THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE WOMEN TOWARD STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

CHARLYCE ROSS KING

Norman, Oklahoma

1957

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/218

ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE WOMEN TOWARD STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

With sincere appreciation, acknowledgement is made to Professors Funston F. Gaither, D. Ross Pugmire, Frank A. Balyeat, Laurence T. Rogers, Ed. F. Crim, and Mary A. Warren of the faculty of the University of Oklahoma for their most helpful and pleasant guidance given the writer in the preparation of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENT iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background, Need, and Purpose of Study
The Problem
The Data
Methodology
Organization of the Report

II. EXPRESSED ATTITUDES TOWARD SPECIFIC STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS 31

Provision for Expression of Attitude toward Selected Organizations
Scoring of Data Regarding Selected Student Organizations
Analysis and Interpretation of Data Regarding Selected Organizations
Summary of Expressed Attitude toward Specific Student Organizations

III. EXPRESSED ATTITUDES TOWARD ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT ORGANIZATION PROGRAM 81

Provision for Expression of Attitudes toward the Nature and Characteristics of Student Organizations and the Student Organization Program
Scoring the Inventory
Reliability of the Fifty Attitude Statements
Validity of the Fifty Attitude Statements
Analysis and Interpretation of Data Regarding the Student Organizations in General and the Student Organization Program
Summary of Attitudes Expressed by All Respondents toward Student Organizations in General and the Student Organization Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 117

BIBLIOGRAPHY 121

APPENDIX A 123

Number and Percentages of Respondents Who Expressed Attitudes and Who Expressed No Attitudes Toward Enjoyment of Each Student Organization

APPENDIX B 127

Number and Percentages of Respondents, of Differing Membership Status, Expressing Degrees of Agreement as to Enjoyment of the Organizations, Listed by Type

APPENDIX C 134

Number and Percentages of Respondents Who Expressed Attitudes and Who Expressed No Attitudes Toward Liking to Belong to Each Student Organization

APPENDIX D 138

Number and Percentages of Respondents, of Differing Membership Status, Expressing Degrees of Agreement Regarding Liking to Belong to the Organizations, Listed by Type

APPENDIX E 148

Number and Percentages of Respondents Who Expressed Attitudes and Who Expressed No Attitudes Toward Help in Personal Development from the Organizations

APPENDIX F 151

Number and Percentages of Respondents, of Differing Membership Status, Expressing Degrees of Agreement as to Personal Development Help Received from the Organizations, Listed by Type

APPENDIX G 158

Number and Percentages of Respondents Who Expressed Attitudes and Who Expressed No Attitudes Regarding Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

APPENDIX H 161

Number and Percentages of Respondents, of Differing Membership Status, Expressing Degrees of Agreement as to Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus with the Organizations Listed by Type

APPENDIX I 176

Percentile Ranks of Organizations as Expressed by All Respondents Who Indicated Attitudes Toward the Organizations Regarding the Four Attitude Statements with the Organizations Listed by Type

APPENDIX J 182

An Attitude Inventory: An Instrument to Measure the Attitudes of College Women Toward Student Organizations

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Summary of Expressed Attitude as to Enjoyment of All Organizations	34
2.	Average Extent of Agreement Scores as Expressed by All Respondents Indicating an Attitude of Enjoyment Toward the Various Types of Organizations	35
3.	Enjoyment of Organizations by Reporting Non-Members as Expressed by Index of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank	37
4.	Enjoyment of Organizations by Reporting Members as Expressed by Index of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank	38
5.	Enjoyment of Organizations by Reporting Past Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank	39
6.	Enjoyment of Organizations by All Reporting Respondents as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank	40
7.	Percentile Ranks of Organizations for Each of Four Kinds of Membership Status Respondents Regarding Enjoyment of the Organization	41
8.	Summary of Attitude Expression Regarding Liking to Belong to All Organizations	43
9.	Average Extent of Agreement Scores as Expressed by All Respondents Indicating an Attitude of Liking to Belong to the Various Types of Organizations	45
10.	Liking to Belong to the Organizations by Reporting Non-Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank	46

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

11. Liking to Belong to the Organizations by Reporting Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 48

12. Liking to Belong to the Organizations by Reporting Past Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 49

13. Liking to Belong to the Organizations by All Reporting Respondents as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 50

14. Percentile Ranks of Organizations for Each of Four Kinds of Membership Status Respondents on the Statement of Liking to Belong to the Organizations 52

15. Summary of Expressed Attitude Regarding Help in Personal Development from the Organizations 54

16. Average Extents of Agreement as Expressed by All Respondents Indicating an Attitude Toward Help in Personal Development Received from the Various Types of Organizations 55

17. Help in Personal Development Received from Organizations by Reporting Non-Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 56

18. Help in Personal Development Received from Organizations by Reporting Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 57

19. Help in Personal Development Received from Organizations by Reporting Past Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 58

20. Help in Personal Development Received from Organizations by All Reporting Respondents as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 59

21. Percentile Ranks of Organizations for Each of Four Kinds of Membership Status Respondents Regarding Statement on Help in Personal Development Received from the Organizations 61

22. Summary of Expressed Attitude Regarding Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus 63

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

23. Average Degrees of Agreement as Expressed by All Respondents Indicating an Attitude Toward the Types of Organizations Regarding Statement on Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus 63

24. Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus by Reporting Non-Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 65

25. Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus by Reporting Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 68

26. Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus by Reporting Past Members as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 69

27. Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus by All Reporting Respondents as Expressed by Extent of Agreement Scores, Rank Order, and Percentile Rank 70

28. Percentile Ranks of Organizations for Each of Four Kinds of Membership Status Respondents Regarding Statement on Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus . . . 73

29. Summary of Expressed Attitude Regarding the Four Attitude Statements 77

30. Average Degrees of Agreement Scores as Expressed by All Respondents Who Indicated Attitudes Toward the Various Type Organizations Regarding Each of the Four Attitude Statements 78

31. Reliability of Attitude Inventory 84

32. Obtained and Theoretical Frequencies and Standard Deviations for Calculating Dickey G 85

33. Means and Standard Deviations According to College Enrolment 87

34. Means and Standard Deviations According to Academic Classification 88

35. Means and Standard Deviations According to Sorority Affiliation 89

36. Mean and Standard Deviation for All Respondents 90

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

37. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward Academic Values of Student Organizations in General 92

38. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward the Administration and Supervision of Student Organizations in General 95

39. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward the Expense of Student Organizations in General 98

40. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward the After College Values of Student Organizations in General 99

41. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward the General Values of Student Organizations in General 101

42. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward Human Relationship Values Received from Student Organizations in General 103

43. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward Leadership Values of Student Organizations in General 105

44. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward Recreational Values of Student Organizations in General 106

45. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward Use of Time in Student Organizations in General 108

46. Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents Toward the Advisory Statements Regarding Student Organizations in General . . 109

47. Summary of Favorable and Unfavorable Attitude Expression Toward the Various Areas of Student Organizations in General and the Student Organization Program as Shown by the Extent of Agreement Index 111

48. Respondents' Estimates of Present Student Organizations . . . 114

49. Correlation Coefficients of Organization Membership, Grade Point Average, and Estimate of Organizations with Attitude Scores 115

ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE WOMEN TOWARD STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background, Need, and Purpose of Study

Background and Need

The premise of this study is that education is concerned with the optimum development of the individual. Abilities, aptitudes, interests, and attitudes have been given a place in the set of educational values. It is generally agreed that attitudes are important outcomes of education and that knowledge alone does not insure a satisfactory adult life.

Attitudes are generally considered to be concomitant learnings. It is known that an individual learns by experience. His attitudes are learned through his experiences and interactions with his environment. These attitudes lead him to respond in certain ways in future experiences. Since attitudes find their origin in personal experience, it is the responsibility of educators to provide students with meaningful experiences which will be helpful in developing desirable attitudes. If educators accept this responsibility there can be lasting value in education. John Dewey recognized this factor and further emphasized the importance of the

development of proper attitudes through educational experiences.[1]

If education has not completely fulfilled its role in providing the kinds of educational experiences from which desirable attitudes grow, it may well be that educators have failed to recognize the importance of attitude development and have failed to understand the relationship of this development in the total educative process. This failure has been recognized by various authorities. Hartmann states that "an attitude is normally a by-product of other activities and is rarely made although it ought to be, the center of attention in school affairs."[2] Williamson further emphasizes this point of view by stating that "teachers have for many years taught facts only, and nowhere in the curriculum do we see anything that has to do with a course on attitudes."[3]

The student personnel program, as an integral part of education, must accept its responsibility for the development of acceptable attitudes. Student personnel work in higher education has largely been concerned with the student's life outside the classroom, but it has recognized that these outside activities must be in harmony with the basic academic purposes of higher education. The role of the student personnel program should be very important in the student's total development. Such programs provide the kinds of educational experiences that lead to the

---

[1]John Dewey, Democracy in Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936, Chapters VII, VIII, X, XVIII.

[2]George W. Hartmann, Educational Psychology. New York: American Book Company, 1941, p. 398.

[3]E. G. Williamson, How to Counsel Students. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938, p. 81.

development of individuals competent to live, work, and play in a democratic society. The student organization and activity program is generally organized to help students toward optimum social and emotional development, and is set up to supplement and complement the educational experiences found in the instructional areas. Hand has pointed out that "students stand to gain much from participating purposefully and responsibly in the enterprises of wisely guided clubs and societies which center around activities of real significance to them."[1] The kinds of attitudes that students obtain through this participation will influence the total educational value of higher education and will serve to influence subsequent behaviors. Remmers has stated that "attitudes determine the entire adjustment of the individual."[2]

Cantril believes that every simple, complex, or specific manifestation of conscious life can be treated as an attitude, because each involves a tendency to action.[3] An attitude is generally agreed to be a certain subjective state of preparation to action.[4] Ferguson states that an attitude covers one's beliefs, or is an expression of belief.[5] Remmers and Gage state that "...an attitude may be defined as a more or less emo-

---

[1]Harold Hand, Campus Activities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938, p. 130.

[2]H. H. Remmers, Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954, p. 5.

[3]Hadley Cantril, "General and Specific Attitudes," Psychological Monographs, XLII (1932), p. 3.

[4]D. D. Dobra, "The Nature of Attitude," The Journal of Social Psychology, IV (November, 1933), p. 447.

[5]Leonard W. Ferguson, Personality Measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952, p. 81.

tionalized tendency, organized through experience, to react positively or negatively toward (for or against) a psychological object."[1]

A series of values which range from complete acceptance (agreement) through neutrality to complete rejection (disagreement) comprise the attitude continuum. The varying degrees of attitude are arranged along a linear scale. Ideally, the base line represents the whole range of attitudes from those at one end who most strongly agree with the issue to those at the other end of the scale who most strongly disagree with it. There will be a neutral zone somewhere between the two extremes representing indifferent (undecided) attitudes on the issue in question.[2]

How shall we proceed to study attitudes? An individual's attitudes may be expressed by what he says, but there is no sure way of comparing his expressed beliefs and feelings with his private unexpressed ones. Direct observation by trained observers in behavioral situations would be one desirable way of studying attitudes. Observation is not always possible. There should be some other means of exploring and determining students' attitudes. Objective measures to determine attitudes may be used to advantage. Thurstone believes that it is of importance to know what people say they believe even if their conduct turns out to be inconsistent with their professed opinion.[3] Cronback states that attitude tests have been used without their validity having been established, but he believes

---

[1]H. H. Remmers, and N. L. Gage, Educational Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943, p. 87.

[2]L. L. Thurstone, and E. J. Chave, The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929, p. xi.

[3]Ibid., p. 9.

that a self-report test has a high degree of validity if the test is limited to the purpose of determining the subject's publicly verbalized opinions.[1]

There has been criticism of student organizations and activities. Much of this criticism has been focused on the high school and its activity program. Cross states his beliefs regarding this matter as follows:[2]

> Often the emotional effects of such activities interfere seriously, not only with the student's thinking and studying, but even with his health. I do not mean to imply that all activities should be eliminated from high school life. I believe that there should be carefully planned activities in every school system, but I believe most sincerely that the average high school has far too many.

If criticism of the high school organization and activity program is justified, then it seems appropriate to examine similar programs which are being carried on in the colleges and universities. It is possible that such a study can contribute to the evaluation of the present student organization program at the University of Oklahoma. The number of student organizations at this University has increased rapidly in the past few years and new organizations continue to be added. This type of study could help this University, or any university, to discover that the students think and feel about the present organizations and could help to provide a basis for future program development and improvement. Purposeful and continuous evaluation is a responsibility of educational leader-

---

[1]Lee J. Cronback, Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949, p. 375.

[2]George L. Cross, "Educators Will Provide What Patrons Demand," Sooner Magazine, XXVIII (March, 1956), p. 7.

ship. This factor is recognized and well expressed by Pugmire.[1]

> In a democratic society, the people depend upon professional knowledge, leadership, and service to help them recognize and understand their educational needs and the ways by which these needs can best be met.

Review of Literature

All available attitude studies have been examined. In general, these studies pertain to attitudes toward religion, politics, minority groups, education and its problems, kinship, relationships centering in home and family living, and myriad social issues. Due to space limitations, it was impossible to include a review of all these studies. It was believed that a more meaningful presentation, for the purposes of the present study, was to include only those studies through which the designs and techniques in the field of attitude study were developed. These studies have been reported here, not to emphasize the kinds of attitudes studied, but to help show the growth and development of the methods, techniques, and procedures used in the study of attitudes.

It is generally agreed that present interest in the area of attitude study is largely due to the findings from fairly recent experiments. In 1925, Allport and Hartman reported a study made of college students to determine whether such a thing as a radical type of personality could be measured and identified.[2] To secure this information they constructed a set of scales by asking sixty upperclassmen to write out their personal

---

[1]D. Ross Pugmire, "Challenge to Educational Administrators," The Educational Forum, XX (March, 1956), p. 330.

[2]F. H. Allport, and D. A. Hartman, "Measurement and Motivation of a Typical Opinion in a Certain Group," American Political Science Review, XIX (1925), pp. 735-60.

views on the various phases of seven items of then current interest: The League of Nations, the distribution of wealth, the qualifications of President Coolidge, the legislative control of the Supreme Court, prohibition, the Ku Klux Klan, and graft in politics. The opinions obtained were sifted and arranged independently by six judges, teachers of political science and psychologists. They arranged these statements in order of their logical position in a scale ranging from one extreme to the opposite extreme. The average rank assigned to each statement was its final rank in the completed scale.

These scales, developed by the selected judges in the Allport and Hartman study, were then given to freshmen students enroled in a "Responsible Citizenship" class at Syracuse University. Each student was asked to check the one statement under each issue listed on the scale that most nearly agreed with his own view. He indicated the certainty of his opinion on a range of five degrees, from "extremely certain" to "extremely uncertain," and he was asked to check one of five steps or positions for the degree of interest or feeling about the question concerned. Opinions and attitudes were obtained from 367 students.

The results of this study by Allport and Hartman included the reporting of frequencies of attitudes for each issue as well as the variations of intensity of feeling or interest and of certainty for each of the issues. They were concerned, for the most part, with the extremes of the scales, those whose opinions were usually in the minority. To determine underlying motives or traits that may contribute to a particular type of personality, the authors also gave the students a personality test, a test for personal attitudes, and a psychoneurotic inventory.

From the total number of respondents three small samples of subjects believed to be representative of reactionary, conservative, and radical points of view were chosen for personal interview. In conclusion, the writers point out that reactionary and radical elements are often similar, but the reactionaries were found to have attitudes more pronounced and opinions more decided than the radicals.

The Allport and Hartman study reports the development of techniques in attitude scale construction. Provision for expressing degrees of intensity of feeling was also provided, and frequency calculations of expressed attitudes were determined. This study shows how expressed attitudes were then related to personality types by way of attitude testing and inventory techniques.

The work of Allport and Hartman gave impetus to other critical experiments in the study of attitudes. By 1929, Thurstone became interested in the problem of whether a rational method of assigning values for the base line of a scale of attitude or opinion could be found.[1]

Thurstone decided to use the statements about prohibition which were developed and used in the Allport study, since these opinions were more complete than those given for other issues included in the study. These thirteen selected statements about prohibition ranged from extreme "dry" to extreme "wet." His assumption was that two individuals who differ from each other widely in their views about prohibition would find it equally easy or equally difficult to say which of two statements is the more in favor of prohibition. The thirteen opinions were mimeographed on

---

[1]L. L. Thurstone, "The Measurement of Opinion," Journal of Abnormal Sociology and Psychology, XXII (1928), pp. 415-30.

cards and given to 200 students to be sorted by each student according to order ranging from statements most strongly favoring prohibition to those least in favor of prohibition. Thurstone presented statistical procedures to test the continuity in each arrangement from extremes of favor to disfavor and to make comparisons among these arrangements. He found gaps between some of the statements to be too great to allow a legitimate frequency distribution to be made.

Thurstone's study resulted in some definite contributions to the field of attitude study. He reccommended that to construct a scale for measurement of opinion one should start with a large number of statements from which a smaller number may be selected for the final scale. These statements could then be chosen so that they would be approximately evenly spaced. Thus, the distributions of opinions between groups could be compared and measures of dispersion and of central tendency could be calculated. Thurstone believes that such a procedure would provide for the construction of a base line for opinion and attitude measurement.

Several years later, in 1934, a study was reported in which Carlson, working with Thurstone at the University of Chicago, used attitude scales with college seniors.[1] She was concerned with attitudes toward five issues: God, pacifism, communism, prohibition, and birth control. In addition, she wanted to determine the relation and interrelation of intelligence of undergraduates and their attitudes on these questions. Another phase of her study was to find out whether undergraduates in different areas of study differ markedly in their attitudes toward these so-

---

[1]H. B. Carlson, "Attitudes of Undergraduate Students," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), pp. 202-13.

cial questions. In order to accomplish these purposes, Carlson and her associates developed scales consisting of approximately twenty statements for each issue being studied. These scales were then given to 215 subjects who completed the forms.

Carlson's contribution from this study was chiefly that of further progress in the area of statistical analysis of attitudes. These statistical contributions included intercorrelations of the five attitude issues being studied, and correlations of attitudes and certain other personal data by means of a multiple-factor analysis.

Further refinement in the study of attitudes can be found in the work of Murphy and Likert, who, in 1938, published the results of a study made of college students in nine colleges and universities.[1] They were investigating, both in qualitative and quantitative terms, a number of problems relative to individual differences in opinion on public issues. An analysis was made of attitudes toward international, interracial, economic, political, and religious issues. Murphy and Likert used statements and questions selected from questionnaires already administered by other psychologists. Some of the questions were original, but in all instances, the authors aimed at simplicity and brevity.

The major contribution of this study was the development of a different method of measuring attitudes from that ordinarily used. The authors had included several types of statements in their scales, some requiring the respondent to choose one of five "multiple choice" answers and others requiring a check on a five-point scale, ranging from "strongly

---

[1]G. Murphy, and R. Likert, Public Opinion and the Individual. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938, pp. 40-51.

approve" to "strongly disapprove." On the assumption that attitudes are distributed normally, they developed a method called the "sigma method of scoring." This method seemed to avoid many of the shortcomings of most of the earlier methods of attitude measurement. A retest conducted five years later showed that the validity and reliability for the retest items were satisfactorily established, enough so that the authors felt they could make some justifiable recommendations for future research in attitudes. They suggested that the next steps in such research be concerned with better gathering of diary, interview, and other biographical material. They further suggested that safeguards against error be studied and emphasized that some means of establishing more penetrating and revealing questions be developed.

The sigma scoring technique developed by Murphy and Likert was used in a more recent study in which the attitudes of a college group of approximately 250 students were surveyed by Conrad and Sanford.[1] They developed a questionnaire containing forty items bearing on military optimism concerning victory, consequences of the war, and general war morale. The authors pointed out that the five-point scale of "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly disagree," enabled the respondent to express his attitude as well as the strength of this attitude. Further, they believed that this scale made possible a more accurate analysis of the group's variability of responses to an item, which would indicate the consistency of attitudes held with regard to a given issue. Also, it would enable the investigator to locate those issues on

---

[1]H. S. Conrad, and R. N. Sandord, "Some Specific War-Attitudes of College Students," Journal of Psychology, XVIII (1944), pp. 153-86.

which particularly undesirable attitudes may be held.

The Likert method of attitude scale construction was adopted and used in a study by Kappes.[1] The attitude inventory developed and used by Kappes has been especially helpful in the present undertaking.

An attitude study was conducted by Adams at the University of Oklahoma in 1948.[2] This study was an attempt to determine the attitudes of the undergraduate women at the University toward their housing assignments and facilities. It sought to identify the effects of particular housing assignments upon the attitudes toward social activities and opportunities, participation in physical education activities, and University policies for women students. The data were gathered by means of questionnaire and group interviews. The chi-square was used to determine whether there were significant variations of attitudes according to housing accomodations.

The Adams study revealed that sorority women, Norman residents, and commuters tended to resemble each other in the attitudes held, and these were largely favorable toward the issues studied. Dormitory residents, married women students, and women living in approved houses were found to resemble each other in the attitudes they held and these were often unfavorable toward the issues studied. Some students felt they were more active than they really wanted to be in the student organizations

---

[1]Eveline Elizabeth Kappes, "An Attitude Inventory to Determine the Attitudes of College Women toward Physical Education and the Services Offered Students by a Physical Education Department," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, University of Oklahoma, (1953) p. 38.

[2]Lena Clara Adams, "A Study of Attitudes among Women Students at the University of Oklahoma," (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Psychology, University of Oklahoma, 1948,) pp. 66-67.

and activities. Others expressed the attitude that they should like to be given more opportunity to participate in these organizations and activities. A definite recommendation was made to the administrative authorities as a result of this study. It was suggested that a reorganization of social activities be carried out in order to provide more equality of opportunity and participation for all women students.

From the review of previous studies, it is evident that many contributions have been made in the area of methods and techniques of studying attitudes. Allport and Hartman provided for measurement of degree or intensity of attitude, the determination of attitude frequency calculations, and attitude inventory and testing techniques which would show relationship of expressed attitude to personality type. Thurstone contributed a method by which attitude statements may be selected for use in attitude scales. In addition, he contributed a method whereby measures of dispersion and central tendency of opinions and attitudes could be calculated and related to an appropriate scale on a base line. Carlson's study gave emphasis to the statistical procedure of intercorrelation of attitudes. By use of multiple factor analysis, Carlson's study made it possible to show the relationship of attitudes to personal data. The sigma method of scoring attitude scales was contributed by Murphy and Likert. The chi-square technique, used by Adams, revealed significant differences in the attitudes of college women at the University of Oklahoma toward various issues. Her recommendation, made in 1948 but not yet achieved, that a reorganization of social activities be carried out at the University of Oklahoma, emphasized the need for the present study. In

this effort, the author has found useful many of the methods and techniques reviewed in the foregoing discussion.

Purpose of Study

It is the purpose of the present study to report the attitudes of the undergraduate college women toward student organizations for these women at the University of Oklahoma in order to provide one basis of evaluating and improving the student organization program at this University.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to discover the kinds of attitudes and the extent to which these attitudes are similar or different as expressed by undergraduate women students toward student organizations at the University of Oklahoma.

Scope of the Study

The study was confined to the expressed attitudes of the full-time undergraduate women students enrolled at the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma in the spring semester of the school year, 1955-56. The organizations included are all those in which undergraduate women participate or are eligible for participation.

Definition of Terms

Attitude. The definition of "attitude" by Remmers and Gage, is: "...an attitude may be defined as a more or less emotionalized tendency, organized through experience, to react positively or negatively toward

(for or against) a psychological object." This definition was accepted as the one used in the present study.[1]

Undergraduate women students. This term includes those full-time women students enroled as freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors on the Norman campus, University of Oklahoma. Graduate women, special, and unclassified students were excluded from the study.

Student organization. For purposes of this study, a student organization has been defined as an organization for which the University assumes responsibility. It has continuing membership, an authorized constitution, an approved sponsor, and such rules and regulations as are necessary for its maintenance. Its membership, constitution, sponsor, and regulations are approved by the University in the Office of Student Affairs. The 111 organizations included in this study were those which fulfilled the above requirements, and all were selected from the official list of organizations in the Office of Student Affairs. For purposes of ease in handling data, these organizations were classified as follows: 1-Governing, 2-Social, 3-Service and University-Wide, and 4-Honorary-Departmental-Others. The "Governing" organizations are those which function to make rules, regulations, and help to determine policies by which the women students live. The "Social" organizations are the sixteen sororities on campus. The "Service and University-Wide" are those organizations which are largely service in nature and are open to all women students regardless of classification or specific departmental enrolment. The "Honorary-Departmental-Others" includes those organizations whose pur-

---

[1]Remmers and Gage, op. cit., p. 87.

poses center in scholastic or other specialized interests. The abbreviations used for these various classifications are as follows: Gov. (Governing), Soc. (Social), Serv. (Service and University-Wide), and HDO (Honorary-Departmental-Others). Abbreviations for membership status of respondents are: NM (Non-Member), M (Member), PM (Past Member), and A (All Respondents).

University of Oklahoma. This is a state-supported, coeducational institution of higher education. It has nine degree granting colleges, including a School of Medicine. Its enrolment is approximately 10,000 students, and it is located at Norman, Oklahoma.

The Data

Nature and Sources

The kinds of data in this study are those which represent the stated or expressed attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward student organizations at the University of Oklahoma. The source of data was the direct reporting of these women's attitudes by use of the questionnaire technique.

Methodology

Type of Research

The survey method of research was adopted and used. Good, Barr, and Scates state that the word "survey" indicates the gathering of data regarding current conditions.[1] After careful examination of the present

---

[1]C. V. Good, S. A. Barr, and D. E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1941, p. 289.

problem, the survey method was chosen as being the appropriate method of research for this study. This decision was made in relation to the nature of the present problem. It is believed that "current conditions" were provided for in this research since these data were the attitudes of undergraduate women students in the spring semester of the school year 1955-56, the time when the study was made.

Techniques of Securing Data

In order to secure the necessary data, two major kinds of techniques were employed. Techniques of instrument construction for use in the questionnaire and the techniques of sampling the population were recognized and studied in relation to the purposes of this research. These selected techniques are explained in the following discussion.

