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This quantitative study was used to determine the perceptions that may have caused a decline in membership in fraternities and sororities and to examine active organization involvement between affiliated and unaffiliated students at a single higher education institution in northeast Texas. Eight perceptions were given regarding fraternity and sorority life and why students chose to remain unaffiliated with fraternities or sororities.

The instrument used was a modified version of the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory, created by Winston and Massaro (1987) and was administered to participants online via Survey Monkey. There were 206 participants total: 55.3% were female, and 44.7% were male. Regarding ethnicities, 47.0% were African American, 37.5% were Caucasian, and 15.5% were Hispanic/Latino. Out of the participants, 20.9% were in their freshman or sophomore year, 23.8% were juniors, 33.5% were seniors, and 21.8% were graduate students. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 32, with a mean of 22.89 (SD = 2.81). The research questions were analyzed using two techniques: logistic regression for the first question and multiple regression for the second question.

Findings for the first research question indicated that lack of values, lack of diversity, poor academic attitudes, and a requirement of too much time were primary reasons unaffiliated students chose not to join a fraternity or sorority. Findings for the second question indicated that Greek-affiliated students averaged higher involvement intensity scores when compared to unaffiliated students. Practical implications and future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Fraternal organizations are unique to American institutions of higher education and were established based on the human desire to band together for a common cause (DeSantis, 2007). These student-centered groups were established as ways for students to become involved with and connected to their college campuses and have since proven to significantly influence the development of students, the experiences in students’ lives, and the cultures of the colleges or universities that the students attend. Fraternities and sororities seek to align themselves with the cause of shaping men and women into responsible adults, model citizens, and ethical leaders (Earley, 1998). Students who have affiliated themselves with Greek-lettered societies are members of a unique and historic sector of American higher education because these students ally themselves with groups of individuals who have existed as prominent campus forces since the mid-18th century.

The National Panhellenic Conference (NPC; n.d.) defined fraternity as “a social experience based on the fundamental right of free people to form voluntary associations” and as one of the most enriching parts of college life (n.p.). Fraternity and sorority communities encourage leadership development, academic achievement, and selfless service to communities, both within and outside of universities (Martin, Hevel, & Pascarella, 2012; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). Fraternities and sororities provide students with opportunities for institutional support and character-building, with the mission of the organizations being the personal improvement and growth of the individual members who have been nurtured in group environments based on mutual trust and support.
Greek organizations offer opportunities for cohesive living and learning communities, allow members to make strong connections with one another, and instill expectations for involvement in community service and leadership opportunities (Martin et al., 2012). Researchers have suggested that these experiences increase students’ satisfaction with their college experiences (Hunt & Rentz, 1994; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). Fraternities and sororities also contribute to reinforcing students’ desires to continue academic pursuits (Hunt & Rentz, 1994).

Fraternal organizations maximize the powerful influence of student peer groups and can provide powerful resources that work in conjunction with universities’ educational missions (Winston & Saunders, 1987). In short, these organizations fuel common people to produce uncommon results. This ideology allows for all students to contribute something extraordinary. More so than any other campus organization, fraternities and sororities offer their members the opportunity for educational development that includes leadership, scholarship, service, and philanthropy (Anson & Marchesani, 1991; Cory, 2011; Harms, Woods, Roberts, Bureau, & Green, 2006; Martin et al., 2012; Zacker, 2001).

Fraternities have existed for nearly 240 years since the inception of Phi Beta Kappa in the year 1776 (Thelin, 2004; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). During these 240 years, the tenets of fraternities—leadership, scholarship, and service—have served as the basis of their memberships. Many individuals desire to be affiliated with something greater than themselves, which can inspire them to become brothers or sisters in one of the numerous fraternities and sororities that exist today. Much research exists about fraternities and sororities, and that information varies based on individual beliefs about the positive and negative influences of these organizations. Frequently, individuals who are employed as fraternity/sorority advisors (e.g.,
vice presidents of student affairs) and headquarters staff must defend not only the purpose and existence of these organizations but also the importance of these organizations to higher education. This justification is necessary because the reputations of these organizations have been negatively affected by some members’ indiscretions (e.g., substance abuse, poor academic performance, and involvement in illegal activities; Perkins, Zimmerman, & Janosik, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

On college campuses across the country, membership in Greek-lettered organizations is declining because many students find fewer reasons to affiliate with fraternities or sororities (Fouts, 2010; Reisberg, 2000). The stereotypes that are associated with fraternal organizations (e.g., hazing, alcohol abuse, and elitism) and the intense competitions among these organizations have hindered communication and trust between affiliated students and non-affiliated students, causing a rift to develop between these two groups (Warber, Taylor, & Makstaller, 2011).

Hoping to avoid these issues that plague Greek-lettered organizations, non-affiliated students are examining other options for involvement and service among many other organizations on campuses that now compete for membership with fraternities and sororities (Fouts, 2010; Reisberg, 2000). For fraternal organizations to survive, research is needed to determine why undergraduate and graduate students are choosing to join other campus groups and to remain unaffiliated with fraternities and sororities. If this phenomenon is not studied, then Greek-lettered organizations may not get the membership they need to continue their traditions.

Significance of the Study

This quantitative study is significant because it contributes to a better understanding of declining affiliation in college fraternities and sororities at one institution. The results of this study may help other institutions determine ways in which they can counter the decline in
affiliations with fraternal organizations. The ultimate goal of this study was to examine the phenomenon of declining participation in Greek-lettered organizations so that stakeholders (e.g., Greek advisors, chapter leaders, and staff members at national headquarters) are able to combat this trend and to continue the traditions of Greek-lettered organizations.

Definition of Terms

**Affiliated**: Refers to students who are members of Greek-lettered fraternities or sororities.

**Involvement**: Refers to the number of campus organizations or extracurricular activities, excluding paid activities, in which students are involved.

**Levels of active involvement**: Refers the amount of involvement students exhibit and includes not only the number of organizations to which students belong but also the number of hours students engage in organizational activities. For this study, there will be four levels of involvement: none (0 hours), low (1–3 hours), moderate (4–6 hours), and high (7 or more hours).

**Non-affiliated**: Refers to students who are not members of Greek-lettered fraternities or sororities.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework on which this dissertation was based was Astin’s (1984/1999) theory of involvement, which has been utilized to explain the dynamics of how students change and develop while being exposed to various outlets of involvement. In his theory, Astin (1984/1999) indicated that students who affiliate with social fraternities and sororities or who participate in extracurricular activities of any kind are less likely to leave their institutions before graduating and are more likely to be engaged learners. Astin (1984/1999) argued that students learn by becoming involved with and engaged in their educational environments. The more
students are involved in and engaged with their educational environments, the more students learn and develop personally during their educational experiences (Astin, 1984/1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Student involvement is the amount of both physical and psychological energy that students devote to experiences and has been found to affect students and their growth (Milem & Berger, 1997; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Kinzie, 2009). In other words, highly involved students invest more time in academics, extracurricular activities, and interactions with staff, faculty, and peers. In his research, Astin (1984/1999) also concluded that student involvement occurs along a continuum and is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Results from longitudinal studies have revealed that students who are involved in fraternities, sororities, or other extracurricular activities are less likely to drop out of college (Milem & Berger, 1997). After researching fraternal organizations, Green and Brock (2005) determined that involvement in these groups positively affects personal growth opportunities like leadership training because fraternity and sorority members often become affiliated with multiple organizations that allow more exposure to leadership training.

When compared to their non-affiliated peers in the area of involvement, members of fraternal groups were found to develop not only a greater sense of intellectual self-esteem but also a greater sense of engagement and involvement on campus through affiliation with fraternities or sororities (Astin, 1993; Hayek, Carini, O’Day, & Kuh, 2002; Martin et al., 2012). Educational institutions play a vital role in this development because educational institutions offer students a variety of social and academic opportunities to become involved with new people, ideas, and experiences. However, students must take advantage of these opportunities because students can only develop and change if they allow themselves to become fully
immersed in the offerings presented to them (Astin, 1984/1999; Newsome, 2009; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Winston & Massaro, 1987).

Involvement in educational organizations has been associated with positive changes for students in self-esteem, communication, and autonomy (Astin, 1993). Participation in student groups, sports teams, and student governments has been found to help students mature and develop into well-rounded individuals. For example, Astin (1984/1999) found that students who participate in one or more student organizations demonstrate greater interdependence and more mature lifestyle plans than do students who do not participate in student organizations. Also, students who were engaged had better interpersonal relationships than did students who were not engaged, further supporting the conclusion that involvement is a key component in the overall positive growth of students. Students who participate in extracurricular activities while in college expressed more satisfaction with their overall college experience than did students who did not participate (Astin, 1984/1999, Winston & Massaro, 1987).

Research Questions
The following research questions guided this dissertation:

RQ1: What perceptions about Greek-lettered organizations may affect student decisions whether or not to join fraternities and sororities?

RQ2: What is the relationship of membership in Greek-lettered organizations to active organization involvement, controlling for potential demographic covariates (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, student classification, and GPA)?

Limitations
I am employed as the advisor for fraternity and sorority life at the institution where the study was conducted. Therefore, researcher bias may exist.
Delimitations and Assumptions

This study was based on a single institution, so results may not be generalizable to other institutions that have fraternities and sororities.

Organization of Study

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter I included a brief introduction to Greek-lettered organizations, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the definition of key terms, the theoretical framework, the research questions, and the delimitations and assumptions of the study. Chapter II is a review of the related literature, which includes the history of Greek-lettered organizations and the probable reasons why students may or may not choose affiliation with fraternities and sororities. Also included in Chapter II are perceptions that non-affiliated students and institutions may have about affiliated students and fraternal organizations and additional literature about the theoretical framework that was utilized for this study. Chapter III is a review of the methodology that was used for this study. Chapter IV outlines the findings of this study. Chapter V provides a summary of this study in its entirety, and also contains a discussion of the findings, implications for the field, recommendations for further research on this topic, and the conclusion.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is necessary to understand the history and relevant establishment of social fraternities and sororities to research how these organizations impact students and campuses. Fraternities and sororities are historical traditions on most college campuses, with some existing for more than 200 years. These organizations allow students to actively and committedly impact their campuses and their college experiences by participating in traditions of brotherhood, sisterhood, and respect for ritual (Winston & Saunders, 1987). McKee (1987) indicated that fraternities and sororities were created to complement the educational missions of the institutions at which they are housed.

However, some researchers have debated the relevance of Greek organizations considering the controversies about these organizations (Martin, Hevel, Asel, & Pascarella, 2011). For example, some evidence about fraternities and sororities has indicated varying degrees of alcohol and drug abuse, negligent behavior, hazing, and poor academic performance by organization members, revealing a dark side to these prestigious groups (Winston & Saunders, 1987). Researchers of Greek-lettered organizations have examined many facets of these groups from both positive and negative aspects and have concluded that affiliation with Greek organizations has both beneficial and potentially detrimental results for students (Martin et al., 2011).

Because of these mixed conclusions about fraternities and sororities, questions arise about why these organizations survive, why they have the influence that they do, and how they can sometimes prove detrimental to the development of college students and to the reputations of college campuses. Chapter II includes literature related to the history of social fraternities and
sororities, the reasons why students may or may not choose fraternal affiliation, and the perceptions of affiliated students and fraternal organizations from the perspectives of non-affiliated students and of institutions of higher education. This chapter also includes literature related to the theoretical framework of this study.

History of Greek-Lettered Organizations

Since 1776, Greek-lettered organizations have played an important role in the lives of college students (Randall & Grady, 1998). According to DiChiara (2009), there are around 800 institutions of higher education across the nation that house fraternal organizations. College and university campuses have long recognized (though sometimes reluctantly) how these organizations can impact students and their interpersonal development. Currently, more than 200 national social-service Greek fraternities and sororities exist, far outnumbering professional fraternities, honor societies, and recognition societies that also utilize Greek letters in their names. Founded to help students build confidence and character and establish intellectual growth that is continued throughout life, fraternities and sororities specialize in educating their memberships in the art of developing human relations and social skills (McKee, 1987).

Foundations of Fraternalism

The first student organization was established in 1703 at Harvard University and focused on creating a place for its members to have an organized, collective safe haven in which to gather and pray together under faculty guidance. The first American institutions of higher education in colonial times were based on religious education, which was reflected in both the curricula and the student groups (Johnson, 1972; Torbenson, 2012). During the time in which fraternal organizations were first established, the American college was viewed as rigid at best and oppressive at worst (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). Original college curricula in America were
prescribed, and classroom settings involved students working to memorize texts and lessons dictated by their professors. Outside of classrooms, students (i.e., primarily male students aspiring to be members of the clergy) experienced a similar lack of freedom and variety (Rudolph, 1990; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

By 1719, other colleges and students groups with more secular focus were established. Student organizations were formed, just as they are today, by groups of individuals who desired to convene with one another about particular ideas or interests and to establish a stronger sense of community and social focus (Rudolph, 1990; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). Originally, most student organizations were literary societies, religious groups, or debate clubs; these types of organizations were most popular between 1760 and 1860 and were formed because of the lack of intellectual excitement and social freedom that the students were experiencing in the classrooms (Rudolph, 1990; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). For example, literary societies helped to fill voids in student life by giving students common meeting grounds and by helping students improve their speaking and writing (i.e., ultimately furthering the educational goals of the institutions). Because numerous literary societies already existed outside of educational institutions, the original student organizations in educational institutions would distinguish themselves with mottoes and badges. As the popularity of these societies increased, competition for membership, affiliation, and active participation in the societies often became more important than did the college curricula (Torbenson, 2012).

Phi Beta Kappa: The First Greek-Letter Society

In 1776, the first Greek-lettered society in the United States—Phi Beta Kappa—was created at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia (Zacker, 2001). With the founding of Phi Beta Kappa came the establishment of what is now an integral part of American
institutions of higher education: an organization that allowed students to institute a social foundation for themselves in ways that they may not have otherwise found and that provided the precedents which modern fraternal organizations still follow (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). Phi Beta Kappa was initially formed for both literary and social purposes, sponsoring essay-writing, debates, and oratorical contests; early iterations of social college fraternities also adopted these purposes upon their establishments (Randall & Grady, 1998; Torbenson, 2012). Phi Beta Kappa quickly grew in popularity and expanded to other educational institutions: By 1780, there were chapters at 20 institutions. After its start at the College of William and Mary, Phi Beta Kappa expanded next to Yale University in 1780 and Harvard University in 1781, and then chapters were established at Dartmouth College (1787), Union College (1817), Bowdoin College (1825), and Brown University (1830), thus increasing the scope of this up-and-coming prestigious organization beyond the scope of previous literary societies (Mathiasen, 2000, Torbenson, 2012).

