



afa ORACLE

THE RESEARCH JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FRATERNITY | SORORITY ADVISORS

VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, SPRING 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv EDITORIAL TEAM

v GENERAL INFORMATION

vi A GLIMPSE BEHIND THE CURTAIN: AN EDITOR'S REFLEXIVITY

1 "EVER AFTER STRICTLY AND RIGIDLY OBEYED—WITH SOME EXCEPTIONS": ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO HAZING IN THE 1870s

JAMES P. BARBER

This article explores college hazing as a part of student culture in the 1870s using historical documents from Cornell University and the University of Michigan. These sources illustrate the conflict between students and the institutional administration over student autonomy and the role of faculty in student life, and characterize hazing as an event to test new students' loyalties to their peers over the faculty. However, as the student body grew larger, and diversified in terms of gender and ethnicity, hazing shifted to smaller exclusive organizations, rather than a demonstration of class solidarity and rebellion against faculty. This article explores the administrative responses at Cornell and Michigan in the late 19th century by documenting reaction to a student hazing death at Cornell in 1873, and detailing an 1874 hazing incident at Michigan, after which 87 men were suspended from the institution following a confrontation involving the freshman and sophomore classes. Connections are drawn to administrative responses to hazing in the early 21st century.

22 TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF FRATERNITY/SORORITY PROGRAMS:
A CONTENT ANALYSIS

PIETRO A. SASSO

Fraternity/sorority standards have been represented as the answer to the Call for Values Congruence authored by the Franklin Squared Group (2003). The outcome of this document was a proliferation of various styles and models of standards programs utilized to establish community practices with the overarching goal of facilitating values-based fraternity and sorority campus communities. However, fraternity/sorority standards programs answering this call have established higher standards through different methods. This study solicited standards programs from institutions from across the United States. Data from 31 standards programs were collected, cataloged, and analyzed through qualitative inquiry with the use of a rubric developed to establish a typology. Five categories resulted from analysis: evaluation, minimum standards, accreditation, awards, and comprehensive. Implications of the study are included along with future directions for research.

**EXAMINING THE LINK BETWEEN PLEDGING, HAZING,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG MEMBERS
OF A BLACK GREEK FRATERNITY**

SEAN ROGERS, CARMEN ROGERS, & TRESHAWN ANDERSON

Black Greek-Letter Organization (BGLO) members hold strong opinions about the purposes and efficacy of pledging and hazing as a means of member initiation. Those who argue in favor of the pledge process claim it is needed to help remove those not genuinely interested in membership, develop appreciation for and pride in the organization, and generate long-term organizational commitment and sustained participation. Those who call for an end to pledging argue that whatever benefit might be gained from such bonding experiences is overshadowed by the mortal, legal, reputational, emotional, and financial risks posed for both the associations and the individuals involved. Despite decades of conjectural debate on the efficacy of pledging and hazing, to the authors' knowledge, no empirical study has examined its impact on BGLO alumni-level membership continuance. To address this deficiency, the researchers conducted a logistic regression analysis of survey responses from alumni members of a BGLO fraternity (n = 285). Results revealed no statistically significant relationship between participation in a pledge process and alumni-level membership. The implication of these findings for BGLOs and their members and leaders are discussed.

**INTERACTIONAL DIVERSITY OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH INVOLVEMENT:
FRATERNITY AND SORORITY STUDENT LEADERS' EXPERIENCES**

HEATHER D. PORTER

This study examined the co-curricular experience of fraternity and sorority student leaders as it relates to their interactional diversity opportunities. Data were collected in the fall of 2008 from 75 students, representing four higher education institutions within the Southeast. Using quantitative and qualitative analyses, the researcher discovered differences in the ways fraternity and sorority student leaders involved themselves beyond the classroom and how that involvement impacted their interactional diversity experiences with peers. Further analyses revealed how fraternity and sorority student leaders perceive diversity affecting their co-curricular collegiate experience.