Techniques employed in development of the instrument

There are several well known methods of measuring attitudes and constructing attitude scales. Among these methods are the Thurstone, Remmers, and Likert techniques.[1] Some of the factors pertaining to the development of these three methods have been previously described above in "The Review of Literature." Brief descriptions of these three major methods follow:

In the Thurstone method of scale construction a very large number of statements or propositions about the subject or issue in question are selected from various sources. Judgements are then made of each statement by a group of experts as to the proper diagnostic position of the state-

---

[1]Ferguson, op. cit., pp. 81-144.

ment on the attitude continuum. Items on which there is insufficient agreement among the judges as to its proper position on the scale are rejected. The remaining items are assigned a scale score, computed as a median position for that item given by the group of judges. Selection is made along the scale from one extreme to the other. The judges' task is to place each item in one of eleven piles. Each of the piles represent an evenly graduated series of attitudes ranging over the entire scale. The respondent taking the Thurstone test is instructed to check each of the items (randomly presented) with which he agrees. The median of the scale values of the items he checks is given as his attitude score.[1]

Remmers followed the Thurstone scaling technique, but instead of making the various propositions refer only to a single object in each scale, the statements were generalized, so that they could be applied with equal meaning to a wide variety of objects. Remmers' scales were designed to escape the task of constructing separate scales for measuring attitudes and beliefs about various objects. These scales are believed to permit the measurement of attitudes and opinions toward virtually any object, without the time-consuming and expensive process of constructing and standardizing a scale adapted solely to that object. This advantage of the Remmers scale is pointed out by Krech and Crutchfield. They explain that since the generalized statements are usually fairly simple, the scales may be more easily understood by the less well educated.[2]

---

[1]Thurstone and Chave, op. cit., p. 64.

[2]David Krech, and Richard S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948, p. 217.

The Remmers scales are believed to be an excellent means of measuring generalized attitudes, while the Thurstone method is suggested for scaling more specific attitudes.

The Likert method for scaling of attitudes involves the collection of a large number of statements which refer either directly or indirectly to the object or issue in question. These statements are given to a group of subjects who indicate for each statement their reaction of strongly approve (strongly agree), approve (agree), undecided, disapprove (disagree), strongly disapprove (strongly disagree). The individual's responses to all the items were summarized by arbitrarily scoring the five categories.[1] This method may give an insight into an individual's opinions and attitudes about the specific issue disclosed in a single item as well as a total score on the attitude or opinion issue being studied. These scales do provide a reliable way of differentiating people in rank order along the attitude or opinion continuum, and therefore make it possible to compare the attitude or opinion score of individuals and of groups of individuals.[2]

The three previously described methods of measuring or scaling attitudes and opinions were carefully studied. The construction of an attitude scale which would reflect degree or extent of feeling, was an integral part of this problem. Therefore, the use of arbitrary weighting of responses and summarized ratings as suggested by Likert was adopted for use in the inventory. This process not only provided for the determination of attitudes, but made possible the determination of degrees or extent of

---

[1]Rensis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, No. 140. New York: Columbia University, 1932.

[2]Krech and Crutchfield, op. cit., p. 226.

agreement expressed by individuals or groups toward the various issues or items.

This instrument used in the present study has herein been called An Attitude Inventory. This Inventory is composed of two parts. Part I included the expressed attitudes of the college women students toward selected student organizations, and Part II included the expressed attitudes of the college women toward student organizations in general and the student organization program. A copy of this Inventory has been included as Appendix J.

As a first step in the formulation and selection of items to be included in the Inventory, it was considered advisable to review the various aspects of the student organization program and construct statements which might represent verbal expressions of feeling concerning the entire program. Statements toward general values of student organizations, skills to be developed in group work or human relationships, recreational values, expected values after college, use of time, academic values, expense, leadership training, and administration and supervision of student organizations were included. Although statements were formulated for each area, no attempt was made to allocate any specific number of statements to the previously mentioned areas. These statements were devised by the writer with the help of members of the staff of the College of Education, a limited number of women students enroled in the University of Oklahoma, and by use of several psychology and guidance reference books. These statements were reviewed and revised to the extent that they were accepted and approved by a qualified jury composed of faculty members from the College of Education and the Office of Student Affairs at the University of Okla-

homa. This approved list consisted of fifty-nine statements regarding characteristics and activities of student organizations in general. The final statement, number sixty, expressed the respondent's generalized estimate of the student organization program current at the time on campus. For reasons of improved form and appearance of the Inventory, these sixty statements pertaining to student organizations in general, became Part II of the Inventory. Part II of the Inventory shall hereafter be referred to as the expressed attitudes toward organizations in general and the then current student organization program.

The second step in the construction of the Inventory was the development of a means of determining and measuring the attitudes of the respondents toward individual organizations. The solution to this problem resulted in a series of four statements regarding the 111 student organizations selected for study. These statements were: "I enjoy this organization," "This organization has helped me in my personal development," "This organization should remain on campus," and "I would like (do like) to belong to this organization." The respondent was given six choices as follows: "5-Strongly Agree," "4-Agree," "3-Undecided," "2-Disagree," "1-Strongly Disagree," and "0-Have No Experience on Which to Judge." Provision was also made for the respondent to indicate membership status in each organization. The response key for membership status was as follows: "X-Member," "0-Non-Member," and "P-Past Member." These four statements and the response keys provided a means of determining and measuring attitudes toward the individual organizations, and became Part I of the Attitude Inventory. Part I is hereafter referred to as the expressed attitudes toward specific organizations.

The Inventory was then used in a pilot study of fifty undergraduate women enroled in the University of Oklahoma. An effort was made to get correct percentage representation of these respondents by classification and college enrolment. However, no attempt was made to get representation by non-member or member status. Personal data asked for in the Inventory included the individual's college classification, college enrolment, grade average, marital status, and employment status.

This preliminary study was employed as a means of refining the Inventory. As a result of this preliminary tryout, several items in Part II were dropped because they were ambiguous or failed to discriminate. Other items were revised, and a few new ones were added. The total number of items remained at sixty. The section on expressed attitudes toward specific student organizations was not revised.

Reliability of the Inventory was tested by use of the Brown-Spearman split-half technique. This technique and its use in the study is given further interpretation and discussion in Chapter III.

The validity of this instrument was established by use of the percent normalcy technique as computed by the Dickey G.method. This method was applied to the sixty attitude items of Part II, those regarding student organizations in general and the then current student organization program on the campus, and an index of validity and discrimination was derived. Further interpretation and discussion of the application of this method can be found in Chapter III.

The form and content of the Inventory designed in this study is based upon the attitude inventory developed by Kappes.[1]

---

[1]Kappes, op. cit., pp. 38-43.

Techniques employed in selection of the sample

Scores on the sixty attitude items were calculated for each of the fifty students answering the preliminary or pilot survey. Mean scores and standard deviations were then determined for the total group and for the various sub-groups classified by college enrolment and academic classification. These data were analyzed for variability, and the size of the sample for the larger survey was determined.

The method of selecting the sample is explained further as follows: In order that the method used in selecting this sample may be discussed in the necessary technical terms, it is desirable to define these terms as they have been used. The word, "universe," is defined as the complete area from which the sample is to be collected. Its boundaries may be geographic, by classification, or otherwise. The germ, "strata," is defined as the logical sub-divisions of the universe. They may be economic levels, physical locations, academic standing of students in a university, or various other sub-divisions. Stratification refers to the dividing of the universe into strata.

The universe in this study is all the undergraduate women enroled in the University. While a purely random sample might have secured reliable results, it was felt that the use of a properly stratified sample would permit a smaller number of items to be used and lend greater reliability. In examining the problem it appeared that the academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior) of the students might have a definite significance on their attitudes regarding the problem in question. Furthermore, it was believed that the variety of interests and attitudes of the students would be reflected to some extent by the academic

college in which they are enroled. Recognizing that a stratification might be accomplished in either of these respects which would improve the reliability of the sample appreciably, it was decided to use a deep stratification technique and combine both strata. Stratification was carried out first by college and then by classification within the colleges.

To accomplish this stratification the distribution of the number of undergraduate women students enroled in the University of Oklahoma during the spring semester 1955-56 was obtained on the basis of the number of undergraduate women in each academic classification according to college. In this connection all freshmen were regarded as being in the University College rather than in the college to which they would eventually be assigned.[1] From the analysis of data obtained from the preliminary study it was decided that a fifteen percent stratified sample would be sufficiently accurate for the purpose of the larger study.

The size of the sample had been predetermined as 299 respondents, or approximately fifteen percent of 2014, the total undergraduate women enroled in the University of Oklahoma. The fifteen percent sample of the universe in question resulted in a sampling error of approximately five percent. The sample number was determined to be 299 respondents. The sample number and the total enrolment of undergraduate women in the University were then computed and used as a factor. This factor was applied to the number of undergraduate women students in each substratum of the University. For example, the total number of undergraduate women in the

---

[1]The University College is a general college to which all freshmen students are assigned for their first two semesters in the University. From this college students enter one of the several academic colleges.

College of Arts and Sciences was 656, therefore, to determine the number of sophomores from the College of Arts and Sciences to be surveyed, the first step was to take fifteen percent of the total 656 students in the College of Arts and Sciences. Thus, it was found that 98 students (sophomores, juniors, and seniors) were needed from the College of Arts and Sciences. The next step was to determine what percent of the total 656 undergraduate women in the College of Arts and Sciences were sophomores. Since 274, or approximately 42 percent of the undergraduate women students in the College of Arts and Sciences were sophomores, the next step was to take 42 percent of the 98. This figure was determined and rounded off so that it was ascertained that 41 sophomores from the College of Arts and Sciences should be included in the sample. This same process was continued in each college by academic standing to determine the number of individuals for each stratum of the sample. In some instances the number of enrollees was too few to warrant classification in the sample. This was true for the students enroled in the College of Engineering and in the College of Pharmacy.

After the number of students needed from each stratum had been determined, a random selection of names of students within these strata was carried out. The Attitude Inventory was mailed to the students thus selected. All 299 Inventories were returned by mail to the writer within ten days from the time they were sent to the students.

Treatment of Data

It will be recalled that Part I of the Attitude Inventory was designed to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women

students at the University of Oklahoma toward the specific student organization. When these data were analyzed it was found that, with the exception of the "Social" group, the largest percent of the respondents indicated that they "had no experience on which to judge" these organizations. Therefore, the problem of interpretation of these small and varying percentages of responses arose. This problem was due to the difficulty in trying to analyze data regarding an organization toward which a large percentage of the respondents expressed attitudes and in trying to interpret this analysis in relation to an organization toward which only a small percentage of the respondents expressed attitudes.

It was decided that a useful analysis and interpretation could be made in relation to the attitudes expressed by those respondents who checked the Inventory key with answers other than "have no experience on which to judge." These responses are not to be interpreted as being representative of attitudes of all women students toward student organizations at the University. They are presented merely as the expressed attitudes of those whose responses indicated an attitude.

Due to the nature of these data, individual scores would have been meaningless. Therefore, the question became one of finding those organizations toward which attitudes were expressed and determining to what extent these expressed attitudes, favorable and unfavorable, tend to agree in relation to the four attitude statements: "I enjoy this organization," "I would like (do like) to belong to this organization," "This organization has helped me in my personal development," and "This organization should remain on campus." This question was raised in order to locate specific organizations or types of organizations toward which a great extent of favorable or unfavorable attitude might be expressed.

An attempt to answer this question was made first by designing a table which would show the number and percentage of total respondents expressing attitudes and the number and percentage of total respondents expressing no attitudes toward each organization regarding the statement on enjoyment of the organization. This table is included as Appendix A. The next step in the process was to design a summary table which would show the total responses expressing attitude and the total responses indicating no attitude regarding an item as based upon the total possible responses for all respondents toward all organizations listed. For example, if all 299 respondents had expressed attitudes toward all 111 organizations there would have been 33,189 total responses. These two types of tables were constructed for each of the four attitude statements, and showed the expressed attitudes toward specific organizations as well as the expressions of attitude toward all organizations. Those tables which show the amount of attitude expression toward specific organizations for each of the four attitude statements are included as Appendices A, C, E, and G.

The next step in the presentation and interpretation of data regarding the specific organizations, was to determine to what extent those who expressed attitudes, favorable and unfavorable, tended to agree in their responses. This was done by the construction of an Extent of Agreement Index. This technique was suggested by Eikert for use when individual scores are meaningless. The Extent of Agreement Index shows a range of all the "agree" and "disagree" responses toward the organizations regarding the four attitude statements. Each "agree" and "disagree" response was weighted and these responses were summated to produce a score for each

organization within the range. As used herein, the Extent of Agreement Index refers to the foregoing technique, and the extent of agreement is expressed as a score for the organization. The extent of Agreement Index for each of the four attitude statements is included as Appendices B, D, F, and H.

In order to identify those organizations toward which the greater extent of favorable attitude was expressed, the organizations were then placed in rank order positions on the basis of the extent of agreement scores for these organizations. For example, the organization toward which the larger extent of favorable attitude was expressed regarding the enjoyment of the organization, was given the number one rank position. From this rank order listing, percentile ranks for each organization were calculated. This procedure not only provided a view of the percentile rank of each organization, but made it possible to determine where the various types of organizations ranked. Rank order and percentile ranks of organizations were calculated and are presented in tables for each of four kinds of membership status regarding each of the four attitude statements. A summary table was constructed to present the percentile rank position of organizations and types of organizations regarding each of the four attitude statements.

Part II of the Attitude Inventory was designed to determine and measure attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the general nature and characteristics of the student organizations and the student organization program. Sixty attitude items were included in this section. Fifty favorable and unfavorable statements toward student organizations in general were presented and responses were weighted in such fashion that a

possible 100 to -100 attitude scale was designed. The other ten items included in this section were judgmental or advisory statements which could not be considered as favorable or unfavorable toward student organizations in general. For example, the statement, "Academic credit should be given for participation in student organizations," could not be considered as being either favorable or unfavorable toward student organizations in general. Attitudes were expressed by all respondents toward each of the sixty attitude items.

Data in Part II of the Inventory were analyzed first by calculation of a score for each respondent on the 100 to -100 scale. These data were then classified according to academic classification, college enrolment, and sorority affiliation of the population. Norms and standard deviations were calculated for each of these groups, and these results determined the further treatment and presentation of the data.

The Extent of Agreement Index, as previously explained, was used in treatment of the data in Part II of the Inventory. The extent or degree of agreement by all respondents toward each of the attitude items was determined. Items were then selected and classified according to their relationship to certain kinds of characteristics or aspects of the student organization program. These items were selected according to their appropriateness in the following kinds of classifications: general values of student organizations, values in human relationships or group work, recreational values, expected values after college, use of time, academic values, expense, leadership training, administration and supervision, and advisory statements regarding student organizations. Scores showing extent of agreement were then added algebraically for the items within each

of the foregoing classifications. In order to compare these various classifications an average score for each classification was needed. This average was derived by adding the extent of agreement scores for each item within the classification and by dividing by the number of items within each classification.

Further treatment of these data regarding the general nature of student organizations and the student organization program was carried out by determining three correlations. The number of memberships in the various organizations was correlated with the attitude score, the grade average was correlated with the attitude score, and the student's estimate of the present student organization program was correlated with the attitude score.

Organization of the Report

Results of this study are presented through tables and discussion. Chapter II includes the analysis and presentation of expressed attitudes toward specific organizations. Expressed attitudes toward organizations in general and the characteristics of the student organization program are presented in Chapter III. The summary and conclusions are given in Chapter IV. A bibliography is provided, and the Attitude Inventory developed in this study is included as Appendix J.

CHAPTER II

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES TOWARD SPECIFIC STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Provision for Expression of Attitude toward Selected Organizations

Responses to the Attitude Inventory were secured from 299 undergraduate women students enroled at the University of Oklahoma. The stratified sampling technique, previously explained in Chapter I, was employed to determine this number. The Inventory was administered in April, 1956.

It will be recalled from the preceding chapter that Part I of the Attitude Inventory was designed to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the specific student organizations selected for study and that four statements were used to secure expression of attitudes toward these selected organizations. These four statements were listed in column form as follows: Column A, "I enjoy this organization;" Column B, "I would like (do like) to belong to this organization;" Column C, "This organization has helped me in my personal development;" and Column D, "This organization should remain on campus." Organizations were listed in alphabetical order according to type as follows: 1-Governing, 2-Social, 3-Service and University-Wide, and 4-Honorary-Departmental-Others. The four statements expressing attitude were placed in columns opposite the 111 selected organizations in such a way that it was possible for a respondent to express attitudes toward each organization regarding

each attitude statement. Respondents marked the appropriate items on a scale as follows: 5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Undecided, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree, and 0-Have No Experience on Which to Judge. Provision was also made for the respondent to indicate membership, past membership, and non-membership in each of the listed organizations. The format of the instrument may be seen in Appendix J.

Scoring of the Data Regarding Selected Student Organizations

When data for Part I were analyzed it was found, with the exception of the Social group, that a larger percent of the respondents had indicated they had "no experience on which to judge." This suggested that they had no attitude toward most of the organizations. In view of this fact the emphasis was turned toward locating those organizations which appeared to be strong and those which appeared to be weak as based upon the kinds of attitudes expressed toward them. In trying to eliminate bias in making this kind of discrimination among organizations toward which attitudes were expressed, it was decided that those organizations toward which fewer than five respondents had indicated an attitude were not to be included in the Extent of Agreement Index, rank order, or percentile rank procedures described in the preceding chapter. It was believed that five respondents would provide opportunity for the five possible responses of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Tables were constructed to present the number and percent of respondents indicating an attitude and the number and percent of respondents indicating no attitude toward each organization in relation to each of the four attitude statements. As indicated in the preceding paragraph,

those organizations toward which five or more respondents had indicated attitudes were included in the Extent of Agreement Index for each of the four attitude statements. In order to determine an Extent of Agreement Index, the responses of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree were arbitrarily weighted 2, 1, -1, and -2 respectively. The percentages of each of these responses were multiplied by the respective weights, and added algebraically. This Extent of Agreement Index shows the total positive ornegative weight of each response. From the Extent of Agreement Index, rank order and percentile ranks were determined for each organization according to the various attitude statements.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data Regarding Selected Organizations

The analysis and interpretation of expressed attitudes toward the organizations included in the study appear in the tables and the discussions which follow. It will be recalled that the statements of attitude were four in number: "I enjoy this organization," "I would like (do like) to belong to this organization," "This organization has helped me in my personal development," and "This organization should remain on campus."

Expressed Attitudes as to Enjoyment of Selected Organizations

The following explanations and tables present the expressed attitudes of those respondents who indicated attitudes toward organizations regarding the statement on enjoyment of the organization. Appendix A shows the number and percentages of respondents who expressed attitudes toward the 111 organizations and the number and percentages of those respondents who indicated no attitudes.

It is evident from Appendix A that the largest percentages of attitudes were expressed toward the social, service, and governing organizations. There were 42 organizations toward which five or more respondents expressed attitudes and 31 organizations towards which no attitudes were expressed in relation to the statement on enjoyment. Table 1 is a summary of Appendix A and shows the total response to the statement relative to the enjoyment of organizations.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF EXPRESSED ATTITUDE AS TO ENJOYMENT OF ALL ORGANIZATIONS

Respondents	Organizations	No. of Times Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		No. of Times No Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		Possible Responses	
		Total No.	Percent	Total No.	Percent	Total	Percent
299	111	1195	3.60	31994	96.40	33189	100

If all 299 respondents had expressed attitudes toward all 111 organizations, there would have been a total of 33,189 responses showing attitudes, but, it is noted, that only 3.60 percent of the number showed attitudes expressed while 96.40 percent showed no attitudes expressed as to enjoyment of the organizations. If it is asked whether it would be possible to enjoy an organization without being a member of and participating in the organization, the answer would be that many of the organizations included in this study sponsor certain kinds of activities in a public way which all students are free to enjoy.

In order to locate those organizations toward which there was an agreement of favorable or unfavorable attitude regarding the enjoyment of

the organizations, the Extent of Agreement Index was employed. It will be recalled from earlier discussion that this Index is a weighted measure of all of the "agree" and "disagree" responses as to the enjoyment of the organization. The possible range of scores provided for in this Index was from 200 to -200. For example, if 100 percent of the respondents expressing attitudes toward an organization strongly agree that they enjoy the organization, the extent of agreement would be a plus 200 score. Or, if they strongly disagree with the statement, the extent or degree of negative agreement would be a -200 score. Appendix B shows the Extent of Scores for the organizations toward which five or more respondents indicated an attitude of enjoyment. These scores range from -146 for one organization to 200 for another. The scores for various types of organizations are shown but are not readily apparent due to the large number of organizations included. Table 2 is presented to show the average of these scores for each type of organization listed.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES AS EXPRESSED BY ALL RESPONDENTS INDICATING AN ATTITUDE OF ENJOYMENT TOWARD THE VARIOUS TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS

Type of Organization	Number of Organizations Included in this Type	Range of Extent of Agreement Scores for Type Organization	Average Extent of Agreement Score for Type Organization
Gov.	6	51 to 154	90
Soc.	16 sororities on campus	154	154
Serv.	2	102 to 123	113
HDO.	102	-146 to 200	133
All Organizations	111	-146 to 200	126

It is noted that the social organizations had the highest average score, 154, and that this type includes only sororities. The governing organizations had the lowest, an average score of 90.

It was deemed important to discover to what extent the attitudes of various member respondents agreed or disagreed regarding the enjoyment of the organizations to which they belonged. In order to locate those organizations toward which the members, non-members, and past members expressed favorable or unfavorable attitudes regarding the organizations, the rank order technique was used. This technique was developed from the Extent of Agreement Scores in Appendix B. The organizations were first listed in rank order, according to differing membership status, from those toward which the highest extent of agreement scores were expressed to those with the lowest scores. From this rank order a percentile rank was determined for each organization toward which a total of five or more respondents expressed attitudes regarding enjoyment of the organization. Organizations toward which a minimum of five members, five non-members, five past members, or five total respondents expressed attitudes, were then given percentile ranks by member, non-member, past member, and total respondents. If fewer than five non-members expressed attitudes toward an organization, that organization was not included in the percentile ranking by non-members. The same basis for elimination was used for ranking according to member, past member, or total respondents. Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 show how the organizations were ranked by these groups regarding the enjoyment of these organizations.

It is evident from Table 3 that the non-members placed the Honorary-Departmental-Other types of organizations near or above the fiftieth

percentile rank. The only exception is the League of Young Democrats which is lowest in rank order and in percentile rank. The Service organizations fall at the 50th and 40th percentile ranks, and all Governing groups lie below the 50th percentile rank.

TABLE 3

ENJOYMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING NON-MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY INDEX OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	5	180	1	98
Engineers Club	HDO.	5	180	1	98
Ducks Club	HDO.	14	150	3	88
Mortar Board	HDO.	12	149	4	83
Orchesis	HDO.	11	145	5	79
Symphony Orchestra	HDO.	7	143	6	74
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	6	133	7	69
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	6	116	8	64
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	6	116	8	64
Fed. of Young Republicans	HDO.	6	116	8	64
Union Activities Board	Serv.	47	111	11	50
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	6	100	12	45
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	17	99	13	40
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	29	85	14	36
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	19	70	15	31
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	26	64	16	26
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	21	60	17	22
Student Senate	Gov.	42	53	18	17
Sorority	Soc.	24	37	19	12
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	21	22	20	7
League of Young Democrats	HDO.	17	-146	21	2

Table 4 shows the ranks of organizations based on the responses of their members as to enjoyment. It is noted that the members have placed the social organization and one service organization above the 50th percentile rank. The Student Senate has moved up from its 17th percentile rank in Table 3 to the 50th percentile when ranked by the members. How-

ever, in Table 4 the remainder of the governing groups are again found below the 50th percentile. The members are found to be in agreement with the non-members in placing the League of Young Democrats again at the lowest rank position and the last percentile rank.

TABLE 4

ENJOYMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY INDEX OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Double "O" Club	HDO.	5	200	1	98
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	9	200	1	98
Mortar Board	HDO.	7	186	3	91
Ducks Club	HDO.	7	186	3	91
Swing Club	HDO.	6	183	5	83
Sorority	Soc.	147	180	6	80
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	5	180	6	80
Racquet Club	HDO.	6	167	8	72
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	16	163	9	69
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	5	160	10	65
Union Activities Board	HDO.	44	154	11	61
Orchesis	HDO.	6	149	12	58
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	22	145	13	54
Student Senate	Gov.	7	143	14	50
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	12	140	15	46
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	10	130	16	43
Oikonomia	HDO.	5	120	17	39
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	6	116	18	35
Fed. of Young Rep.	HDO.	6	116	18	35
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	6	116	18	35
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	43	115	21	24
Fut. Teachers of Amer.	HDO.	26	106	22	20
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	27	99	23	17
Omicron Nu	HDO.	13	90	24	13
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	41	74	25	9
Pep Council	HDO.	7	51	26	6
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	6	49	27	2

Table 5 is presented to show how the past members have ranked the organizations in relation to enjoyment. It seems important to note that

only two Honorary-Departmental-Other types of organizations had five or more respondents and were eligible to be included for ranking by the past-member group. This is perhaps understandable since most of the Honorary and Departmental groups would not have memberships terminating as would the governing organizations. When ranked by past-members, the Student Senate moved from the 50th percentile rank, as given by members, shown in Table 4, to the top rank position of 96th percentile. The Association of Women Students was placed below the 50th percentile by all three groups, non-member, member, and past-member. This low rank on enjoyment may be related to the fact that this is the organization which makes the rules and regulations under which the women students live at the University of Oklahoma. The other governing groups for women serve to use these basic rules and extend them further.