Phi Beta Kappa formed the basis of Greek-lettered organizations through secrecy of ritual, emphasis on brotherhood/sisterhood, usage of Greek letters, and bringing together groups of individuals for a common purpose (Torbenson, 2012; Newsome, 2009; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). Membership in Phi Beta Kappa was limited to students who attended colleges or universities because chapters were required to be connected with campuses. Phi Beta Kappa departed from the previous focus of the literary societies and expanded its reach into social activities. The membership of Phi Beta Kappa devised a secret handshake, motto, and password with which to easily identify other individuals who were official members. The initiation ritual of the organization was comprised of both Greek and Latin elements and explained the organization’s secrets to new initiates (Newsome, 2009; Torbenson, 2012).
During the 1820s, Phi Beta Kappa experienced backlash for the mystery surrounding its organizations and ideas and was forced to divulge its secrets after general public outcry against all groups that operated under secrecy. This effort was led by the Anti-Masonic Party in 1831, an organization with a mission to eradicate all secret societies. As a result of the uprising in 1831, Phi Beta Kappa evolved into an honor society and published its secrets, and it exists in this manner today (Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005; Torbenson, 2012).

Rise of Social College Fraternities and Sororities

The establishment of a new Greek-lettered organization would not occur for several years after the establishment of Phi Beta Kappa, but the organization that developed next would come to be known as the first truly social fraternity in existence. This fraternity—Kappa Alpha—was formed in 1812 at the University of North Carolina by four former members of Phi Beta Kappa and expanded its reach to include 21 chapters in the South (Torbenson, 2012). Phi Beta Kappa’s influence spread across northern and southern states, and the Union Triad was born, which included the Kappa Alpha Society (a distinct society with a similar name to the Kappa Alpha fraternity) established in 1825, Sigma Phi established in 1827, and Delta Phi established in 1827. Union College is known as the “Mother of Fraternities” due to the establishment of three additional organizations on that campus: Phi Upsilon (1833), Chi Psi (1841), and Theta Delta Chi (1847). These fraternal organizations would be followed by the founding of a number of new groups, such as Theta Xi in 1864 at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and Alpha Tau Omega in 1865, Kappa Sigma Kappa in 1867, and Sigma Nu in 1869 at the Virginia Military Institute (Owen, 1998; Torbenson, 2012).

National social-service Greek fraternities and sororities developed from these original Greek-letter organizations and are unique in their structure and membership because fraternities
and sororities provide environments in which students’ learning outside of classrooms is stimulated by various personalities consistently interacting with one another (Hunt & Rentz, 1994). The social Greek experience generates opportunities for students to develop mature interpersonal relationships with their peers while interchanging ideas and promoting values that are congruent with historical, deeply structured learning communities (Winston & Saunders, 1987). These structural differences set Greek societies apart from other organizational counterparts and from other fraternal groups. Some Greek societies are more conservative in their practices, and others are more liberal. Some aim to establish chapters at particular types of institutions, but others have less restricted chartering methods. Some societies base their memberships on particular racial, ethnic, or religious groups or even particular fields of study. There are also societies based on regional, national, or international distribution (Torbenson, 2012).

These organizations are primarily found in the United States and in Canada, but equivalents exist in many European universities, though none exactly resemble the modern American Greek-lettered organization (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). In their early iterations, fraternities and sororities emerged due to the rigors of academia in higher education (Anson & Marchesani, 1991). At their core, Greek-lettered organizations are the creation of individuals who had similar interests and values and who desired to build relationships with others of like minds, which is similar to other student organizations that were previously established. These students used Greek-lettered organizations to stand up against institutional injustices for their rights as collegians and to find outlets for civic engagement and involvement (Ayers, 2007; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).
Historically, fraternities and sororities are products of the movement to institute student-centered organizations on college campuses. Fraternities and sororities were often separated from academic communities and were disliked by faculty (Nelson, Halperin, Wasserman, Smith, & Graham, 2006). However, these organizations made it easier for students to assimilate themselves into campus culture, allowing students to participate in more educationally purposeful activities. These organizations met the emerging needs of students because students were able to come together in groups in which they could share their values with one another (Gregory, 2003; Kuh, 1996).

Goals of fraternal groups. Since their origins, fraternities and sororities have been committed to standards of high ideals, morals, and ethical teachings (Anson & Marchesani, 1991). Terms such as integrity, service, friendship, truth, social responsibility, and honor typically have been used to describe these organizations (Boschini & Thompson, 1998; Earley, 1998). Established to meet the cultural and academic needs of students, fraternal organizations have catered to the needs of various populations and campus subcultures (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

Rudolph (1990) called the establishment of Greek-lettered organizations a movement that allowed collegiate men and women to redefine American colleges. With the advent of social college fraternities, previous literary societies that populated campuses declined in membership and activity (Rudolph, 1990). Over time, campus populations became more heterogeneous, colleges’ focus on careers in the ministry waned, and debating and literary societies evolved into modern fraternal organizations (Rudolph, 1990; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). With their social activities, Greek organizations created a higher degree of membership loyalty with which literary societies could not compete.
The establishment of these organizations moved quickly across the nation, and few institutions were left untouched by this movement. The speed at which Greek-lettered organizations spread to other American colleges indicated the initiative of college students. College presidents found themselves, much to their bewilderment, wondering how exactly Greek-lettered organizations and systems found their way to their campuses, organizations that were neither invited nor encouraged in the first place (Rudolph, 1990).

Common goals of fraternal groups included correcting the perceived wrongs of college administration, providing activities in which students could become involved, attending social issues ignored by colleges and universities, and rallying for the rights of the student bodies (Ayers, 2007; Bryan, 1987; Torbenson, 2012). For Black Greek-lettered organizations (BGLOs), combating racism was an added mission. A more general goal of Greek-lettered organizations was creating a place in which students could find fellowship in brotherhood or sisterhood (Gregory, 2003; Rudolph, 1990; Torbenson, 2012; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

Early on, the goals of fraternities and sororities included maintaining high standards of scholarship, service, and achievement in human endeavor, leadership development, and philanthropic spirit. Fraternities and sororities aimed to establish places where students could belong and have a sense of community (Martin et al., 2012; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Previous literary societies satisfied students’ intellectual needs in college life, but fraternal organizations satisfied students’ needs for brotherhood/sisterhood and for refuge from the mundane daily operations of academia (Rudolph, 1990; Torbenson, 2012; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

Similarities and differences among fraternal groups, Phi Beta Kappa, and literary societies. Fraternities and sororities shared many of the same characteristics of the literary
societies that came before them (e.g., badges, pins, and mottoes), but fraternities and sororities
differed in their usage of Greek letters to represent their mottoes and of Masonic-like practices
for their initiations and rituals (Torbenson, 2012; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). In their infancy,
Greek-lettered organizations established themselves in the pattern of Phi Beta Kappa and based
their purposes on those of literary societies, which is quite different from the purposes of modern
fraternities. Instead of utilizing Greek letters for their names, the initial fraternities used names
such as Adelphian, Calliopean, and Philolethean because these names resembled classical names
that mirrored the literary mindset of the day (Owen, 1998). Some of the initial fraternities were
secret, and others were more open. The purposes of these early iterations of college fraternities
were aligned with training in oratory, composition, and debate skills. Initially, institutions
catered to these organizations because these organizations provided the training ground for
scholarly activity. It was considered the duty of these groups to strengthen the educational
foundation of the students who comprised their memberships (Owen, 1998).

This literary view of fraternal organizations changed at the beginning of the 19th century
when the persona of college students was altered to reflect a more heterogeneous mentality.
With the evolution of college students came the evolution of Greek-lettered organizations into
more social types of groups (Rudolph, 1990). This modification created the groundwork of the
modern fraternity. Many of the changes that were witnessed in college fraternities during the
19th century were in response to the strict control that faculty members exerted over the student
body and their experiences. This alteration in the scope of fraternities was meant to reflect a
need to fulfill both social and emotional needs of evolving college students (Rudolph, 1990).

Development of sororities. Fraternal organizations were originally reserved for students
who were wealthy, Caucasian, Christian, and male; students who were female, non-Caucasian,
non-Christian, and of lower socioeconomic status were denied membership (Boschini & Thompson, 1998; DeSantis, 2007). Because of the separatist nature of fraternities, women began to establish their own social organizations (DeSantis, 2007). Social organizations for women started soon after the founding of men’s organizations and are associated with the launch of coeducational institutions in the Midwest and South and not with the women’s only institutions in the East (Torbenson, 2012).

Women were minorities on coeducational campuses when fraternities were originally established, but they organized themselves in their small numbers to obtain a strong position against the opposition of the male-dominated faculty and student body, thus creating their own fraternal organizations (Ayers, 2007; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). The already established men’s groups influenced women’s fraternities because female students were only offered subpar or peripheral status in the male-dominated fraternities, if any membership opportunities were offered to them at all. Women initially lobbied for full membership in male fraternities, which never came to fruition. Being denied membership in male fraternities caused women to create their own organizations, with the earliest being established at Wesleyan College in Georgia in 1851 and 1852 (Torbenson, 2012).

Like male fraternities, female fraternities initially resembled literary societies and used similar classical names to delineate themselves from one another. However, the names of these organizations later changed to reflect the usage of Greek letters and were known as Alpha Delta Pi and Phi Mu, which remained local organizations until the early 1900s (Torbenson, 2012). The first national women’s fraternity was Pi Beta Phi, which was called I. C. Sororis until 1888. Founded in 1867 at Monmouth College in Illinois, Pi Beta Phi was based on the blueprint of male fraternities and quickly established itself as a viable organization with a second chapter in
the 1869, becoming a national organization. Like the male fraternity movement, the movement for female fraternal organizations also spread rapidly (DeSantis, 2007; Torbenson, 2012).

Kappa Alpha Theta was founded in 1870 at DePauw University in Indiana by Betty Locke and was the first women’s group to exclusively utilize Greek letters in its name (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). In 1874, women’s organizations made history with the founding of Gamma Phi Beta at Syracuse University. Before Gamma Phi Beta, women’s organizations had been known as societies, but in 1882, Gamma Phi Beta became the first female organization to utilize the term sorority, thus moving the description of women’s groups from societies or women’s fraternities to the term by which they are known today. Soon after Gamma Phi Beta coined it, the word sorority became popular to delineate between male and female fraternities (Torbenson, 2012).

Expansion of fraternities and sororities in the 19th century. The expansion of fraternities and sororities was widespread across America, with the highest concentration in the northern and southern states. This early growth of fraternal organizations can be attributed to members discussing organizations through word of mouth, local groups affiliating with a national fraternity or sorority, and national organizations approaching institutions about starting chapters, a process which is known as colonization (Torbenson, 2012). Colonization is typically how new chapters are started today. With a fervent push toward creating new Greek-lettered organizations, campuses saw their students mobilizing and establishing chapters of either already established organizations or new fraternal groups. It was during this time of immense growth that fraternities and sororities came to a point in which a naming system for their chapters had to be formulated and implemented because so many chapters of a particular organization would be established within months of the last one (Torbenson, 2012).
Faculty still tended to oppose the establishment of fraternities and sororities because the establishment of these groups was not based on conventional methods of academia. During the 19th century, most faculty members were trained in traditional areas of study, such as the clergy (Rudolph, 1990). During their time as students, faculty had few freedoms. Consequently, faculty members felt that their students had to be exposed to the same experiences that they had had during their time as collegiate students. Faculty members desired students to conform to the ways of old and believed the influences of fraternal organizations were evil (Nelson et al., 2006; Rudolph, 1990). For that reason, both administrators and faculty monitored Greek-lettered organizations, and some institutions banned them altogether. This tactic caused Greek-lettered organizations to become more secretive. On the other hand, some institutions decided against limiting or opposing fraternities because these institutions perceived that fraternities could help recruitment and provide housing for students (Ayers, 2007; Rudolph, 1990; Torbenson, 2012; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

During the Civil War, expansion of fraternities in American society slowed for two reasons: first, students left college to fight in the war, usually eradicating an entire chapter’s roster (Torbenson, 2012); and second, membership that fueled chapter numbers naturally declined because of declining enrollment in the nation’s institutions. Estimations from the Civil War era have indicated that almost 80.0% of losses sustained by chapters were because of the war. During the war, the University of California-Berkeley became the first institution on the western side of the United States to adopt fraternities when five chapters were established during that time (Torbenson, 2012).

With the void created by inactive fraternity chapters, new chapters were established to take their place. For example, Alpha Tau Omega (1865), Kappa Sigma Kappa in (1867), and
Sigma Nu (1869) were founded at Virginia Military Institute. Pi Kappa Alpha (1868) and Kappa Sigma (1869) were also established at the University of Virginia. Washington and Lee University in Virginia was the founding place of the Kappa Alpha Order in 1865, and Cumberland College in Tennessee was the founding place of Alpha Gamma in 1867 (Torbenson, 2012).

Although the Civil War did slow expansion down, 53 chapters were established during this time. The majority of those chapters were established in the South, and 13 of them were completely new (Torbenson, 2012). In the 1880s, only five organizations were established (i.e., two fraternities and three sororities), and in the 1890s, 18 new organizations (half of which were sororities) were established, which equaled the number of new chapters from the two previous decades combined (Torbenson, 2012). These numbers indicated the momentum with which the fraternal movement was spreading on campuses across the nation.

Anti-fraternity movement of the 19th and 20th centuries. The anti-fraternity movement began in the 1870s and 1880s when fraternities were attacked for their immoral and selective membership practices. By 1874, the anti-fraternity sentiment appealed to students at institutions such as Amherst College, Union College, and Hamilton College; these students sought to eradicate not only the secrecy in campus organizations but also the fraternal movement altogether (Rudolph, 1990). From 1875 to 1890, approximately 191 chapters became inactive, and 50.0% of these chapter losses came from institutions imposing anti-fraternity directives. Institutions and fraternal organizations became locked in legal cases involving students and their rights to establish and join Greek-lettered organizations after some institutions imposed pledges on students entering their campuses to not affiliate with any Greek-lettered groups.
Administrators hoped that attrition would kill off the remaining Greek groups on their campuses (Torbenson, 2012).