2011-2012 EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITOR

J. Patrick Biddix, Ph.D.
The University of Tennessee

GRADUATE ASSISTANT

Alessandra Brown
The University of Tennessee

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Georgianna L. Martin
Loyola University Chicago

Malinda Matney, Ph.D.
University of Michigan

VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Jennifer A. Leung
The College of William & Mary

PEER REVIEW BOARD

James P. Barber, Ph.D.
College of William and Mary

Denny Bubrig, Ph.D.
Samford University

Daniel Bureau, Ph.D.
University of Memphis

Mari Ann Callais, Ph.D.
Delta Delta Delta

Heather Cohen
Kaplan Test Prep

Angelo L. Colon, Jr.
Virginia Tech

Eileen Marin Coombes
North Carolina State University

Robert Debard, Ph.D.
Bowling Green State University

Amber Garrison Duncan
University of Oregon

Charles Eberly, Ph.D.
Eastern Illinois University

David Grady, Ph.D.
The University of Iowa

Dennis Gregory, Ed.D.
Old Dominion University

Lea Hanson
*Association of Fraternal
Leadership & Values*

Lori Hart, Ph.D.
Pi Kappa Phi

Debbie Heida, Ph.D.
Berry College

Michael Hevel, Ph.D.
The University of Iowa

Steven M. Janosik, Ed.D.
Virginia Tech

John Wesley Lowery, Ph.D.
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Kimberly Nehls, Ph.D.
University of Nevada – Las Vegas

Eric Norman, Ed.D.
*Indiana University Purdue
University Fort Wayne*

Ashley Tull, Ed.D.
University of Texas at Arlington

Heather Wilson, Ed.D.
Carlow University

GENERAL INFORMATION

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors advances the study of college fraternities and sororities through a peer reviewed academic journal promoting scholarly discourse among partners invested in the college fraternal movement. The vision of Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors is to serve as the premier forum for academic discourse and scholarly inquiry regarding the college fraternity and sorority movement.

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors is published biannually. Past issues of Oracle are available on the AFA website.

COPYRIGHT:

Copyright © 2012 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, Inc. (AFA). All material contained in this publication is the property of AFA. The opinions expressed in Oracle do not necessarily reflect those of AFA. Requests for permission to reprint should be sent to the AFA Central Office at info@afa.1976.org or 317/876-1632.

SUBMISSIONS:

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors accepts submissions focused on articulating research involving fraternity and sorority members at the collegiate, alumni, inter/national organization, and volunteer advisory levels. Manuscripts should be written for the student affairs generalist who has broad responsibility for educational leadership, policy, staff development, and management. Articles on specialized topics should provide the generalist with an understanding of the importance of the program to student affairs overall and fraternity/sorority advising specifically.

Research articles for Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors should stress the underlying issues or problems that stimulated the research; treat the methodology concisely; and, most importantly, offer a full discussion of results, implications, and conclusions. In the belief that AFA readers have much to learn from one another, we also encourage the submission of thoughtful, documented essays or historical perspectives.

Visit <http://afa1976.org> for more detailed submission guidelines.

A GLIMPSE BEHIND THE CURTAIN: AN EDITOR'S REFLEXIVITY

PATRICK BIDDIX, ORACLE EDITOR

Reflexivity is not a concept editors write about often. We ask our qualitative researchers to be aware of the influences they have on the research process but fail at contemplating our own influence as editors publically. Admittedly, my perspectives, preferences, and decisions—no matter how well grounded in training, theory, and practice—affect what Oracle publishes. The extent of this effect, like the influence itself, varies with each manuscript I read or edit. Two of the articles in this issue deviate from the customary five-section format we see in academic journals. The process of consciously working to understand my editorial perspective and not imposing my mechanic and stylistic preferences on the pieces led me to reflect on my role as an editor. The result is a departure from the standard journal editorial, but one I believe has broader implications for both consumers and producers of published research.

Academic writing, like any form of communication, shares language elements of mechanics and style. Both teaching and editing academic writing influences these aspects of publication. I often reflect on how my writing and editing style shapes the development of my students' prose. As one of the final round editors of an academic journal, my style, along with the peer reviewers, associate editors, and copyeditors, is also reflected in the articles we publish. I have come to the conclusion that editing is a constructivist practice. When an editor suggests (or requests) clarification, a different word choice, organizational changes or other revisions, the original mechanics and style of an article can change—sometimes quite drastically. This is not necessarily a bad thing, but I think one worth exploring.