TABLE 5

ENJOYMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING PAST MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Student Senate	Gov.	6	183	1	96
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	7	157	2	87
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	7	143	3	79
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	9	123	4	71
Union Activities Board	Serv.	13	116	5	62
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	10	100	6	54
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	14	91	7	46
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	35	66	8	37
Pep Council	HDO.	6	51	9	29
Sorority	Soc.	6	31	10	21
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	12	26	11	12
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	5	20	12	4

TABLE 6

ENJOYMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS BY ALL REPORTING RESPONDENTS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	5	200	1	99
Double "O" Club	HDO.	8	186	2	98
Engineers Club	HDO.	5	180	3	94
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	10	180	3	94
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	5	180	3	94
University Players	HDO.	5	180	3	94
Mortar Board	HDO.	20	165	7	85
Swing Club	HDO.	8	162	8	82
Ducks Club	HDO.	23	161	9	80
Fencing Club	HDO.	5	160	10	78
Philosophy Club	HDO.	5	160	10	78
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	18	160	10	78
Chess Club	HDO.	5	160	10	78
Racquet Club	HDO.	12	158	14	68
Sorority	Soc.	177	154	15	66
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	22	154	15	66
Orchesis	HDO.	19	154	15	66
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	6	150	18	59
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	7	129	19	55
Union Activities Board	Serv.	104	124	20	54
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	37	123	21	52
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	5	120	22	49
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	6	116	23	47
International Relations	HDO.	6	116	23	47
Omicron Nu	HDO.	6	116	23	47
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	9	110	26	40
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	10	110	26	40
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	14	108	28	35
Student Senate	Gov.	55	107	29	33
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	48	106	30	30
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	95	102	31	28
Oikonomia	HDO.	9	100	32	25
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	60	98	33	23
Fed. Young Rep.	HDO.	16	95	34	21
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	33	94	35	18
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	34	90	36	16
Pep Council	HDO.	17	90	36	16
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	13	90	36	16
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	46	86	39	9
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	13	84	40	6
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	74	51	41	4
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	25	-88	42	2

Table 6 is presented to show how all respondents, including members, non-members, and past members, have ranked the organizations as to enjoyment by these groups. It is noted here that all respondents indicating an attitude toward the enjoyment of the governing organizations have placed these organizations below the 50th percentile rank. The League of Young Democrats is again in the lowest. Twelve, or 38 percent, of the 32 Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations are listed below the 50th percentile rank.

The organizations, as ranked by each of the various membership status groups, are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

PERCENTILE RANKS OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR EACH OF FOUR KINDS OF MEMBERSHIP STATUS RESPONDENTS REGARDING ENJOYMENT OF THE ORGANIZATION

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks for All Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Past Member Respondents
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	99			
Double "O" Club	HDO.	97		98	
Engineers Club	HDO.	94	98		
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	94	98	80	
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	94			
University Players	HDO.	94			
Mortar Board	HDO.	85	83	91	
Swing Club	HDO.	82		83	
Ducks Club	HDO.	80	88	91	
Fencing Club	HDO.	78			
Philosophy Club	HDO.	78			
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	78	45	98	
Chess Club	HDO.	78			
Racquet Club	HDO.	68		72	
Sorority	Soc.	66	12	80	21
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	66	69	69	
Orchesis	HDO.	66	79	58	
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	59			
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	55			

TABLE 7 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks for All Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Past Member Respondents
Union Activities Bd.	Serv.	54	50	61	62
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	52	64	54	71
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	49			
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	47			
International Rel.	HDO.	47			
Omicron Nu	HDO.	47		13	
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	40		65	
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	40		35	
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	35	74		
Student Senate	Gov.	33	17	50	96
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	30	36	46	79
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	28	40	24	37
Oikonomia	HDO.	25		39	
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	23	31	17	46
Fed. Young Rep.	HDO.	21	64	35	
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	18		20	
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	16	22	35	87
Pep Council	HDO.	16		6	29
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	16			
Quadrangle Council	HDO.	9	26	43	54
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	6			4
Ind. Students Assn.	HDO.	4	7	9	12
League Young Demo.	HDO.	2	2	2	

An easy comparison of how various membership status groups have ranked the organizations regarding the enjoyment of these organizations can be made from Table 7. It is interesting to note that those in the upper percentile rank positions have generally been given high ranks by all four membership groups, while those organizations in the lower percentile ranks have consistently been given low ranks.

Expressed Attitudes as to Liking to Belong to Selected Organizations

The statement, "I would like to belong to this organization," was designed to help locate those organizations to which the students liked

to belong. It was also designed to help identify those organizations about which there was the greatest agreement among members and past members with reference to liking to belong.

The responses to the statement about liking to belong to the selected organizations, are shown in Appendix C. It is evident here that the largest numbers of attitudes were expressed toward the social, service, and governing organizations. Sororities lead among these with the largest number of respondents expressing attitudes toward them. There were 61 organizations toward which five or more respondents expressed attitudes regarding liking to belong. There were only 18 organizations about which no expression of attitude was made in relation to liking to belong. Table 8 shows the summary of expressions of attitudes towards all organizations with respect to liking to belong.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF ATTITUDE EXPRESSION REGARDING LIKING TO BELONG TO ALL ORGANIZATIONS

Respondents	Organizations	No. of Times Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		No. of Times No Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		Possible Responses	
		Total No.	Percent	Total No.	Percent	Total	Percent
299	111	2,204	6.94	30,985	93.06	33,189	100

If 299 respondents had expressed attitudes toward all 111 organizations, there would have been a total of 33,189 responses. Table 8 shows that 6.94 percent of the possible total responses were given regarding liking to belong to the organizations. This is almost twice as great as the 3.60 percent of expressions regarding the enjoyment of the

organizations as shown in Table 2. Perhaps this is due to the statement "I would like (do like) to belong to this organization." This statement provided a greater opportunity for the non-members to express attitudes toward the various organizations than did the statement, "I enjoy this organization."

In order to locate those organizations toward which there was an agreement of favorable or unfavorable attitude regarding liking to belong to them, the Extent of Agreement Index was again employed. This procedure was particularly helpful in identifying those organizations toward which the non-members expressed a desire to belong. The Extent of Agreement Index has been previously explained in connection with Appendix A. The same procedures have been followed in determining the extents of agreement regarding liking to belong to the organizations. The details are to be found in Appendix D. It is noted here that the scores of extent of agreement as expressed by all respondents, range from -93 for one organization to a plus 188 for another organization. Significant data from Appendix D are summarized in Table 9 where ranges and averages of scores are shown.

The Honorary-Departmental-Other type of organization has the highest average score. This is contrary to the average degree of agreement shown toward the types of organizations in regard to enjoyment of the organizations, where the Social type had the greatest amount of favorable agreement. As compared with enjoyment of the organizations, Table 2, it is noted that the degrees of favorable agreement are lower for each of the four types of organizations regarding liking to belong to them than they were in relation to the enjoyment of the organizations.

TABLE 9

AVERAGE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES AS EXPRESSED BY ALL RESPONDENTS INDICATING AN ATTITUDE OF LIKING TO BELONG TO THE VARIOUS TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS

Type Organization	No. of Organizations Included in this Type	Range of Extent of Agreement Scores for Type	Average Extent of Agreement Score for Type Organization
Gov.	6	-8 to 79	51
Soc.	16 Sororities	112	112
Serv.	2	79 to 106	98
HDO.	102	-93 to 182	156
All Organizations	111	-93 to 182	117

Table 10 shows how the non-members ranked the organizations in relation to liking to belong to these groups. It is interesting to note in Table 10 that all of the organizations placed above the 50th percentile rank by the non-members are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. This seems to indicate that the non-member respondents who indicated attitudes would rather belong to the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. This seems to indicate that the non-member respondents who indicated attitudes would rather belong to the Honorary-Departmental-Other groups than to the social, service, or governing types of organizations. The sororities are ground at the 50th percentile rank. This indicates agreement among independent women that they do not wish to become sorority members. The League of Young Democrats is again at the low point in rank order and percentile rank regarding liking to belong to the organizations. It will be recalled that the non-members placed this organization in the lowest rank position in relation to enjoyment of the organizations.

TABLE 10

LIKING TO BELONG TO THE ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING NON-MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	5	200	1	99
Mortar Board	HDO.	62	188	2	97
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	30	177	3	95
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	6	171	4	93
Psi Chi	HDO.	5	160	5	91
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	7	157	6	89
Orchesis	HDO.	27	156	7	87
Philosophy Club	HDO.	8	150	8	85
Swing Club	HDO.	8	150	8	85
Oikonomia	HDO.	11	137	10	81
Omicron Nu	HDO.	9	134	11	80
Chess Club	HDO.	6	133	12	78
Double "O" Club	HDO.	42	133	12	78
Fencing Club	HDO.	13	130	14	74
Fed. Young Rep.	HDO.	20	130	14	74
Racquet Club	HDO.	10	130	14	74
English Club	HDO.	7	128	17	68
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	7	127	18	66
Social Work Club	HDO.	11	126	19	64
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	9	122	20	62
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	14	122	20	62
Badminton Club	HDO.	11	117	22	58
Accounting Club	HDO.	6	116	23	56
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	6	116	23	56
International Club	HDO.	7	115	25	52
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	8	114	26	50
University Players	HDO.	7	113	27	48
Ducks Club	HDO.	42	104	28	46
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	8	102	29	44
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	7	101	30	38
Entre Nous	HDO.	8	100	31	40
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	5	100	31	40
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	19	89	32	36
Union Activities Board	Serv.	121	88	34	34
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	7	84	35	32
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	11	81	36	30
Pep Council	HDO.	13	70	37	28
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	10	70	37	28
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	116	66	38	25
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	81	61	39	23

TABLE 10 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	117	61	39	23
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	5	60	41	19
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	16	56	43	17
Sorority	Soc.	64	43	44	15
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	73	40	45	13
Student Senate	Gov.	141	40	45	13
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	77	42	47	9
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	6	-17	48	7
Independent Stud. Assn.	Gov.	71	-56	49	5
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	33	-107	50	2

Table 11 shows the rank order and percentile ranks of the organizations as expressed by the members regarding liking to belong to these organizations. It appears that the members have placed the social organization and both service groups above the 50th percentile rank. Other organizations above the 50th percentile rank are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. The League of Young Democrats is not included in this table because fewer than five respondents indicated an attitude regarding liking to belong to it.

Table 12 shows how the past members ranked the organizations in relation to liking to belong. It is important to note that only three Honorary-Departmental-Other type organizations had five or more past members indicating attitudes toward them and were eligible to be included for ranking by the past-member group. These groups usually do not have elective or expiring memberships as do the governing organizations. The Student Senate has moved up from its 13th and 22nd rank positions by the non-member and member groups to the 96th percentile rank by past members. Although the sororities were ranked high by members who indicated an atti-

tude toward liking to belong, they are placed fairly low, in the 14th percentile rank position by the past members.

TABLE 11

LIKING TO BELONG TO THE ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Mortar Board	HDO.	7	200	1	99
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	9	200	1	99
Swing Club	HDO.	6	183	3	94
Sorority	Soc.	151	181	4	90
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	5	180	5	86
Orchesis	HDO.	5	180	5	86
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	16	163	7	78
Double "O" Club	HDO.	5	160	8	74
Ducks Club	HDO.	5	160	8	74
Union Activities Board	Serv.	45	151	10	66
Racquet Club	HDO.	6	150	11	62
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	22	145	12	58
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	35	142	13	54
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	11	137	14	50
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	6	133	15	46
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	30	132	16	42
Oikonomia	HDO.	5	120	17	38
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	8	114	18	34
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	9	111	19	30
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	23	105	20	26
Student Senate	Gov.	8	101	21	22
Fed. Young Rep.	HDO.	7	100	22	18
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	5	100	22	18
Pep Council	HDO.	6	99	24	10
Independent Stud. Assn.	Gov.	38	65	25	6
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	6	33	26	2

TABLE 12

LIKING TO BELONG TO THE ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING PAST MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Student Senate	Gov.	6	183	1	96
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	7	129	2	86
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	9	121	3	77
Union Activities Bd.	Serv.	13	99	4	68
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	9	67	5	59
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	16	82	6	50
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	9	56	7	41
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	36	55	8	32
Pep Council	HDO.	6	51	9	23
Sorority	Soc.	6	34	10	14
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	6	16	11	5
Independent Stud. Assn.	Gov.	10	-80	12	1

Table 13 shows how all respondents, including members, non-members, and past members, have ranked the organizations regarding liking to belong to these groups.

It is evident that all respondents indicating an attitude toward liking to belong to the Social, Service, and Governing organizations, have placed these organizations below the 50th percentile rank. All organizations above the 50th percentile rank are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. The League of Young Democrats is once again found in the last rank order position and last percentile rank.

TABLE 13

LIKING TO BELONG TO THE ORGANIZATIONS BY ALL REPORTING RESPONDENTS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	8	188	1	99
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	35	182	2	98
Finance Club	HDO.	5	180	3	96
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	5	180	3	96
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	7	171	5	93
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	7	171	5	93
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	6	167	7	89
Swing Club	HDO.	14	164	8	88
Mortar Board	HDO.	19	162	9	86
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	5	160	10	85
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	5	160	10	85
Psi Chi	HDO.	5	160	10	85
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	7	157	13	80
Orchesis	HDO.	34	156	14	78
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	24	155	15	76
Double "O" Club	HDO.	14	143	16	75
Chess Club	HDO.	8	138	17	73
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	12	135	18	71
University Players	HDO.	9	134	19	70
International Club	HDO.	9	134	19	70
Omicron Nu	HDO.	13	133	21	66
Philosophy Club	HDO.	12	133	21	66
Fencing Club	HDO.	16	132	23	63
Racquet Club	HDO.	19	132	23	63
English Club	HDO.	10	130	25	60
Badminton Club	HDO.	14	129	26	58
Accounting Club	HDO.	7	129	26	58
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	26	127	28	55
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	7	127	28	55
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	37	126	30	52
Social Work Club	HDO.	11	126	30	52
Fed. Young Rep.	HDO.	30	123	32	48
Oikonomia	HDO.	18	121	33	47
History Club	HDO.	5	120	34	45
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	6	118	35	44
Entre Nous	HDO.	10	118	35	44
Lambda Tau	HDO.	6	117	37	40
Sorority	Soc.	221	112	38	39
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	9	110	39	37
International Rel.	HDO.	11	109	40	35

TABLE 13 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	15	107	41	34
Union Activities Board	Serv.	179	106	42	32
Ducks Club	HDO.	49	105	43	30
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	7	101	44	29
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	13	99	45	27
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	46	93	46	25
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	14	87	47	24
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	7	84	48	22
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	6	82	49	20
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	162	79	50	19
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	137	79	50	19
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	152	79	50	19
Student Senate	Gov.	155	72	53	14
Pep Council	HDO.	25	72	53	14
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	7	58	55	11
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	23	49	56	9
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	9	44	57	7
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	90	42	58	6
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	90	38	59	4
Independent Stud. Assn.	Gov.	119	-8	60	2
League Young Demo.	HDO.	38	-93	61	1

Table 14 shows how the organizations have been ranked by the various membership status groups in regard to liking to belong to the organizations. It provides a view of how each organization has been ranked by the various membership status groups relative to liking to belong to it.

Attention is directed to the fact, in Table 14, that the members of Phi Beta Kappa, Orchesis, Racquet Club, Double "O" Club, Federation of Young Republicans, Oikonomia, Future Teachers of America, Theta Sigma Phi, and Junior Panhellenic have ranked these organizations lower than the non-members ranked them. Past members ranked Junior Panhellenic, Union Activities Board, Quadrangle Council, and Alpha Lambda Delta higher than the non-members, members, or all respondents who indicated attitudes toward these groups.

TABLE 14

PERCENTILE RANKS OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR EACH OF FOUR KINDS OF MEMBERSHIP STATUS RESPONDENTS ON THE STATEMENT OF LIKING TO BELONG TO THE ORGANIZATIONS

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks for All Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Past Member Respondents
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	99	99		
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	98	95	86	
Finance Club	HDO.	96			
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	96			
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	93	93		
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	93			
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	89			
Swing Club	HDO.	88	85	94	
Mortar Board	HDO.	86	97	99	
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	85			
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	85			
Psi Chi	HDO.	85	91		
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	80	89		
Orchesis	HDO.	78	87	86	
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	86	62	99	
Double "O" Club	HDO.	75	78	74	
Chess Club	HDO.	73	78		
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	71			
University Players	HDO.	70	48		
International Club	HDO.	70	52		
Omicron Nu	HDO.	66	80		
Philosophy Club	HDO.	66	85		
Fencing Club	HDO.	63	74		
Racquet Club	HDO.	63	74	62	
English Club	HDO.	60	68	62	
Badminton Club	HDO.	58	58		
Accounting Club	HDO.	58	56		
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	55	28	78	
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	55	66		
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	52	56	58	59
Social Work Club	HDO.	52	64		
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	48	74	18	
Oikonomia	HDO.	47	81	38	
History Club	HDO.	45			
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	44	62	46	
Entre Nous	HDO.	44	40		
Lambda Tau	HDO.	40			
Sorority	Soc.	39	15	90	14
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	37	40		

TABLE 14 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks for All Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Past Member Respondents
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	35	50		
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	34	30		
Union Act. Board	Serv.	32	34	66	68
Ducks Club	HDO.	30	46	74	
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	29	38		
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	27		30	
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	25	36	26	
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	24	44	18	
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	22	32		
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	20	19		
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	19	25	42	50
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	19	23	50	77
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	19	23	54	32
Student Senate	Gov.	14	13	22	96
Pep Council	HDO.	14	28	10	23
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	11			
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	9	17		5
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	7	7		
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	6	9	2	86
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	4	13	34	41
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	2	5	6	1
League Young Demo.	HDO.	1	2		

Expressed Attitudes Regarding Help in Personal Development from the Organizations

The Statement, "This organization has helped me in my personal development," was included in the inventory in order to locate those organizations which the respondents felt had been of great or of little benefit to them. The details can be seen in Appendix E.

The largest numbers and percentages of attitudes were expressed toward the Social, Service, and Governing organizations. There were 40 organizations toward which five or more respondents expressed attitudes. Thirty-one organizations had fewer than five respondents indicating atti-

tudes toward them, and 34 had no respondents expressing attitudes toward them in relation to help in personal developmental from these groups. Expressions of attitudes toward all the organizations regarding help in personal development are summarized in Table 15. It is noted that only 3.44 percent of the total possible responses were given to the statement of help in personal development received from student organizations. This is less than the 6.94 percent expressing attitudes on liking to belong to the organizations, and it is slightly less than the 3.60 percent expressing attitudes toward enjoyment of the organizations.

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF EXPRESSED ATTITUDE REGARDING HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT FROM THE ORGANIZATIONS

Respondents	Organizations	No. of Times Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		No. of Times No Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		Possible Responses	
		Total No.	Percent	Total No.	Percent	Total	Percent
299	111	1143	3.44	32046	96.56	33189	100

In order to locate those organizations toward which there was an agreement of favorable or unfavorable attitude regarding help in personal development received from these organizations, the Extent of Agreement Index was again used. This procedure was particularly helpful in locating those organizations which the members felt had been most helpful in personal development. Also, it was believed important to locate those organizations which the non-members and past members felt had been of great help or of little help in personal development.

Appendix F. shows that extents of agreement, as expressed by all respondents, ranging from -27 for one organization to a plus 188 for another. Table 16 shows the average degree or extent of agreement as expressed by all respondents indicating an attitude toward the various types of organizations in relation to personal developmental help received from these organizations. It is evident in Table 16 that the average degree of favorable attitude toward personal developmental help received from the various types of organizations, is greater toward the Social type. This expression of attitude is in agreement with the statement on enjoyment of the organizations, where the average degree of agreement was also higher toward the Social groups. The Honorary-Departmental-Other type of organizations were given second place in average degree of agreement toward personal developmental help, whereas, in liking to belong, they received the most favorable average degree of agreement.

TABLE 16

AVERAGE EXTENTS OF AGREEMENT AS EXPRESSED BY ALL RESPONDENTS INDICATING AN ATTITUDE TOWARD HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED FROM THE VARIOUS TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS

Type of Organization	No. of Organizations Included in This Type	Range of Extent of Agreement Scores for Type	Average Extent of Agreement Score for Type Organization
Gov.	6	-11 to 107	35
Soc.	16 Sororities	159	159
Serv.	2	68 to 74	71
HDO.	102	-27 to 188	110
All Organizations	111	-27 to 188	95

Table 17 shows how the non-members ranked the organizations in relation to personal developmental help received. Those indicating an

attitude toward personal developmental help received from the organizations, have placed the Student Senate at the 50th percentile rank position. All organizations above this position are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. The Governing, Social, and Service organizations are all below the 50th percentile rank, and one organization of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type is found below this 50th percentile. This organization is the League of Young Democrats, and it was placed in the lowest percentile rank position by the non-members. This was its same position in relation to enjoyment of the organization and liking to belong to the organization by this group.

TABLE 17

HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED FROM ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING NON-MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	10	190	1	97
Engineers Club	HDO.	5	180	2	92
Ducks Club	HDO.	14	150	3	87
Orchesis	HDO.	7	143	4	82
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	7	142	5	76
Mortar Board	HDO.	13	131	6	71
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	5	120	7	66
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	6	116	8	61
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	8	100	9	55
Student Senate	Gov.	42	86	10	50
Independent Students Assn.	Gov.	30	43	11	45
Union Activities Board	Serv.	40	42	12	40
Sorority	Soc.	24	38	13	34
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	18	33	14	29
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	29	20	15	24
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	42	-2	16	19
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	29	-10	17	13
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	19	-12	18	8
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	5	-80	19	3

TABLE 18

HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED FROM ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	8	200	1	98
Sorority	Soc.	147	179	2	93
Student Senate	Gov.	7	143	3	88
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	15	126	4	83
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	6	116	5	78
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	39	110	6	73
Swing Club	HDO.	6	99	7	68
Union Activities Board	Serv.	43	93	8	63
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	9	90	9	58
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	14	87	10	53
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	26	85	11	48
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	19	70	12	43
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	5	60	13	38
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	23	48	14	33
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	5	40	15	28
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	5	40	15	28
Independent Students Assn.	Gov.	32	35	17	18
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	7	26	18	13
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	9	11	19	8
Pep Council	HDO.	7	-29	20	3

In Table 18, it can be seen that 64 percent of the Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations have been placed above the 50th percentile rank by the members indicating attitudes toward these groups regarding personal developmental help. The members have placed 50 percent of the Governing organizations above the 50th percentile. Both Service organizations are found above the 60th percentile. The League of Young Democrats moved up by members from lowest rank position by the non-members regarding personal developmental help. In its place, the Pep Council was ranked lowest by members.

Table 19 shows how the past members ranked the organizations toward which they indicated attitudes in relation to help in personal de-

velopment received from these organizations. Only one Honorary-Departmental-Other organization is included in this table. The Student Senate was ranked first as a source of help in personal development as it had been, by the same group, on the questions pertaining to enjoyment and liking to belong to the organization. The sororities or Social type organization was ranked high by members with respect to help in personal development, but it was placed in the 39th percentile rank by past members in this respect. One Service organization, the Union Activities Board, is found above the 50th percentile, and the other Service organization, the Y.W.C.A., was placed at the 48th percentile rank by past members regarding help in personal development. The Independent Students Association was placed in the 45th percentile rank by non-members and in the 18th percentile rank by members while past members placed this organization in the lowest rank order and lowest percentile.

TABLE 19

HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED FROM ORGANIZATIONS BY REPORTING PAST MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Student Senate	Gov.	6	183	1	94
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	8	139	2	84
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	6	117	3	75
Union Activities Board	Serv.	12	75	4	66
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	9	68	5	57
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	36	49	6	48
Sorority	Soc.	6	34	7	39
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	17	-13	8	30
Pep Council	HDO.	6	-17	9	16
Independent Students Assn.	Gov.	10	-70	10	8

TABLE 20

HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED FROM ORGANIZATIONS BY ALL REPORTING RESPONDENTS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	5	200	1	99
Double "O" Club	HDO.	8	188	2	96
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	11	182	3	94
Engineers Club	HDO.	5	180	4	91
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	5	180	4	91
Ducks Club	HDO.	23	161	6	86
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	5	160	7	84
Fencing Club	HDO.	5	160	7	84
Sorority	Soc.	177	159	9	79
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	13	154	10	76
Mortar Board	HDO.	18	146	11	74
Orchesis	HDO.	13	146	11	74
Omicron Nu	HDO.	7	143	13	69
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	18	124	14	66
Swing Club	HDO.	9	121	15	64
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	5	120	16	61
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	6	116	17	59
Oikonomia	HDO.	8	113	18	56
Racquet Club	HDO.	8	113	19	54
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	11	109	20	51
Student Senate	Gov.	55	107	21	49
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	16	106	22	46
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	93	74	23	44
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	25	73	24	41
Badminton Club	HDO.	7	71	25	39
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	10	70	26	36
Union Activities Board	Serv.	95	68	27	34
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	32	68	27	34
Womens Recreation Assn.	HDO.	14	64	29	29
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	5	60	20	26
Philosophy Club	HDO.	5	60	30	26
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	7	45	32	21
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	47	41	33	19
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	49	36	34	16
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	34	32	35	14
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	82	11	36	11
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	9	11	36	11
Pep Council	HDO.	15	-7	38	6
Independent Students Assn.	Gov.	72	-11	39	4
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	11	-27	40	1

Table 20 shows how all organizations toward which five or more respondents, including members, non-members, and past members indicating attitudes toward personal developmental help, have ranked these organizations. The sororities are found at the 79th percentile rank while all other organizations above the 50th percentile rank are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. The Student Senate is located at the 49th percentile, and the other five Governing groups are below the 20th percentile. The Y.W.C.A. is 44th in percentile rank, and the other Service organization, Union Activities Board, is 34th. The League of Young Democrats is again found in the last rank position and in the lowest percentile rank.

Table 21 shows how the organizations were ranked by the various membership status groups in regard to help in personal development received from the organizations. It should be recalled that those organizations are included about which fewer than five respondents expressed attitudes. This table shows that Alpha Lambda Delta was rated lower by members than by non-members. Past members gave higher percentile rank positions to the Student Senate, Union Activities Board, Panhellenic Council, Junior Panhellenic Council, and Pep Council than did the members of these organizations.