During the first decade of the 1900s, the movement to abolish fraternal organizations continued, and fraternities and sororities faced scrutiny about claims that they were undemocratic and bordered on debauchery. The Populist Party was the primary influence for this mindset, and due to their influence, state laws were passed that either banned Greek systems or reduced their activities at colleges and universities (Torbenson, 2012). Institutions such as the University of South Carolina (1897), the University of Arkansas (1901), and the University of Mississippi (1912) banned fraternal groups by passing state laws prohibiting their presence on those campuses. Between 1912 and 1916, a similar process occurred in Texas, California, Kansas, Wisconsin, Ohio, California, and Missouri; however, legislation failed to pass those states, but the pattern had been established that administrators and faculty alike were bitter toward college fraternities (Torbenson, 2012). Despite opposition from numerous forces, Greek-lettered organizations continued to revitalize themselves and grow. Numerous institutions (e.g., denominational schools, land grant institutions, and private schools) allowed Greek groups to establish themselves and expand (Torbenson, 2012).

Renewed expansion of fraternities and sororities during the 20th century. As time progressed, fraternities and sororities gained a second life on campuses, and now, becoming “Greek” was the “thing to do”; because Greek organizations became a normative part of the college experience, expansion efforts skyrocketed, and institutional opinion started to sway away from opposition to compromise (Torbenson, 2012). One reason for this change in attitude was the establishment of fraternity and sorority houses. As institutions continued to grow and students continued to enroll in large numbers, campuses were quickly losing space in their
dormitories. The need for housing space was met by fraternal organizations, so campuses were eager to assist fraternities and sororities in building chapter houses. This initiative relieved institutions’ administration from worrying about where to house students. It became obvious that Greek organizations able to help universities handle an issue with which they were struggling, which further strengthened the cause of fraternities and sororities (Binder, 2003; Torbenson, 2012).

Greek-lettered organizations grew immensely in the 20th century, with the 1920s being the most prominent decade of progress until the 1970s (Torbenson, 2012). Diversification of college campuses between 1885 and 1929 created different groups of students as distinctive ethnic and religious groups became members of campus communities across the nation. With their arrival came the establishment of fraternities and sororities that would cater to their needs, such as a Chinese fraternity, Rho Psi (1916); a Spanish American fraternity, Sigma Iota (1904); and a Canadian fraternity, Phi Kappa Pi (1913; Torbenson, 2012).

This wave of diverse students reaching college campuses caused many older fraternal organizations to institute exclusionary clauses, limiting their membership to students who were male, Caucasian, and from Protestant backgrounds (Torbenson, 2012). By 1928, more than half of the national fraternities had membership clauses that limited their membership on the basis of religious affiliation and race. Though the tactics to limit fraternal membership were enacted by older fraternities, the explosion of both fraternities and sororities for other members of the student body continued as enrollment of students from different backgrounds caused them to unify and establish their own groups (Torbenson, 2012).

As higher education became more democratized, Greek organizations of all types experienced explosive growth in the second half of the 20th century as men and women of
working class, minority, and immigrant groups enrolled at college campuses (Halberstam, 1994). These marginalized populations were now joining fraternities and sororities in large numbers, and while new organizations were materializing at alarming rates, older organizations were expanding onto new campuses. Both new and old chapters experienced steady increase in their membership rates, and because of the need for more university housing, fraternities and sororities were authorized to build their own residences, complete with full kitchens, bedrooms, and chapter rooms (DeSantis, 2007).

**Governing organizations of sororities and fraternities.** Due to this growth, the need to govern and manage these organizations under a common umbrella was recognized with the NPC’s (n.d.) establishment in 1902. The NPC consists of 26 sororities and fraternities that were traditionally comprised of Caucasian members. Following the establishment of NPC, the National Interfraternity Conference (NIC) was formed in 1909 and was founded initially for traditionally Caucasian fraternities but now boasts a membership roster including fraternities for African American, Latino, and other multicultural organizations. The NIC currently supports 75 male fraternal organizations (Ayers, 2007). Sometime during the 20th century, African American students began forming their own fraternities and sororities (DeSantis, 2007). In 1929, historically African American fraternities and sororities mobilized their efforts and established their own governing group, the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC). The current membership of NPHC includes the nine historically African American Greek-lettered organizations (Ayers, 2007; Newsome, 2009; Torbenson, 2012).

The implementation of the G. I. Bill in 1944 further increased the numbers of students coming to college campuses as men and women from the military enrolled in institutions after World War II (Ayers, 2007). Many of these students were attracted to Greek life, and
membership numbers rose in the 1950s and 1960s. Additionally, the Hispanic student population increased in the early 1970s, and the need for a fraternal community to support this group also became prevalent. In December of 1975, a group of Latino students from Kean University in New Jersey organized the first Latino fraternity and sorority, Lambda Theta Phi Fraternidad and Lambda Theta Alpha Latin Sorority (Ayers, 2007; Newsome, 2009). After these two groups were formed, more Latino organizations were established. Due to their immense growth during the 1980s, Latino fraternal groups created their own governing group in 1998, the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO). Currently, the NALFO includes 20 fraternities and sororities (Ayers, 2007; Newsome, 2009; Torbenson, 2012).

Summary. Today, there are more than 700,000 members across college campuses, and more than 10,000,000 alumni of fraternal groups across the country, including groups from a variety numerous racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds (Ayers, 2007; Torbenson, 2012). From the humble beginnings of Phi Beta Kappa to today, this rich and continuing history of Greek-lettered organizations gives an example of the enduring quality and spirit of college fraternities. The endurance and longevity of Greek-lettered organizations indicates the uniqueness of these groups and their members because their ideologies have endured the test of time and the disdain of faculty and administrators on college campuses.

Fraternal Affiliation

Why Students Choose to Join

Campus and headquarters professionals alike have often asked, “Why do students join Greek-lettered organizations?” Greek-lettered organizations create unique student cultures with powerful implications for their members’ learning (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Astin (1993) stated that “a student’s peer group is the single most potent source of influence on growth
and development in their undergraduate years” (p. 398). Fraternities and sororities are important environments in which that growth and development transpire because they provide a number of opportunities for students to develop mature interpersonal relationships and to participate in leadership opportunities. Fraternal organizations also allow members to practice teamwork and values congruence and to develop autonomy and personal identity (Hunt & Rentz, 1994).

Students affiliate with Greek-lettered groups for different reasons, so Greek-lettered groups are powerful socializing agents (Strange, 1986). Supporters of the fraternal movement indicate various benefits of affiliation that include leadership development, philanthropic and community service experiences, and membership notoriety (Martin et al., 2011). Additionally, some students may become affiliated because they are seeking a familial resource to which they can turn at various times in their collegiate careers, and fraternal organizations contribute to students’ psychological sense of community, especially on large campuses (Lounsbury & DeNeui, 1995). Other students (most notably students who were raised as only children) may choose to affiliate due to the desire to fill the void of never having sibling relationships while growing up and to have a place where they can feel a sense of belonging on campus. Others still may be looking for close-knit groups of individuals with whom to perform service activities. Whatever reason students choose to join fraternal organizations, this involvement could positively influence these students in number of ways, including cognitive development and participation in campus affairs both inside and outside of classrooms. In short, affiliation with fraternal organization provides an all-inclusive, cocurricular experience (Pike, 2000).

A liberal education is meant to facilitate student learning in a number of ways, including the incorporation of critical thinking skills, diverse experiences, and unique interactions with peers and educators alike. Affiliation in Greek-lettered organizations is one of the most
prestigious attachments that students can have while in college, providing an ideal framework for positive ethical development (Earley, 1998). This association allows students to establish various relationships and connections inside and outside of the campus community. These connections allow for students to build upon their leadership skills and to develop philanthropic spirits (Martin et al., 2012). Greek-affiliated students only constitute 8.5% of American college students, but these students often become American leaders in politics, law, and business (DeSantis, 2007). The ranks of fraternal organizations have among their membership 76.0% of U.S. senators, 85.0% of Fortune 500 executives, 85.0% of U.S. Supreme Court Justices since 1900, and 18 U.S. presidents since 1877 (DeSantis, 2007).

Rudolph (1990) indicated that fraternal organizations should be considered schools of success that prepare young men and women to take their places among society. The fraternal experience helps students become good citizens and servant leaders and exposes students to numerous networking and service opportunities because community outreach and service is pinnacle to the fraternal experience. This service component is of such importance to Greek-lettered organizations that it is stated in many Greek-lettered creeds and missions. Being involved with fraternities or sororities has positive aspects for students who desire such experiences (Bureau, Ryan, Ahren, Shoup, & Torres, 2011; Jackson & Iverson, 2009).

Researchers have often portrayed members of Greek-lettered organizations as sectors of campus populations that are complex and multifaceted. One side of the debate, members are described negatively due to reported alcohol abuse, hazing, and lack of consideration for diversity (Asel, Seifert, & Pascarella, 2009). On the other side of the debate, members have demonstrated a number of positive aspects, including stronger affiliation to their host institutions,
additional commitment to campus life and activities, and active contributions to community service and leadership activities (Asel et al., 2009).

The positive, holistic development of their members has always been an instrumental part of the mission of fraternities and sororities (Earley, 1998). Fraternal organizations are synonymous with the formation of students into leaders, notably in the areas of community service and volunteerism, because students who become affiliated are more likely to be active in this arena (Hayek et al., 2002; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Students who were affiliated with fraternities and sororities reported spending more hours per week participating in service and volunteer activities than did students who were unaffiliated; affiliated students also felt that maintaining their connections to service- and community-related activities were extremely important because members believed they could continue their organizational rituals through good citizenship (Asel et al., 2009; Earley, 1998; Martin et al., 2012). Students who were affiliated with Greek-lettered organizations have also been shown to be more engaged in leadership opportunities than have students who were unaffiliated (Martin et al., 2012).

Greek-lettered organizations are obligated to present members with opportunities not only to lead but also to hone leadership skills both inside and outside of their chapters. Astin (1993) found a positive correlation between fraternity and sorority membership and development of leadership skills. This trait can be considered one of the most recognizable trademarks of the Greek experience because many mission statements for these groups express a direct desire to help members holistically develop leadership and responsibility. Students who are affiliated with these groups tend to be consistently more engaged and social than do students who are not affiliated; affiliated students also report more gains from their college experience than do non-affiliated students (Hunt & Rentz, 1994; Winston & Saunders, 1987). In fact, it is not
uncommon to find members of fraternities and sororities holding notable positions at their institutions, including student government president, homecoming king and queen, and student activity chairs on various campuses across America (DeSantis, 2007). Earley (1998) also found that affiliated students were more likely to have been involved in other organizations and community service outside of their Greek organizations than were non-affiliated students.

Affiliation with Greek-lettered organizations has been shown to increase the extrinsic value that students attach to their education because students who are affiliated with Greek-lettered groups are more likely to be more engaged in educationally effective practices than are students who are unaffiliated (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Students who are affiliated with fraternities and sororities are also less likely to withdraw from their institutions because membership positively impacts their sense of belonging to their campuses (Winston & Saunders, 1987). Affiliation strengthens the bond between student and their campuses (Ayers, 2007). Astin (1977) indicated that membership in fraternal organizations substantially and positively affects students’ overall satisfaction with college, indicating gains in persistence, satisfaction with instruction, and social life.

Affiliated members are more likely than are their non-affiliated peers to hold memberships in multiple campus groups outside of their fraternity or sorority chapters and to serve in positions of responsibility. Affiliated students tend to have a greater sense of connection to their campuses and exhibit greater leadership skills. (Asel et al., 2009; Green & Brock, 2005; Gregory, 2003; Kelley, 2008; Long & Snowden, 2011; Martin et al., 2012). Gains in self-esteem and self-confidence have also been reported for members of fraternities and sororities (Winston & Saunders, 1987). In comparison to their unaffiliated counterparts, freshman members of fraternities and sororities expressed greater satisfaction with their social, personal, and
interpersonal development. Senior members of fraternities and sororities reported significantly
greater gains in their educational experience, interpersonal skill development, and intellectual
development (Pike, 2003).

Membership in one of the nine historically African American fraternities or sororities has
been found to significantly and positively affect African American students by providing this
minority group with positive role models and supportive social networks for members and
nonmembers alike (McKee, 1987; Perkins et al., 2011). McClure (2006) found that BGLOs not
only connect their members to their campuses and to African American history but also create
social networks for this population of students. BGLOs link African American students to one
another and to other members of the campus population through involvement opportunities
which they may not have utilized otherwise. For this sector of individuals, research has revealed
an increased sense of morale, self-esteem, political efficacy, and community orientation
(McClure, 2006). BGLOs are often the major social programming bodies on campuses for
African American students (McKee, 1987). This group of students has also indicated
experiencing lower levels of apathy, social withdrawal, and alienation from their institutions
(McClure, 2006; Perkins et al., 2011).

African American students who are affiliated are more likely to experience greater
degrees of leadership development and to perceive the value of that development at greater levels
than are African American students who are unaffiliated (Harper, 2007; Perkins et al., 2011).
African American students who are affiliated also reported having greater sense of self-
motivation, role-modeling, and collective responsibility than did African American students who
are unaffiliated. Researchers have concluded that BGLOs have improved the experiences of
African American students, especially at predominantly Caucasian institutions (Harper, 2007;
McClure, 2006). In addition to BGLOs, fraternal organizations for other student ethnicities and orientations within the student body have since been created, including groups for students who are Asian American and Latino and students who identify as gay/lesbian. These specific organizations provide another reason for students to become affiliated because these organizations offer another avenue for a greater population of the student body to become involved in Greek life (Zacker, 2001).

Membership across all fraternal organizations has resulted in greater levels of social involvement for students: Research has revealed that affiliation explains why on-campus participation is high (Pike, 2003). Fraternal organizations contribute strongly to the social capital of institutions and allow affiliated students to easily transition to other aspects of campus life. Social capital refers to the social connections and cohesions that unify groups of individuals, including social norms, networks, and unwavering trust that unite individuals in a common cause. Whipple and Sullivan (1998a) described social capital as one of the most important positive effects of fraternity and sorority membership. Social capital is a measure of civic participation and is based on the assumption that investing time, energy, and money improves the quality of one’s own community and the lives of others (Newsome, 2009; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). The social norms that are incorporated into social capital include belief in community outreach, service, and scholastic values. Pierson (2002) found that affiliation with fraternal organizations actually increased the likelihood that students would volunteer while in college. Increases in self-efficacy have also been reported: Students who were affiliated with fraternal organizations demonstrated a greater sense of self-efficacy than did students who were non-affiliated students, and this greater sense of self-efficacy was associated with greater gains in academic performance (Thompson, Oberle, & Lilley, 2011).
Researchers have indicated that fraternal membership increases exposure to diverse perspectives, which in turn leads to increased tolerance of individual differences (Green & Brock, 2005). Students who decide to affiliate reportedly have a greater propensity for engagement in civic activity. Greek-lettered organizations place high regard in educating their memberships about the importance of civic engagement and responsibility, both locally and globally. This engagement has been shown to positively correlate to students’ educational persistence (Green & Brock, 2005).