Mechanics suggests form and function—the process and organization of writing. The most influential perspective I've heard on the mechanics of academic writing was during a panel of well-published higher education authors who spoke at a workshop I attended several years ago. When asked how to plan for an article, one of the panelists surgically dissected the five traditional sections of a study. Her basic advice was, after determining a word limit (often dictated by journal policy), distribute the planned text of an article into three parts. One-third should be devoted to the introduction, review of literature, and method combined, one-third to results, and one-third to discussion. While methodology and topic can shift these estimates, I have found this formula invaluable. It answers the “how do I start this paper” question simply—X journal limits to 5,000 words, so I need roughly 1,600 words per part. If I am using a qualitative methodology, I know I need more time for results, so I will shift another section appropriately. If the literature on my topic is rich, I know I need to truncate or blend my introduction and leave more room for relating my findings to the previous research in my discussion.

Without question, this approach affects my editing style. When I receive a new submission or begin copyediting a manuscript after our peer reviewers have completed their work, among the first things I do is to visually “size up” the text to understand the balance of each section. If the review section is heavier than the discussion, I am more likely to focus my comments on the latter. I do this largely subconsciously and realize at times that I am attempting to impose my style on the manuscript. As a result, in the case of a manuscript that requires more heavy editing or a more critical review, I

frequently read the same manuscript twice and compare my results—the first time looking for how the word devotion fits the importance the author suggests (e.g., only 500 words for discussion, but 2,000 for literature, how?), the second time for content. I recognize this preference has implications for what we ultimately print, so I am grateful for having two associate editors who have the final read to ensure my mechanical preferences (or other biases recognized or not) are not so influential.

Style is much more subjective for me. My approach to teaching my graduate students how to find their academic voice is admittedly simplistic: If it is interesting to you, it is too casual. Academic writing is not a conversation; it is much more like a lecture. Monotonous, repetitive, or even boring is more customary. This description arose accidentally for me one day. I spent some time as a journalism major and edited my undergraduate institution's campus newspaper. Sports pages notwithstanding, Associated Press style is succinct. While clichés and idiomatic expressions occasionally find their way into print, there is often only room for the essentials in a column. What AP writing taught me is to find a middle ground between formal and casual. The challenge for adopting the prose we most often see in academic journals and keeping your own style is to be informative (i.e., somewhat dry) while finding a way to be engaging (but not conversational).

When I see it, I tend to treat conversational writing with the same red ink and calls for “word choice” that I do jargon-laden prose. Admittedly, I see much more of the former. My prevalent in-text comment is that casual writing “weakens your argument.” Certainly, there are those who would contend my perspective on style—arguing that it is not an editor's job to change the tone of a manuscript. I agree and am cognizant that my preference is the not the one and only true way to write for academic publication (hence, invoking my inner constructivist). I am consciously aware of this bias, which is another reason I read and edit a manuscript multiple times to ensure that my style is not improperly affecting a manuscript. That said, I feel I have a responsibility to help elevate the scholarly discourse on fraternity/sorority involvement. To ensure our articles contribute to the larger body of research, I favor a more formal prose style.

In this short reflection on my role, I have attempted to demonstrate that reflexivity is an important aspect of all components of inquiry. I believe it has a powerful role in the process of refining and ultimately publishing research. The mechanics and style of academic writing are both learned and shaped by experience. As our valuable work in the field or classroom is related to research and captured by the writing and publishing process, I think it is important to consider how our preferences, far beyond content, can affect how that work is communicated. In my two years as editor and six as a faculty member, I have come to recognize some aspects of the influence I may have on how scholarship is communicated. I discussed mechanics and style, but as easily could have written about the articles we accept, layout, or even distribute. I urge you, as writers, editors, and consumers of research, to consider your own reflexivity, or how the writing process affects and is affected by your role in communicating our understanding of fraternal involvement.

**“EVER AFTER STRICTLY AND RIGIDLY OBEYED—
WITH SOME EXCEPTIONS”:
ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO HAZING IN THE 1870s**

JAMES P. BARBER

This article explores college hazing as a part of student culture in the 1870s using historical documents from Cornell University and the University of Michigan. These sources illustrate the conflict between students and the institutional administration over student autonomy and the role of faculty in student life, and characterize hazing as an event to test new students' loyalties to their peers over the faculty. However, as the student body grew larger, and diversified in terms of gender and ethnicity, hazing shifted to smaller exclusive organizations, rather than a demonstration of class solidarity and rebellion against faculty. This article explores the administrative responses at Cornell and Michigan in the late 19th century by documenting reaction to a student hazing death at Cornell in 1873, and detailing an 1874 hazing incident at Michigan, after which 87 men were suspended from the institution following a confrontation involving the freshman and sophomore classes. Connections are drawn to administrative responses to hazing in the early 21st century.