TABLE 21

PERCENTILE RANKS OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR EACH OF FOUR KINDS OF MEMBERSHIP STATUS RESPONDENTS REGARDING STATEMENT ON HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED FROM THE ORGANIZATIONS

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks for All Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks for Past Member Respondents
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	99			
Double "O" Club	HDO.	96			
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	94		98	
Engineers Club	HDO.	91			
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	91			
Ducks Club	HDO.	86	87		
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	84			
Fencing Club	HDO.	84			
Sorority	HDO.	79	34	93	39
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	76	97		
Mortar Board	HDO.	74	71		
Orchesis	HDO.	74	82		
Omicron Nu	HDO.	69			
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	66		83	
Swing Club	HDO.	64		68	
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	61			
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	59			
Oikonomia	HDO.	56			
Racquet Club	HDO.	54			
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	51	66		
Student Senate	HDO.	49	50	88	94
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	46	61	78	
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	44	29	73	48
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	41	76	43	
Badminton Club	HDO.	39			
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	36		38	
Union Act. Board	Serv.	34	40	63	66
Fut. Teachers Am.	HDO.	34		48	
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	29	55		
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	26			
Philosophy Club	HDO.	26			
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	21		28	
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	19	24	58	57
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	16	13	53	75
Jr. Panhellenic	Gov.	14	8	13	84
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	11	19	33	30
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	11		8	
Pep Council	HDO.	6		3	16
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	4	45	18	8
League Young Demo.	HDO.	1	3	28	

Expressed Attitudes Regarding Desire for the Organizations to Remain on Campus

The statement, "This organization should remain on campus," was designed in order to locate those organizations and types of organizations which the respondents felt were of such little value that they should no longer remain on campus. Also, it was intended to identify those organizations toward which strong favorable attitudes were held regarding the statement of remaining on campus. These data are shown in detail in Appendix G.

It is evident from these data that more attitudes were expressed toward the Social, Service, and Governing types than toward other types. There were 96 organizations toward which five or more respondents indicated attitudes as to whether the organization should remain on campus and 15 organizations about which fewer than five respondents expressed attitudes. All organizations listed had one or more respondents expressing attitudes toward them. Table 22 contains a summary of expressed attitudes toward all organizations. It is noted that 10.10 percent of the total possible responses expressed the attitude that the organizations should remain on campus. This percentage is larger than the percentages reflecting attitudes towards enjoyment of the organizations, liking to belong to the organizations, or help in personal development received from the organizations.

The Extent of Agreement Index, included as Appendix H, shows the degrees of agreement of those respondents who indicated attitudes toward the statement that the organizations should remain on campus. The range is from a -12 for the League of Young Democrats to a plus 188 for Mu Phi Epsilon.

TABLE 22

SUMMARY OF EXPRESSED ATTITUDE REGARDING DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS

Respondents	Organizations	No. of Times Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		No. of Times No Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		Possible Responses	
		Total No.	Percent	Total No.	Percent	Total	Percent
N is 299	N is 111	3353	10.10	29836	89.90	33189	100

TABLE 23

AVERAGE DEGREES OF AGREEMENT AS EXPRESSED BY ALL RESPONDENTS INDICATING AN ATTITUDE TOWARD THE TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS REGARDING STATEMENT ON DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS

Type Organization	No. of Organizations Included in This Type	Range of Extent of Agreement Scores for Type	Average Extent of Agreement Score for Type Organization
Gov.	6	137 to 158	147
Soc.	16 Sororities	152	152
Serv.	2	150 to 161	156
HDO.	102	-12 to 188	154
All Organizations	111	-12 to 188	152

Table 23 shows the average degree of agreement as expressed by all respondents indicating an attitude toward the various types of organizations in relation to the organizations remaining on campus. The average degree of favorable attitude is greatest toward the Service types and least toward the Governing type. This is in agreement with the expression of attitude toward these groups as to enjoyment of the organizations, help in personal development received from the organizations, and liking to belong to the organizations. The Governing types were given

the lowest average degrees of agreement on all four of the attitude statements. However, it is noted that the range is relatively small, 147 to 156, on the question of whether the various types of organizations should remain on campus.

Table 24 shows how the non-members ranked the organizations on the question of retaining these groups on campus. Two Governing organizations, the Association of Women Students and the Student Senate, are found at the 54th percentile point. The remainder of the Governing groups are found at the 37th, 33rd, 15th, and 13th percentile rank positions. All other organizations above the 50th percentile rank are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. The Service organizations, the Union Activities Board and the Y.W.C.A., were placed at the 45th and 43rd percentile rank, respectively. It is interesting to note that non-members, who indicated attitudes toward the Sororities, placed these groups at the third percentile rank. Whereas, non-members placed the Independent Students Association at the 33rd percentile rank. The League of Young Democrats again is found in the last rank and last percentile rank positions. Non-members gave the League of Young Democrats a score of -30. This negative score, the only negative score given any organization, seems to indicate that those respondents who expressed attitudes toward this organization, tend to agree that it should not remain on campus.

TABLE 24

DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS BY REPORTING NON-MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	41	185	1	99
Mortar Board	HDO.	69	182	2	98
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	9	178	3	97
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	11	175	4	96
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	8	175	4	96
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	8	175	4	96
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	46	175	4	96
Oikonomia	HDO.	19	174	8	92
Orchesis	HDO.	38	174	8	92
Double "O" Club	HDO.	18	172	10	90
International Club	HDO.	14	171	11	89
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	17	171	11	89
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	10	170	13	85
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	7	170	13	85
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	7	170	13	85
Philosophy Club	HDO.	13	169	16	84
Badminton Club	HDO.	6	167	17	83
Classics Club	HDO.	9	167	17	83
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	6	167	17	83
University Players	HDO.	20	167	17	83
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	12	166	21	81
Sigma Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	8	163	22	77
Ducks Club	HDO.	52	163	22	77
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	8	163	22	77
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	17	163	22	77
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	13	162	26	74
Int. Rel. Club	HDO.	15	161	27	71
Omicron Nu	HDO.	18	161	27	71
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	13	161	27	71
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Am. Pharm. Assn.	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Am. Soc. Civil Engr.	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Rho Chi	HDO.	5	160	30	69
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	7	157	40	58
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	7	157	40	58

TABLE 24 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	7	157	40	58
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	7	157	40	58
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	171	156	44	54
Student Senate	Gov.	220	156	44	54
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	20	155	46	52
Psi Chi	HDO.	11	155	46	52
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	11	155	46	52
Chess Club	HDO.	11	155	46	52
Engineers Club	HDO.	11	155	46	52
English Club	HDO.	9	155	46	52
Union Activities Board	Serv.	154	154	52	45
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	15	153	53	44
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	106	150	54	43
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	10	150	54	43
History Club	HDO.	10	150	54	43
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	12	150	54	43
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	12	150	54	43
Xi Mu	HDO.	6	150	54	43
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	194	149	60	37
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	31	148	61	36
Racquet Club	HDO.	15	147	62	35
Fencing Club	HDO.	13	146	63	34
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	169	145	64	33
Phi Sigma	HDO.	9	144	65	31
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	9	144	65	31
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	7	143	67	29
Air Knockers	HDO.	7	143	67	29
Entre Nous	HDO.	14	143	67	29
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	7	143	67	29
German Club	HDO.	7	143	67	29
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	15	141	72	27
Industrial Arts Club	HDO.	5	140	73	23
Lambda Tau	HDO.	5	140	73	23
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	5	140	73	23
Sigma Tau	HDO.	5	140	73	23
Social Work Club	HDO.	15	140	73	23
Society Industrial Mgt.	HDO.	5	140	73	23
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	10	140	73	23
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	171	139	80	15
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	177	137	81	13
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	8	137	81	13
Finance Club	HDO.	6	133	83	11
Petroleum Engr. Club	HDO.	6	133	83	11
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	6	133	83	11
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	12	133	83	11

TABLE 24 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Soc. Geological Engr.	HDO.	6	133	83	11
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	6	133	83	11
Swing Club	HDO.	10	130	89	6
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	27	115	91	4
Pep Council	HDO.	20	115	91	4
Sorority	Soc.	84	102	92	3
Accounting Club	HDO.	12	101	93	2
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	45	-30	94	1

Table 25 shows how the members have ranked their organizations in relation to desire for the organizations to remain on campus.

It is evident here that 56 percent of the Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations have been placed above the 50th percentile rank by members. Five of the six Governing organizations had five or more members indicating attitudes toward them, and were eligible to be included. Only one Governing group, the Student Senate, was placed above the 50th percentile rank. Members gave the sororities a fairly high percentile rank, 76, and the Service groups are found at the 54th and 39th percentile ranks. The League of Young Democrats was placed at the sixth percentile rank. The members of the Pep Council placed it in the last rank order position and lowest percentile rank.

TABLE 25

DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS BY REPORTING MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Double "O" Club	HDO.	5	200	1	98
Ducks Club	HDO.	7	200	1	98
Mortar Board	HDO.	7	200	1	98
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	5	200	1	98
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	9	200	1	98
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	5	200	1	98
Sorority	Soc.	150	190	7	76
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	21	190	7	76
Student Senate	Gov.	7	186	9	69
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	6	183	10	65
Swing Club	HDO.	6	183	10	65
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	15	180	12	58
Union Activities Board	Serv.	46	177	13	54
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	12	175	14	48
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	31	174	15	43
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	46	168	16	39
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	11	164	17	36
Fut. Teachers of Amer.	HDO.	27	163	18	32
Oikonomia	HDO.	5	160	19	28
Orchesis	HDO.	5	160	19	28
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	11	155	21	21
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	6	150	22	17
Racquet Club	HDO.	6	150	22	17
Indep. Students Assn.	Gov.	46	125	24	10
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	5	120	25	6
Pep Council	HDO.	5	100	26	2

Table 26 shows how the past members ranked the organizations toward which they indicated attitudes regarding desire for the organizations to remain on campus.

It is noted that two of the three Honorary-Departmental-Other type organizations are below the 50th percentile rank and are in the last rank order and lowest percentile rank position. These are the Pep Council and the Womens Recreation Association. The Panhellenic Council was

given the highest rank order and highest percentile rank position. The Student Senate is second in rank order position and is in the 88th percentile rank. This differs somewhat from the first rank and highest percentile ranks given by the Senate past members on enjoyment, liking to belong, and help in personal development. The sororities were given fairly low rank order and a percentile rank of 29 by past members. The Service organizations are at the 63rd and 46th percentile rank positions.

TABLE 26

DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS BY REPORTING PAST MEMBERS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	7	200	1	96
Student Senate	Gov.	6	183	2	88
Jr. Panhellenic Council	Gov.	8	175	3	79
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	9	166	4	71
Union Activities Board	Serv.	13	154	5	63
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	13	153	6	54
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	34	138	7	46
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	10	130	8	38
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	10	120	9	29
Sorority	Soc.	5	120	9	29
Pep Council	HDO.	5	100	11	13
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	5	100	11	13

Table 27 shows how the organizations have been ranked by all respondents who indicated attitudes toward them regarding having the organization remain on campus. All respondents who indicated attitudes toward the organizations listed in this table, have placed one Service organization and two Governing organizations above the 50th percentile rank. All other organizations above this rank are those of the Honorary-Departmental-Other type. The sororities are located at the 37th percentile. The Quad-

rangle Council received the lowest percentile rank of all Governing organizations. The League of Young Democrats is again found in the last rank order and in the lowest percentile rank position with a score of -12. Respondents tend to agree that it should not remain on campus.

TABLE 27

DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS BY ALL REPORTING RESPONDENTS AS EXPRESSED BY EXTENT OF AGREEMENT SCORES, RANK ORDER, AND PERCENTILE RANK

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	32	188	1	99
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	46	187	2	99
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	11	182	3	98
Mortar Board	HDO.	77	182	3	98
Double "0" Club	HDO.	26	181	5	95
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	5	180	6	94
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	76	179	7	93
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	8	175	8	92
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	11	175	8	92
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	26	173	10	90
Orchesis	HDO.	43	172	11	89
International Club	HDO.	17	171	12	88
University Players	HDO.	17	171	12	88
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	7	170	14	86
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	10	170	14	86
Omicron Nu	HDO.	22	168	16	84
Ducks Club	HDO.	61	167	17	83
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	9	167	17	83
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	6	167	17	83
Pen Club	HDO.	6	167	17	83
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	8	167	17	83
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	12	166	22	78
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	14	164	23	77
Oikonomia	HDO.	25	164	23	77
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	11	164	23	77
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	11	164	23	77
Badminton Club	HDO.	8	163	27	72
Sigma Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	8	163	27	72
International Relations	HDO.	19	162	29	70
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	13	162	29	70

TABLE 27 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Union Activities Board	Serv.	213	161	31	68
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	13	161	31	68
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	10	160	33	66
Am. Society Civil Engr.	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Classics Club	HDO.	10	160	33	66
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	10	160	33	66
Rho Chi	HDO.	5	160	33	66
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	15	160	33	66
Assn. of Women Students	Gov.	215	158	44	55
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	26	158	44	55
Student Senate	Gov.	233	157	46	53
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	7	157	46	53
Am. Pharm. Assn.	HDO.	7	157	46	53
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	7	157	46	53
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	7	157	46	53
Xi Mu	HDO.	7	157	46	53
Lambda Tau	HDO.	9	156	52	46
Engineers Club	HDO.	11	155	53	46
Psi Chi	HDO.	11	155	53	46
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	24	155	53	46
Chess Club	HDO.	13	154	56	42
Entre Nous	HDO.	17	153	57	41
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	19	153	57	41
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	17	153	57	41
Philosophy Club	HDO.	17	153	57	41
Sorority	Soc.	239	152	61	37
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	213	151	62	36
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	186	150	63	35
English Club	HDO.	12	150	63	35
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	12	150	63	35
History Club	HDO.	10	150	63	35
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	10	150	63	35
Swing Club	HDO.	16	150	63	35
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	14	150	63	35
Finance Club	HDO.	8	149	70	28
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	62	149	70	28
Racquet Club	HDO.	25	148	72	26
German Club	HDO.	9	144	73	25
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	16	144	73	25
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	16	144	73	25

TABLE 27 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	No.	Index for Extent of Agreement	Rank	Percentile Rank
Phi Sigma	HDO.	9	144	73	25
Air Knockers	HDO.	7	143	77	20
Pet. Engineers Club	HDO.	7	143	77	20
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	225	141	79	18
Industrial Arts Club	HDO.	5	140	80	17
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	5	140	80	17
Sigma Tau	HDO.	5	140	80	17
Social Work Club	HDO.	15	140	80	17
Society Indus. Mgt.	HDO.	5	140	80	17
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	10	140	80	17
Jr. Panhellenic	Gov.	189	139	86	11
Fencing Club	HDO.	16	138	87	10
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	192	137	88	9
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	6	133	89	8
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	12	133	89	8
Society Geol. Engr.	HDO.	6	133	89	8
Fed. of Young Repub.	HDO.	7	125	92	5
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	7	115	93	4
Pep Council	HDO.	30	110	94	3
Accounting Club	HDO.	13	100	95	2
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	51	-12	96	1

Table 28 shows how the organizations have been ranked by the various membership status groups regarding desire for the organizations to remain on campus. If an organization had fewer than five respondents of specific membership status expressing attitudes toward it, this organization was included in the ranked list by that specific membership group. It is interesting to note in this table that Alpha Lambda Delta, Oikonomia, Association of Women Students, Las Dos Americas, Future Teachers of America, and the Independent Students Association were all given lower percentile ranks by members than by non-members while past members gave higher percentile ranks to the Union Activities Board, the Independent Students Association, and the Y.W.C.A. than did the members.

TABLE 28

PERCENTILE RANKS OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR EACH OF FOUR KINDS OF MEMBERSHIP STATUS RESPONDENTS REGARDING STATEMENT ON DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks by All Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Past Member Respondents
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	99	89	58	
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	99	99	98	
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	98	97	98	
Mortar Board	HDO.	98	98	98	
Double "O" Club	HDO.	95	90	98	
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	94			
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	93	96	76	71
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	92	96		
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	92	96		
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	90	44	98	
Orchesis	HDO.	89	92	28	
International Club	HDO.	88	89		
University Players	HDO.	88	83		
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	86	85		
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	86	85		
Omicron Nu	HDO.	84	71		
Ducks Club	HDO.	83	77	98	
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	83	58		
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	83	69		
Pen Club	HDO.	83			
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	83	83		
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	78	81		
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	77	43		
Oikonomia	HDO.	77	92	28	
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	77	77		
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	77	11	98	
Badminton Club	HDO.	72	83		
Sigma Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	72	77		
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	70	71		
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	70	74		
Union Activities Bd.	Serv.	68	45	54	63
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	71			
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	66	69		
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	66	85		
Am. Soc. Civil Engr.	HDO.	66	69		
Classics Club	HDO.	66	83		
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	66	69		
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	66	69		
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	66	69		
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	66	69		

TABLE 28 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks by All Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Past Member Respondents
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	66	96		
Rho Chi	HDO.	66	69		
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	66	43		
Assn. Women Students	HDO.	55	54	43	54
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	55	52		
Student Senate	HDO.	53	54	69	88
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	53	58		
Amer. Pharm.	HDO.	53	69		
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	53	58		
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	53	58		
Xi Mu	HDO.	53	43		
Lambda Tau	HDO.	46	23		
Engineers Club	HDO.	46	52		
Psi Chi	HDO.	46	52		
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	46	77	13	
Chess Club	HDO.	42	52		
Entre Nous	HDO.	41	29		
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	41	13	36	
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	41	52	17	
Philosophy Club	HDO.	41	84		
Sorority	Soc.	37	3	76	29
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	36	37	48	96
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	35	43	39	46
English Club	HDO.	35	52		
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	35	29		
History Club	HDO.	35	43		
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	35	29		
Swing Club	HDO.	35	6	65	
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	35	23		
Finance Club	HDO.	28	11		
Fut. Teachers Amer.	HDO.	28	36	32	
Racquet Club	HDO.	26	35	17	
German Club	HDO.	25	29		
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	25	43		
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	25	27		
Phi Sigma	HDO.	25	31		
Air Knockers	HDO.	20	29		
Pet. Engr. Club	HDO.	20	11		
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	18	33	10	38
Industrial Arts	HDO.	17	23		
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	17	23		
Sigma Tau	HDO.	17	23		
Social Work Club	HDO.	17	23		
Soc. Ind. Mgt.	HDO.	17	23		

TABLE 28 - Continued

Organization Name	Type	Percentile Ranks by All Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Non-Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Member Respondents	Percentile Ranks by Past Member Respondents
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	17	31		
Jr. Panhellenic	Gov.	11	13		
Fencing Club	HDO.	10	34		
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	9	15	21	29
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	8	11		
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	8	11		
Soc. Geol. Engr.	HDO.	8	11		
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	5	4	65	
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	4	69		
Pep Council	HDO.	3	4	2	13
Accounting Club	HDO.	2	2		
League of Young Demo.	HDO.	1	1	6	

Summary of Expressed Attitude Toward Specific Student Organizations

It is emphasized again that the attitudes expressed toward specific student organizations are not to be interpreted as being the attitudes of all undergraduate women at the University of Oklahoma toward the specific organizations. They are merely presented as the expressed attitudes of those respondents who indicated attitudes.

The previous tables presented in this chapter provide a view of expressions of attitudes by the respondents toward the various organizations regarding enjoyment of the organization, liking to belong to the organization, help in personal development received from the organization, and desire for the organization to remain on campus. They are intended to show the status of each organization in relation to attitudes expressed toward it regarding the four attitude statements. However, in order to summarize the expression of attitudes toward the specific organizations, two special tables have been constructed. Table 29 shows the summary of

expressed attitude as given by the survey respondents toward each of the four attitude statements. Table 30 shows how the average degrees or extents of agreement vary toward the types of organizations in relation to the four attitude statements.

In Table 29 it can be seen that the statement regarding desire for the organizations to remain on campus received the largest amount of response from the respondents. The statement regarding liking to belong received the next largest amount of response, with 6.94 percent of the total possible responses given to it. Enjoyment ranked third in amount of response received, and help in personal development received the least response from the respondents. It is easy to understand that a respondent might express an attitude toward an organization remaining on campus, and not be able to express an attitude toward that organization regarding its value for help in personal development. The statement on liking to belong to the organization gave non-members a chance to name those organizations to which they would most like to belong, and this may help to explain the comparatively large percent of possible attitude response given to this statement. When a respondent checked the statement, "Have no experience on which to judge," it meant that no attitudes were being expressed toward the four attitude statements.

TABLE 29

SUMMARY OF EXPRESSED ATTITUDE REGARDING THE FOUR ATTITUDE STATEMENTS

Attitude Statement	No. of Times Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		No. of Times No Attitudes Were Expressed Toward Organizations		Possible Responses[a]	
	Total No.	Percent	Total No.	Percent	Total	Percent
"I enjoy this organization."	1159	3.60	31994	96.40	33189	100
"I would like (do like to belong to this organization."	2204	6.94	30985	93.06	33189	100
"This organization has helped me in my personal development."	1143	3.44	32046	96.56	33189	100
"This organization should remain on campus."	3353	10.10	29836	89.90	33189	100

[a]If all 299 respondents had expressed attitudes toward all 111 organizations, a total of 33,189 attitudes would have been expressed toward each statement.

The average degrees of agreement toward the various types of organizations in relation to each of the four attitude statements are shown in Table 30.

Here it is noted that the respondents who indicated attitudes toward enjoyment of the various organizations, have agreed that they enjoy the sororities or Social type organization more than they do the other three types. Respondents who indicated attitudes toward liking to belong to the organizations have agreed that they would like, or do like, to belong to the Honorary-Departmental-Other type better than they would like, or do like, to belong to the Governing, Social, or Service types. The

TABLE 30

AVERAGE DEGREES OF AGREEMENT SCORES AS EXPRESSED BY ALL RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED ATTITUDES TOWARD THE VARIOUS TYPE ORGANIZATIONS REGARDING EACH OF THE FOUR ATTITUDE STATEMENTS

Type of Organization	Enjoyment of the Organization	Liking to Belong to the Organization	Help in Personal Development from the Organization	Desire for Organization to Remain on Campus	Average Extent of Agreement for All Four Statements Combined
	Average Extent of Agreement	Average Extent of Agreement	Average Extent of Agreement	Average Extent of Agreement	
Governing	90	51	35	147	81
Social	154	112	159	152	144
Service	113	93	71	156	108
Honorary-Departmental-Other	133	126	110	154	131
All Organizations	126	117	98	152	123

sororities again have the greatest agreement of favorable attitude from respondents indicating attitudes toward them regarding help in personal development received. The Service organizations received the highest score of favorable attitude from the respondents regarding the desire for the organizations to remain on campus. It should be noticed that the respondents who indicated attitudes toward these four attitude statements, gave the Governing organizations the lowest score on average extent of agreement on each of the four attitude statements. When all four attitude statements were combined and the average extents of agreement were calculated for each of the four types of organizations, it was found that the Social type organization had the highest extent of favorable attitude

agreement regarding these four statements. The Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations were next highest in extent of agreement with these four statements, and the Governing groups had the lowest, a score of plus 81. When the extents of agreement were averaged for all organizations in relation to each of the four attitude statements, the statement regarding the desire for the organizations to remain on campus was given the highest score. Enjoyment of the organizations was second highest, with an average agreement score of 126. Liking to belong was third highest with a score of 117, and help in personal development was given the lowest score.

Appendix I is included as a summary to show each organization's rank as determined by the respondents who indicated attitudes toward the organization in relation to each of the four attitude statements. This Appendix shows that there are eleven organizations toward which fewer than five respondents failed to express attitudes regarding all of the four attitude statements. These organizations were the American Chemical Society, the American Institute of Architects, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Gamma Theta Upsilon, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, Petroleum Engineers Club, Phi Lambda Upsilon, Pi Tau Sigma, Public Health Society, Sigma Pi Sigma, Society of Automotive Engineers, Society of Engineering Physicists, Society of Natural Gas Engineers, and the Statistics Club. Most of these organizations are those in which the membership is predominately that of men students, and all are of the Honorary-Departmental-Other classification.

It is evident from Appendix I that, in general, the higher percentile ranks have been given toward the Honorary-Departmental-Other type organizations. The low percentile ranks given to the League of Young Democrats, the Pep Council, the Women's Recreation Association make these organizations exceptions to the otherwise favorable attitudes shown toward the Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations. In general, we find that the Governing organizations have received lower percentile ranks than the Service, Social, or Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations.

In briefer terms, the data presented in this chapter show that there was greater agreement among the respondents on the statement regarding a desire for the organizations to remain on campus than on any other of the statements used. In general, attitudes seem to be most favorable toward the Social and Honorary-Departmental-Other types of organizations and least favorable toward the Governing types on all four statements, i.e., regarding enjoyment of the organization, liking to belong to the organization, help in personal development from the organization, and desire for the organization to remain on campus.

In Chapter III, data are presented showing the expressed attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the student organizations in general and the characteristics of the student organization program.

CHAPTER III

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES TOWARD ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT ORGANIZATION PROGRAM

Provision for Expression of Attitudes toward the Nature and Characteristics of Student Organizations and the Student Organization Program

In order to provide for expression of attitude toward student organizations in general and the characteristics of the student organization program, it was considered advisable to review the various aspects of the student organization program. Statements were then constructed which were believed would represent verbal expressions of feeling concerning the entire program. Statements toward general values of student organizations, skills to be developed in group work or human relationships, recreational values, expected values after college, use of time, academic values, expense, leadership training, and administration and supervision of student organizations were constructed and presented as Part II of the Attitude Inventory. Although several statements were formulated for each area, no attempt was made to allocate any specific number of statements to the previously mentioned areas. A total of sixty statements were designed and presented as Part II of the Inventory. Fifty of these statements were constructed to determine and measure attitude toward student organizations in general and the student organization pro-

gram, and nine of the statements were included as advisory statements. The nine advisory statements were of such nature that they could not be classified as being for or against student organizations. The majority of the nine statements dealt with various aspects of student organization programming which were not being carried on in the then current student organization program at the University of Oklahoma. In addition to the fifty favorable and unfavorable attitude statements and the nine advisory statements, one statement was included to provide for the respondent's estimate of the present student organization program at the University of Oklahoma.