Fraternities and sororities aid students who are transitioning from high school into college because these organizations offer students who become affiliated numerous opportunities for student development. Greek-affiliated seniors reported significantly higher gains in relation to education than did their non-affiliated peers (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Members of fraternal organizations have especially been noted as having more positive classroom relationships, better overall academic involvement, more practical competence, and increased overall engagement in their collegiate environments. Affiliation with Greek-lettered organizations leads to advanced levels of social participation, which in turn leads to advanced levels of cognitive ability (Astin, 1985; Gregory, 2003; Thorson, 1997; Zacker, 2001).

Improved retention and graduation rates and more involved alumni. Affiliation with fraternal organizations has been shown to positively affect retention rates: Members of fraternities and sororities are much more likely to remain in college and receive degrees than are nonmembers (Winston & Saunders, 1987). DeBard, Lake, and Binder (2006) found that women who were Greek affiliated had a retention rate of 84.0% in their first year, compared to 74.0% for women who were not Greek affiliated. The retention rates were similar for males, with rates of 83.0% being reported for affiliated males and 71.0% for unaffiliated males. A study conducted
at the University of Missouri at Columbia revealed that affiliated members had a retention rate
that was 28.0% higher than was the rate for non-affiliated students. At that same institution, a
cross-sectional study of approximately 600 freshmen and 1,000 seniors revealed that members of
Greek-lettered groups reported substantially higher levels of both academic and social
involvement (Pike, 2003). Additionally, Pike (2003) found that affiliated students had higher
levels of academic and cocurricular involvement and of interaction with other students.
Affiliated students have better retention rates because fraternal organizations provide students
with academic support and social connections, so members are less likely to withdraw than are
nonmembers (Winston & Saunders, 1987).

Membership has also been linked to improved graduation rates. Astin (1985) found that
involvement with Greek-lettered organizations increased students’ chances of graduating from
6.0% to 9.0%. In the early 1960s, a study was conducted by the United States Department of
Education, which produced data revealing that 59.0% of males who were affiliated with
fraternities graduated but that only 47.0% of men who attended institutions with no fraternal
organizations graduated. Therefore, members of Greek-lettered organizations tend to persist
through their senior years to graduation. Fraternal organizations provide many meaningful
benefits for their members because these organizations allow students to form lifelong
friendships that last when they become alumni members and to have opportunities for long-term
relationships with host institutions. Members report higher levels of morale, self-esteem, and
political efficacy and lower levels of alienation, apathy, and social withdrawal (Astin, 1993;
Bureau et al., 2011; McClure, 2006; Newsome, 2009; Perkins et al., 2011; Pike, 2000; Thorson,
1997).
Green and Brock (2005) found that members’ civic engagement continued into alumni status: Alumni members reported higher levels of participation in community service activities and philanthropic giving. Alumni members are more prone to contribute financially to charitable and nonprofit organizations and do so in larger amounts than do alumni nonmembers (Nelson, 1984). Also, Greek alumni are the most generous givers to their alma maters (DeSantis, 2007; Green & Brock, 2005). Alumni members also reported more satisfaction with their collegiate experience and social development because they felt more prepared for postgraduation pursuits than did alumni nonmembers (Ayers, 2007; Cory, 2011; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

Ultimately, fraternities and sororities play an important role for alumni members because lifetime commitment from this demographic of individuals is invaluable (Anderson, 1987).

Despite arguments to the contrary, many researchers agree that involvement in Greek-lettered organizations creates positive outcomes for students (Hunt & Rentz, 1994). Kuh (1984) described the Greek experience in the following words:

The Greek experience can be one of the greatest influences in a person’s life. Fraternities and sororities perpetuate rich, positive traditions and provide a sense of continuity to the life of an institution of higher education, a continuity perhaps unmatched by any other group to which a college student might belong. (p. 14)

Fraternities and sororities, as some of the oldest institutions in North America, have had to face significant challenges from various constituencies, inclusive of the unaffiliated student body, faculty, staff, administration and the general public, but have stood the test of time due to their ability to cater to very specific and legitimate student needs (Anderson, 1987; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). The following section will chronicle those challenges, and discuss what causes students to choose to remain unaffiliated with Greek-lettered organizations.
Why Students Choose Not to Join

There are many reasons for students to affiliate with fraternal organizations, but there are just as many reasons why students may choose to refrain from any type of affiliation during their collegiate careers. Members of fraternal organizations are often labeled with negative stereotypes on many campuses (DeSantis, 2007). One of the underlying assumptions that have created these stereotypes is the presumed incompatibility of fraternities and sororities with the goals of higher education and the ideas of academia (Maisel, 1990). Furthermore, some researchers have suggested that members of fraternal organizations may engage in higher levels of unethical behaviors (e.g., academic dishonesty) than do nonmembers (Martin et al., 2011; McCabe & Bowers, 1996).

There is a lot of research about the negative aspects of fraternities and sororities, including literature about hazing, substance abuse, sexual assault and promiscuity, intolerance to diversity, and poor attitudes toward academic achievement. Evidence also exists about the negative relationship between affiliation with fraternal organizations and moral or ethical development (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Among the many reasons why students choose not to join fraternal organizations, the top three that are considered the most problematic are alcohol, hazing, and sexual assault (Molasso, 2005). Members of the anti-fraternal movement also mention self-segregation as another reason why students choose not to join (Martin et al., 2011).

Along with those reasons, students also cite lack of time and personal benefits and other financial obligations as other reasons why they choose to not “go Greek.” Students further mention discomfort with the elitism of fraternal affiliation as a reason to remain unaffiliated. For example, Thelin (2004) indicated that affiliated students view themselves as the “haves” but view non-affiliated students as the “have-nots” of college campuses, especially in relation to the
battle of power and prestige (p. 219). Fouts (2010) also added that students’ job responsibilities,
lack of awareness, incongruence with values and interests, and type of campus culture might also
contribute to their lack of interest in affiliation.

For first-year students, affiliation can be problematic due to the adjustments that this
group must make in transitioning to college, especially if college attendance was not a tradition
in their families. The academic demands of college and the need to cultivate study habits and
time management skills can be difficult for some incoming students (Hayek et al., 2002).
Participating in fraternal organizations may positively aid some students in social integration and
influence persistence, but the time commitment necessary for this affiliation, particularly for
first-year students, tends to create a difficult balancing act between academics and organizational
responsibilities (Hayek et al., 2002). Therefore, involvement in Greek-lettered organizations can
force students to divert attention from their studies and to affiliation with the groups. Students
whose family members have gone to college can also be influenced by their family members’
perceptions of Greek-lettered organizations. If their parents or other family members who have
attended college had negative experiences with Greek-lettered organizations, then those students
may have other personal reasons not to affiliate with Greek-lettered organizations (Fouts, 2010;
Pascarella, Flowers, & Whitt, 2001).

As national headquarters staff, fraternity/sorority advisors, and collegiate and alumni
members continue to recruit membership for these organizations, many researchers and scholars
continue to collect data about the negative aspects of these historical societies. In the following
sections, the most serious claims against fraternal organizations (i.e., hazing, substance abuse,
sexual assault, lack of diversity, and anti-intellectual attitudes) are discussed. Leaders in
fraternal organizations can use this information to identify why students may choose to remain unaffiliated with Greek-lettered fraternities and sororities.

_Hazing._ Hazing has seemingly always been connected with the secretive practices of fraternities and sororities (Zacker, 2001). Hazing has garnered more attention than has any other aspect of these organizations and continues to cause problems (i.e., death, legal cases, and institutional conflicts; Hennessy & Huson, 1998). Media outlets have reported not only about hazing and its associated problems but also about the brutality and senselessness of hazing. Hazing is deeply embedded in the cultural system of fraternal organizations, sometimes with and sometimes without the incorporation of alcohol (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b).

Hazing on educational campuses occurred before it became mainstream in fraternal organizations, with the first death from class hazing in 1838 (Nuwer, 1990). Hazing can occur on any campus but also occurs in other aspects of society, including most branches of the military, civic organizations, professional schools, and fraternities and sororities (Bryan, 1987). Hazing is a tradition that is speculated to build pledge unity, providing a way in which potential new members can learn about the organizations and the value of membership in those organizations. Hazing tactics are often implemented as a means of indirect revenge by initiated members on a cohort of potential new members (Bryan, 1987).

Although hazing is not limited to Greek-lettered organizations, the visibility of fraternities and sororities makes it seem as if they are the only organizations that engage in the activity. Many university administrators and their counterparts at national headquarters for Greek-lettered organizations have tried to educate their memberships about the dangers of hazing and the detriment that it could cause the organizations as a whole (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). To that end, a number of states have anti-hazing laws, with some laws dating back 20
years. These laws against hazing were created in response to the multitude of injuries and deaths resulting from individuals subjecting themselves to hazing. Despite these laws, hazing continues with understandable frustration from institutions and administrators (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

Anyone who participates in hazing can now be charged with a number of different violations, varying from simple or aggravated assault to kidnapping, manslaughter, or even murder. Some states even treat hazing as a felony charge, though most states only classify hazing as a criminal misdemeanor. Hazing statutes in various states actually extend the criminal liability associated with hazing to persons who knowingly permit, fail to report, or participate in hazing. These types of statutes could implicate faculty and administrative staff and advisors who work with fraternities and sororities (Hennessy & Huson, 1998). The penalty for failing to report or for even passively participating in hazing can include fines and incarceration. Institutions can even be held liable if hazing occurs and causes injuries to students (Hennessy & Huson, 1998).

As previously stated, hazing persists in Greek-lettered organizations despite laws enacted by states and safeguards created by institutions and organizational headquarters to prevent hazing (Hennessy & Huson, 1998). Hazing occurs in many forms, from physical violence and emotional abuse involving massive amounts of alcohol to subjecting victims to silly antics. Hopeful initiates may be subjected to forced food consumption, exposure to the elements, verbal abuse, and sleep deprivation (Hennessy & Huson, 1998). Hazing rituals have been used as rites of passage since the early 1600s, and institutions of higher education have reported at least one hazing-related fatality each year connected to fraternal organizations since 1970; the number of reported injuries related to hazing is much greater. The first fraternity hazing death occurred in 1873 at Cornell University in Ithica, New York (Bubrig, 2008; Hoover, 2012; Nuwer, 1990).
Hazing is intended to create a sense of dependency on a particular group, and that dependency is intended to evolve into a relationship that encourages and celebrates the continuation of the act as a rite of passage for new potential members (Keating et al., 2005). The earliest forms of hazing were based on personal servitude and were both physical and psychological in nature. Hazing is a powerful form of groupthink, or Greekthink as Nuwer (1990) coined it. Groupthink succeeds when members of the group establish a social network that is deemed exclusive and important. Individuals desire affiliation with and membership in the exclusive social network and are therefore willing to subject themselves to virtually whatever process is necessary to be accepted.

Sweet (2004) stated that hazing is not an illogical practice because it joins students who yearn for a sense of belonging. This desired sense of belonging causes students to subject themselves to hazing as a necessary part of the process of becoming accepted by a peer group. This mentality creates a legitimate reason for allowing oneself to be hazed because it is believed to be an essential part of the initiation process. For this reason, hazing is a self-perpetuating process: Many incoming members vow that they will end the brutality once they become initiated, but they actually continue the process into their membership. New members are made to believe that the abuse is a part of group membership and that older members and alumni who conduct hazing are doing so in the best interests of the new members and of the group as a whole. Some members of Greek-lettered organizations argue that members cannot be respected if they do not allow themselves to be hazed. Hazing is the primary process to delineate the haves (i.e., the initiated members) from the have-nots (i.e., pledges who desire what the initiated members already possess, which is membership and respect; Nuwer, 1990; Zacker, 2001).
Rituals connected to hazing vary among students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Hazing among Caucasian students typically involves excessive alcohol consumption, and hazing among African American students typically involves brutality and physical abuse. Hazing has been difficult to prevent, so university administrators can only seem to implement policies that merely deter the practice, as opposed to eradicating it altogether (Hoover, 2012; Perkins et al., 2011). Hazing has become such a popular subject on college campuses and in the media that students who are unaffiliated may avoid membership because of this practice. Given the popularity and availability of literature about hazing, students can easily research information about hazing cases that led to injuries and deaths, which could sway them from seeking membership in Greek-lettered organizations if they were previously undecided.

Substance abuse. Like hazing, experimentation with alcohol and other substances has become typical of the college experience, with alcohol being cited as the most widely used drug among college students (Riordan & Dana, 1998; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). College is a time of discovery, and college students consume alcohol early in their college careers, sometimes as a part of fraternity/sorority membership (Ayers, 2007). Students who arrive at college with a high propensity for alcohol consumption tend to more readily embrace the concept of the drunken frat parties and therefore are more likely to join fraternal organizations just for the alcohol exposure. Students who join for this reason perpetuate the heavy alcohol consumption in fraternities and sororities and the stereotype of fraternity and sorority members as binge drinkers (i.e., people who consume five or more alcoholic beverages in a single sitting; Juth, Smyth, Thompson, & Nodes, 2010; Larimer, Turner, Mallett, & Geisner, 2004; Riordan & Dana, 1998).

DeSimone (2009) found a strong correlation between binge drinking and fraternity/sorority affiliation and determined that membership affected the intensity and
frequency of alcohol consumption. Riordan and Dana (1998) supported DeSimone’s conclusion, indicating in their research that fraternity and sorority affiliation increases the likelihood of students’ alcohol abuse. Students who are affiliated with fraternal organizations have been reported to be 4 times more likely to engage in binge drinking throughout college than are students who are unaffiliated (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). A study by the Harvard School of Public Health revealed that members of fraternities and sororities are more likely to abuse alcohol than are nonmembers (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996).

The culture of Greek-lettered organizations seems to align with the belief that alcohol usage is meant to be a traditional element of the Greek experience because students who are interested in joining fraternal organizations are more likely to consume alcohol than are students who are not interested in joining (Earley, 1998). DeSimone (2009) found that fraternity and sorority members tend to host the majority of social gatherings at which alcohol is readily available for consumption by students who may be under the legal age for alcohol intake. The injuries and deaths that have resulted from fraternal organizations providing alcohol and other substances at their functions have lead a growing number of states to institute social host liability statutes, which make host organizations responsible for the negligent acts of intoxicated persons. These statutes place Greek-lettered organizations in the same position as many public establishments where alcohol is served, creating a standard of responsibility for chapters and their members and for guests and visitors to fraternity or sorority events (Hennessy & Huson, 1998).

