUBSCALE ITEMS

Item Number	Statement
13	Bluff, pull, and personality usually get students elected to chapter leadership positions.
23	Salaries for those serving in fraternity leadership positions should not be paid as these are tools for learning.
25	Fraternity men are governed by rules that they had no part in formulating, and have no part in enforcing.
33	Chapter officer elections do not usually generate enthusiasm or support.
38	Even though University administrators go through the motions of working with fraternity government, they permit little real involvement in planning the environment in which the students work and live.
41	Chapter government is regarded by some as a nuisance.
45	The scholarship chairman should consult with faculty regarding causes of residents' academic failure.

TABLE XIX
TEXT OF RULES AND REGULATIONS
SUBSCALE ITEMS

Item Number	Statement
14	Fraternity rules and regulations force upon the student an unreal environment, i.e., students are not being prepared to enter life-roles because of many prohibitions.
19	Too many university administrators are overly concerned with regulating student values and morals.
29	Fraternity men are sufficiently involved in the handling of violations of university regulations.
39	Fraternity rules and regulations are geared to the least common denominator of student behavior and aim to destroy individuality.
43	Students feel that they are overly constrained by rules and regulations in fraternities.
46	The ability to be creative in one's fraternity house room is stifled by rules and regulations.
50	The ever constant irritation of rules listing do's and don'ts has led students to demand and seek housing outside university supervised housing.
53	Fraternity regulations are the primary cause for members to seek living accommodations off campus.
56	Rules and regulations governing fraternity living causes residents to feel too supervised.

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS TO CHAPTER PRESIDENTS FOR
ADMINISTERING THE FRATERNITY
ATTITUDE SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE
FRATERNITY ATTITUDE SCALE

1. Read aloud all directions as those taking the attitude scale read along.
2. Answer any questions your members may have concerning the Fraternity Attitude Scale.
3. Be sure to set a proper atmosphere. The results will be of no help to your chapter if your members do not react honestly.
4. Be sure that your members respond to all items. Incomplete answer cards can not be used.
5. Be sure that each answer card contains the following information:
 - (1) The student ID number (recorded in the student number section)
 - (2) The testing date (recorded in the ID section; i.e., 10-72 for October, 1972)
 - (3) The chapter's code number (recorded in the section space) YOUR CODE NUMBER IS _____.
6. Please return all answer cards, booklets, and pencils by Friday, _____.

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOUND THROUGH ANALYSES OF VARIANCE

TABLE XX
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOUND
THROUGH ANALYSES OF VARIANCE

Location of Differences	Source of Variation by Subscale*						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Total Respondents (Leaders & Members)			*				
Individual Fraternities:							
Acacia							
Alpha Gamma Rho							
Alpha Phi Alpha				*			
Beta Theta Pi						*	
Beta Sigma Psi							
Delta Chi							
Delta Tau Delta							
Delta Upsilon		*					
Farmhouse							
Kappa Sigma			*				
Lambda Chi Alpha							
Phi Delta Theta				*			
Phi Gamma Delta						*	
Phi Kappa Psi		*					
Phi Kappa Tau							
Phi Kappa Theta							
Pi Kappa Alpha							
Pi Kappa Phi						*	
Sigma Alpha Epsilon							
Sigma Chi							
Sigma Nu		*		*		*	*
Sigma Phi Epsilon						*	
Triangle							

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 - Interfraternity Council | 5 - Chapter Government |
| 2 - Chapter Cohesion | 6 - Rules and Regulations |
| 3 - Chapter Programs | 7 - Total |
| 4 - Physical Facilities | |

APPENDIX F
SUMMARY OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE BETWEEN
LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF ALL
FRATERNITIES FOR EACH
FAS SUBSCALE

TABLE XXI
SUMMARY OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE BETWEEN
LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF ALL
FRATERNITIES FOR EACH
FAS SUBSCALE

Subscale	\bar{x}_L	\bar{x}_M	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob. > F
Interfraternity Council	19.429	19.004	1	29.740	29.740	2.371	0.120
Chapter Cohesion	24.437	24.654	1	7.783	7.783	0.331	0.572
Chapter Programs	24.080	24.779	1	80.478	80.478	4.050	0.0419*
Physical Facilities	23.720	23.563	1	4.107	4.107	0.439	0.515
Chapter Government	18.0421	18.315	1	12.254	12.254	0.971	0.674
Rules and Regulations	26.057	26.0625	1	0.0042	0.0042	0.0002	0.986
Total	135.766	136.377	1	61.558	61.558	0.263	0.615

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

2
VITA

Thomas Monroe Keys

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF FRATERNITY ATTITUDES BETWEEN
SELECTED FRATERNITY MEMBERS AND THEIR ELECTED
LEADERS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Natchitoches, Louisiana,
September 9, 1945, the son of R. Ralph and
Elizabeth C. Keys; married to Pamela J. Rushing,
1967; son Scott T. Keys born April 18, 1971.

Education: Attended public schools in Natchitoches,
Louisiana; graduated from Natchitoches High School
in June, 1963; received the Bachelor of Science
degree with a major in Business Finance from the
Louisiana State University in April, 1967; received
the Master of Education degree from Northwestern
State College of Louisiana with a major in Student
Personnel in Higher Education in January, 1969;
completed the requirements for the Doctor of Edu-
cation degree at Oklahoma State University with a
major in Student Personnel and Guidance, December,
1974.

Professional Experience: Received a full graduate
assistantship at Northwestern State College of
Louisiana, Natchitoches, Louisiana; served as Pro-
gram Director of Student Union and Special Assist-
ant to the Dean of Student Services, 1967-1969;
appointed Coordinator of Student Activities at
Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia, 1969; at Okla-
homa State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma,
appointed Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, 1969
to present.

Professional and Honorary Organizations: Who's Who In
American Colleges and Universities, Omicron Delta
Kappa, Phi Eta Sigma, Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Delta
Kappa, American Personnel and Guidance Association,
American College Personnel Association, Oklahoma
College Personnel Association.