Scoring the Inventory

The Inventory was scored in the following ways. The 50 statements designed to measure favorable and unfavorable attitude toward student organizations in general and the student organization program, were randomly placed in Part II of the Attitude Inventory. Sixteen of the 50 attitude statements which measure favorable and unfavorable attitudes were considered to be statements which were favorable toward the student organizations in general and favorable toward the student organization program. Thirty-four of the 50 attitude statements were considered to be negative in nature or against student organizations and the student organization program. There were five possible responses to each of these statements. These responses were "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." Thus, if a respondent indicated "strongly agree" with a statement which was favorable toward student organizations, a score of plus two was given for that statement. If the

respondent "agreed" with the favorable statement, a score of plus one was given for the statement. An "undecided" reply would be a score of zero for the statement. If the respondent "disagreed" with the statement which was favorable toward student organizations and the student organization program, then a minus one score was given for that statement. A response of "strongly disagree" given toward a favorable statement, gave the respondent a minus two score for that statement. These weights were then reversed for the negative statements. For example, to "strongly agree" with a negative statement resulted in a minus two score for that statement. Whereas, to "strongly disagree" with the statement which was unfavorable toward student organizations in general and the student organization program, would result in a plus two score for that statement. The response of "undecided" was given zero score on both the favorable and the unfavorable attitude statements. The scores ranging from minus two to plus two for each statement were then added algebraically, and the respondent's total attitude score was determined. By use of this scoring process it was possible for a respondent to make a possible score of plus 100 or minus 100. For example, if the respondent "strongly agreed" with the 16 favorable attitude statements, and if she "strongly disagreed" with the 34 unfavorable attitude statements, then her attitude score would be plus 100.

The nine advisory statements and the statement of the respondent's estimate of the present student organization program were not included in the scoring process. Responses to the nine advisory statements were classified by use of the Extent of Agreement Index, and average or mean estimates were calculated for the student's estimate of the present student organization program at the University of Oklahoma.

Individual scores for each of the 299 survey respondents were calculated. Means and standard deviations were determined by academic classification, college enrolment, and sorority affiliation. These data were analyzed and interpreted. The following presentation is given in relation to these findings. The Extent of Agreement Index was again employed to find the respondent's degree of favorable or unfavorable attitude toward student organizations in general and the student organization program.

Provision for Determining Reliability of the Fifty Attitude Statements

The reliability of the 50 attitude statements in Part II was determined by the split-halves (Brown-Spearman) technique. The correlation coefficient is presented in Table 31.

TABLE 31

RELIABILITY OF ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Method	Correlation
Split-Half (Brown-Spearman)	.72 $\pm$ .010

The correlation is indicative of a fairly high degree of reliability. This reliability was probably reached as a result of the pilot study which was employed to eliminate the ambiguous statements and to exclude those statements which failed to discriminate.

Provision for Determining Validity of the Fifty Attitude Statements

The obtained and theoretical frequencies with the standard deviations for calculating Dickey G was employed as a technique for determining the validity of the fifty attitude statements.[1] The obtained and theoretical frequencies with the standard deviations for calculating Dickey G are shown in Table 32.

TABLE 32

OBTAINED AND THEORETICAL FREQUENCIES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR CALCULATING DICKEY G[a]

Score	f_o	f_t	f_s	SD	% Equivalent of Y_o
55-63	7	0	0	3.07	.00106
46-54	11	5	5	2.36	.06174
37-45	31	28	28	1.65	.25634
28-36	57	53	53	.94	.64287
19-27	72	81	72	.24	.97161
10-18	61	69	61	-.61	.83023
1-9	28	48	28	-1.26	.45212
-8-0	21	12	12	-1.97	.14364
-17-9	7	2	2	-2.69	.02684
-26-18	2	0	0	-3.38	.00432
-35-27	2	0	0	-4.09	.00001
N	299			SD	12.7
M	21			G	88 ± 2

[a]Source of Table: Table 20, Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947, p. 126.

The range is from -4.09 to ±3.07 standard deviations, which for 299 cases is wide. The 88 percent normal, computed by the Dickey G method, shows a natural expectancy as to distribution. This is a fairly high index of validity, or an index of discrimination.

[1]John W. Dickey, "Normalcy as a Statistic," Journal of Educational Psychology, September, 1934, pp. 437-446.

Physical traits always follow the Gaussian or normal curve, and mental traits usually do so. There is no reason to believe that this trait, attitude, is different from other mental and physical traits. The questions in the Inventory were definitely written to cover all ranges of attitudes and the test given gave range and distribution.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Data Regarding the Student Organizations in General and the Student Organization Program

Responses to the Attitude Inventory were secured from 299 undergraduate women students enroled at the University of Oklahoma. This number represented 15 percent of the 2014 full-time, undergraduate women students enroled at the Norman Campus, University of Oklahoma. The 15 percent sample provided for a sampling error of approximately five percent. This sample was determined by use of the stratified sampling technique. Stratification was carried out first by college and then by classification within the colleges. In some instances the number of enrollees in a college was too few to warrant classification in the sample. This was true for the students enroled in the College of Engineering and in the College of Pharmacy. The method by which the number of students from each college and academic standing within that college, has been previously described in Chapter I. In all cases, the number selected from a college and from academic classifications within that college was in proportion to the total number of undergraduate women enroled in that college and its various academic enrolments of the selected population.

Each respondent's inventory was scored according to the previously described scoring procedure. There was a possible range of plus 100 to

minus 100. Scores obtained from the 299 survey respondents ranged from a -34 to a plus 61.

It had been assumed at the outset of this study that attitudes toward student organizations would vary according to academic classification and college enrolment. This assumption was the basis of the stratified sampling technique in which stratification was carried out by colleges and academic standing within colleges. Means and standard deviations were then calculated for each college, each academic classification, and for all respondents. Data were also grouped by sorority and non-sorority affiliation and means and standard deviations were calculated for these groups.

Table 33 shows the mean scores and standard deviations when data were grouped and analyzed according to college enrolment.

TABLE 33

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ACCORDING TO COLLEGE ENROLMENT

College	Number of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation
University College	99	20.90	12.81
College of Arts and Sciences	98	22.70	12.16
College of Business Administration	31	20.89	12.35
College of Education	47	21.32	11.98
College of Fine Arts	24	22.60	12.63

From inspection of Table 33 it would appear that the women students in the College of Arts and Sciences have the most favorable attitudes toward student organizations and the student organization program. This is suggested by the high mean of 22.70. By this same inspection, one could say that the students in the College of Business Administration have

the least favorable attitudes toward student organizations in general and toward the student organization program, since the mean for this group was 20.90 and the lowest one for any of the colleges. The difference between these two means in 1.80 and the question became that of determining the significance of this difference. By use of the formula for determining differences between two means, we have good reason to believe that our samples were drawn from the same parent population and differ only by sampling errors.[1] Thus, in interpretation of the differences between means of college enrolment, we find that the differences are below the .05 level of significance, and it may be stated with confidence that there is no reason to suspect a true mean difference between college enrolments exists.

Table 34 presents the means and standard deviations when data were grouped and analyzed according to academic classification.

TABLE 34

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION

Academic Classification	Number of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation
Freshmen	99	20.90	12.63
Sophomores	81	22.71	12.61
Juniors	61	20.88	12.78
Seniors	58	21.67	12.54

Table 34 shows that the Juniors have a mean of 20.88 and this is the lowest one for the four academic groups. The Sophomores have the highest mean of 22.71. However, when the formula for determining differ-

[1] Garrett, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

ences between means was applied to these data, it was found that the difference between these two means was not significant. Thus, we may conclude with confidence that a true mean difference does not exist between the four academic groups.

Means and standard deviations for sorority and non-sorority women are presented in Table 35.

TABLE 35

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ACCORDING TO SORORITY AFFILIATION

Sorority Affiliation	Number of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation
Sorority Women	153	22.70	12.77
Independent Women	146	21.84	12.55

The difference between the means for sorority and independent women shown in Table 35 was found to be below the .05 level of significance. Thus, on present evidence there is no reason to suspect a true mean difference exists between sorority and independent women.

From results of data presented in Tables 33, 34 and 35 we may conclude that the attitudes of the women students are not significantly different when analyzed according to college enrolment, academic classification, or sorority affiliation. Therefore, data were grouped according to all respondents, and these results are presented as the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward student organizations in general and the student organization program.

The mean and standard deviation are presented for all respondents in Table 36.

TABLE 36

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

Respondents	Number of Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation
All Women	299	21.40	12.7

In Table 36 it is found that the mean for all survey respondents is 21.40. This mean is based upon a possible attitude score of plus 100 to minus 100 and may be interpreted to indicate that the attitudes of the undergraduate women tend to be favorable toward student organizations in general and the student organization program at the University of Oklahoma. The standard error for this mean was found to be .675.

The Extent of Agreement Index has been employed again in this study to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward student organizations in general and the student organization program. Data are presented as expressed attitudes toward academic values from student organizations, administration and supervision of student organizations, expense of student organizations, expected values (after college) from student organizations, general values of student organizations, values in the area of human relationships, leadership values, recreation values, use of time, and the advisory statements regarding student organizations.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward Academic Values of Student Organizations in General and the Student Organization Program

Seven statements were designed to determine and measure the attitudes of the women students toward academic values of student organiza-

tions in general and the student organization program. These statements and corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 12. Information acquired in student organizations has little value outside these organizations.

Statement 20. Freshmen women should not be allowed to participate in student organizations and should devote all their time to studying.

Statement 22. University honors and awards should be based upon good grades only, and no consideration should be given for participation in student organizations.

Statement 40. To make good grades is more important than to participate in student organizations.

Statement 44. Students would get a better college education if student organizations were discontinued.

Statement 54. Student organizations have been of greater benefit to me than the courses (classes) I have taken.

Statement 59. Participating in student organizations improves my grades in my courses.

The first five statements included in this category were considered to be negative in nature or against student organizations in general and against the student organization program.

Table 37 shows the extent or degree to which the respondents agreed with these statements regarding the academic values of student organizations and the student organization program.

We find in Table 37 that the respondents have indicated fairly strong disagreement with the statement that "information acquired in student organizations has little value outside these organizations." Stronger disagreement has been indicated by the respondents in regard to the statement that freshmen women should not be allowed to participate in student

TABLE 37

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD ACADEMIC VALUES OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement[a]	Nature of the State-ment[b]	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
12	-	2%	7%	19%	54%	18%	-79
20	-	2%	2%	18%	50%	28%	-100
22	-	1%	6%	13%	47%	33%	-105
40	-	14%	32%	23%	29%	2%	27
44	-	3%	5%	11%	57%	24%	-94
54	/	1%	7%	22%	53%	17%	-78
59	/	1%	14%	34%	44%	7%	-42

[a]Numbers correspond to statement numbers given in Part II of Attitude Inventory (Appendix J). These are used in subsequent tables on attitude statements pertaining to various areas of student organizations.

[b]A mark of "/" indicates that the statement is favorable toward student organizations and an "-" indicates it is unfavorable. These marks are used in subsequent tables on attitude statements pertaining to various areas of student organizations.

organizations. The respondents have shown the strongest disagreement with the idea that University honors and awards should be based on good grades only, with no consideration given to participation in student activities. A fairly strong disagreement has been indicated by the respondents toward the idea that student organizations have been of greater benefit than the courses or classes taken by these respondents. Also, the respondents seem to believe or feel that participating in student organizations does not help them to improve their grades. The plus 27 extent of

agreement seems to indicate that the women students feel it is more important to make good grades than to participate in student organizations.

In order to summate the attitudes of the women students toward academic values of student organizations in general and the student organization program, the extents of agreement were added algebraically and the total sum was divided by the number of statements. A minus extent of agreement shown toward an unfavorable attitude statement, would indicate that the respondents express favorable attitudes toward student organizations, and the minus extent became a plus sum when all extents of agreement were totaled. A plus extent of agreement given to an unfavorable statement would then become a minus sum when extents of agreement are totaled. A plus extent of agreement given to a statement which was favorable toward student organizations in general and the student organization program, would indicate favorable attitude and remain a plus sum in the totaling of the extents of agreement. However, a minus extent of agreement given by the respondents toward a favorable attitude statement would remain a minus sum when the extents of agreement were averaged.

When the extents of agreement expressing degrees of favorable and unfavorable attitude toward academic values received from organizations in general and the organization program were totaled and divided by seven statements in this area, the average extent of agreement was 22.8.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward the Administration and Supervision of Student Organizations

Twelve statements were designed to determine and measure the attitudes of the women students toward the administration and supervision

of student organizations. Two of these statements were favorable and ten were unfavorable or negative toward supervision and administration of student organizations. These statements and corresponding numbers as listed in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 8. Sponsors are not needed in student organizations.

Statement 31. Student discipline cases should be handled by University officials, and governing organizations should have no part in these decisions.

Statement 32. Student governing organizations make rules and regulations which should be made by University officials.

Statement 33. The University authorities should delegate more power to student governing organizations.

Statement 34. Only the student organizations to which all students may belong should exist on this campus.

Statement 38. Not enough faculty members take an active interest in student organizations.

Statement 42. Too much emphasis is given to student organizations at this University.

Statement 45. Students do not receive enough information about student organizations on this campus.

Statement 50. Students need more help from advisors and counselors in selecting student organizations available to them.

Statement 51. Faculty members do not encourage students to participate in student organizations.

Statement 55. The University provides adequate meeting places for the student organizaticns to which I belong.

Statement 56. Sponsors take too little interest in the supervision of student organizations to which I belong.

It was believed that the 12 statements regarding administration and supervision of student organizations would help to determine the degree of favorable and unfavorable attitude toward present administration and supervision of the organizations. Table 38 shows the expressed attitudes of

all respondents toward the administration and supervision of the student organizations in general and the student organization program.

TABLE 38

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD THE ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement[a]	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
8	-	1%	4%	12%	60%	23%	-100
31	-	3%	11%	24%	45%	17%	-62
32	-	0%	4%	30%	54%	12%	-74
33	/	9%	29%	36%	24%	2%	19
34	-	3%	10%	11%	55%	21%	-81
38	-	10%	41%	38%	11%	0%	50
42	-	8%	20%	27%	43%	2%	-9
45	-	15%	54%	12%	17%	2%	63
50	-	12%	53%	18%	16%	1%	59
51	-	8%	46%	27%	17%	2%	41
55	/	7%	64%	19%	8%	2%	58
56	-	1%	12%	38%	45%	4%	-39

It is evident in Table 38 that the respondents have disagreed with the statement that sponsors are not needed in student organizations. Thus, the -100 extent of agreement becomes a plus 100 as a weighted sum for expression of favorable attitude toward the administration and supervision of student organizations. The respondents have disagreed with the

idea that student discipline cases should be handled entirely by University officials, and the minus 62 extent of agreement becomes a plus 62. A minus 74 was given to the statement, "Student governing organizations make rules and regulations which should be made by University officials," and this indicates the respondents are favorable toward the governing functions of the student organizations. The respondents have indicated that they feel more power should be delegated to the governing organizations, and they do not feel that only those organizations to which all students may belong should exist on this campus. The undergraduate women students have agreed that not enough faculty members take an active interest in the student organizations, and they feel that students do not receive enough information about the student organizations on campus. There is agreement among the undergraduate women students that faculty members do not encourage students to participate in student organizations, and that students need more help from advisors and counselors in selecting student organizations available to them. There is agreement that the University provides adequate meeting places for student organizations. The respondents disagreed with the statement, "Sponsors take too little interest in the supervision of student organizations to which I belong." The respondents tend to disagree with the statement that too much emphasis is given to student organizations at this University.

It is noted that the women students have disagreed with six of the unfavorable statements. It will be recalled from earlier discussion that disagreement with an unfavorable statement results in a plus sum or quantity for the statement. Therefore, the extents of agreement for these six statements became favorable or plus sums when extents of agreement

were totaled. There was fairly strong agreement with the two favorable attitude statements, and only four of the unfavorable attitude statements received positive extents of agreement.

The undergraduate women have, in general, expressed favorable attitude toward sponsors, governing aspects of student organizations, disciplinary procedures involved in student organizations, membership requirements of student organizations, and meeting placed provided for student organizations.

The attitudes of the women students are less favorable toward faculty support given to student organizations, the amount of information provided regarding student organizations and help received from counselors and advisors regarding student organizations.

The average extent of agreement for all statements pertaining to the administration and supervision of student organizations was plus 19.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward Expense of Student Organizations

Three statements were included to determine and measure attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the expense of student organizations. These statements and their corresponding numbers as listed in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 5. Student organizations are too expensive.

Statement 47. Initiation fees are too expensive in honorary organizations.

Statement 48. Social organizations are too expensive.

These three negative or unfavorable statements and the extents to which the women students have agreed with them are presented in Table 39.

TABLE 39

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD THE EXPENSE OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
5	-	1%	9%	22%	58%	10%	-67
47	-	8%	25%	43%	22%	2%	15
48	-	11%	24%	23%	39%	3%	1

Table 39 shows that the undergraduate women students have indicated weak agreement, 15 extent of agreement, that the honorary organizations are too expensive. A plus one extent of agreement for the statement, "Social organizations are too expensive," indicates the smallest possible amount of agreement with this statement. The plus one extent of agreement is so slight, that it could almost be said the respondents are undecided regarding this statement. The respondents tend to disagree with the statement that student organizations are too expensive.

The average extent of agreement for all respondents toward the expense of student organizations was plus 17. This seems to indicate a slightly favorable attitude toward the expense of student organizations.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward After College Values of Student Organizations

A total of four statements were designed to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the values they would expect to receive after college from their in-college student organization participation. Three of these statements were favorable in

nature toward student organizations, and one was considered to be negative or unfavorable. In general, these statements deal with the areas of community life, family living, employment opportunities, and general success after college. The four statements regarding after college values and their corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 16. Student organizations teach skills useful in adult community life.

Statement 18. Student organizations encourage skills and attitudes useful in later family living.

Statement 46. Participating in student organizations helps students to secure desirable employment after college.

Statement 53. Student organizations have little to do with one's success after college.

Table 40 presents the attitudes of all respondents as expressed toward after college values of student organizations.

TABLE 40

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD THE AFTER COLLEGE VALUES OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
16	/	16%	61%	18%	4%	1%	87
18	/	17%	56%	21%	6%	0%	84
46	/	5%	45%	36%	14%	0%	41
53	-	2%	12%	24%	48%	14%	-60

It is found in Table 40 that the undergraduate women students have agreed with all three of the statements which are favorable toward student

organizations, and they have disagreed with the unfavorable attitude statement. Thus, their responses indicate that they have favorable attitudes toward student organizations in relation to the expected after college values of in-college participation in student organizations. The average extent of agreement toward the after college values was plus 68.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward General Values of Student Organizations

Five statements were designed to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the general values of student organizations and the student organization program. Three of these statements were favorable toward student organizations and two were negative or unfavorable in nature toward these organizations. These statements and their corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 6. Student organizations are of little value.

Statement 19. Student organizations are of sufficient value that sororities should require pledges and members to participate in them.

Statement 27. Student organizations are of sufficient value that students with less than a C average should be allowed to participate in them.

Statement 41. Student service organizations sponsor worthwhile activities.

Statement 52. Participating in college student organizations is not helpful if one has been active in high school organizations and activities.

Table 41 shows the degree to which the undergraduate women students have agreed with these statements regarding the general value of student organizations and the student organization program.

TABLE 41

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD THE GENERAL VALUES OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
6	-	1%	2%	6%	57%	34%	-121
19	/	14%	33%	23%	22%	8%	31
27	/	4%	29%	32%	30%	5%	-3
41	/	11%	69%	17%	3%	0%	88
52	-	1%	7%	22%	53%	17%	-78

It is evident in Table 41 that the respondents have disagreed with the statement that student organizations are of little value. They tend to agree that sororities should require pledges and members to participate in student organizations. The responses seem to indicate that the undergraduate women feel participating in student organizations is helpful even if one has been active in high school organizations and activities. There is fairly strong agreement with the statement that student service organizations sponsor worthwhile activities. However, the respondents tend to disagree with the idea that students with less than C average should be allowed to participate in student organizations. The average extent of agreement for all respondents toward the general values of student organizations was plus 63.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward Human Relationship Values Received from Student Organizations in General

A total of four statements were included in the Attitude Inventory to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the values in the area of human relationships. These statements and their corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 1. Student organizations are helpful in making friends.

Statement 7. Participating in student organizations helps teach people to get along better with one another.

Statement 29. Student organizations help promote good student-faculty relationships.

Statement 39. Social organizations help teach democratic living.

Table 42 shows the degree to which the students have agreed that student organizations are helpful in the improvement of human relationships.

It is noted from Table 42 that there is considerably strong agreement among the respondents that student organizations are helpful in making friends. There is also strong agreement that student organizations help teach people to get along better with one another. There is fairly strong agreement that student organizations help promote good student-faculty relationships, and the respondents have agreed that social organizations help teach democratic living. The average extent of agreement for all respondents toward the values of student organizations in the area of human relationships was plus 101.

TABLE 42

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD HUMAN RELATIONSHIP VALUES RECEIVED FROM STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
1	/	44%	51%	3%	1%	1%	136
7	/	36%	54%	5%	4%	1%	120
29	/	13%	56%	25%	6%	0%	76
39	/	14%	57%	17%	11%	1%	72

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward Leadership Values of Student Organizations

Nine statements were included in the Attitude Inventory to determine and measure the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the leadership values of student organizations. These statements were included to determine to what extent the women students felt the organizations were helping to train good leaders. They were also included to help locate specific leadership needs of these organizations which might be apparent in the attitudes revealed by the women students. Eight of the attitude statements were worded in such fashion as to be considered unfavorable toward student organizations, and only one statement was favorable toward these organizations. These nine statements and their corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 10. In student organizations open to both men and women, the men students tend to get the most important offices.

Statement 24. Sorority and fraternity members tend to get all the important offices in student organizations.

Statement 25. Student organizations are not democratic.

Statement 26. Junior and senior students tend to secure all the important offices in the student organizations.

Statement 28. Sponsors exert too much influence when decisions are being made in student organizations.

Statement 35. There is too much practice of "politics" in the governing organizations.

Statement 37. A few people tend to do all the work in student organizations.

Statement 43. Student organizations help students to become good leaders.

Statement 49. The officers in student organizations tend to run these organizations.

These nine statements regarding the leadership values of student organizations and the extents to which the respondents agree with these statements, are presented in Table 43.

In Table 43 it is found that the undergraduate women students do not feel that the men get the most important offices in student organizations. There is fairly strong disagreement with the statement that sorority and fraternity members get the important offices in student organizations, and there is even stronger disagreement with the idea that student organizations are not democratic. But, the respondents have agreed that the junior and senior students get the important offices in student organizations. The women students have disagreed with the statement that sponsors exert too much influence in decision making. There is fairly strong agreement that the officers tend to run the organizations, that there is too much practice of "politics" in the organizations, and that

a few people do all the work in the student organizations. However, the respondents agreed that the student organizations help students to become good leaders. The average extent of agreement for all respondents toward the leadership values of student organizations was plus 9. This average would indicate that the attitudes of the women students toward the leadership values of student organizations only tend to be favorable.

TABLE 43

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD LEADERSHIP VALUES OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the Statement	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
10	-	7%	20%	33%	35%	5%	-11
24	-	4%	15%	21%	51%	9%	-46
25	-	1%	6%	30%	50%	13%	-68
26	-	5%	37%	26%	30%	2%	13
28	-	2%	16%	37%	40%	5%	-30
35	-	18%	33%	32%	16%	1%	51
37	-	16%	62%	12%	10%	0%	84
43	/	21%	62%	11%	6%	0%	98
49	-	5%	43%	31%	32%	1%	31

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward Recreational Values of Student Organizations

Three statements were designed and included in the Attitude Inventory to determine and measure attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the recreational values of student organizations. These

statements and their corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 9. Participating in student organizations is fun.

Statement 11. Student organizations never have any interesting activities.

Statement 15. Student organizations are dull.

Table 44 shows the expressed attitudes of the respondents toward these recreational values of student organizations.

TABLE 44

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD RECREATIONAL VALUES OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
9	/	27%	60%	10%	3%	0%	105
11	-	1%	3%	11%	63%	22%	-102
15	-	2%	3%	16%	57%	22%	-94

Table 44 shows the attitudes of the undergraduate women students to be quite favorable toward the recreational values of student organizations. There is strong agreement among the respondents that participating in student organizations is fun. There is strong disagreement with the idea that student organizations never have any interesting activities, and the respondents have disagreed that student organizations are dull.

The average extent of agreement of attitudes toward recreational values of student organizations was plus 100.

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward Use of Time in Student Organizations

Three negative or unfavorable attitude statements were designed and included in the Inventory to measure the attitudes of the respondents toward the use of time involved in student organizations. These statements and corresponding numbers as given in the Attitude Inventory (Appendix J) are as follows:

Statement 4. Student organizations are a waste of time.

Statement 57. Participating in student organizations requires so much time and energy that I have insufficient time for rest and study.

Statement 58. Student organizations meet at times inconvenient for me.

These statements were included for the purpose of determining and measuring the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the time aspects of student organizations. The extent or degree to which the respondents have agreed with the statements regarding the use of time in student organizations are presented in Table 45.

We find in Table 45 that the undergraduate women students have indicated strong disagreement with the statement that student organizations are a waste of time. The respondents have disagreed that participation in student organizations leaves insufficient time for rest and study. There is a very weak disagreement with the statement, "Student organizations meet at times inconvenient for me." This latter statement has a minus two extent of agreement, and this is only a slight negative expression of attitude toward the statement. From the plus 82 extent of agreement given toward use of time in student organizations, we may conclude that the attitudes of the undergraduate women students toward the use of time in student organizations tend to be favorable.

TABLE 45

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD USE OF TIME IN STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Nature of the State-ment	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Un-decided (0)	Dis-agree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
4	-	1%	1%	7%	53%	38%	-126
57	-	5%	15%	22%	52%	6%	-39
58	-	5%	31%	22%	41%	1%	-2

Expressed Attitudes of All Respondents toward the Advisory Statements Regarding Student Organizations

It has been previously explained that the advisory statements were not included in the determination of the respondent's score. The majority of the advisory statements were included for the purpose of determining attitudes toward various aspects of student organization programming which are not being carried out at the present time at the University of Oklahoma. Others were reflections of attitudes which could neither be considered as favorable or unfavorable toward student organizations and the student organization program. These advisory statements and the degree to which the students have indicated agreement with them, are presented in Table 46.