Zacker (2001) indicated that affiliated students typically consumed 3 times more alcohol than did non-affiliated students. Other researchers have found that fraternity members had the highest rate of alcohol consumption, followed by sorority members, unaffiliated males, and
unaffiliated females (Barry, 2007). As a result of their increased alcohol consumption, affiliated members also reported higher levels of unsafe behaviors, such as unprotected sexual encounters, physical altercations, driving while under the influence of alcohol, and vandalism of property (Barry, 2007; Caudill et al., 2006; Danielson, Taylor, & Hartford, 2001; DeSimone, 2009; Perkins et al., 2011).

*Sexual assault.* Fraternity and sorority membership has recently been linked to cases of sexual abuse and assault, which is also tied to alcohol usage by members (Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Perkins et al., 2011). Given the social aspect of fraternal organizations, the atmosphere for sexual assault is typically created during fraternity and sorority parties at which alcohol and other substances may be present. Evidence exists that reveals both fraternity and sorority members are more likely to support male dominance and sexual aggression than are their nonmembers (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Sexual assaults can also be connected fraternity members’ beliefs that it is okay to debase women through language and physical aggression. Sorority women who allow fraternity men to objectify them with this behavior may reinforce this outlook. When alcohol and drugs are used in conjunction with one another, this conduct increases throughout the Greek community and will continue if members do not stop it themselves (Warshaw, 1988; Zacker, 2001). Members of the campus community who are not affiliated with fraternal organizations perceive these attitudes as destructive, which can further divide unaffiliated and affiliated students.

*Lack of diversity.* Institutions of higher education are facing new demands to prepare their students and graduates for living and working in an increasingly multicultural world. Greek leaders often proclaim that membership in their organizations prepares students for diversity after campus life (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). However, some researchers argue that social
Greek-lettered organizations remain the most segregated institutions in America (DeSantis, 2007). The lack of respect for diversity, religious choice, and sexual orientation are issues that plague fraternities and sororities across the country (Bryan, 1987).

DeSantis (2007) asserted that the social Greek system has generally remained as segregated today as it was in 1776. At the beginning of the fraternal movement, students had to be male, Caucasian, and Christian to be eligible for membership (Boschini & Thompson, 1998; Hughey, 2007). It was normal for exclusion and racism to be a part of the fraternal experience because students who were female, Jewish, and minorities were barred from the Greek system. Fraternal organizations practiced gender, religious, and racial discrimination until the 1960s (Zacker, 2001).

Since the 1960s, fraternal organizations have changed membership practices to include various gender, religious, and ethnic backgrounds. Nevertheless, some collegiate chapter members, alumni, and headquarters staff have resisted changing membership practices to improve diversity within fraternal organizations. Both historically Caucasian and historically African American fraternities and sororities are often criticized for their unwillingness to diversify their memberships (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Some researchers have found that membership in some fraternal organizations encourages affiliated students in attitudes against diversity, though most Greek organizations have constitutions based on non-discriminatory language (Boschini & Thompson, 1998). Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found that fraternities and sororities can negatively influence members’ attitudes toward racial and ethnic differences and openness to diverse ideas and people.

Other researchers have indicated that students affiliated with Greek-lettered organizations scored lower on assessments to measure openness to diversity than did students who were not
affiliated and that Greek members’ openness to diversity declined after the first year of college (Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a). In a similar study, fraternity and sorority members scored lower on measures of interracial interactions and promotions of racial understanding than did nonmembers (Antonio, 2001). These sentiments of discrimination support members’ sense of social elitism by allowing members to avoid any type of interaction with others who are from diverse backgrounds that are not represented within the members’ organizations (Marlowe & Auvenshine, 1982; Zacker, 2001). Many modern fraternal groups still lack diversity within the ranks of their membership, which can negatively affect recruitment of unaffiliated individuals.

With changing demographics on college and university campuses, it is becoming more prevalent that students who identify as male, Caucasian, and Christian no longer represent the majority of all students. The current exclusivity that Greek organizations practice contradicts the missions of diversity that American universities espouse (Boschini & Thompson, 1998; Zacker, 2001).

Research about diversity issues in Greek-lettered organizations is still emerging and is mostly based on Caucasian fraternities and sororities. BGLOs have been attracting attention within the last 10 years, and fraternal organizations for other cultures (e.g., Latino and Asian fraternities and sororities) have been attracting attention in the last 7 years, so literature about diversity in fraternities and sororities is increasing (Park, 2008; Perkins et al., 2011). For example, Arnold and Kuh (1992) found that the term diversity means different things to different groups, apart from how the general population would define it. Instead of understanding diversity as an idea of embracing individuals from groups that are historically underrepresented,
fraternity members described diversity as varying degrees of tolerance related to individual preferences for recreation, sports, academic major, and tastes.

For fraternal organizations to attract new membership to sustain themselves, diversifying their memberships is key. If fraternal organizations refuse to implement diversification strategies, they may not be able to attract new members from the increasingly diverse populations on college campuses (Boschini & Thompson, 1998). Diverse memberships expand educational opportunities for chapters so that chapters grow and remain viable. Exposing members to others from diverse backgrounds will help members transition into a highly diverse society (Boschini & Thompson, 1998). Greek-lettered organizations must match the diversity of their college campuses diversify because diversity will be the primary way in which these groups will continue to exist at the institutions that support them (Perkins et al., 2011).

Anti-intellectual attitudes. Research results vary about the difference in academic persistence and achievement between affiliated students and non-affiliated students. Some fraternal organizations state that their mission includes helping their members achieve high academic marks, and some researchers have found that affiliated students perform better academically than do non-affiliated students (Thompson et al., 2011). However, other researchers have found that affiliated students perform either at the same level or below the level of non-affiliated students (Thompson et al., 2011).

In a study conducted by Martin et al. (2011), members of fraternal organizations demonstrated lower levels of critical thinking or persistence in literacy when compared to nonmembers. Some researchers have also found that fraternity or sorority membership inhibits students’ growth in principled moral reasoning (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Cheating was also found to be one of the most prevalent issues among affiliated students: Fraternity and
sorority members have been noted to be significantly more likely to cheat on examinations than have nonmembers (McCabe & Bowers, 1996). Consequently, some chapters seem to conflict with the academic ideologies and missions of college campuses (Winston & Saunders, 1987; Zacker, 2001).

Zacker (2001) found that membership in Greek-lettered organizations during the first year of college can negatively affect students’ cognitive development, including reading comprehension, mathematics, and critical thinking. Affiliation during the first year of college could distract students’ focus on academics by reducing the available time necessary to create a solid academic foundation (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b; Zacker, 2001). In addition, members of fraternities and sororities must conform to group standards and spend more time attending social events, which can isolate them from their non-affiliated peers and from the intellectual and social challenges that are needed for cognitive development (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b).

Other studies about Greek affiliation and academics have revealed that affiliated students usually score lower in all academic measures. For example, Pike (2003) found that, for males, membership was associated with significantly lower levels of mathematics performance, reading comprehension, and critical thinking. Pike (2003) also found that women in sororities were reported to suffer from low reading comprehension. In a study of 2,200 alumni who were either affiliated or unaffiliated, results revealed that sorority alumni and non-affiliated students were more satisfied with their academic performance than were fraternity alumni (DeBard et al., 2006; Pascarella, Edison, Whitt, et al., 1996; Whipple, 1998). Additionally, Astin (1993) found evidence supporting negative associations between grade point averages and affiliations. Members of fraternities tend to experience the strongest negative correlation with lower
academic performance: Zacker (2001) concluded that at two thirds of participating institutions, the grade point averages of fraternity members were lower than were the grade point averages of the overall male population.

The Center for the Study of the College Fraternity (2009) also reported that only 31.4% of private institutions and 18.8% of public institutions had fraternity chapters with grade point averages that were higher than were the grade point averages of the overall male population. However, the same study revealed that members of sororities seem to have better academic results than do members of fraternities: 43.4% of sorority members on public campuses had higher grade point averages than did the overall female population (Center for the Study of the College Fraternity, 2009). Nevertheless, fraternity and sorority members as a whole were more likely to admit to academic dishonesty during college than were nonmembers (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The lower academic performance of some affiliated students could deter non-affiliated students from joining Greek-lettered organizations because non-affiliated students may not want to be associated with the premise that grades are not important and with members who do not meet standards of academic excellence. Because of the academic pressures that both affiliated and non-affiliated students face, leaders of Greek-lettered organizations should seriously consider deferred recruitment (i.e., a recruitment period that occurs later in the academic year) for new members (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a).

Perceptions of Affiliated Students and Fraternal Organizations

From Non-affiliated students’ Perspectives

Students who are not affiliated with fraternities or sororities are important to Greek-lettered organizations because these organizations recruit new members among non-affiliated students to sustain their memberships on college campuses. Therefore, it is important to
understand how non-affiliated students perceive these organizations. Recruiters can use this understanding to answer non-affiliated students’ questions about whether or not involvement in a fraternal organization is worth their time and about how membership will affect them financially as struggling college students.

Researchers have found that non-affiliated students have negative opinions about affiliated students, most notably because non-affiliated students believe that fraternal organizations and their members do not meet their own standards and expectations (Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998b). Affiliated students typically reciprocate that attitude with their own negative opinions about non-affiliated students. Non-affiliated students tend to believe that members of Greek-lettered organizations are cheaters, snobs, womanizers, promiscuous, and/or alcoholics, and affiliated students tend to believe that nonmembers are socially inept or of a lower class than themselves (Tollini & Wilson, 2010). These stereotypical opinions that affiliated and non-affiliated students hold about one another generally hinder relationships being established between the groups, and non-affiliated students use these and other reasons to refrain from joining fraternities or sororities.

The nature of fraternal organizations inherently creates boundaries between members and nonmembers. These boundaries tend to be publically known, and the separations between the two groups are obvious, especially because both groups must interact on a number of occasions inside and outside of classrooms. These interactions could influence how non-affiliated students perceive affiliated students. Non-affiliated students develop perceptions of fraternal organizations based on the interactions they have had with affiliated students. In previous studies about these types of interactions, results have revealed that many students chose not to affiliate because of the attitude of members toward faculty and staff, the misrepresentation of the
organization by members who may come to class hung over or sloppily dressed in their fraternal
tailor, and the promotion of wild partying and promiscuous sexual encounters by members.
Negative stereotyping, misrepresentation by members, and feelings of competition among
affiliated and non-affiliated students can then hinder cooperation and trust between these two
groups, especially on campuses where non-affiliated students vie with affiliated students for the
positions of leadership in other campus organizations that are not fraternal organizations (Fouts,
2010; Scott-Sheldon, Carey, & Carey 2008; Storch & Storch, 2002; Warber et al., 2011). Given
the negative opinions that some non-affiliated students have about affiliated students, Greek
organizations need to reach out to their academic communities and dispel the misperceptions of
both groups, which would establish an atmosphere of support and respect for both sides.

From Institutions’ Perspectives

Institutions of higher education also have perceptions of the Greek system that cause
them to question the value of Greek experience for students and institutions alike.
Administrators’ attitudes about Greek-lettered organizations vary from hostility to enthusiasm
(McKee, 1987). Many institutions have reviewed the Greek systems on their campuses,
including Bucknell University, Colby College, and Dartmouth College. In the late 1980s, Colby
College became the first institution to withdraw the official recognition of fraternities and
sororities in an effort to eliminate the Greek system from its campus (Anson & Marchesani,
temporarily banned fraternal organizations due to excessive alcohol use leading to alcohol-
related deaths; however, the institution eventually reinstated fraternal organizations, agreeing
that fraternities and sororities served a positive purpose for students (Bryan, 1987).
Institutional reviews of the Greek systems have been conducted because Greek-lettered organizations were not aligning themselves with the educational missions of their institutions and were causing issues on their campuses (Anson & Marchesani, 1991; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Colleges and universities have been facing public and legal scrutiny because of problems related to the Greek systems (Hennessy & Huson, 1998; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). These problems related to incidents caused by members of fraternities and sororities who are visible examples of insensitive, illegal, and sometimes tragic behaviors, and these problems provide further evidence that fraternal organizations contradict the missions of colleges and universities (Kuh et al., 1996; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b).

In their research, Owen and Owen (1976) stated that educational institutions need to determine the essential, enduring worth of fraternities and sororities besides the quantity of individuals whom they recruit. Not including individuals who work directly with Greek-lettered organizations, institutional faculty and staff have varying opinions about the value of fraternal organizations on campuses, but ultimately, administrators expect fraternal organizations to fulfill their self-proclaimed mottoes of positively contributing to students’ college experience; it is not unexpected that administrators would be frustrated if fraternities and sororities do not deliver on this core mission (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Institutional and national headquarter staff have worked together to increase the number and value of educational programming and community service initiatives provided by fraternities and sororities, but many administrators are disappointed in the results that they perceive to be negligible at best (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b).

In their research, Whipple and Sullivan (1998a, 1998b) questioned whether or not fraternities and sororities contribute to institutions’ educational missions, especially considering
the extent to which anti-intellectualism continues to pervade memberships. Faculty members have described Greek-lettered organizations as distractions, particularly during new member recruitment and orientation periods (Hayek et al., 2002). Many institutions have found that fraternity and sorority chapters simply do not live up to their own standards because of negative behaviors such as hazing, alcohol abuse, allegations of sexism, institutional liability associated with housing Greek chapters, and poor relations with the surrounding communities (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b; Zacker, 2001). Administrative trust in Greek-lettered organizations weakens as current members continue their negative behaviors and seem apathetic to the rules against such behaviors. Some college administrators believe that they no longer control the general morals of students as they did in the days of in loco parentis (Hennessy & Huson, 1998).

Administrative criticisms of fraternal organizations have existed since their inception, so lack of support from faculty and staff members is not a new concept; in fact, administrators’ perceptions of fraternal organizations are often similar to non-affiliated students’ (Zacker, 2001). However, administrators have been more tolerant of fraternal organizations than are non-affiliated students because administrators have supported the benefits that fraternal organizations offer their campuses. Nevertheless, administrative tolerance lessens as more issues of hazing, substance abuse, and other anti-intellectual behaviors persist in fraternal organizations and cause legal ramifications for institutions that host Greek-lettered organizations (Hennessy & Huson, 1998; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). This eroded level of administrative support has made it difficult for Greek systems either to add new chapters or to sustain themselves on some campuses.

The relationship between institutions and Greek organizations fluctuate between strict policing and disassociation (i.e., institutions refuse to recognize the organizations or student
memberships, which would then cause the organizations to operate outside of the jurisdiction of their host institutions; Hennessy & Huson, 1998). Disassociation prevents chapters from having access to on-campus resources and advising and to other perks of being recognized by their host institutions. Institutions that choose to disassociate want to limit their own legal liability with regards to fraternal organizations, but these institution risk other types of liability for exercising either too little or too much control over affiliated students and their organizations (Hennessy & Huson, 1998).