In the years immediately following the Civil War, American higher education experienced a surge in enrollment, the founding of many new institutions, and an influx of philanthropic support (Leslie, 1992; Thelin, 2004). Along with this institutional growth, students expanded their activities from generally two literary societies to a multitude of clubs, organizations, and teams (Finnegan & Alleman, 2009; Sheldon, 1901). Students eagerly sought to create their own world, parallel to, yet outside of the established structure of their institutions (Geiger, 2000; Horowitz, 1987; Leslie, 1992). This new generation of students created dynamic communities on campus, characterized by diverse activities, collegiate athletics, and elaborate, sometimes deadly, rites of passage.

This article chronicles the practice of hazing at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor in the late 19th century and the university administration's response to this type of student behavior. Hazing during this time period was associated more with class rivalries (e.g., sophomores hazing freshmen) than individual organi-

zations, such as fraternities or sororities. President James B. Angell's correspondence with colleagues, students, and parents are the primary data used in analyzing how he and other University of Michigan officials dealt with hazing on campus. Angell's personal correspondence on this subject with officials of other institutions of higher education, including Cornell, Dartmouth, Swarthmore, and Michigan State Normal School (now Eastern Michigan University), and their replies add regional and national perspectives to this analysis.

The perspective of university administrator is often tangential to accounts of student life and escapades. In *The Company He Keeps: A History of White College Fraternities*, Syrett (2009) offers a comprehensive history of the American college fraternity, focused squarely on the student experience. Other more general treatments of college life in the 19th century also focus primarily on the student point of view (e.g., Horowitz, 1987; Leslie, 1992; Turk, 2004).

The aim of this article is to explore the practice of hazing in late 19th century student

culture and investigate responses to this type of student behavior by faculty, parents, fellow students, and especially administrators. This article uncovers a story that sheds light on the conceptualization of hazing, administrative leadership, and institutional responsibility in 1870s academe. This historical account may be of particular interest to administrators and educators working with fraternity and sorority communities, given the genuine interest in eradicating hazing in fraternal organizations. Studying hazing practices and administrative responses is essential to understanding the culture and rites of passage of students in the late 19th century, and will provide a perspective on the historical roots of this phenomenon in the university setting for 21st century students, faculty, parents, and administrators struggling with harmful and even fatal hazing incidents on American campuses.

EARLY CAMPUS LIFE AND CULTURE

From the origins of American colleges in the 17th century, students rebelled against authority and sought to make their own rules of behavior and social norms (Jackson, 2000). In the early years, protests erupted over undesirable dining hall food, strict social policies, and what students considered outdated curricula (Bethell, Hunt, & Shelton, 2004). During this era, class rivalries became a common element of campus culture at schools throughout the young nation. Class divisions were institutionalized in the colonial era through “Freshman Laws” that created a social system where the sophomores instructed the freshmen in the ways of the college, and the new students were expected to run errands for the upper classmen (Sheldon, 1901). Though the official Freshman Laws were abolished by colleges near the close of the 18th century, the class system endured. Sheldon (1901) described the devolution of the system into physical mistreatment, noting the “degeneration of the tutoring and instructing of freshmen into rough horseplay, and finally into

the hazing and rushing of the modern period [late 19th century]. The Freshman Laws contained in germ all the abuse to which first-year men have since been subjected” (p. 87).

College men highly valued mutuality, creating bonds that united them against the faculty and administration of an institution. This opposition between the faculty and students was a mainstay in college life into the 20th century, and defined the relationship between perceived student leaders and the administration until the 1930s when more encouraging student affairs professionals were widely introduced at American colleges and universities (American Council on Education, 1937).

Following the American Civil War, the types of institutions that comprised higher education in the United States diversified. The Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 paved the way for land-grant institutions as public institutions specializing in agricultural and mechanical studies (Thelin, 2004). One of the most significant changes in higher education in the late 19th century was the development of the research university. Several institutions began to add graduate and professional degrees and engaged in more original research, modeling themselves somewhat on the German universities where so many American scholars pursued doctoral studies. Fourteen U.S. institutions came together in 1900 to found the Association of American Universities (AAU), marking the emergence of the modern university.