In Table 46 it is found that the undergraduate women students feel that membership in student organizations should not be required of all students, and these women students have further agreed that no student should be forced to participate in student organizations. These respondents do not want academic credit given for participation in student

TABLE 46

EXPRESSED ATTITUDES OF ALL RESPONDENTS TOWARD THE ADVISORY STATEMENTS REGARDING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL

Attitude Statement	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index 200 to -200
2	7%	12%	15%	46%	20%	-40
3	5%	13%	23%	41%	18%	-54
13	1%	3%	8%	46%	42%	-125
14	20%	50%	16%	12%	2%	152
17	16%	32%	13%	32%	7%	18
21	47%	42%	6%	4%	1%	130
23	14%	47%	18%	16%	5%	49
30	1%	3%	10%	51%	35%	-112
36	1%	9%	27%	53%	10%	-62

organizations, nor do they want academic credit or grades recorded on the student's transcript. However, they have expressed agreement with the idea that organizations in which a student participates should be recorded on the student's transcript. There is agreement among the attitudes of the respondents that the University should limit the number of offices that a student may hold in the various organizations during a semester. The undergraduate women students have agreed that ways of working with people in groups is the most valuable thing to be learned in student organizations, but they do not feel that the Departmental-Honorary-Other organizations are more worthwhile than the Governing, Social or Service type.

The average extent of agreement was not calculated for these advisory statements, since it would be meaningless in relation to these statements. The statements were not designed to be favorable or unfavorable toward student organizations.

Summary of Attitudes Expressed by All Respondents Toward Student Organizations in General and the Student Organization Program

Expressed attitudes of all survey respondents have been shown toward the nine areas of student organizations in general and the student organization program. Table 47 is presented to show which of these areas have received the most favorable and the least favorable attitudes from the undergraduate women students.

Table 47 shows the expression of attitude by the survey respondents toward the various areas of student organizations in general and the student organization program. The advisory statements were not included in this table since they were not considered as being for or against student organizations and were not a part of the measurement process. We find that the most favorable attitudes have been expressed toward the area of human relationships. There has been fairly strong agreement among the women students that the student organizations help in making friends, help teach people to get along better with one another, help promote good student-faculty relationships, and that the social organizations help teach democratic living.

The area which has ranked second in expression of favorable attitude, is that of recreational value of the student organizations. Here we find that the women students have agreed that to participate in stu-

dent organizations is fun and interesting, and they have further agreed that the student organizations are not dull.

TABLE 47

SUMMARY OF FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE ATTITUDE EXPRESSION TOWARD THE VARIOUS AREAS OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL AND THE STUDENT ORGANIZATION PROGRAM AS SHOWN BY THE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT INDEX

Area toward Which Attitudes Were Expressed	Extent of Favorable Attitude
Academic Values of Student Organizations	22.8
Administration and Supervision of Student Organizations	19
Expense of Student Organizations	17
After College Values of Student Organizations	68
General Values of Student Organizations	63
Human Relationship Values of Student Organizations	101
Leadership Values of Student Organizations	9
Recreational Values of Student Organizations	100
Use of Time in Student Organizations	82

The area of use of time in student organizations has ranked third in expression of favorable attitude given toward it. The respondents have agreed that participation in student organizations does leave sufficient time for rest and study. There was further agreement that student

organizations are not a waste of time, and do not meet at times which are inconvenient for the students.

The after college values of student organizations have placed fourth in rank on the basis of favorable attitude expression. The respondents have agreed that student organizations teach skills and attitudes which will be useful in later family living and adult community life. There was further agreement that student organization participation will help in securing desirable employment after college and that student organizations do help to determine one's success after college.

The expression of attitude toward the general values of student organizations was slightly less favorable than that given to the area of after college values. The respondents indicated that they felt the student organizations are valuable, and are of sufficient value that the sororities should require members and pledges to participate in them. There was agreement among the respondents that the service organizations sponsor worthwhile activities, and that to participate in student organizations is helpful even if one has been active in high school organizations and activities. The only statement considered to be favorable toward student organizations with which the respondents did not agree, was that students with less than a C average should be allowed to participate in student organizations.

There was less favorable attitude given to the area of academic values of student organizations. This area received a 22.8 extent of favorable attitude agreement, and ranked sixth in place as compared with the other areas. In this area the women students agreed that information obtained in student organizations does have value outside the organiza-

tions, and the respondents felt that freshmen women should be allowed to participate in student organizations rather than spend all their time studying. There was strong expression of attitude that student organization participation should be considered when honors and awards are being given. However, the respondents felt that to make good grades is more important than to participate in student organizations and further agreed that classes were of greater benefit than student organizations. The women students did not feel that to participate in student organizations helped them to improve their grades.

The area of administration and supervision of student organizations ranked seventh with a score of plus nineteen extent of agreement. In this area we find that the respondents expressed favorable attitudes toward sponsors of the organizations and toward the governing functions of the student organizations. Favorable attitudes were shown toward the meeting places provided by the University for student organizations. But, unfavorable attitudes were shown toward the support given by faculty members to the student organizations. Attitudes were expressed by the respondents which indicated that they definitely felt more help should be given to them in selection of the student organizations.

The area of expense of student organizations was given a plus seventeen extent of agreement score, and this area ranked eighth in the list of nine areas toward which attitudes were expressed. The respondents indicated that they did not feel that the student organizations in general were too expensive, but they did tend to agree that the honorary organizations were too expensive. There was only slight agreement that the social organizations are too expensive.

There was less agreement of favorable attitude shown toward the leadership values of student organizations than toward any of the other areas. This area received a plus nine extent of agreement from the respondents. The respondents indicated that they felt junior and senior students tend to get the important leadership offices in student organizations. The women students agreed that there is too much practice of "politics" among the governing organizations, and that a few people tend to do all the work in the student organizations. The respondents also indicated that they felt the officers tend to run the organizations, but they agreed that the student organizations are democratic and help train students to become good leaders.

Respondents' Estimates of Present Student Organizations

Statement 60 of the Attitude Inventory was designed to determine a general estimate of student organizations at the present time. This statement and estimates suggested are as follows: "My estimate of student organizations on this campus at the present time, is that they are: 'Excellent,' 'Good,' 'Fair,' 'Poor,' and 'Very Poor.'" Table 48 shows the percentages of responses for each estimate that the undergraduate women students have given to this statement.

TABLE 48

RESPONDENTS'ESTIMATES OF PRESENT STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Statement	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
"My estimate of student organizations on this campus at the present time, is that they are:"	12%	51%	32%	4%	1%

We find in Table 48 that over half the respondents felt that the student organizations were good. There were more respondents indicating that the organizations were excellent than there were respondents who felt the organizations to be poor or very poor. A total of 63 percent of the students estimated the organizations to be good to excellent.

Correlation Coefficients of Organization Membership, Academic Grades, and Student's Estimate of Organizations with Attitude Score

Product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to express the relationship between organization membership and attitude scores. Correlation coefficients were also computed to express the relationship between academic grades and attitude scores and to express the relationship of the student's estimate of organizations with attitude scores. The three correlation coefficients shown in Table 49 were calculated to determine to what degree attitudes toward student organizations would correlate with other factors.

TABLE 49

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP, GRADE POINT AVERAGE, AND ESTIMATE OF ORGANIZATIONS WITH ATTITUDE SCORES

Factors Correlated	Correlation	
Organization Memberships with Attitude Scores	.19	.010
Grade Point Average with Attitude Scores	-.08	.020
Student's Estimate of Organizations with Attitude Scores	.55	.017

It was deemed important to discover if there was a correlation between number of organizations students belonged to and the attitudes they hold toward student organizations. Therefore, the question was based upon the idea that students who held memberships in several organizations might indicate more favorable attitudes toward student organizations than did the students who belong to few or no organizations. We find that there is .19 correlation, and this indicates that there is no correlation between the number of organizations the students belong to and their attitudes toward student organizations.

We find there is -.08 correlation between grade point averages and attitudes toward student organizations. This correlation coefficient is not significant, and, we may conclude that from present evidence of this study there is no correlation between grades and attitudes toward student organizations.

The .55 correlation coefficient indicates that there is a significant correlation between the students' estimates of the present organization and the attitudes toward the student organizations. This would indicate that the higher the estimates of the student organizations the better the attitudes toward these student organizations.

The conclusions and recommendations for use of this study are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The summaries of the data obtained in this study are given in Chapters II and III. Conclusions based upon these summaries are given below.

From results obtained from Part I of the Attitude Inventory, it may be concluded that the attitudes of the respondents who indicated attitudes toward specific organizations were most favorable toward the Social organizations. This conclusion is made on the basis of attitudes expressed toward the four attitude statements of enjoyment, liking to belong, help in personal development, and desire for the organization to remain on campus. The Honorary-Departmental-Other organizations were second, the Service organizations were third, and the least favorable attitudes were expressed toward the Governing organizations regarding these four attitude statements. The low percentile ranks given to the League of Young Democrats, Pep Council, and Womens Recreation Association make these organizations exceptions to the otherwise favorable attitudes shown toward the Honorary-Departmental-Other type organizations.

It may be concluded that the attitudes of the women students toward student organizations in general and the then current student organization program are based upon the use of a valid and reliable instrument,

Part II of the Attitude Inventory. The following conclusions based upon data obtained by use of this instrument may then be stated with confidence.

On the basis of results obtained in this study it is with confidence that we reject the hypothesis that significant differences will be found in attitudes of women students when they are surveyed according to academic classification and college enrolment. This was the hypothesis used as a basis for the stratified sample. It may be stated, therefore, that the college enrolment or academic classification of a student is not related to the kinds of attitudes she holds toward student organizations. From evidence gained in this study, there is no reason to suspect a difference in the attitudes of sorority and independent women as these attitudes are expressed toward student organizations in general and the student organization program.

It may be concluded that the attitudes of the women students are most favorable toward the human relationship values and the recreational values of student organizations. There was general agreement of favorable attitude expressed toward the after college values and general values of student organizations. In general, the women students expressed favorable attitudes toward the use of time in the student organizations. Less favorable attitude was given to the areas of academic values and the administration and supervision of student organizations. There was fairly strong agreement that honorary organizations were too expensive and slight agreement that the social groups were too expensive. The less favorable attitudes were expressed toward the leadership values of student organizations than toward any of the other areas.

A majority of the women students estimated that the present student organizations were good. A fairly large percentage of the respondents rated these organizations as being fair, a lesser percentage said they were excellent, and a very small percentage considered them to be poor or very poor.

There seems to be no relationship between membership in organizations and the expressed attitudes toward student organizations in general and the student organization program. Evidence indicates that there is no relationship between grade point average and attitudes toward student organizations in general and the student organization program, but there is a relationship between the student's estimate of present organizations in general and the student organization program.

As a result of the foregoing conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

1. That further research be conducted to determine how attitudes are formed in relation to participation or non-participation in student organizations, and it is further recommended that the attitudes of the men students be determined and measured in order to furnish a further basis of evaluating and improving the present student organization program.

2. That further study and evaluation be given to the expense entailed in honorary and social organization membership.

3. That the whole area of leadership, as it pertains to student organizations, be given careful analysis and study by students and faculty.

4. That student organization sponsors and interested faculty persons hold monthly meetings with student organization officers for the

purpose of evaluating and improving the entire student organization program, and it is suggested that qualified persons be engaged to give help to those specific organizations toward which unfavorable attitudes were expressed.

5. That the results of this study be made known to those persons engaged in the supervision and administration of student organizations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Cronback, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Dewey, John. Democracy in Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941.

Ferguson, Leonard W. Personality Measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1952.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1947.

Good, C. V., Barr, S.A., and Scates, D. E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1941.

Hand, Harold. Campus Activities. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1938.

Hartmann, George W. Educational Psychology. New York: American Book Co., 1938.

Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard S. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1948.

Murphy, G. and Likert, R. Public Opinion and the Individual. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.

Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

_____, and Gage, N. L. Educational Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Thurstone, L. L. and Chave, E. J. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Williamson, E. G. How to Counsel Students. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1938.

Articles

Allport, F. H. and Hartmann, D. A. "Measurement and Motivation of a Typical Opinion in a Certain Group," American Political Science Review, XIX (1925), pp. 735-60.

Cantril, Hadley. "General and Specific Attitudes," Psychological Monographs, XLII (1932), pp. 3-13.

Carlson, H. B. "Attitudes of Undergraduate Students," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), pp. 202-13.

Conrad, H. S. and Sanford, R. B. "Some Specific War-Attitudes of College Students," Journal of Psychology, XVIII (1944), pp. 153-86.

Cross, George L. "Educators Will Provide What Patrons Demand," Sooner Magazine, XXVIII (March, 1956), p. 107.

Dobra, D. D. "The Nature of Attitude," The Journal of Social Psychology, IV (November, 1933), p. 447.

Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, No. 140 (1932), p. 330.

Pugmire, D. Ross. "Challenge to Educational Administrators," The Educational Forum, XX (March, 1956), p. 330.

Thurstone, L. L. "The Measurement of Opinion," Journal of Abnormal Sociology and Psychology, XXII (1928), pp. 415-30.

Unpublished Material

Adams, Lena Clara. "A Study of Attitudes among Women Students at the University of Oklahoma." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Psychology, University of Oklahoma, 1948.

Kappes, Eveline Elizabeth. "An Attitude Inventory to Determine the Attitudes of College Women toward Physical Education and the Services Offered Students by a Physical Education Department." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1953.

APPENDIX A

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS WHO EXPRESSED ATTITUDES AND WHO EXPRESSED NO ATTITUDES TOWARD ENJOYMENT OF EACH STUDENT ORGANIZATION

Key to Symbols:
No. - Number of Respondents
Gov. - Governing Type of Organization
Soc. - Social Type of Organization
Serv. - Service Type Organization
HDO. - Honorary, Departmental, and Others Type of Organization

ORGANIZATION[a]		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sorority	Soc.	177	59.88	122	40.12	299	100.00
Union Act. Board	Serv.	104	35.12	195	64.88	299	100.00
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	95	32.11	204	67.89	299	100.00
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	74	25.08	225	74.92	299	100.00
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	60	20.40	239	79.60	299	100.00
Student Senate	Gov.	55	18.73	244	81.27	299	100.00
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	48	16.39	251	83.61	299	100.00
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	46	15.72	253	84.28	299	100.00
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	37	12.71	262	87.29	299	100.00
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	34	11.71	265	88.29	299	100.00
Future Teachers Am.	HDO.	33	11.37	266	88.63	299	100.00
League Young Democrat	HDO.	25	8.69	274	91.31	299	100.00
Ducks Club	HDO.	23	8.00	276	92.00	299	100.00
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	22	7.69	277	92.31	299	100.00
Mortar Board	HDO.	20	7.00	279	93.00	299	100.00
Orchesis	HDO.	19	6.69	280	93.31	299	100.00
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	18	6.35	281	93.65	299	100.00
Pep Council	HDO.	17	6.00	282	94.00	299	100.00

[a]Organizations toward which fewer than five respondents expressed attitudes are included in this table. They will not be included in subsequent tables pertaining to enjoyment of the organizations.

APPENDIX A - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Fed. Young Republican	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Racquet Club	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Oikonomia	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Double "O" Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Swing Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Omicron Nu	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Badminton Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Engineers Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Fencing Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Philosophy Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
University Players	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Accounting Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Chess Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Entre Nous	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
International Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Lambda Tau	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Pick and Hammer	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Deutsche L. (German)	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Social Work Club	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX A - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Am. Pharmaceutical	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Assn. Dev. Manage.	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Classics Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
English Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Finance Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
History Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Pem Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Phi Sigma	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Xi Mu	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Air Knockers	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Chem. Society	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Architects	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Civil Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Mech. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Gamma Theta Upsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Industrial Arts Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Inst. Aeronautical S.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Petroleum Engr. Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Phi Lambda Upsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Epsilon Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Tau Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Psi Chi	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Public Health Soc.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Rho Chi	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX A - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Pi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Auto. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Engr. Physicists	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Geol. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Ind. Management	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Nat. Gas Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Statistics Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX B

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS, OF DIFFERING MEMBERSHIP STATUS, EXPRESSING DEGREES OF AGREEMENT AS TO ENJOYMENT OF THE ORGANIZATIONS, LISTED BY TYPE[a]

Key to Symbols:

NM - Non-members
M - Members
PM - Past members
No. - Number of respondents by four categories of membership status expressing attitudes toward each organization.
A - All respondents expressing attitudes toward the organization.
(/2, /1, 0, -1, -2) - Weighting factors.
200 to -200 - Scale for Extent of Agreement Scores.

Organization[a]		Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
Gov.	Assn. of Women Students	NM	19	100	23%	53%	18%	5%	12%	70
		M	27	100	44%	44%	7%	0%	5%	99
		PM	14	100	35%	35%	14%	14%	0%	91
		A	60	100	35%	43%	12%	5%	5%	98
Gov.	Independent Students Association	NM	21	100	5%	52%	15%	14%	14%	22
		M	41	100	22%	49%	17%	5%	7%	74
		PM	12	100	25%	34%	8%	8%	25%	26
		A	74	100	18%	47%	15%	8%	12%	51
Gov.	Junior Panhellenic Council	NM	21	100	14%	52%	19%	10%	5%	60
		M	6	100	50%	33%	0%	17%	0%	116
		PM	7	100	57%	43%	12%	0%	0%	157
		A	34	100	29%	47%	12%	9%	3%	90

[a]It should be noted that only those organizations toward which five or more respondents indicated attitudes are included in this table.

APPENDIX B - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Gov.	Panhellenic Council	NM	29	100	14%	66%	14%	3%	3%	85
		M	12	100	28%	33%	0%	9%	0%	140
		PM	7	100	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%	143
		A	48	100	31%	52%	11%	4%	2%	106
Gov.	Student Senate	NM	42	100	33%	38%	19%	2%	8%	53
		M	7	100	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%	143
		PM	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		A	55	100	42%	35%	16%	2%	5%	107
Gov.	Quadrangle Council	NM	26	100	23%	42%	23%	0%	12%	64
		M	10	100	60%	20%	10%	10%	0%	130
		PM	10	100	20%	70%	0%	10%	0%	100
		A	46	100	30%	44%	15%	4%	7%	86
Soc.	Sorority	NM	24	100	25%	16%	38%	13%	8%	37
		M	147	100	84%	13%	2%	1%	0%	180
		PM	6	100	33%	16%	17%	17%	17%	31
		A	177	100	74%	13%	8%	3%	2%	154
Serv.	Union Activities Board	NM	47	100	32%	53%	11%	2%	2%	111
		M	44	100	52%	41%	5%	2%	0%	154
		PM	13	100	31%	54%	15%	0%	0%	116
		A	104	100	40%	48%	9%	2%	1%	124
Serv.	Y.W.C.A.	NM	17	100	35%	47%	6%	6%	6%	99
		M	43	100	51%	33%	14%	2%	0%	115
		PM	35	100	33%	40%	21%	14%	3%	66
		A	95	100	38%	38%	14%	8%	2%	102
HDO.	Alpha Lambda Delta	NM	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		M	22	100	50%	45%	5%	0%	0%	145
		PM	9	100	33%	33%	23%	11%	0%	88
		A	37	100	43%	43%	11%	3%	0%	123

APPENDIX B - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Badminton Club	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Delta Phi Delta	NM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	4	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
HDO.	Double "O" Club	NM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		M	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		A	8	100	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%	168
HDO.	Ducks Club	NM	14	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	7	100	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	186
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	23	100	61%	39%	0%	0%	0%	161
HDO.	Engineers Club	NM	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Eta Epsilon	NM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-100
		A	6	100	50%	33%	0%	17%	0%	116
HDO.	Fencing Club	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160

APPENDIX B - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Federation of Young Republicans	NM	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		M	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		PM	4	100	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%	75
		A	16	100	31%	44%	25%	0%	0%	106
HDO.	Future Teachers of America	NM	3	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	26	100	30%	58%	0%	12%	0%	106
		PM	4	100	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	0
		A	33	100	24%	58%	6%	12%	0%	94
HDO.	International Relations Club	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	2	100	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50
		A	6	100	34%	50%	16%	0%	0%	116
HDO.	Kappa Delta Pi	NM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		M	13	100	30%	46%	8%	16%	0%	90
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	30%	46%	8%	16%	0%	90
HDO.	Kappa Kappa Psi	NM	4	100	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	75
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	120
HDO.	Las Dos Americas	NM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		PM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	10	100	20%	70%	10%	0%	0%	110
HDO.	League of Young Democrats	NM	17	100	6%	6%	0%	12%	76%	-146
		M	6	100	33%	0%	50%	17%	0%	49
		PM	2	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	25	100	12%	4%	20%	12%	52%	-88

APPENDIX B - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Mortar Board	NM	12	100	58%	33%	9%	0%	0%	149
		M	7	100	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	186
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	20	100	70%	25%	5%	0%	0%	165
HDO.	Mu Phi Epsilon	NM	6	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		M	16	100	69%	25%	6%	0%	0%	163
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	22	100	59%	36%	5%	0%	0%	154
HDO.	Oikonomia	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	5	100	40%	40%	0%	20%	0%	120
		PM	2	100	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50
		A	9	100	33%	45%	11%	11%	0%	100
HDO.	Omicron Nu	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	4	100	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	75
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
HDO.	Orchesis	NM	11	100	45%	55%	0%	0%	0%	145
		M	6	100	66%	17%	17%	0%	0%	149
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	19	100	52%	43%	5%	0%	0%	154
HDO.	Pep Council	NM	4	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	7	100	29%	43%	14%	14%	0%	87
		PM	6	100	17%	50%	0%	33%	0%	51
		A	17	100	30%	47%	6%	17%	0%	90
HDO.	Phi Beta Kappa	NM	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		M	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180

APPENDIX B - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Philosophy Club	NM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Racquet Club	NM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	6	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		A	12	100	58%	42%	0%	0%	0%	158
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Eta	NM	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Iota	NM	4	100	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	100
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	129
HDO.	Sooner Sashay	NM	6	100	17%	66%	17%	0%	0%	100
		M	9	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		A	18	100	67%	28%	5%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Swing Club	NM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	162
HDO.	Tau Beta Sigma	NM	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	3	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	6	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150

APPENDIX B - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores +200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Theta Sigma Phi	NM	3	100	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	101
		M	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-100
		A	9	100	55%	22%	0%	23%	0%	109
HDO.	University Players	NM	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	University Symphony Orchestra	NM	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
		M	4	100	75%	0%	0%	0%	25%	100
		PM	3	100	34%	0%	33%	33%	0%	35
		A	14	100	50%	29%	7%	7%	7%	108
HDO.	Womens Recreation Association	NM	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	5	100	0%	40%	40%	20%	0%	20
		A	13	100	23%	46%	23%	8%	0%	84

APPENDIX C

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS WHO EXPRESSED ATTITUDES AND WHO EXPRESSED NO ATTITUDES TOWARD LIKING TO BELONG TO EACH STUDENT ORGANIZATION

ORGANIZATION[a]		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sorority	Soc.	221	74.94	78	25.06	299	100.00
Union Act. Board	Serv.	179	60.55	120	39.45	299	100.00
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	162	54.86	137	45.14	299	100.00
Student Senate	Gov.	155	52.52	144	47.48	299	100.00
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	152	51.52	147	48.48	299	100.00
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	137	46.50	162	53.50	299	100.00
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	119	40.48	180	59.52	299	100.00
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	90	30.43	209	69.57	299	100.00
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	90	30.43	209	69.57	299	100.00
Mortar Board	HDO.	69	23.41	230	76.59	299	100.00
Ducks Club	HDO.	49	16.72	250	83.28	299	100.00
Future Teachers Am.	HDO.	46	15.72	253	84.28	299	100.00
League Young Democrat	HDO.	38	13.04	261	86.96	299	100.00
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	37	12.71	262	87.29	299	100.00
Orchesis	HDO.	34	11.71	265	88.29	299	100.00
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	34	11.71	265	88.29	299	100.00
Fed. Young Republican	HDO.	30	10.36	269	89.64	299	100.00
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	26	9.00	273	91.00	299	100.00
Pep Council	HDO.	25	8.69	275	91.31	299	100.00
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	24	8.36	275	91.64	299	100.00
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	23	8.00	276	92.00	299	100.00
Racquet Club	HDO.	19	6.69	280	93.31	299	100.00
Oikonomia	HDO.	18	6.35	281	93.65	299	100.00
Fencing Club	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00

[a]Organizations toward which fewer than five respondents expressed attitudes are listed in this table. They will not be included in subsequent tables pertaining to liking to belong to the organizations.

APPENDIX C - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	15	5.35	284	94.65	299	100.00
Badminton Club	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Doubld "O" Club	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Swing Club	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Omicron Nu	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Philosophy Club	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Entre Nous	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
International Rel.	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Social Work Club	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
English Club	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
International Club	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Univ. Players	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Chess Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Accounting Club	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299.	100.00
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Lambda Tau	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Finance Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
History Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Psi Chi	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Assn. Develop. Mgt.	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Classics Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00

APPENDIX C - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Air Knockers	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Engineers Club	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Pem Club	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Phi Sigma	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Xi Mu	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Am. Pharm. Assn.	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
German Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Society Ind. Mgt.	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Industrial Arts Club	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Rho Chi	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Soc. Auto. Engr.	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Soc. Engr. Physicists	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Soc. Geol. Engr.	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Soc. Nat. Gas Engr.	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Statistics Club	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Chem. Society	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Architects	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Civil Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Mech. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Gamma Theta Upsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Inst. Aero. Science	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Petroleum Engr. Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Phi Lambda Upsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Epsilon Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX C - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Pi Tau Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Public Health Soc.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Pi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100,00	299	100.00
Sigma Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX D

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS, OF DIFFERING MEMBERSHIP STATUS, EXPRESSING DEGREES OF AGREEMENT REGARDING LIKING TO BELONG TO THE ORGANIZATIONS, LISTED BY TYPE

Organization		Member-ship Status[a]	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
Gov.	Assn. of Women Students	NM	116	100	13%	53%	24%	7%	3%	60
		M	30	100	44%	50%	3%	0%	3%	132
		PM	16	100	25%	44%	19%	12%	0%	82
		A	162	100	20%	51%	20%	6%	3%	79
Gov.	Independent Students Association	NM	71	100	4%	27%	13%	39%	17%	-56
		M	38	100	21%	47%	16%	8%	8%	65
		PM	10	100	10%	10%	0%	50%	30%	-80
		A	119	100	10%	32%	13%	30%	15%	-8
Gov.	Junior Panhellenic Council	NM	77	100	10%	44%	22%	16%	8%	32
		M	6	100	50%	0%	0%	33%	17%	33
		PM	7	100	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	129
		A	90	100	16%	41%	20%	15%	8%	42
Gov.	Panhellenic Council	NM	117	100	20%	47%	17%	10%	6%	61
		M	11	100	64%	18%	9%	9%	0%	137
		PM	9	100	44%	45%	0%	11%	0%	121
		A	137	100	26%	45%	15%	10%	4%	79

[a]Extents of agreement are shown in this table for various membership groups of fewer than five respondents. However, organizations toward which fewer than five respondents expressed attitudes will not be included in the following tables regarding liking to belong to the organizations.