Greek housing was once an important reason for hosting Greek organizations at institutions with space issues for on-campus students (Binder, 2003) but has now become another source of contention for university administrators because Greek housing is a source of safety and behavioral concerns, especially related to substance abuse. Consequently, faculty and community members have begun to complain about the liability of Greek housing on campuses (Hennessy & Huson, 1998). Privately owned chapter houses especially concern administrators and create tensions between universities and communities. Social gatherings of at Greek house often result in noise complaints, loitering, littering, and physical altercations involving members and their guests, which detracts from the safety and order that communities and neighbors expect (Newsome, 2009; Zacker, 2001). Also, Greek houses can diminish the property values in their neighborhoods, and communities hold the host institutions responsible for these behaviors and demand change (McKee, 1987). Administrators cannot ignore communities’ complaints about members’ behaviors, so administrators constantly struggle to maintain community relationships and to allow Greek organizations to host their activities. Additionally, communities often remember the problems that fraternal organizations may have caused instead of the positive
contributions that fraternal organizations may have made to both their institutions and to the surrounding communities of which they are a part (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b).

The difficulty in managing fraternal organizations has caused many institutions to prohibit Greek organizations on their campuses because many administrators feel that the negatives of Greek organizations outweigh the positives (McKee, 1987). Fraternities and sororities may experience pressure from their host institutions because of the adverse public and political problems that their members are creating (McKee, 1987). Some campuses have found that Greek organizations have required more administrative time, effort, and resources on both institutional and financial levels than do other non-fraternal groups, which has given some institutions more reasons to eradicate fraternal organizations (Zacker, 2001).

Positive relationships with both institutions and communities are integral to the success of Greek-lettered organizations (Bryan, 1987). Some faculty and administrative members continue to believe that Greek affiliation is detrimental to student development, so campus organizations must be well represented by institutional advocates, alumni, collegiate chapter members, and national headquarters representatives if fraternal organizations are allowed to remain on their campuses. Fraternal organizations produce many worthwhile and tangible community service and philanthropic efforts, but these efforts are diminished in public opinion by negative behaviors of members. Nonmembers (i.e., non-affiliated students, administrators, and community members) who experience consequences from the negative behaviors of affiliated students may associate Greek-lettered organizations with some affiliated students’ rowdy behaviors and negative reputations, which is not representative of the principles on which these groups were founded (Bryan, 1987).
Fraternal groups must remember that they are guests of their host institutions, and the privilege to exist may be retracted at any time. If fraternal organizations hope to remain on their host campuses, they must redefine their priorities and align themselves with the educational missions of their institutions (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998a, 1998b). Organizations that wish to continue to reside on campuses must cooperate to ensure positive campus partnerships (Ackerman, 1990).

Astin’s Theory of Involvement

The theoretical framework that was utilized for this study was Astin’s (1984/1999) theory of involvement, which was established to understand how involvement (i.e., the amount of physical and psychological time and energy that is devoted to the academic experience) impacts college students (Milem & Berger, 1997; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2009). Astin’s (1984/1999) theory includes persistence in college and is among one of the most widely cited theories in literature about higher education (Milem & Berger, 1997). In his theory, Astin (1984/1999) determined that the more that students were involved in the collegiate experience, the more successful those students will be while in college.

This theory is based on the assumption that involvement includes both psychological and physical investments of time and energy and that involvement occurs along a continuum (Astin, 1984/1999). The term continuum means that different students invest different amounts of energy in different tasks that are independent to them (Astin, 1984/1999; Milem & Berger, 1997). In keeping with this definition of continuum, Astin (1984/1999) indicated that students will also invest varying degrees of involvement in a single activity and that those same students will invest varying degrees of involvement in different activities at different times (Astin, 1984/1999). Astin (1984/1999) also found that involvement contains both quantitative and
qualitative components and that students’ learning and development from involvement is directly proportional to both the quantity and quality of their involvement. Astin (1984/1999) also indicated that institutions of higher education play important roles in encouraging involvement, therefore enhancing educational effectiveness.

Astin’s (1984/1999) theory of involvement has been cited in a number of articles, books, dissertations, and studies about college students, including the following: Patterns in Group Involvement Experiences During College: Identifying a Taxonomy by Dugan (2013); Triumph or Tragedy: Comparing Student Engagement Levels of Members of Greek-Letter Organizations and Other Students by Hayek et al. (2002); and How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research by Pascarella and Terenzini (2005). Astin’s (1984/1999) theory can be applied to various levels of student involvement and engagement, and scholars who have used this theory have been able to understand how organizational affiliation and extracurricular involvement impacts student development, retention, progression and matriculation.

Examining involvement in fraternal organizations and other campus groups was the focal point of this study; therefore, Astin’s (1984/1999) theory of involvement was the ideal theoretical framework to utilize for this dissertation. Student involvement in extracurricular and cocurricular activities aid in their retention, investment, and enjoyment of the college experience, and Astin’s (1984/1999) theory of involvement can be used to investigate those elements and to understand if active membership in campus groups (e.g., fraternities and sororities) contributes to overall satisfaction in college attendance. This study adds to the understanding of this theory by showcasing the level of active involvement that students have in one or multiple organizations and extracurricular activities, including fraternities and sororities.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Problem Statement

On college campuses across the country, membership in Greek-lettered organizations is declining because many students find fewer reasons to affiliate with fraternities or sororities (Fouts, 2010; Reisberg, 2000). Hoping to avoid these issues that plague Greek-lettered organizations, non-affiliated students are examining other options for involvement and service among many other organizations on campuses that now compete for membership with fraternities and sororities (Fouts, 2010; Reisberg, 2000). For fraternal organizations to survive, research is needed to determine why undergraduate and graduate students are choosing to join other campus groups and to remain unaffiliated with fraternities and sororities. If this phenomenon is not studied, then Greek-lettered organizations may not get the membership they need to continue their traditions. Therefore, the following research questions guided this dissertation:

RQ1: What perceptions about Greek-lettered organizations may affect student decisions whether or not to join fraternities and sororities?

RQ2: What is the relationship of membership in Greek-lettered organizations to active organization involvement, controlling for potential demographic covariates (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, student classification, and GPA)?

This chapter includes the method and instrumentation that was used in this study, the selection of study participants, the profile of the institution where this study was conducted, and the statistical analysis that was used to interpret the results of this study.
Method

This study was based on a quantitative method using survey instruments to collect data. Survey research for this study was appropriate because this method has been used extensively in the social sciences (Stapleton, 2010). Surveys are valid research tools for various reasons, which are outlined in the following sections.

Instrumentation

The instrument that was used to collect data in this study was the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory (EII; Winston & Massaro, 1987). This survey instrument was designed to measure involvement in student activities and organizations that did not include salaries (see Appendix A). In the EII, participants completed an Involvement Index (INIX) for each organized extracurricular activity in which they were involved since their freshman years of college. Massaro and a publisher of the survey gave the researcher of this dissertation permission to use the EII through email communication (see Appendices B and C).

The instrument was disseminated to two different groups within the student population. The first distribution was to students who were affiliated with Greek-lettered organizations. The second dissemination was to students who were not affiliated with Greek-lettered organizations but who were affiliated with other campus groups. The instrument was modified slightly to include general demographic information regarding gender, year of birth, ethnicity, classification, and GPA, as well as a question regarding opinions about Greek-lettered fraternities and sororities. The EII requested that participants include information about the type of organizations in which they had been involved, an approximation of how many hours they spent involved with activities for the organizations, and any office held in the organizations. Following the EII portion of the survey, participants were then asked a series of five questions,
on a Likert scale, designed to measure the quality of their involvement with their organizations (i.e., the INIX; Winston & Massaro, 1987).

Winston and Massaro (1987) calculated scores on this instrument by summing the intensity scores on the INIX. To determine the intensity score for an INIX, Winston and Massaro totaled the responses to the five questions assessing quality of involvement. Points were awarded for each response, depending on the type of response given. Three points were awarded for each very often response, two points for each often response, one point for each occasionally response, and zero points for each never and for all other responses. With those criteria, Winston and Massaro’s scores on the dimension of quality ranged from 0 to 15.

Winston and Massaro multiplied the sum of the five items by the quantity measure based on the following conversion scale: 0 hours = 0; 1–8 hours = 1; 9–16 hours = 2; and so on at intervals of 8 hours. In other words, Winston and Massaro’s intensity score was the product of the quality measure and the quantity measure, and their EII score was the sum of the intensity scores on all of the INIXs. The researcher in this study used the same scoring process used by Winston and Massaro.

Two separate studies have been conducted to test the reliability and validity of the EII. Winston and Massaro (1987) performed Pearson’s product–moment correlations to determine the test–retest reliability of the instrument, which was found to be .97. Categorized hours were used as a variable, and the test–retest correlation was .55. Pretest and posttest data (with data summarized as 0, 1, and 2 or more activities) and a chi-square analysis ($\chi^2 = .20, df = 2$) revealed no statistically significant difference in the number of activities in which participants were involved. These findings indicated that the EII had stable reliability over a short time (Winston & Massaro, 1987).
In addition to the reliability test of the EII, the validity of the EII was estimated in two ways. The first procedure used to measure the validity of the EII was a correlations test between the EII and the Clubs & Organizations (C&O) scale from Pace’s (1983) College Student Experiences questionnaire, which was designed to measure a range of involvement in an assortment of college activities, programs, and facilities. The second procedure used to measure the validity of the EII was contrasted groups. The correlation between the EII and the C&O was found to be .45 ($n = 75$) for Sample C in Pace’s original study and .55 for Samples A and B combined ($n = 79$) in the original study. Both correlations were significant with $p < .001$ (Winston & Massaro, 1987).

Validity was also determined by dividing Sample A into three groups based on their EII scores, with Group 1 ($n = 14$) having EII scores of 0, Group 2 ($n = 20$) having EII scores between 1 to 40, and Group 3 ($n = 15$) having EII scores above 40 (Winston & Massaro, 1987). Winston and Massaro (1987) performed a one-way analysis of variance with C&O as the dependent variable, $F(2, 46) = 28.57, p < .01$. The following were the means and standard deviations for each group: for Group 1, $SD = 18.07, M = 3.69$; for Group 2, $SD = 26.30, M = 6.23$; for Group 3, $SD = 29.80, M = 8.58$. Scheffé post hoc comparisons revealed statistically significant differences between Group 1 and each of Groups 2 and 3. However, no statistically significant differences were found between Groups 2 and 3. These findings seem to suggest that the EII may be more sensitive than is the C&O scale in measuring the levels of involvement at the upper end of the involvement continuum (Winston & Massaro, 1987).

Survey instruments can be used to quantitatively describe attitudes, values, needs, traits, trends, or opinions of a sample population (Creswell, 2009). Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) defined survey as a method of research often based on questionnaires or interviews. Survey results allow
researchers to make generalizations or claims about the population that is being studied through the sample group. Surveys are economical in design and allow for rapid turnaround time. Also, the sample that is being studied does not necessarily need to be very large relative to the population, which adds to the usefulness of survey research (Creswell, 2009; Dooley, 1995; Mason & Bramble, 1997).

Gall et al. (2007) further cited that the convenience for participants and the low cost and quick turnaround time for researchers add to the value and ease of use of questionnaires. Questionnaires are particularly useful because they can be used to collect data quickly. Survey research based on questionnaires aligns with quantitative research because of the standardized and highly structured designs of questionnaires. Also, a characteristic of quantitative research is emphasis on generalizations of populations, which makes surveys an ideal method to utilize for data collection (Gall et al., 2007).

**Selection of Study Participants**

The prospective number of participants came from a general population of approximately 600 male and female undergraduate and graduate students from a university located in the northeast Texas region (see the Institutional Profile section for more information). Participants included students who were affiliated with fraternities or sororities and students who were not affiliated with fraternities or sororities but who were actively involved in other extracurricular activities and student organizations. Potential participants were contacted by email and at various organizational meetings. The names and contact information of potential participants were obtained through roster information from the office of the student organizations at the campus where this study was conducted. This office stores contact information in an online database known as OrgSync. This database allows organizational information (e.g., organization
names, member rosters, calendars, and contact information) to be easily accessed and used by staff members and other students. Right to use the information in this database is granted to employees of the office and to the Assistant Director of Fraternity and Sorority Life, a position which the researcher held at the time of this study; these individuals can access this information for organizational management and information dissemination to various student leaders.

Once contact information for potential participants was collected, the questionnaire for this study was created using SurveyMonkey and was distributed electronically to potential participants’ email addresses. The cover email provided the background information for the study, initial instructions for survey completion including the link to the questionnaire on SurveyMonkey, and the dates that the three reminder emails went out (see Appendix D). The first reminder email went out 2 weeks after the initial cover email. The second reminder email went out 1 week after the first reminder email, followed by the third reminder email a week after the second reminder email. Before participating in this study, participants were required to complete an informed consent form (see Appendix E). The researcher applied for approval through the Institutional Review Board of the University of North Texas and received approval for this study on June 11, 2013.

Institutional Profile

The institution where this study was conducted is a public 4-year university located in rural northeast Texas and is a member of one of the largest systems of higher education in the state. Founded in the late 19th century as a college for teachers, today it is enrolls more than 11,000 students and offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees. This institution has made the transition from being primarily a commuter institution to being a more residential campus,
focusing on retaining students with a multitude of activities and events held on evenings and weekends (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013).

Statistical Analysis

The research questions in this study were analyzed using two distinct techniques. The researcher used logistic regression for the first research question and multiple regression for the second research question. Logistic regression is a technique that is utilized to fit a regression surface to data in which the dependent variable is dichotomous; this technique is considered a versatile and flexible modeling strategy for data analysis (Howell, 2010; O’Connell & Amico, 2010). Logistic regression can be used to predict the probability of success based on one or more categorical predictors (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012; O’Connell & Amico, 2010). Utilizing a priori power analysis (i.e., an analysis that is conducted prior to conducting a study), a minimum sample size of 153 participants was required to measure significance for the first research question. The first research question was tested to determine whether a belief about the occurrence of hazing, substance abuse, etc., affects individuals’ decisions about whether or not to affiliate with fraternal organizations. The dependent variable in this question was whether the respondents were affiliated with fraternal organizations or with other campus groups.