As the types of educational institutions differentiated and grew increasingly complex in the 19th century, so did the variety of student organizations and activities (Finnegan & Alleman, 2009). According to Frederick Rudolph (1962/1990), early student activities followed a predictable cycle. In the first stage, an activity would begin informally, sometimes even spontaneously. Faculty members were often aware of these activities, and ignored, if not encouraged them. If an undesirable activity took hold among the students, administrators were generally quick to try and either eradicate or legislate

against the behavior. Attempts to control these activities usually failed, and the activity would take on a clandestine form among students, occurring at night or beyond campus limits. Eventually, the institution would attempt to formalize the ritual nature of the event (Jackson, 2000).

With the increase in the number of students on campuses came an increased competitive spirit and system of initiation into college life. This competition manifested itself in the birth and institutionalization of intercollegiate athletics, beginning with the first crew races between Harvard and Yale in August 1852 (Veneziano, 2002). College men competed for social status on the playing field and in the academic yard in organized athletics as well as ritualized violence in various rites of initiation into campus life (Horowitz, 1987; Sheldon, 1901; Townsend, 1996). These rites included hazing, a term that was just as prevalent in conversation among students and administrators on campus in 1870 as it is today.

HAZING CONCEPTUALIZED

In our current 21st century American culture, hazing is defined broadly as:

An activity that a high-status member orders other members to engage in or suggests that they engage in that in some way humbles a newcomer who lacks the power to resist, because he or she wants to gain admission to a group. Hazing can be noncriminal, but it is nearly always against the rules of an institution, team, or Greek group. It can be criminal, which means that a state statute has been violated. This usually occurs when a pledging-related activity results in gross physical injury or death. (Nuwer, 1999, p. xxv)

However, the practice is not limited to modern or American contexts. Records show that hazing occurred in the learning institutions of

Berytus, Carthage, and Athens during ancient times. The Byzantine emperor Justinian I attempted to outlaw hazing among law students by issuing a decree forbidding the practice. European institutions in the Middle Ages also battled hazing, which was linked closely to alcohol abuse (Nuwer, 1999).

The first documented American student implicated in hazing was Joseph Webb, a member of the class of 1684 at Harvard College. Webb was expelled for physically abusing new students and requiring them to commit acts of personal servitude. After two months, Webb apologized and returned to the institution with the permission of administrators and eventually graduated with his class (Nuwer, 1999). Evidently, Harvard did not consider this a severe issue since Webb was allowed to return so quickly.

Nearly 200 years later, students at the University of Michigan engaged in highly organized hazing behavior that was quite visible on campus and to the general public. Athletic competitions or challenges between classes or departments were common rivalries that sometimes devolved into hazing events (Jackson, 2000; Sheldon, 1901). Each incoming freshman class was expected to prove itself as worthy of their place at the institution. To earn their place among their peers, the college freshmen were forced to endure the physical and psychological pain of initiation through various types of hazing. A common form of hazing was called a "rush." This was generally a rowdy and violent challenge that would quickly devolve into a no-holds-barred fist fight between the classes (Horowitz, 1987).

These "rushes," or competitions, sometimes took place between departments on campus as well, and the details were often reported in the local papers, much as intercollegiate sporting events are followed today. A letter to the editor appearing in the November 12, 1872 edition of *The Detroit Post* provided the highlights of a "rush" between the literature class (the "Lits") and the medical students (the "Medics"):

Throughout the day the best of feeling prevailed, as was shown by one Medic, who dismantled a Lit with one fell sweep and then kindly gave him some of his own garments to cover his nakedness. We trust that in the future the same good feeling which has characterized the past may continue, and that the two departments may ever be on the very best terms with each other. (Adelphos, 1872)

“Pumping” was another popular form of hazing at Michigan, where a group of sophomores forcibly held the freshmen down at a water pump and “pumped” water over their heads. A Michigan student’s letter to the editor of *The Detroit Post* described the practice in benign terms:

When a man is pumped he is not wetted all over, but a little water is simply pumped on the back of his head, wetting him about as much as he would himself for the purpose of combing his hair. It does not hurt anybody. The writer has been pumped himself, and has seen others pumped and can vouch for the truth of the statement. (“Hazing: Collection of Letters,” 1873)

The anonymous writer did not indicate what the purpose of this seemingly innocuous form of hazing might be in his defense of it. Yet another form of hazing in the mid- to late-19th century was “smoking out,” in which a group of older students would rotate in and out of a new student’s room and smoke tobacco furiously until the room filled with smoke, making it difficult to breathe, all with the intention of making the freshmen sick (Syrett, 2009).