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Gov.	Student Senate	NM	141	100	21%	42%	23%	8%	6%	40
		M	8	100	50%	25%	12%	0%	12%	101
		PM	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		A	155	100	25%	41%	21%	7%	6%	72
Gov.	Quadrangle Council	NM	73	100	8%	51%	14%	16%	11%	40
		M	8	100	38%	50%	0%	12%	0%	114
		PM	9	100	22%	45%	0%	33%	0%	56
		A	90	100	12%	50%	11%	18%	9%	38
Soc.	Sorority	NM	64	100	11%	13%	23%	28%	25%	43
		M	151	100	85%	11%	4%	0%	0%	181
		PM	6	100	17%	50%	0%	16%	17%	34
		A	221	100	62%	10%	10%	8%	8%	112
Serv.	Union Activities Board	NM	121	100	28%	45%	17%	7%	3%	88
		M	45	100	53%	45%	2%	0%	0%	151
		PM	13	100	23%	61%	8%	8%	0%	99
		A	179	100	34%	46%	13%	6%	1%	106
Serv.	Y.W.C.A.	NM	81	100	18%	46%	22%	10%	4%	64
		M	35	100	54%	34%	12%	0%	0%	142
		PM	36	100	17%	42%	25%	11%	5%	55
		A	152	100	26%	42%	20%	9%	3%	79
HDO.	Accounting Club	NM	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	129
HDO.	Alpha Lambda Delta	NM	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		M	22	100	50%	45%	5%	0%	0%	145
		PM	9	100	33%	33%	22%	12%	0%	87
		A	37	100	43%	43%	11%	3%	0%	126

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Badminton Club	NM	11	100	36%	45%	18%	0%	0%	117
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	14	100	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	129
HDO.	Beta Gamma Sigma	NM	7	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171
HDO.	Chess Club	NM	6	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	38%	62%	0%	0%	0%	138
HDO.	Chi Upsilon	NM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Delta Phi Delta	NM	8	100	38%	38%	12%	12%	0%	102
		M	4	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	12	100	59%	25%	8%	0%	0%	135
HDO.	Delta Sigma Pi	NM	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
HDO.	Double "O" Club	NM	6	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
		M	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		PM	3	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		A	14	100	50%	43%	7%	0%	0%	143

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Ducks Club	NM	42	100	26%	52%	17%	5%	0%	104
		M	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		PM	2	100	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50
		A	49	100	31%	49%	14%	6%	0%	105
HDO.	English Club	NM	7	100	57%	14%	29%	0%	0%	128
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	10	100	50%	30%	20%	0%	0%	130
HDO.	Entre Nous	NM	8	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	10	100	18%	82%	0%	0%	0%	130
HDO.	Eta Epsilon	NM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	166
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		A	7	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171
HDO.	Fencing Club	NM	13	100	38%	54%	8%	0%	0%	130
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	16	100	44%	44%	12%	0%	0%	132
HDO.	Finance Club	NM	3	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Federation of Young Republicans	NM	20	100	35%	60%	5%	0%	0%	130
		M	7	100	29%	42%	29%	0%	0%	100
		PM	3	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		A	30	100	33%	57%	10%	0%	0%	123

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Organization Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Future Teachers of America	NM	19	100	5%	79%	16%	0%	0%	89
		M	23	100	35%	48%	4%	13%	0%	105
		PM	4	100	25%	0%	50%	25%	0%	25
		A	46	100	22%	57%	13%	8%	0%	93
HDO.	Gamma Alpha Chi	NM	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
HDO.	History Club	NM	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-100
		A	5	100	60%	20%	0%	20%	0%	120
HDO.	International Club	NM	7	100	43%	43%	0%	14%	0%	115
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	9	100	56%	33%	0%	11%	0%	134
HDO.	International Relations Club	NM	8	100	38%	50%	0%	12%	0%	114
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	36%	46%	9%	9%	0%	109
HDO.	Kappa Alpha Mu	NM	4	100	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	50
		M	3	100	33%	34%	0%	33%	0%	67
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	29%	29%	14%	29%	0%	58
HDO.	Kappa Delta Pi	NM	4	100	25%	50%	0%	25%	0%	75
		M	9	100	22%	67%	11%	0%	0%	111
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	23%	61%	8%	8%	0%	99

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Kappa Gamma Epsilon	NM	4	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Kappa Kappa Psi	NM	5	100	20%	40%	20%	20%	0%	60
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%	82
HDO.	Lambda Tau	NM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	4	100	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	17%	83%	0%	0%	0%	117
HDO.	Las Dos Americas	NM	9	100	22%	78%	0%	0%	0%	122
		M	6	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	16	100	31%	56%	13%	0%	0%	118
HDO.	League of Young	NM	33	100	6%	18%	3%	9%	64%	-107
		M	4	100	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	0
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	38	100	5%	18%	11%	11%	55%	-93
HDO.	Mortar Board	NM	62	100	73%	42%	4%	0%	0%	188
		M	7	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	69	100	65%	32%	0%	0%	0%	162
HDO.	Mu Phi Epsilon	NM	10	100	31%	40%	10%	10%	10%	70
		M	16	100	69%	25%	6%	0%	0%	163
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	26	100	54%	31%	7%	4%	4%	127

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Oikonomia	NM	11	100	55%	36%	0%	9%	0%	137
		M	5	100	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	120
		PM	2	100	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50
		A	18	100	44%	39%	11%	6%	0%	121
HDO.	Omicron Nu	NM	9	100	56%	33%	0%	11%	0%	134
		M	4	100	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%	125
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	55%	31%	7%	7%	0%	133
HDO.	Orchesis	NM	27	100	56%	44%	0%	0%	0%	156
		M	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		PM	2	100	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100
		A	34	100	59%	38%	3%	0%	0%	156
HDO.	Pep Council	NM	13	100	23%	39%	23%	15%	0%	70
		M	6	100	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	99
		PM	6	100	17%	50%	0%	33%	0%	51
		A	25	100	24%	40%	20%	16%	0%	72
HDO.	Phi Beta Kappa	NM	30	100	80%	17%	3%	0%	0%	177
		M	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	35	100	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%	182
HDO.	Philosophy Club	NM	8	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	3	100	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	134
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	12	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
HDO.	Pi Kappa Lambda	NM	7	100	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	127
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	127

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Pick and Hammer	NM	3	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Psi Chi	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Racquet Club	NM	10	100	50%	40%	0%	10%	0%	130
		M	6	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	3	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	19	100	42%	53%	0%	5%	0%	132
HDO.	Sequoyah Indian Club	NM	7	100	28%	28%	44%	0%	0%	84
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	28%	28%	44%	0%	0%	84
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Eta	NM	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%	188
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Iota	NM	6	100	16%	16%	16%	33%	16%	-17
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	9	100	33%	22%	11%	22%	11%	44
HDO.	Sigma Delta Epsilon	NM	7	100	29%	57%	0%	14%	0%	101
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	29%	57%	0%	14%	0%	101

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Social Work Club	NM	11	100	45%	45%	0%	0%	9%	126
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	45%	45%	0%	0%	9%	126
HDO.	Sooner Sashay	NM	14	100	36%	57%	0%	7%	0%	122
		M	9	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	24	100	63%	33%	0%	4%	0%	155
HDO.	Swing Club	NM	8	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	14	100	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%	164
HDO.	Tau Beta Sigma	NM	5	100	40%	40%	0%	20%	0%	100
		M	3	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	9	100	33%	55%	0%	11%	0%	110
HDO.	Theta Sigma Phi	NM	8	100	38%	38%	12%	12%	0%	102
		M	5	100	40%	40%	0%	20%	0%	100
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-100
		A	14	100	36%	36%	7%	21%	0%	87
HDO.	University Players	NM	7	100	71%	0%	0%	29%	0%	113
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	9	100	78%	0%	0%	22%	0%	134
HDO.	University Symphony Orchestra	NM	11	100	27%	45%	9%	18%	0%	81
		M	3	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	15	100	40%	40%	7%	13%	0%	107

APPENDIX D - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Womens	NM	16	100	6%	69%	6%	13%	6%	56
	Recreation	M	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
	Association	PM	6	100	16%	17%	34%	34%	33%	16
		A	23	100	9%	56%	13%	17%	4%	49

APPENDIX E

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS WHO EXPRESSED ATTITUDES AND WHO EXPRESSED NO ATTITUDES TOWARD HELP IN PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT FROM THE ORGANIZATIONS

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sorority	Soc.	177	59.88	122	40.12	299	100.00
Union Act. Board	Serv.	95	32.11	204	67.89	299	100.00
Y.W.C.A.	Serv.	93	31.44	206	68.56	299	100.00
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	82	27.76	217	72.24	299	100.00
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	72	24.41	227	75.59	299	100.00
Student Senate	Gov.	55	18.73	244	81.27	299	100.00
Panhellenic	Gov.	49	16.72	250	83.28	299	100.00
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	47	16.05	252	83.95	299	100.00
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	35	12.04	264	87.96	299	100.00
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	34	11.71	265	88.29	299	100.00
Fut. Teachers of Am.	HDO.	32	11.00	267	89.00	299	100.00
Ducks Club	HDO.	23	8.00	276	92.00	299	100.00
Mortar Board	HDO.	18	6.35	281	93.65	299	100.00
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	18	6.35	281	93.65	299	100.00
Fed. Young Repub.	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Pep Council	HDO.	15	5.35	284	94.65	299	100.00
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Orchesis	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
League Young Demo.	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Swing Club	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Oikonomia	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Double "O" Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Racquet Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Badminton Club	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00

APPENDIX E - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Omicron Nu	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Engineers Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Fencing Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Int. Relations Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Philosophy Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Chess Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Entre Nous	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Lambda Tau	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Social Work Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
German Club	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
International Club	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Pick and Hammer	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
University Players	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Am. Pharmaceutical	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Assn. Develop. Mgt.	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Classics Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
English Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Finance Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
History Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Pem Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00
Xi Mu	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00

APPENDIX E - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Accounting Club	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	1	.33	298	99.67	299	100.00
Air Knockers	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Chem. Society	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Architects	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Civil Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Mech. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Gamma Theta Upsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Industrial Arts Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Inst. Aero. Science	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Petroleum Engr. Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Phi Lambda Upsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Phi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Epsilon Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Pi Tau Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Psi Chi	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Public Health Society	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Rho Chi	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Pi Sigma	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Sigma Tau	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Auto. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Engr. Physicists	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Geol. Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Ind. Management	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Soc. Nat. Gas Engr.	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00
Statistics Club	HDO.	0	0	299	100.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX F

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS, OF DIFFERING MEMBERSHIP STATUS, EXPRESSING DEGREES OF AGREEMENT AS TO PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT HELP RECEIVED FROM THE ORGANIZATIONS, LISTED BY TYPE

Organization		Member-ship Status[a]	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
Gov.	Assn. of Women Students	NM	42	100	0%	43%	24%	21%	12%	-2
		M	23	100	30%	13%	36%	17%	4%	48
		PM	17	100	6%	29%	29%	18%	18%	-12
		A	82	100	10%	32%	28%	19%	11%	11
Gov.	Independent Students Association	NM	30	100	0%	30%	20%	27%	23%	-43
		M	32	100	13%	34%	28%	25%	0%	35
		PM	10	100	0%	30%	10%	20%	40%	70
		A	72	100	6%	32%	22%	25%	15%	-11
Gov.	Junior Panhellenic Council	NM	19	100	5%	26%	32%	26%	11%	-12
		M	7	100	28%	28%	0%	28%	15%	26
		PM	8	100	63%	25%	0%	12%	0%	139
		A	34	100	24%	26%	17%	24%	9%	32
Gov.	Panhellenic Council	NM	29	100	10%	21%	28%	31%	10%	-10
		M	14	100	36%	36%	7%	21%	0%	87
		PM	6	100	50%	17%	33%	0%	0%	117
		A	49	100	22%	24%	22%	24%	6%	32

[a]Extents of agreement are shown in this table for various membership groups of fewer than five respondents. However, organizations toward which fewer than five respondents expressed attitudes will not be included in the following tables on personal developmental help from organizations.

APPENDIX F - Continued

Organization		Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
Gov.	Student Senate	NM	42	100	33%	38%	19%	2%	7%	86
		M	7	100	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%	143
		PM	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		A	55	100	42%	35%	16%	2%	5%	107
Gov.	Quadrangle Council	NM	29	100	7%	48%	24%	7%	14%	20
		M	9	100	45%	33%	0%	11%	11%	90
		PM	9	100	45%	11%	0%	33%	0%	68
		A	47	100	21%	38%	15%	13%	13%	41
Soc.	Sorority	NM	24	100	25%	17%	37%	13%	8%	38
		M	147	100	84%	13%	2%	1%	0%	179
		PM	6	100	33%	16%	16%	16%	16%	34
		A	177	100	75%	14%	7%	3%	1%	159
Serv.	Union Activities Board	NM	40	100	18%	35%	20%	25%	2%	42
		M	43	100	30%	42%	21%	5%	2%	93
		PM	12	100	25%	33%	33%	8%	0%	75
		A	95	100	24%	38%	22%	14%	2%	68
Serv.	Y.W.C.A.	NM	18	100	17%	33%	33%	11%	6%	33
		M	39	100	46%	26%	20%	8%	0%	110
		PM	26	100	19%	28%	36%	17%	0%	49
		A	93	100	30%	28%	29%	12%	0%	74
HDO.	Alpha Epsilon Rho	NM	4	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Alpha Lambda Delta	NM	7	100	71%	0%	29%	0%	0%	142
		M	19	100	32%	16%	47%	0%	5%	70
		PM	9	100	11%	22%	56%	11%	0%	33
		A	35	100	34%	14%	46%	3%	3%	73

APPENDIX F - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Badminton Club	NM	3	100	33%	34%	0%	33%	0%	100
		M	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		PM	2	100	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50
		A	7	100	14%	57%	14%	14%	0%	71
HDO.	Delta Phi Delta	NM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	4	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
HDO.	Double "O" Club	NM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		M	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		A	8	100	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%	188
HDO.	Ducks Club	NM	14	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	7	100	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	186
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	23	100	61%	39%	0%	0%	0%	161
HDO.	Engineers Club	NM	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Eta Epsilon	NM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-100
		A	6	100	50%	33%	0%	17%	0%	116
HDO.	Fencing Club	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160

APPENDIX F - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Federation of Young Republicans	NM	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		M	6	100	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	116
		PM	4	100	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%	75
		A	16	100	31%	44%	25%	0%	0%	106
HDO.	Future Teachers of America	NM	2	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		M	26	100	27%	38%	27%	7%	0%	85
		PM	4	100	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	0
		A	32	100	25%	31%	31%	13%	0%	68
HDO.	International Relations Club	NM	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Kappa Alpha Mu	NM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	4	100	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	50
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	20%	40%	20%	20%	0%	60
HDO.	Kappa Delta Pi	NM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		M	9	100	11%	22%	33%	33%	0%	11
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	9	100	11%	22%	33%	33%	0%	11
HDO.	Las Dos Americas	NM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	5	100	40%	0%	40%	20%	0%	60
		PM	3	100	0%	67%	0%	33%	0%	34
		A	10	100	30%	30%	20%	20%	0%	70
HDO.	League of Young Democrats	NM	5	100	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%	-80
		M	5	100	20%	20%	40%	20%	0%	40
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-100
		A	11	100	9%	18%	27%	27%	18%	-27

APPENDIX F - Continued

Organization		Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200
Type	Name									
HDO.	Mortar Board	NM	13	100	62%	15%	15%	8%	0%	131
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	18	100	67%	17%	11%	5%	0%	146
HDO.	Mu Phi Epsilon	NM	3	100	33%	34%	33%	0%	0%	100
		M	15	100	60%	13%	20%	7%	0%	126
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	18	100	56%	17%	22%	5%	0%	124
HDO.	Oikonomia	NM	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	4	100	50%	25%	0%	25%	0%	100
		PM	2	100	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50
		A	8	100	50%	25%	12%	12%	0%	113
HDO.	Omicron Nu	NM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	4	100	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	125
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
HDO.	Orchesis	NM	7	100	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%	143
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	13	100	54%	38%	8%	0%	0%	146
HDO.	Pep Council	NM	2	100	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100
		M	7	100	14%	0%	43%	29%	14%	-29
		PM	6	100	0%	33%	33%	17%	17%	-18
		A	15	100	13%	13%	40%	20%	13%	-7
HDO.	Phi Beta Kappa	NM	10	100	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%	190
		M	3	100	33%	0%	33%	34%	0%	32
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	77%	8%	7%	8%	0%	154

APPENDIX F - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Philosophy Club	NM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	3	100	33%	0%	34%	33%	0%	0
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	40%	0%	40%	20%	0%	60
HDO.	Racquet Club	NM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	4	100	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	100
		PM	3	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		A	8	100	25%	63%	12%	0%	0%	113
HDO.	Sooner Sashay	NM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	8	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	11	100	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%	182
HDO.	Swing Club	NM	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	6	100	33%	50%	0%	17%	0%	99
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	9	100	44%	44%	0%	11%	0%	121
HDO.	Tau Beta Sigma	NM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	3	100	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	67
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	5	100	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	120
HDO.	Theta Sigma Phi	NM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		M	5	100	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%	40
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-200
		A	7	100	29%	29%	14%	14%	14%	45
HDO.	University Symphony Orchestra	NM	5	100	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%	120
		M	4	100	75%	0%	0%	0%	25%	100
		PM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	11	100	36%	55%	0%	0%	9%	109

APPENDIX F - Continued

Organization		Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
HDO.	Womens	NM	8	100	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	100
	Recreation	M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
	Association	PM	4	100	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	-50
		A	14	100	21%	43%	21%	7%	7%	64

APPENDIX G

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS WHO EXPRESSED ATTITUDES AND WHO EXPRESSED NO ATTITUDES REGARDING DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sorority	Soc.	239	80.96	60	19.04	299	100.00
Student Senate	Gov.	233	78.95	66	21.05	299	100.00
Ind. Students Assn.	Gov.	225	76.27	74	23.73	299	100.00
Assn. Women Students	Gov.	215	72.93	84	27.07	299	100.00
Panhellenic Council	Gov.	213	71.93	86	28.07	299	100.00
Union Act. Board	Serv.	213	71.93	86	28.07	299	100.00
Quadrangle Council	Gov.	192	64.89	107	35.21	299	100.00
Junior Panhellenic	Gov.	189	63.88	110	36.12	299	100.00
Y.W.C.A.	Gov.	186	62.89	113	37.11	299	100.00
Mortar Board	HDO.	77	26.07	222	73.91	299	100.00
Alpha Lambda Delta	HDO.	76	25.75	223	74.25	299	100.00
Future Teachers Am.	HDO.	62	21.07	237	78.93	299	100.00
Ducks Club	HDO.	61	20.74	238	79.26	299	100.00
League Young Democrat	HDO.	51	17.39	248	82.61	299	100.00
Phi Beta Kappa	HDO.	46	15.72	253	84.28	299	100.00
Orchesis	HDO.	43	14.72	256	85.28	299	100.00
Fed. Young Republican	HDO.	37	12.71	262	87.29	299	100.00
Mu Phi Epsilon	HDO.	32	11.00	267	89.00	299	100.00
Pep Council	HDO.	30	10.36	269	89.64	299	100.00
Double "O" Club	HDO.	26	9.00	273	91.00	299	100.00
Sooner Sashay	HDO.	26	9.00	273	91.00	299	100.00
Univ. Symphony Orch.	HDO.	26	9.00	273	91.00	299	100.00
Oikonomia	HDO.	25	8.69	274	91.31	299	100.00
Racquet Club	HDO.	25	8.69	274	91.31	299	100.00
Womens Rec. Assn.	HDO.	24	8.36	275	91.64	299	100.00
Omicron Nu	HDO.	22	7.69	277	92.31	299	100.00
International Rel.	HDO.	19	6.69	280	93.31	299	100.00
Kappa Delta Pi	HDO.	19	6.69	280	93.31	299	100.00
Entre Nous	HDO.	17	6.00	282	94.00	299	100.00

APPENDIX G - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
International Club	HDO.	17	6.00	282	94.00	299	100.00
Las Dos Americas	HDO.	17	6.00	282	94.00	299	100.00
Philosophy Club	HDO.	17	6.00	282	94.00	299	100.00
University Players	HDO.	17	6.00	282	94.00	299	100.00
Fencing Club	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Kappa Alpha Mu	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Kappa Kappa Psi	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Swing Club	HDO.	16	5.68	283	94.32	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Iota	HDO.	15	5.35	284	94.65	299	100.00
Social Work Club	HDO.	15	5.35	284	94.65	299	100.00
Tau Beta Sigma	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Delta Phi Delta	HDO.	14	4.68	285	95.32	299	100.00
Accounting Club	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Beta Gamma Sigma	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Chess Club	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Epsilon	HDO.	13	4.35	286	95.65	299	100.00
English Club	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Eta Epsilon	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Pi Kappa Lambda	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Sequoyah Indian Club	HDO.	12	4.00	287	96.00	299	100.00
Chi Upsilon	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Engineers Club	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Psi Chi	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Sigma Alpha Eta	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Chi	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Theta Sigma Phi	HDO.	11	3.68	288	96.32	299	100.00
Am. Marketing Assn.	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Classics Club	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Pi	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
History Club	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Pi Omega Pi	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
Pick and Hammer Club	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
St. Pat's Council	HDO.	10	3.34	289	96.66	299	100.00
German Club	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Iota Epsilon	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Lambda Tau	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Phi Sigma	HDO.	9	3.00	290	97.00	299	100.00
Alpha Delta Sigma	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Badminton Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Finance Club	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Sigma Delta Pi	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00

APPENDIX G - Continued

ORGANIZATION		Respondents Expressing Attitudes		Respondents Expressing No Attitudes		TOTAL	
Name	Type	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sigma Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	8	2.70	291	97.30	299	100.00
Air Knockers	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Alpha Chi Sigma	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Delta	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Elec. Engr.	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Am. Pharmaceutical	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Delta Sigma Rho	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Gamma Alpha Chi	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Petroleum Engr. Club	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Xi Mu	HDO.	7	2.34	292	97.66	299	100.00
Kappa Gamma Epsilon	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Pem Club	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Pi Mu Epsilon	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Society Geol. Engr.	HDO.	6	2.00	293	98.00	299	100.00
Alpha Epsilon Rho	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Chem. Engr.	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Civil Engr.	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Delta Phi Alpha	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Eta Kappa Nu	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Industrial Arts Club	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Lambda Kappa Sigma	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Pi Sigma Alpha	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Rho Chi	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Sigma Gamma Tau	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Sigma Tau	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Soc. Industrial Mgt.	HDO.	5	1.67	294	98.33	299	100.00
Am. Chemical Society	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Am. Soc. Mech. Engr.	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Gamma Theta Upsilon	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Inst. Aero. Science	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Pi Epsilon Tau	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Pi Tau Sigma	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Sigma Pi Sigma	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Society Auto. Engr.	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Soc. Engr. Physicists	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Soc. Nat'l. Gas Engr.	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Statistics Club	HDO.	4	1.34	295	98.66	299	100.00
Am. Inst. Architects	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Pi Lambda Upsilon	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Public Health Society	HDO.	3	1.00	296	99.00	299	100.00
Assn. Develop. Mgt.	HDO.	2	.67	297	99.33	299	100.00

APPENDIX H

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS, OF DIFFERING MEMBERSHIP STATUS, EXPRESSING DEGREES OF AGREEMENT AS TO DESIRE FOR THE ORGANIZATIONS TO REMAIN ON CAMPUS WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS LISTED BY TYPE

Organization		Member-ship Status[a]	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
Gov.	Assn. of Women Students	NM	171	100	63%	32%	3%	2%	0%	156
		M	31	100	77%	20%	3%	0%	0%	174
		PM	13	100	69%	23%	0%	8%	0%	153
		A	215	100	65%	30%	3%	2%	0%	158
Gov.	Independent Students	NM	169	100	54%	40%	4%	1%	1%	145
		M	46	100	48%	35%	13%	2%	2%	125
		PM	10	100	40%	50%	10%	0%	0%	130
		A	225	100	52%	40%	6%	1%	1%	141
Gov.	Junior Panhellenic Council	NM	177	100	52%	36%	10%	1%	1%	137
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	8	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		A	189	100	53%	36%	9%	1%	1%	139
Gov.	Panhellenic Council	NM	194	100	59%	34%	5%	1%	1%	149
		M	12	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	7	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	213	100	61%	32%	5%	1%	1%	151

[a]Extents of agreement are shown in this table for various membership groups of fewer than five respondents.