As previously discussed, the researcher analyzed the second research question using multiple regression. Multiple regression is an analytical technique that is based on the simultaneous use of two or more independent variables to predict a continuous dependent or criterion variable and has been described as a general data analytic system (Kelley & Maxwell, 2010; Kirk, 1999). Kelley and Maxwell (2010) explained that the research goals with multiple regression are prediction or explanation. Kelley and Maxwell (2010) indicate that multiple regression is one of the more widely used and most important statistical methods that exist in
social science research. As with the first research question, *a priori* power analysis was utilized to determine the minimum number of participants \((N = 55)\) that were necessary to measure significance for the second research question. The second research question was tested to determine if being affiliated with fraternities or sororities impacts levels of active involvement, which was measured by the proposed score from the survey instrument after controlling for other variables (e.g., demographic variables).

The demographic variables that were measured in this study include gender, age, ethnicity, student classification, and grade point average. The researcher surveyed a total of 206 students for this study: Half of the respondents were affiliated with fraternities or sororities, and half were unaffiliated with fraternities or sororities. The survey instrument was disseminated to the participants via SurveyMonkey. Analyses were also conducted to check the inter-relations among the demographic, independent, and dependent variables.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Table 1, which correlates to RQ1, shows the relationships between Greek life and the independent variables in this study. The relationship between community outreach and Greek life was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 18.09, p < .001$, Cramer’s $V = .296$. A greater proportion of participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations believed that such organizations help promote a strong sense of community outreach (82.4%), compared to participants who were not involved with such organizations (54.8%). The relationship between lack of values and Greek life was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 12.06, p = .001$, Cramer’s $V = .242$. A smaller proportion of participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations believed that such organizations suffer from lack of values showcased by affiliated members (26.5%), compared to participants who were not involved with such organizations (50.0%). The relationship between philanthropy and Greek life was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 15.89, p < .001$, Cramer’s $V = .278$. A greater proportion of participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations believed that such organizations help to emphasize philanthropic/charitable giving (85.3%), compared to participants who were not involved with such organizations (60.6%). The relationship between lack of diversity and Greek life was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 15.50, p < .001$, Cramer’s $V = .274$. A smaller proportion of participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations believed that Greek-lettered organizations suffer from lack of diversity (23.5%), compared to participants who were not involved with such organizations (50.0%). The relationship between poor academic attitudes and Greek life was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 11.46, p = .001$, Cramer’s $V = .236$. A smaller proportion of participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations were concerned about the prevalence of poor academic/anti-intellectual
attitudes (19.6%), compared to participants who were not involved with such organizations (41.3%). The relationship between time and Greek life was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 7.47, p = .006$, Cramer’s $V = .190$. A smaller proportion of participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations believed that such organizations require too much time (18.6%), compared to participants who were not involved (35.6%). The relationships between Greek life and remaining independent variables (i.e., hazing and substance abuse) were not significant ($p > .05$).
Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages for Hazing, Substance Abuse, Community Outreach, Lack of Values, Philanthropy, Lack of Diversity, Poor Academic Attitudes, Time by Greek Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unaffiliated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Affiliated</th>
<th></th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Values*</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy*</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Diversity*</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Academics*</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes Significant Finding   ** Denotes Least-Significant Finding
As shown in Table 2, a multiple linear regression model was fitted to predict involvement intensity using the variables ethnicity, classification, and Greek life, to answer RQ2. Ethnicity and classification were entered into the model in Block 1, leading to an insignificant model \( (p = .075) \) and only explaining 5.1% of the variance in the response variable. Membership in a Greek-lettered organization was added to the model in Block 2, creating a significant model that explained 12.8% of the variance in the response variable. Significant predictors in this model were ethnicity—Caucasian \( (\text{Beta} = .227, p = .024) \) and Greek life \( (\text{Beta} = .296, p < .001) \). Being Caucasian compared to Hispanic/Latino, was a predictor of higher involvement in student organizations, while being a member of a Greek-lettered organization was also predictive of higher involvement in organizational activities.

Table 2

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Involvement Intensity using Greek life, and Demographic Variables and Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (Caucasian)</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (African/African American)</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (Freshman/Sophomore)</td>
<td>-.582</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (Junior)</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (Senior)</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (Caucasian)</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (African/African American)</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (Freshman/Sophomore)</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (Junior)</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (Senior)</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Involved - Greek Life</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the frequencies and percentages of the dependent variable Greek life. Of the 206 participants in this study, 49.5% were involved with Greek-lettered organizations, and 50.5% were not involved with Greek-lettered organizations. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for involvement intensity. As shown, the involvement intensity scores range from 0 to 600 with a mean of 168.84 ($SD = 116.36$). To ensure normality, a transformation was imposed on involvement intensity, which created a transformed variable that ranged from 1 to 24.52 with a mean of 12.25 ($SD = 4.47$). Both of these tables correlate to RQ2.

Table 3

*Frequencies and Percentages for Greek Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Involved - Greek Life</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations for Involvement Intensity (original and SQRT)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement Intensity</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>168.84</td>
<td>116.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement Intensity (SQRT)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Introduction

Membership within Greek-lettered organizations is declining because students find fewer reasons to affiliate themselves with fraternities or sororities (Fouts, 2010; Reisberg, 2000). Stereotypes, (e.g., hazing, alcohol abuse, and elitism) have caused non-affiliated students to avoid involving themselves with these historical organizations, which creates a rift between affiliated and non-affiliated students (Warber et al., 2011).

This study was used to examine the factors that caused a decline in membership in fraternities and sororities and to explore active organization involvement between affiliated and non-affiliated students. In the previous chapter, findings from this study were reported. This final chapter shows findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research. This study used the campus population of an institution of higher education as its sample population. Survey instrumentation was utilized to collect responses from participants with quantitative techniques instituted to analyze respondents’ data. This study was driven by two research questions, described in the next section.

Summary of Findings

The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: What perceptions about Greek-lettered organizations may affect student decisions whether or not to join fraternities and sororities?

RQ2: What is the relationship of membership in Greek-lettered organizations to active organization involvement, controlling for potential demographic covariates (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, student classification, and GPA)?
The first research question of this study was used to determine what perceptions about Greek-lettered organizations affected students’ decisions whether or not to join fraternities and sororities. DeSantis (2007) indicated that members of fraternal organizations are often labeled with negative stereotypes that cause students to refrain from affiliating with them. Findings that resulted from data analysis of non-affiliated members’ responses showed that four perceptions of Greek-lettered organizations indicated possible reasons for not affiliating with fraternities or sororities. The perceptions cited as the primary reasons they chose not to join a fraternity or sorority were lack of values, lack of diversity, poor academic attitudes, and a requirement of too much time.

A smaller proportion of participants (n = 27) who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations believed that such organizations suffer from lack of values showcased by affiliated members (26.5%), compared to participants who were not involved with fraternities or sororities (50.0%). This result supports not only previous findings about underlying assumptions that fraternities and sororities are presumably incompatible with greater goals of higher education and ideas of academia but also evidence that members of fraternal organizations typically engage in higher levels of unethical behaviors than do nonmembers (Maisel, 1990; Martin et al., 2011; McCabe & Bowers, 1996). This finding also supports research by Pascarella and Terenzini (2005), which indicated that affiliation with a fraternal organization was often linked to a lack of moral or ethical development in members.

Regarding responses about concerns that fraternities and sororities lack diversity, 23.5% of respondents who are involved with Greek-lettered organizations perceived that such groups suffer from a lack of diversity, and 50.0% of non-affiliated respondents perceived that Greek-lettered organizations suffer from a lack of diversity. These results indicated a perception that a
lack of diversity exists within fraternal organizations on this particular campus; researchers of previous studies regarding diversity also reported these types of results and Greek-lettered organizations, which are cited in the literature review of this study. Specifically, previous research has indicated that Greek-lettered organizations are still some of the most segregated institutions in America, lacking a respect for diversity, religious choice, and sexual orientation, which forces them to remain as segregated today as they were in 1776 (Bryan, 1981; DeSantis, 2007). In general, non-affiliated students who participated in this study held a perception that the fraternal organizations that are present on this campus lack diversity within their memberships.

The findings indicate that 19.6% of affiliated participants were concerned about poor academic/anti-intellectual attitudes displayed in fraternities or sororities, and 41.3% of non-affiliated participants were concerned about poor academic/anti-intellectual attitudes displayed in fraternities or sororities. The respondents’ results about perceptions concerning poor academic attitudes supports research that has indicated that involvement in a Greek-lettered organization contributes to poor academics and anti-intellectual attitudes. These results replicate findings of previous studies about fraternal organizations and academics.

Martin et al. (2011) indicated that members of Greek-lettered organizations demonstrated lower levels of critical thinking and academic persistence when compared to non-members, and Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) showed that fraternity or sorority memberships inhibit students’ growth in principled moral reasoning. Cheating in classes was also indicated to be more prevalent among affiliated students compared to non-affiliated students (McCabe & Bowers, 1996). In general, researchers indicated that some fraternity and sorority chapters conflict with academic ideologies and missions of college campuses (Winston & Saunders, 1987; Zacker
Findings regarding anti-intellectual attitudes indicated that there is a concern about how members of fraternal organizations on this campus represent their chapters within the classroom, as non-affiliated members have a perception that there is a gap between membership in fraternities or sororities and positive academic attitudes. This finding supports previous studies regarding academics and fraternal organizations, so it is incumbent that fraternity and sorority chapters work to change that perception of Greek-lettered organizations.

This study also detailed students’ concerns that Greek-lettered organizations take up too much time. Specifically, 18.6% of affiliated students held the perception that membership responsibilities required too much time. However, 35.6% non-affiliated students had the perception that Greek-lettered organizations were too demanding in terms of time commitment. In this study, time was indicated to be one of the most significant perceptions that may have influenced non-affiliation with Greek-lettered organizations because the academic demands of college (especially for first-year students) and the need to establish and cultivate study habits and balance job responsibilities can be difficult for students (Fouts, 2010; Hayek et al., 2002).

Affiliating with fraternal organizations can assist students in social integration, but time commitments in these organizations are necessary; these affiliations tend to make it challenging to balance academic and organizational responsibilities (Hayek et al., 2002). Additionally, these time commitments can cause students to divert their attention away from their studies in favor of the demands of their fraternity or sorority memberships (Hayek et al., 2002). Because of these time constraints and demands, affiliation with fraternities or sororities may be detrimental to the academic achievement for some students. In his theory of involvement, Astin (1984/1999) speaks to engagement and involvement as positive correlations to student satisfaction with their educational experiences. Involved students become more engaged in their educational
environments, and this engagement allows for students to learn and develop personally while on the college campus (Astin, 1984/1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Therefore, while this study found that the commitment of too much time was a negative perception of Greek-lettered organizations, previous research done on Greek-lettered and student organizations as a whole indicate that this type of time commitment and involvement can be a positive for overall student development, as students who participate in extracurricular activities of any kind are less likely to leave their institutions before graduating (Astin, 1984/1999).

The second research question was used to examine the relationship between memberships in Greek-lettered organizations and involvement in active organizations, questioning which demographics of students were more likely to be active in campus organizations and extracurricular activities – students who are affiliated with fraternities or sororities, or students who are unaffiliated with fraternities or sororities. Findings indicated that participants who were involved with Greek-lettered organizations averaged higher involvement intensity scores when compared to participants who were not involved with Greek-lettered organizations; therefore, being a member of a Greek-lettered organization on this particular campus was also predictive of higher involvement in organizational activities. For this single institution, this finding indicated that students who are involved with Greek-lettered organizations at this campus are typically involved in other extracurricular activities and groups outside of their particular fraternities or sororities when compared to their unaffiliated counterparts. This finding also ties in with prior research conducted on involvement, supporting Astin’s (1984/1999) theory, which states that highly involved students invest more time in extracurricular activities and interactions with other peer groups, along with faculty and staff members.

Participants were asked to complete a slightly modified version of the EII, originated by
Winston and Massaro (1987). Participants who were involved in a fraternity or sorority \((n = 101)\) averaged higher involvement intensity scores \((M = 13.50, SD = 4.32)\), compared to participants who were not involved in a fraternity or sorority \((n = 99; M = 10.97, SD = 4.28)\). This finding shows that students who are affiliated with Greek-lettered organizations tend to consistently be more socially engaged and involved at this university than do non-affiliated students. It is common to find members of fraternities and sororities holding notable positions in other college groups (e.g., student government association, homecoming court, and student activity chairs; DeSantis, 2007; Hunter & Rentz, 1994; Winston & Saunders, 1987). Students who are affiliated in Greek-lettered organizations and who are involved in other organizations on campus are more likely than their non-affiliated peers to hold memberships in multiple campus groups outside of their fraternity or sorority chapters and serve in positions of responsibility (DeSantis, 2007; Hunter & Rentz, 1994; Winston & Saunders, 1987).

Implications for Practice

This study was used to identify perceptions of non-affiliated students regarding Greek-lettered organizations at one institution. Although this study was a single-institution study, the findings have implications for consideration at other college campuses with fraternity and sorority communities. Individuals who work with the collegiate chapters of Greek-lettered organizations (e.g., campus-based professionals, headquarters staff, regional and local volunteers, and leadership consultants) might discover the findings of this study helpful. Findings of student perceptions about Greek life could be used to educate memberships and chapters about effective recruitment practices that would address perceptions listed in this study, that detract from the positive reputation of Greek-lettered organizations.

Campus-based professionals who work in the Fraternity & Sorority Life office interact
with the members of the chapters on a more consistent basis. For these professionals, the findings of this study might offer insight into which of these significant perceptions listed should be handled from a campus personnel perspective during trainings and programs offered by the Office of Fraternity & Sorority Life, versus those addressed by headquarters staff during annual leadership consultant visits. Especially helpful to the fraternity and sorority community would be the findings centered on poor academic attitudes and lack of values, as Greek-lettered groups are organizations founded on principles of high scholastics and the expression of a higher type of manhood and womanhood, respectively. Programs (e.g., Greek Leadership Retreat, Greek Week, and Student Organization Trainings) would provide ideal opportunities for fraternity/sorority advisors to discuss perceptions of fraternity and sorority life. Fraternity and sorority advisors can describe the following findings to their members of why other students may choose not to affiliate with Greek-lettered organizations: lack of diversity, poor academic attitudes, lack of values showcased by members, and a requirement of too much time. These perceptions may negatively impact the recruitment numbers. This study was centered on the fraternity and sorority community of one institution; however, data from this study can be taken into consideration at other campuses in America. Specifically, headquarters staff members and advisors for fraternities and sororities at college campuses may utilize this study to combat negative behaviors in affiliated students. For instance, regional and local volunteers could work with leadership consultants to provide specific programs for their respective chapters by discussing organizational branding, recruitment strategies, and marketing strategies for particular fraternities or sororities.

Research findings contained within this study showed that those in fraternities and sororities are more active in organizations, which, according to Astin’s Theory of Involvement
(1984/1999), leads to college retention and completion, which should be motivation for encouraging increased participation in these groups.