Hazing was a rite of passage that students perceived to be a harmless, yet socially important ritual. They assumed that newcomers needed to be initiated into their institution. Not to participate, or worse yet to report hazing to the college or local authorities, would have been branded traitor-

ous by fellow students. To maintain a high social status on campus and the respect of his peers, a student had to be allegiant to his classmates above the faculty. To break this code was to risk ostracism from the student community and being classified as a “grind,” “fisherman,” or “brownnose” (Horowitz, 1987, p. 13). One mother wrote to President Angell describing the sociological side of hazing, saying:

When the Freshmen entered last fall they were ignorant of the tricks, but were soon initiated by the Sophomores, in the way of pumping and other christening ceremonies, and were obliged to play their part or be dubbed with coward or tattler, which boy men [sic] will not submit to with grace. (J. S. Smith, 1874, p. 2)

Administrators were keenly aware of the hazing on campus, and openly condemned the behavior. In a letter dated May 5, 1874, President Angell called hazing “an abuse which has brought great discredit on the University” (Angell, 1874). *The Chicago Tribune* echoed this sentiment in an 1874 editorial on the “rowdyish and outrageous practice of hazing”:

Of the character of this practice there is no doubt. It is an ungentlemanly, low-bred, cowardly, and sometimes brutal sport, indulged in usually at the expense of the weaker class and those who are too timorous to resent the insolent outrage. . . . It is the criminal offense of assault and battery in nine cases out of ten. It very often results in temporary injury. It has sometimes proved fatal. In its very lightest form it is an outrage which has not the excuse of mischievous fun which characterizes other college practices. (“Michigan University Hazing,” 1874)

Under attack, the Michigan students defended their behavior and offered a window on

the meaning late-19th century men made from their hazing. In a letter from the junior and senior classes at the University of Michigan dated May 7, 1874, hazing was explained and defended by the upperclassmen:

We understand that away from the University there is prevalent a very strong feeling against what is termed "hazing." But we are of the opinion that such sentiment is generated through an ignorance of the real nature of the custom. As practiced in the University of Michigan, hazing is simply an athletic contest between the Sophomore and Freshman classes, and, like other athletic sports, is participated in with the best of mutual good feeling. *Only hazers are hazed* [original emphasis]. A principle of hazing here is that those who refrain from it are not molested. We deem it unjust to associate hazing here with traditions of English and Eastern dormitory-colleges, and with customs which are understood to have prevailed at the U.S. naval and military academies. (Maxwell et al., 1874)

Obviously, hazing was a controversial and publicly debated topic in the late 19th century at the University of Michigan, in no small part due to the 1874 incident at the heart of this article. Before delving into the details of the event, a context for campus culture at Michigan and the administrative connections between the institution and Cornell University, another prominent institution plagued by hazing at this time, is provided.

STUDENT LIFE AT MICHIGAN: DIVERSITY AND STRUCTURE

Life at the University of Michigan, or Michigan University as it was commonly referred to at the time, was rapidly changing in the late 19th century. The student body quickly diversified in

terms of gender and ethnicity, making Michigan look more like a modern university than an all-male religious seminary. In 1868, Gabriel Franklin Hargo became the first known African-American man to be admitted to the university, joining the law department (Bartlett & Koehler, 1997). Madelon Stockwell was the first woman admitted to the institution in 1870. By 1871, student enrollment at Michigan topped 1,100, making it one of the largest student populations in the United States. In 1876, Mary Henrietta Graham was the first African-American woman known to be admitted to the university (Bordin, 1999).