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization		Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
Gov.	Student Senate	NM	220	100	66%	28%	3%	2%	1%	156
		M	7	100	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	186
		PM	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		A	233	100	67%	27%	3%	2%	1%	157
Gov.	Quadrangle Council	NM	171	100	50%	42%	6%	1%	1%	139
		M	11	100	73%	18%	0%	9%	0%	155
		PM	10	100	40%	50%	0%	10%	0%	120
		A	192	100	50%	41%	6%	2%	1%	137
Soc.	Sorority	NM	84	100	24%	44%	25%	4%	3%	102
		M	150	100	91%	8%	1%	0%	0%	190
		PM	5	100	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	120
		A	239	100	67%	21%	10%	1%	1%	152
Serv.	Union Activities Board	NM	154	100	63%	31%	4%	1%	1%	154
		M	46	100	83%	15%	0%	0%	2%	177
		PM	13	100	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	154
		A	213	100	67%	29%	3%	0%	1%	161
Serv.	Y.W.C.A.	NM	106	100	57%	26%	7%	0%	0%	150
		M	46	100	70%	28%	2%	0%	0%	168
		PM	34	100	59%	26%	12%	0%	3%	138
		A	186	100	60%	32%	7%	0%	1%	150
HDO.	Accounting Club	NM	12	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	101
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	100
HDO.	Air Knockers	NM	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Alpha Chi Sigma	NM	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
HDO.	Alpha Delta Sigma	NM	8	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
HDO.	Alpha Epsilon Delta	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	2	100	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	43%	43%	0%	14%	0%	115
HDO.	Alpha Epsilon Rho	NM	4	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		M	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
HDO.	Alpha Lambda Delta	NM	46	100	78%	19%	2%	0%	0%	175
		M	21	100	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%	190
		PM	9	100	66%	34%	0%	0%	0%	166
		A	76	100	80%	19%	1%	0%	0%	179
HDO.	American Institute of Chemical Engineers	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	American Institute of Electrical Engineers	NM	7	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	170
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	170

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	American Marketing Association	NM	7	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	170
		M	3	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	10	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	American Pharmaceutical Association	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
HDO.	American Society of Civil Engineers	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Badminton Club	NM	6	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	163
HDO.	Beta Gamma Sigma	NM	13	100	77%	15%	0%	8%	0%	161
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	77%	15%	0%	8%	0%	161
HDO.	Chess Club	NM	11	100	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	155
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	154
HDO.	Chi Upsilon	NM	9	100	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%	178
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%	182

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization		Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
HDO.	Classics Club	NM	9	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	10	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Delta Phi Alpha	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Delta Phi Delta	NM	10	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	4	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	14	100	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%	164
HDO.	Delta Sigma Pi	NM	10	100	70%	30%	0%	0%	0%	170
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	10	100	70%	30%	0%	0%	0%	170
HDO.	Delta Sigma Rho	NM	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
HDO.	German Club	NM	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	9	100	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%	144
HDO.	Double "O" Club	NM	18	100	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%	172
		M	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	3	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	26	100	81%	19%	0%	0%	0%	181

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Ducks Club	NM	52	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	163
		M	7	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	61	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
HDO.	Engineers Club	NM	11	100	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	155
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	155
HDO.	English Club	NM	9	100	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	155
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	12	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
HDO.	Entre Nous	NM	14	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	17	100	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%	153
HDO.	Eta Epsilon	NM	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	12	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
HDO.	Eta Kappa Nu	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Fencing Club	NM	13	100	46%	54%	0%	0%	0%	146
		M	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	16	100	44%	50%	6%	0%	0%	138

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (/2)	Agree (/1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Finance Club	NM	6	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	8	100	62%	25%	13%	0%	0%	149
HDO.	Federation of Young Republicans	NM	27	100	44%	41%	7%	0%	7%	115
		M	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		PM	4	100	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%	125
		A	37	100	51%	35%	8%	0%	6%	125
HDO.	Future Teachers of America	NM	31	100	48%	52%	0%	0%	0%	148
		M	27	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	163
		PM	4	100	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50
		A	62	100	52%	45%	3%	0%	0%	149
HDO.	Gamma Alpha Chi	NM	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
HDO.	History Club	NM	10	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	10	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
HDO.	Industrial Arts Club	NM	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
HDO.	International Club	NM	14	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	17	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Organization Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	International Relations Club	NM	15	100	67%	27%	6%	0%	0%	161
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	19	100	68%	27%	5%	0%	0%	162
HDO.	Iota Epsilon	NM	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	9	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
HDO.	Kappa Alpha Mu	NM	12	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	4	100	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	125
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	16	100	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%	144
HDO.	Kappa Delta Pi	NM	8	100	37%	63%	0%	0%	0%	137
		M	11	100	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%	164
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	19	100	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%	153
HDO.	Kappa Gamma Epsilon	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
HDO.	Kappa Kappa Psi	NM	15	100	47%	47%	6%	0%	0%	141
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	16	100	50%	44%	6%	0%	0%	144
HDO.	Lambda Kappa Sigma	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Lambda Tau	NM	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
		M	4	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	9	100	56%	44%	0%	0%	0%	156
HDO.	Las Dos Americas	NM	11	100	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	155
		M	6	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	17	100	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%	153
HDO.	League of Young Democrats	NM	45	100	20%	16%	18%	6%	40%	-30
		M	5	100	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	120
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	51	100	22%	20%	19%	6%	35%	-12
HDO.	Mortar Board	NM	69	100	83%	16%	1%	0%	0%	182
		M	7	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	77	100	84%	14%	2%	0%	0%	182
HDO.	Mu Phi Epsilon	NM	17	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171
		M	15	100	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	180
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	32	100	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%	188
HDO.	Oikonomia	NM	19	100	74%	26%	0%	0%	0%	174
		M	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	25	100	68%	28%	4%	0%	0%	164
HDO.	Omicron Nu	NM	18	100	61%	39%	0%	0%	0%	161
		M	4	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	22	100	68%	32%	0%	0%	0%	168

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization		Member-ship Status	No.	Per-cent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
Type	Name									
HDO.	Orchesis	NM	38	100	74%	26%	0%	0%	0%	174
		M	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	43	100	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%	172
HDO.	Pem Club	NM	4	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
HDO.	Pep Council	NM	20	100	45%	40%	5%	5%	5%	115
		M	5	100	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	100
		PM	5	100	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	100
		A	30	100	43%	33%	18%	3%	3%	110
HDO.	Petroleum Engineers Club	NM	6	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%	143
HDO.	Phi Beta Kappa	NM	41	100	85%	15%	0%	0%	0%	185
		M	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	46	100	87%	13%	0%	0%	0%	187
HDO.	Phi Sigma	NM	9	100	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%	144
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	9	100	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%	144
HDO.	Philosophy Club	NM	13	100	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	169
		M	3	100	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	134
		PM	1	100	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0
		A	17	100	65%	23%	12%	0%	0%	153

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Pi Kappa Lambda	NM	12	100	66%	34%	0%	0%	0%	166
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	12	100	66%	34%	0%	0%	0%	166
HDO.	Pi Mu Epsilon	NM	6	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
HDO.	Pi Omega Pi	NM	7	100	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	143
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	10	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
HDO.	Pi Sigma Alpha	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Pick and Hammer Club	NM	8	100	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	175
		M	2	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	10	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Psi Chi	NM	11	100	64%	27%	9%	0%	0%	155
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	64%	27%	9%	0%	0%	155
HDO.	Racquet Club	NM	15	100	47%	53%	0%	0%	0%	147
		M	6	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		PM	4	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		A	25	100	48%	52%	0%	0%	0%	148

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Rho Chi	NM	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Sequoyah Indian Club	NM	12	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	12	100	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	133
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Eta	NM	8	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	163
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%	164
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Iota	NM	12	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	3	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	15	100	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	160
HDO.	Sigma Delta Chi	NM	11	100	73%	27%	0%	0%	0%	175
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	73%	27%	0%	0%	0%	175
HDO.	Sigma Delta Epsilon	NM	13	100	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	162
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	13	100	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	162
HDO.	Sigma Delta Pi	NM	6	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Sigma Gamma Epsilon	NM	8	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	163
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	8	100	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	163
HDO.	Sigma Gamma Tau	NM	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
HDO.	Sigma Tau	NM	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
HDO.	Social Work Club	NM	15	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	15	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
HDO.	Society of Geological Engineers	NM	6	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	6	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
HDO.	Society of Industrial Management	NM	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	5	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
HDO.	Sooner Sashay	NM	15	100	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%	153
		M	9	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	26	100	73%	27%	0%	0%	0%	173

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	St. Pat's Council	NM	9	100	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%	144
		M	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		PM	1	100	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100
		A	10	100	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	140
HDO.	Swing Club	NM	10	100	30%	70%	0%	0%	0%	130
		M	6	100	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	183
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	16	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
HDO.	Tau Beta Sigma	NM	10	100	50%	40%	10%	0%	0%	140
		M	3	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	14	100	57%	36%	7%	0%	0%	150
HDO.	Theta Sigma Phi	NM	6	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		M	5	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	11	100	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%	164
HDO.	University Players	NM	15	100	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	167
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		A	17	100	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	171
HDO.	University Symphony Orchestra	NM	20	100	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	155
		M	3	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	3	100	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	133
		A	26	100	58%	42%	0%	0%	0%	158
HDO.	Womens Recreation Association	NM	17	100	70%	23%	7%	0%	0%	163
		M	2	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	5	100	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	100
		A	24	100	63%	29%	4%	0%	4%	155

APPENDIX H - Continued

Organization Type	Name	Membership Status	No.	Percent	Strongly Agree (+2)	Agree (+1)	Undecided (0)	Disagree (-1)	Strongly Disagree (-2)	Extent of Agreement Index Scores 200 to -200 Range
HDO.	Xi Mu	NM	6	100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	150
		M	1	100	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	200
		PM	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
		A	7	100	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	157

APPENDIX I

PERCENTILE RANKS OF ORGANIZATIONS AS EXPRESSED BY ALL RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ORGANIZATIONS REGARDING THE FOUR ATTITUDE STATEMENTS WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS LISTED BY TYPE[a]

Organization		Statement: I enjoy this organization	Statement: I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	Statement: This organization has helped me in my personal development	Statement: This organization should remain on campus
Type	Name	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank
Gov.	Assn. of Women Students	23	19	11	55
Gov.	Independent Students Association	4	2	4	18
Gov.	Junior Panhellenic Council	16	6	14	11
Gov.	Panhellenic Council	30	19	16	36
Gov.	Student Senate	33	14	49	53
Soc.	Sorority	66	39	79	37
Serv.	Union Activities Board	54	32	34	68
Serv.	Y.W.C.A.	28	19	44	35
HDO.	Accounting Club		58		2
HDO.	Air Knockers				20
HDO.	Alpha Chi Sigma				53
HDO.	Alpha Delta Sigma				92
HDO.	Alpha Epsilon Delta		84		94
HDO.	Alpha Epsilon Rho		84		94

[a]If fewer than five respondents failed to express an attitude toward an organization regarding an attitude statement, then the percentile rank will not be given for this statement.

APPENDIX I - Continued

Organization		Statement: I enjoy this organization	Statement: I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	Statement: This organization has helped me in my personal development	Statement: This organization should remain on campus
Type	Name	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank
HDO.	Alpha Lambda Delta	52	52	41	93
HDO.	American Chemical Society				
HDO.	American Institute of Architects				
HDO.	American Inst. of Chem. Engr.				66
HDO.	American Inst. of Elec. Engr.				86
HDO.	American Marketing Assn.				66
HDO.	American Pharmaceutical Assn.				53
HDO.	American Soc. of Civil Engr.				66
HDO.	American Soc. of Mechanical Engr.				
HDO.	Assn. for Develop. of Mgt.				
HDO.	Badminton Club	78	58	39	72
HDO.	Beta Gamma Sigma		93		68
HDO.	Chess Club		73		42
HDO.	Chi Upsilon		85	98	20
HDO.	Classics Club				66
HDO.	Delta Phi Alpha				66
HDO.	Delta Phi Delta	99	71	99	77
HDO.	Delta Sigma Pi		80		84
HDO.	Delta Sigma Rho				53
HDO.	German Club				25
HDO.	Double "O" Club	97	75	96	95
HDO.	Ducks Club	80	30	86	83

APPENDIX I - Continued

Type	Name	Statement: I enjoy this organization — Percentile Rank	Statement: I would like (do like) to belong to this organization — Percentile Rank	Statement: This organization has helped me in my personal development — Percentile Rank	Statement: This organization should remain on campus — Percentile Rank
HDO.	Engineers Club	94		91	46
HDO.	English Club		60		35
HDO.	Entre Nous		44		41
HDO.	Eta Epsilon	47	93	59	35
HDO.	Eta Kappa Nu				66
HDO.	Fencing Club	78	63	84	10
HDO.	Finance Club		96		28
HDO.	Federation of Young Republicans	21	48	46	5
HDO.	Future Teachers of America	18	25	34	28
HDO.	Gamma Alpha Chi		89		53
HDO.	Gamma Theta Upsilon				
HDO.	History Club		45		35
HDO.	Industrial Arts Club				17
HDO.	Inst. Aeronautical Sciences				
HDO.	International Club		70		88
HDO.	International Relations Club	47	35	91	70
HDO.	Iota Epsilon				83
HDO.	Kappa Alpha Mu		11	26	25
HDO.	Kappa Delta Pi	16	27	11	41
HDO.	Kappa Gamma Epsilon		85		83
HDO.	Kappa Kappa Psi	49	20		25
HDO.	Lambda Kappa Sigma				66

APPENDIX I - Continued

Organization		Statement: I enjoy this organization	Statement: I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	Statement: This organization has helped me in my personal development	Statement: This organization should remain on campus
Type	Name	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank
HDO.	Lambda Tau		40		46
HDO.	Las Dos Americas	40	44	36	41
HDO.	League of Young Democrats	2	1	1	1
HDO.	Mortar Board	85	86	74	98
HDO.	Mu Phi Epsilon	66	55	66	99
HDO.	Oikonomia	25	47	56	77
HDO.	Omicron Nu	47	66	69	84
HDO.	Orchesis	66	78	74	89
HDO.	Pem Club				83
HDO.	Pep Council	16	14	6	3
HDO.	Petroleum Engineers Club				
HDO.	Phi Beta Kappa	94	98	76	99
HDO.	Phi Lambda Upsilon				
HDO.	Phi Sigma				25
HDO.	Philosophy Club	78	66	26	41
HDO.	Pi Epsilon Tau				
HDO.	Pi Kappa Lambda		55		78
HDO.	Pi Mu Epsilon				8
HDO.	Pi Omega Pi				35
HDO.	Pi Sigma Alpha				66
HDO.	Pi Tau Sigma				
HDO.	Pick and Hammer Club		96		66

APPENDIX I - Continued

Organization		Statement: I enjoy this organization	Statement: I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	Statement: This organization has helped me in my personal development	Statement: This organization should remain on campus
Type	Name	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank
HDO.	Psi Chi		85		46
HDO.	Public Health Society				
HDO.	Racquet Club	68	63	54	26
HDO.	Rho Chi				66
HDO.	Sequoyah Indian Club		22		8
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Eta	94	99		77
HDO.	Sigma Alpha Iota	55	7		66
HDO.	Sigma Delta Chi				92
HDO.	Sigma Delta Epsilon		29		70
HDO.	Sigma Delta Pi				83
HDO.	Sigma Gamma Epsilon				72
HDO.	Sigma Gamma Tau				17
HDO.	Sigma Pi Sigma				
HDO.	Sigma Tau				17
HDO.	Social Work Club		52		17
HDO.	Society of Automotive Engr.				
HDO.	Society of Engr. Physicists				
HDO.	Society of Geological Engr.				8
HDO.	Society of Ind. Management				17
HDO.	Society of Natural Gas Engr.				
HDO.	Sooner Sashay	78	76	94	90
HDO.	St. Pat's Council				17

APPENDIX I - Continued

Type	Organization Name	Statement: I enjoy this organization — Percentile Rank	Statement: I would like (do like) to belong to this organization — Percentile Rank	Statement: This organization has helped me in my personal development — Percentile Rank	Statement: This organization should remain on campus — Percentile Rank
HDO.	Statistics Club	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	
HDO.	Swing Club	82	88	64	35
HDO.	Tau Beta Sigma	59	37	61	35
HDO.	Theta Sigma Phi	40	24	21	77
HDO.	University Players	94	70	. . . . .	88
HDO.	University Symphony Orchestra	35	34	51	55
HDO.	Womens Recreation Assn.	6	9	29	46
HDO.	Xi Mu	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	53

(University of Oklahoma letterhead)

April 24, 1956

Dear

In an effort to improve the student organization program on this campus, a research project is being conducted to determine the attitudes of the women students toward student organizations.

From the list of women students at the University of Oklahoma, a random sample has been selected. Your name was chosen to receive the enclosed attitude Inventory.

It will require about ten minutes of your time to complete the inventory. It is necessary that every person selected in the sample cooperate in the study. You are being asked to complete the inventory and return it in the envelope provided. Your signature is not necessary since we are interested in the attitudes expressed by groups.

It will be very helpful if you will complete this inventory and return it immediately. Your cooperation will certainly be appreciated.

Cordially yours,

(Mrs.) Charlyce King
Assistant Counselor of Women

AN ATTITUDE INVENTORY

AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE THE ATTITUDES
OF COLLEGE WOMEN TOWARD STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

****Please list the following information (Do not give your name)

Classification in School_____; College_____; Major_____.

Marital Status: Married____; Single____; Widowed___; Divorced____.

Sorority member or pledge: Yes_____; No_____.

Employed: Yes_____; No_____; Grade Average (over-all)_____.

In an effort to improve the student organization program at this university this inventory has been constructed to determine your attitudes toward student organizations. Please be honest in your responses.

READ ALL STATEMENTS CAREFULLY AND INDICATE YOUR FIRST REACTION.

WORK QUICKLY AND INDICATE THE WAY YOU HONESTLY FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT.

Part I

You are being given four statements with regard to each of the student organizations listed below. Following the key given in each column, record the NUMBER corresponding to your attitude toward that organization with respect to the statement given. Be sure to answer all columns opposite each organization.

ORGANIZATIONS	Member?	A I enjoy this organization	B I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	C This organization has helped me in my personal development	D This organization should remain on campus
	Key: x Yes 0-No P-Past Member	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge
GOVERNING					
1. Assn. of Women Students (Rep.)					
2. Independent Students Association					
3. Junior Panhellenic Council (Rep.)					
4. Panhellenic Council (Rep.)					
5. Student Senate					
6. Quadrangle Council					
SOCIAL					
1. Sorority					

SERVICE AND UNIVERSITY-WIDE					
1. Union Activities Board					
2. Y.W.C A.					
HONORARY, DEPARTMENTAL and others	*****SPECIAL NOTE: To save time, you may skip those organizations in this group with which you are not familiar. Be sure to check all columns regarding those organizations in which you have present or past membership, and any others toward which you have attitudes.				
1. Accounting Club					
2. Air Knockers (Aviation)					
3. Alpha Chi Sigma (Chemistry)					
4. Alpha Delta Sigma (Advertising)					
5. Alpha Epsilon Delta (Pre-Med)					
6. Alpha Epsilon Rho (Radio)					
7. Alpha Lambda Delta					
8. American Chemical Society					
9. American Institute of Architects					
10. American Inst. of Chemical Engr.					
11. American Inst. of Elec. Engr.					
12. American Marketing Association					
13. American Pharmaceutical Assn.					
14. American Society of Civil Engr.					
15. Am. Society of Mechanical Engr.					
16. Assn. for Develop. of Management					
17. Badminton Club					
18. Beta Gamma Sigma (Business)					
19. Chess Club					
20. Chi Upsilon (Geology)					
21. Classics Club					
22. Delta Phi Alpha (German)					
23. Delta Phi Delta (Art)					
24. Delta Sigma Pi (Business)					
25. Delta Sigma Rho (Forensic)					
26. Deutsche Liederfruende (German)					
27. Double "o" Club					
28. Ducks Club					

(Honorary, Departmental and Others - continued) Statements and Keys are repeated for your convenience

ORGANIZATIONS	Member?	A I enjoy this organization	B I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	C This organization has helped me in my personal development	D This organization should remain on campus
	Key: X-Yes O-No P-Past Member	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge
29. Engineers Club					
30. English Club					
31. Entre Nous (French Club)					
32. Eta Epsilon					
33. Eta Kappa Nu (Electrical Engr.)					
34. Fencing Club					
35. Finance Club					
[illegible]. Federation of Young Republicans					
37. Future Teachers of America					
38. Gamma Alpha Chi (Advertising)					
39. Gamma Theta Upsilon (Geography)					
40. History Club					
41. Industrial Arts Club					
42. Inst. of Aeronautical Sciences					
43. International Club					
44. International Relations Club					
45. Iota Epsilon (Business)					
46. Kappa Alpha Mu (Photo-Journalism)					

47. Kappa Delta Pi (Education)					
48. Kappa Gamma Epsilon (Foreign Lang.)					
49. Kappa Kappa Psi (Band)					
50. Lambda Kappa Sigma (Pharmacy)					
51. Lambda Tau (Medical Technology)					
52. Las Dos Americas (Spanish Club)					
53. League of Young Democrats					
54. Mortar Board					
55. Mu Phi Epsilon (Music)					
56. Oikonomia (Home Economics)					
57. Omicron Nu (Home Economics)					
58. Orchesis					
59. Pem Club					
60. Pep Council					
61. Petroleum Engineers Club					
62. Phi Beta Kappa					
63. Phi Lambda Upsilon (Chemistry)					
64. Phi Sigma (Biological Sciences)					
65. Philosophy Club					
66. Pi Epsilon Tau (Engineers)					
67. Pi Kappa Lambda (Music)					
68. Pi Mu Epsilon (Mathematics)					
69. Pi Omega Pi (Business Education)					
70. Pi Sigma Alpha (Political Science)					
71. Pi Tau Sigma (Engineering)					
72. Pick and Hammer Club (Geology)					
73. Psi Chi (Psychology)					
74. Public Health Society					
75. Racquet Club					
76. Rho Chi (Pharmacy)					
77. Sequoyah Indian Club					
78. Sigma Alpha Eta (Speech)					
79. Sigma Alpha Iota (Music)					
80. Sigma Delta Chi (Journalism)					
81. Sigma Delta Epsilon (Speech-Drama)					
82. Sigma Delta Pi (Spanish)					
83. Sigma Gamma Epsilon (Geology)					
84. Sigma Gamma Tau (Engineering)					

(Honorary, Departmental and Others - continued) Statements and Keys are repeated for your convenience

ORGANIZATIONS	Member?	A I enjoy this organization	B I would like (do like) to belong to this organization	C This organization has helped me in my personal development	D This organization should remain on campus
	Key: x-Yes 0-No P-Past Member	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge	Key: 5 Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Undecided 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree 0-Have no Experience On Which To Judge
85. Sigma Pi Sigma (Physics)					
86. Sigma Tau (Engineering)					
87. Social Work Club					
88. Society of Automotive Engr.					
89. Society of Engr. Physicists					
90. Society of Geological Engr.					
91. Society of Ind. Management					
92. Society of Natural Gas Engr.					
93. Sooner Sashay					
94. Saint Pat's Council					
95. Statistics Club					
96. Swing Club (Golf)					
97. Tau Beta Sigma (Music)					
98. Theta Sigma Phi (Journalism)					
99. University Players (Drama)					
100. University Symphony Orchestra					
101. Women's Recreation Assn.					
102. Xi Mu (Pre-Law)					

Part II

Please read each statement carefully and underline your reaction to it at once. Be sure to answer every item.

1. Student organizations are helpful in making friends.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. Membership in student organizations should be required of all students.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. Academic credit should be given for membership in student organizations.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. Student organizations are a waste of time.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. Student organizations are too expensive.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. Student organizations are of little value.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. Participating in student organizations helps teach people to get along better with one another.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

8. Sponsors are not needed in student organizations.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. Participating in student organizations is fun.
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

10. In student organizations open to both men and women, the men students tend to get the most important offices.
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

11. Student organizations never have any interesting activities.
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

12. Information acquired in student organizations has little value outside these organizations.
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

13. Regular grades, A, B, C, etc., should be given in student organizations.
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

14. Ways of working with people in groups is the most valuable thing to be learned in student organizations.
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

15. Student organizations are dull.
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

16. Student organizations teach skills useful in adult community life.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

17. The University should limit the number of offices, such as president, secretary, etc., that a student may hold in the various organizations during a semester.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

18. Student organizations encourage skills and attitudes useful in later family living.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

19. Student organizations are of sufficient value that sororities should require pledges and members to participate in them.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

20. Freshmen women should not be allowed to participate in student organizations and should devote all their time to studying.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

21. No student should be forced to participate in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

22. University honors and awards should be based upon good grades only, and no consideration should be given for participation in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

23. Organizations in which a student participates should be recorded on his transcript.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

24. Sorority and fraternity members tend to get all the important offices in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

25. Student organizations are not democratic.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

26. Junior and senior students tend to secure all the important offices in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

27. Student organizations are of sufficient value that students with less than a C average should be allowed to participate in them.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

28. Sponsors exert too much influence when decisions are being made in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

29. Student organizations help promote good student-faculty relationships.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

30. Academic credit and regular grades, A,B,C, etc., should be given in student organizations and these should be recorded on the student's transcript.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

31. Student discipline cases should be handled by University officials, and governing organizations should have no part in these decisions.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

32. Student governing organizations make rules and regulations which should be made by University officials.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

33. The University authorities should delegate more power to student governing organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

34. Only the student organizations to which all students may belong should exist on this campus.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

35. There is too much practice of "politics" in the governing organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

36. Departmental and honorary organizations are more worthwhile than the governing, social, or service types.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

37. A few people tend to do all the work in the student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

38. Not enough faculty members take an active interest in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

39. Social organizations help teach democratic living.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

40. To make good grades is more important than to participate in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

41. Student service organizations sponsor worthwhile activities.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

42. Too much emphasis is given to student organizations at this University.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

43. Student organizations help students to become good leaders.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

44. Students would get a better college education if student organizations were discontinued.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

45. Students do not receive enough information about student organizations on this campus.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

46. Participating in student organizations helps students to secure desirable employment after college.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

47. Initiation fees are too expensive in honorary organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

48. Social organizations are too expensive.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

49. The officers in student organizations tend to run these organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

50. Students need more help from advisors and counselors in selecting the student organizations available to them.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

51. Faculty members do not encourage students to participate in student organizations.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

52. Participating in college student organizations is not helpful if one has been active in high school organizations and activities.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

53. Student organizations have little to do with one's successs after college.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

54. Student organizations have been of greater benefit to me than the courses (classes) I have taken.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

55. The University provides adequate meeting places for the student organizations to which I belong.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

56. Sponsors take too little interest in the supervision of student organizations to which I belong.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

57. Participating in student organizations requires so much time and energy that I have insufficient time for rest and study.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

58. Student organizations meet at times inconvenient for me.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

59. Participating in student organizations improves my grades in my courses.
STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

60. My estimate of student organizations on this campus at the present time, is that they are:
EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR VERY POOR