Examining results of this study could provide comparatives for members to closely focus on the behaviors of their members and chapters and identify what they themselves portray to the non-affiliated students. By addressing the perceptions cited in this study, members of fraternity/sorority chapters might be able to combat negative perceptions to exemplify values and characteristics that would encourage non-affiliated students to consider joining their Greek-lettered communities.

Recommendations for Future Research

The delimitation of this study was that the research was focused on a single, public institution. By broadening this study to include more than one campus type, stronger evidence may be established regarding additional concerns of fraternities and sororities. Studies should include more colleges and universities from across the country, such as historically black institutions and private institutions. If other campus types are studied in the future, results may become more generalizable to other institutions that have fraternities and sororities. Future studies should also consider the inclusion of faculty, staff, and administrators regarding their perceptions of Greek-lettered organizations, as they would provide insights beyond the student perspective. Future studies should also examine the perspectives of individuals who live in the communities surrounding the institution to obtain the viewpoints regarding fraternities and sororities from the “town-and-gown” (community relations) perspective.

Future researchers should also think about separating future studies into examining fraternities or sororities separately. Studies about perceptions of male-only organizations and female-only organizations may result in varied responses because this study examined
fraternities and sororities together. Data taken from these potential studies could specifically assist fraternity headquarters and sorority headquarters in their efforts toward better programming for their specific groups. Future research could also examine specific reasons as to why non-affiliated students refrained from joining a fraternal organization, as opposed to just examining the perceptions held by affiliated and non-affiliated students.

This study was used to compare affiliated students to non-affiliated students in regards to level of active extracurricular involvement. Future research about participation in Greek-lettered organizations could also be used to examine the level of active involvement and how it correlates to grade point average, retention, and graduation rates.

Conclusions

Findings from this study identified perceptions of Greek-lettered organizations at a single institution located in northeast Texas and were used to examine perceptions that may have been influential in causing students to remain unaffiliated with Greek-lettered organizations. This study also detailed the intensity of organizational involvement, comparing two participant groups: students who are affiliated with Greek-lettered organizations and students who are unaffiliated with Greek-lettered organizations. This investigation revealed that out of eight perceptions about Greek life, four of those perceptions (lack of values, lack of diversity, poor academic attitudes, and time commitment) were cited as significant perceptions that may have influenced students to remain unaffiliated with a fraternity or sorority at this particular campus.

Overall, results of this study indicated that members of Greek-lettered organizations have higher levels of involvement than do their non-affiliated counterparts at the college campus that was examined. Affiliated and non-affiliated respondents at this campus reported some negative elements of fraternities and sororities; however, affiliated respondents, in general, had more
positive perceptions of fraternities and sororities than they did negative perceptions of their fraternities and sororities. This study had positive outcomes. For instance, more respondents held the perception that fraternal organizations are positive contributors to student and campus experiences. This ideology was supported through responses that pointed to fraternities and sororities as actively involved in community service and philanthropy, extracurricular involvement, and leadership development.

Students who choose to affiliate themselves with fraternities or sororities are provided with opportunities to expose themselves to leadership development and education through social and service opportunities (Ayers, 2007). By utilizing this study, fraternity and sorority members, advisors, and other constituents can become more aware of students’ perceptions and areas of need for these organizations and their reputations on college campuses in America.
APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Involvement Index

Thank you for participating in this survey. By answering the following questions, you will be with a research project about student organizations and groups. Please answer all questions. There is no right or wrong answer.

Please answer the general demographic information and then indicate: (1) the type of organization(s) it is, (2) the approximate number of hours you have been involved (for example: attending meetings, working on projects, or playing games) with this group or organization from the time you entered college as a freshman and became involved with this organization until now, and (3) leadership position held, if any. Then, answer questions 1 through 6 below. Please continue until you have completed an Involvement Index for every student group or organization in which you have been involved in from the time you entered college as a freshman up until now.

General Demographic Information

Gender
( ) Male  ( ) Female

Year of Birth

Ethnicity
( ) Caucasian  ( ) African/African American  ( ) Hispanic/Latino  ( ) Other

Student Classification
( ) Freshman  ( ) Sophomore  ( ) Junior  ( ) Senior  ( ) Graduate

Grade Point Average (GPA)
( ) 1.00–1.49  ( ) 1.50–1.99  ( ) 2.00–2.49  ( ) 2.50–2.99  ( ) 3.00–3.49  ( ) 3.50–4.00

What organization(s) are you involved in? (Check all that apply)
( ) Greek Life
( ) Intercollegiate Athletic Team
( ) Religious
( ) Academic (academic department or major related) Club or Society
( ) Academic Honoray
( ) Programming (e.g., Student Center/Union, lecture or concert committee)
( ) Intramural Sports Team
( ) Student Publication (e.g., newspaper, magazine, or yearbook)
( ) Service or Philanthropic
( ) Performing Group (e.g. choir, drama production, debate team)
( ) Governance (e.g., hall council, student government, student judiciary)
( ) Other (Please Specify):
From the time you entered college as a freshman and became involved in this/these organization(s) until now, approximately how many semesters have you been involved with this/these group(s) or organization(s) and its activities or programs?
( ) 1 Semester
( ) 2 Semesters
( ) 3 Semesters
( ) 4 Semesters
( ) 5 Semesters
( ) 6 Semesters
( ) 7 Semesters
( ) 8+ Semesters

During this time, and on average, how many hours per week were you involved with this/these groups(s)/organization(s) and its activities and programs? ________ hours per week

From the time you entered college as a freshman and became involved in this organization, until now, have you held an office in this organization or a position equivalent to one of the following offices? (Check one)
( ) President/Chairperson/Team Captain/Editor
( ) Treasurer
( ) Vice-President/Vice-Chairperson
( ) Committee/Task Force/Project Chairperson
( ) Secretary
( ) I held no office or leadership position
( ) Other Office, Please specify: ___________________________________________________________________

Please respond to the following statements about your involvement in the above student organization or group. Check the one best response for each statement.

FROM THE TIME YOU BECAME INVOLVED AS A FRESHMAN UP UNTIL NOW...

1. When I attended meetings, I expressed my opinion and/or took part in the discussions.
   ( ) Very Often
   ( ) Often
   ( ) Occasionally
   ( ) Never
   ( ) I attended no meetings in the past year
   ( ) The group/organization held no meetings in the past year

2. When I was away from members of the group/organization, I talked with others about the organization and its activities, or wore a pin, jersey, organizational letters, etc. to let others know about my membership.
   ( ) Very Often
   ( ) Often
   ( ) Occasionally
   ( ) Never
3. When the group/organization sponsored a program or activity, I made an effort to encourage other students and/or members to attend.
   ( ) Very Often
   ( ) Often
   ( ) Occasionally
   ( ) Never
   ( ) The organization had no program or activity during the past year

4. I volunteered or was assigned responsibility to work on something that the group/organization needed to have done.
   ( ) Very Often
   ( ) Often
   ( ) Occasionally
   ( ) Never

5. I fulfilled my assigned duties or responsibilities to the group/organization on time.
   ( ) Very Often
   ( ) Often
   ( ) Occasionally
   ( ) Never
   ( ) I had no duties or responsibilities except to attend meetings.

6. Which of the following do you believe to be true about Greek-lettered fraternities and sororities (Check all that apply)?
   ( ) Helps develop leadership skills
   ( ) Concerns about hazing exist
   ( ) Helps to promote Brotherhood/Sisterhood
   ( ) Concern about alleged substance abuse
   ( ) Helps to promote a strong sense of community outreach
   ( ) Lack of values are showcased by affiliated members
   ( ) Concerns about alleged sexual assault/abuse exists
   ( ) Helps to emphasize philanthropic/charitable giving
   ( ) Lack of diverse members within the fraternity or sorority
   ( ) Helps to promote campus involvement/engagement
   ( ) Prevalence of poor academics/anti-intellectual attitudes
   ( ) Greek-lettered organizations require too much time
   ( ) Lack of interaction with the rest of campus is common
   ( ) What are some of your other beliefs regarding Greek-lettered organizations that were not listed above? (please describe):

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX B

EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE WITH ANNE V. MASSARO
From: Anne Massaro <amassaro@hr.osu.edu>  
Date: June 12, 2012 1:34:05 PM CDT  
To: Zachary Shirley <Zach.Shirley@tamuc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Permission for Use

Shirley,

You have my permission to use the instrument. I cannot help you with finding the full instrument except to direct you to a librarian. Give her/him the full reference, and ask for guidance. I no longer have the instrument easily accessible. Here is the reference:


Anne

From: Zachary Shirley [mailto:Zach.Shirley@tamuc.edu]  
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 1:34 PM  
To: massaro.11@osu.edu  
Subject: Permission for Use

Good afternoon, Dr. Massaro,

I hope this correspondence finds you well!

My name is Zach Shirley, and I am currently a doctoral student at the University of North Texas (located in Denton, Texas) in the Higher Education/Student Affairs program. I am now in the process of writing my dissertation on students and their involvement in Greek-lettered organizations during their collegiate tenure. I came across a few dissertations that referenced the *Extracurricular Involvement Inventory* instrument that you and Winston created, and I was hoping that I could be granted the permission to use your instrument in my study? My Chair, Dr. Kathleen Whitson, informed me that searching for instruments on student involvement and extracurricular/co-curricular activity would be best for my study, and yours was one of the first ones that I came across in my search of various dissertations.

I would truly appreciate it if you would allow me to utilize your instrument in my endeavor, as I feel that it would assist me in studying the Greek-lettered population at my institution. If granted the opportunity to utilize your instrument, I was also hoping that I could inquire as to where I could find it at, since the *Journal for College Student Development* database only goes back to 1990, and I have not yet been successful in coming across the instrument in its entirety through internet searches.

I thank you for your time and consideration, Dr. Massaro!
Zach Shirley, MS
APPENDIX C

EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE WITH ACPA
Good morning Zach -

Thank you for your email. ACPA grants you permission to reproduce the referenced survey instrument to fulfill your dissertation requirements. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me. Congratulations on completing your Doctoral degree.

Sincerely,

Chris

On Mon, Jun 9, 2014 at 5:44 PM, <Zach.Shirley@tamuc.edu> wrote:
54599 (http://www.myacpa.org/users/54599) sent a message using the contact form at http://www.myacpa.org/contact.

Good afternoon!

My name is Zach Shirley (ACPA Member #0059803), and I have recently received my Doctoral degree from the University of North Texas. The purpose of my email is to request permission from ACPA and the Journal of College Student Development for the reproduction of a survey instrument that I utilized in my dissertation.

The Graduate School at my institution indicated that, while I have the permission to use the instrument from the creator of the survey (I can share that communication with you all if need be), I am now also in need of permission to reproduce the survey instrument for use in my study. I was informed that I needed to obtain this permission from the publishers of the article in which the survey is in, as opposed to the author/creator, themselves. Before the Graduate School can finalize my dissertation, I am required to provide this permission to our Graduate Reader for inclusion with my document.
I emailed jcsdonline@gmail.com, and received a response from Mary Hutchens, the Publication Coordinator, who informed me that I would need to contact ACPA directly as opposed to the JCSD. She indicated that, since the JCSD copyright is held by ACPA, I would need to reach out to you all.

With that being said, I am hoping that I can obtain permission from the ACPA for reproduction of this instrument for my study? The survey instrument is the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory, and it was found in the following reference:


I appreciate any assistance that you are able to provide for me. Thank you!

Zach Shirley, Ed.D.
APPENDIX D

COVER EMAIL SOLICITING PARTICIPATION
Dear __________________

My name is Zach Shirley, and I am currently a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas in the Higher Education program. I am currently working on my dissertation entitled: *Declining Participation in Fraternity and Sorority Life: A Comparison of Perceptions on Greek-Lettered Organizations Between Affiliated and Non-Affiliated Students*, under the supervision of my dissertation chair, Dr. Kathleen Whitson. The intent of this research is to determine the various reasons college students are choosing not to affiliate with Greek-lettered social fraternities and sororities, seek out membership in other campus organizations or choose not to be involved in any campus sponsored organizations.

I will be sending out an electronic survey via Survey Monkey entitled the Extracurricular Involvement Inventory, which is designed to assess involvement in student activities and organizations. I would like to have a wide variety of participants, as the survey is divided into two separate components – one for those students who are affiliated with a fraternal organization, and one for those who are not affiliated, but are involved in other campus groups. The criteria for participating in this study are as follows:

- Be an individual involved in student activities and organizations on campus that is registered on ManeSync and with the Office of Student Activities and Leadership.
- Be an undergraduate or graduate student.
- Be an English speaker and over the age of 18 years old.

If you would like to participate in this study and are willing to complete the survey, please follow the link below to the Survey Monkey website. A reminder email will go out two weeks after this initial correspondence, followed by a second and third reminder message. All information will remain confidential.

Thank you,

Zach Shirley, MS

Principal Investigator
APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

**Title of Study:** Declining Participation in Fraternity and Sorority Life: A Comparison of Perceptions on Greek-Lettered Organizations Between Affiliated and Non-Affiliated Students

**Student Investigator:** Zachary Shirley, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Education – Higher Education Program.

**Supervising Investigator:** Dr. Kathleen Whitson.

**Purpose of the Study:** You are being asked to participate in a research study that involves an exploration of fraternities and sororities. The intent of this research is to determine the various reasons college students are choosing not to affiliate with Greek-lettered social fraternities and sororities versus other campus organizations.

**Study Procedures:** You will be asked to complete a survey regarding your organizational involvement and your opinions on fraternities and sororities. The survey will take about thirty minutes of your time.

**Foreseeable Risks:** There are no foreseeable risks that are involved in this study.

**Benefits to the Subjects or Others:** This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you, but we hope to learn more about fraternities and sororities, along with student choice in regards to why affiliation with fraternal organizations may or may not occur.

**Compensation for Participants:** None.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records:** To maintain participant confidentiality, the researcher will refrain from using names or campus wide identification numbers in this study. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study.

**Questions about the Study:** If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Zach Shirley at zach.shirley1914@gmail.com or Dr. Kathleen Whitson at Kathleen.Whitson@unt.edu.

**Review for the Protection of Participants:** This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

**Research Participants’ Rights:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:
• *Zach Shirley* has explained the study to you and answered all of your questions. You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.

• You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.

• *Your decision whether to participate or to withdraw from the study will have no effect on your grade or standing in any course.*

• You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.

• You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.

• You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

---

**Printed Name of Participant**

**Signature of Participant** _________________________  **Date**

**For the Student Investigator or Designee:**

I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the subject signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the participant understood the explanation.

**Signature of Student Investigator** _________________________  **Date**
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