Recruited from his position as president of the University of Vermont, James Burrill Angell became the third president of the University of Michigan in 1871 after more than a year of negotiation with the Board of Regents. His annual salary was established at \$4,500 (approximately \$83,000 in 2012 dollars) and his final demand before accepting the position was that a water closet be installed in the president's home, the first indoor plumbing in Ann Arbor. Angell would serve as president for 38 years, the longest term of any University of Michigan president (Peckham, 1994). Leading the university through a time of tumultuous change, Angell established its position as one of the foremost research universities in the United States.

Student culture flourished on Michigan's campus due to an expanding and diversified student body, the members of which were able to create their own co-curricular experiences outside the reach of faculty and administrators. The University Football Association, Michigan's first football team, was organized in 1873 and played its first official intercollegiate game six years later. Sororities first entered campus life in 1879 with the establishment of Kappa Alpha Theta. Male students mocked them as imitators of the fraternity system, which had been in place on campus since the 1845 founding of a Beta Theta Pi chapter (Peckham, 1994).

Organized athletics gave students an outlet for physical activity that previously had been

directed toward rushing, pumping, and other physical types of hazing. Rudolph (1990) noted that the emergence of football and other inter-collegiate athletics was responsible for diminishing the incidence of rebellions and rioting, in addition to hazing.

The 1870s also marked a rapid diversification and professionalization of the curriculum, with several new colleges and schools being founded at the university, including the Homeopathic Medical College (1875), the School of Mines (1875), the College of Dental Surgery (1875), and the School of Pharmacy (1876). It was in 1880 that a music instructorship was added to the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. As the turn of the century approached, the School of Nursing opened its doors in 1891, and the Department of Engineering followed shortly after in 1895 (Bartlett & Koehler, 1997). This diversification and expansion of Michigan's academic offerings created more divisions and rivalries within the student body, promulgating more groups that could engage in competitions and hazing-style events (e.g., the rush between the Lits and the Medics described earlier).

MICHIGAN AND CORNELL: SISTER UNIVERSITIES

During this era, the curriculum at Michigan and several other institutions began to shift from the English-style liberal arts focus to the German-influenced emphasis on research and independent study. Combined with the growing appeal of secularism in the United States, several institutions, including Michigan, rose to the top of the higher education hierarchy to become the first research universities in the United States (Thelin, 2004). Characterized by professional schools, graduate programs, and the awarding of Ph.D. degrees, this new breed of institutions was the antithesis of the strong push for liberal education outlined in the Yale Report of 1828. A young professor at Michigan, Andrew White, was enamored with this idea of a secular university with the ability to pursue truth in a number

of highly specialized fields ("White," 2001).

White left Michigan in 1863 to pursue this ideal as the first president of Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. Though he and Angell never worked at the University of Michigan at the same time, the two were colleagues and friends, exchanging ideas and practices through lengthy correspondence and occasional visits. White was the featured speaker at the dedication of the new University Hall at Michigan on November 5, 1873. Angell introduced White in a friendly and collegial manner, as described in an uncredited newspaper article:

After a quartette, which was sung with spirit and energetically encored, President Angell introduced the next speaker in the manner following: During my recent visit to the East, the distinguished President of Cornell University remarked that he was so much indebted for his ideas and methods to Michigan University that he felt like calling the institution over which he presided the daughter of this; to which I could only reply by reciting the first lines of the ode, "*O mater pulchra, O filia pulchrior.*"

And, now, those mothers who, to avoid unpleasant inferences to their own age or looks, would fain pass off their grown up daughters as their sisters, will sympathize with me, I am sure, in the sentiment, when I introduce to you Andrew D. White, President of *our sister* University [emphases original]. ("Dedication," 1873)

The strong relationship between Presidents Angell and White, and their respective universities, would grow stronger over the years. Angell and White were friends, colleagues, and professional allies united in their vision and pursuit of the American research university. Both Michigan and Cornell would be among the founding members of the AAU in 1900

(Thelin, 2004). Over the course of their careers, Angell and White would share ideas on curricular reform, the elective system, and managing the increasingly volatile hazing situations on their campuses.

As American colleges and universities continued to diversify in mission, curriculum, student demographics and activities, hazing took hold as a method for students to bond, compete, and prove themselves among an ever-growing number of peers. As student organizations flourished and student populations became larger and co-educational, hazing spread from class or department rivalries to student organizations, athletic teams, and fraternities. A tradition of proving one's place at an institution also became a method for establishing even closer bonds within smaller organizations; this was certainly true at both Michigan and Cornell.

One of the first documented cases of a death from hazing happened at Cornell University in 1873. Mortimer Leggett, son of General Mortimer Dormer Leggett, the U.S. Commissioner of Patents, was fatally injured when he fell off a cliff during a ceremony to induct him into the Kappa Alpha Society (Nuwer, 1990, 1999; Syrett, 2009). This fraternal organization was founded in 1825 at Union College, and still exists today (with an active chapter at Cornell as of 2012). A local newspaper reported that:

[Leggett] and two fellow students had fallen down a steep ravine; Leggett was killed, his companions were seriously injured. It is now stated that the unfortunate youth was being "initiated," and while being led blindfolded through devious paths, up and down dangerous precipices, he and his initiators fell some 40 feet, with the fatal consequence to which we have referred. Relief was prompt, but poor Leggett's skull was fractured and his neck partially dislocated. ... In an hour or two he died. Of his companions, one had his hip broken and the other sus-

tained internal injuries. ("Fatal Ceremony," ca. 1873)

The newspaper was particularly critical of the Cornell administration, stating:

This terrible accident will arouse popular indignation to such a pitch that the practice and system of hazing, initiation, and other college orgies of that character will have to be forever abolished. If the college authorities cannot protect the lives and limbs of students, the law can and will. ("Fatal Ceremony," ca. 1873)

President White was well aware of this incident and became wary of the practice and its potential to ruin not only lives but also institutional reputation. Students at Michigan were keenly aware of the fatal hazing incident at Cornell as well. However, this knowledge did not dissuade students from participating in rushing, pumping, and other hazing activities at their own university. Several students, including at least one who would be suspended from Michigan for hazing in May 1874, had a copy of an article describing the Cornell Kappa Alpha Society death clipped from a newspaper and pasted into his scrapbook (Choate, ca. 1873).

THE 1874 MICHIGAN HAZING INCIDENT

On April 18, 1874, a hazing incident escalated into a fight between members of the sophomore (class of 1876) and freshman (class of 1877) classes at the University of Michigan. It was a Saturday evening, and representatives of the freshman class met in the freshman debating room on the Ann Arbor campus to discuss retaliation for a year's worth of hazing by the sophomores. A recent incident of "smoking out" had left several freshmen sick and eager for revenge against their intimidators. The freshmen decided to accost several members of the sophomore class on their way home

from evening classes and “pump” them in order to even the score and redeem the class’s dignity. However, their plan did not unfold as expected. The incident itself is described in a class history written for the 1877 graduation:

The question of the punishment due the sophs. was stormily argued until a quiet youth suggested that we catch them first. This plan was adopted, and as the sophomores came from their lyceum several were caught and carried toward the pump. But our plans had been betrayed, and the entire class was upon us. Then began a rush which lasted till midnight, when it dawned upon their sophomoric minds that rushing upon the Sabbath is immoral, and they withdrew. This is the only occasion upon which their respect for holy things was conspicuous. (Orcutt, 1877, p. 264)

Following the incident, three men from each of the freshman and sophomore classes were suspended from the University. Students were outraged by this decision, the first time that administrators had levied any type of punishment for hazing. The two classes held meetings to discuss their responses; each drafted petitions stating that the signers were also guilty of hazing and should be suspended with their classmates. Some of the women of each class wanted to sign the petitions in solidarity, but their male classmates would not allow it (“A Splendid Institution,” 1886; see p. 19).

The petitions were submitted to the faculty. Students paraded and demonstrated in the streets of Ann Arbor in protest. Some students publicly insulted individual faculty members during these demonstrations. *The Boston Journal* reported that “the Faculty, it is said, were groaned and hissed in public, and some of the demonstrations approached a riotous character” (“Emeute at Michigan,” ca. 1874).

The petition signed by the freshmen stated, in part:

TO THE FACULTY OF MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY—GENTLEMEN:

We, the undersigned, members of the man class, wish to respectfully inform you, that in the affair for which three of our number have been suspended we are equally implicated with them; and protest against the injustice of suspending three of us only. (Angell, 1874; “Freshman petition,” 1874)

Members of the sophomore class signed a similar petition, stating: “We respectfully request the attention of the Faculty of the University to the fact that we also have been engaged in hazing” (Angell, 1874; “Sophomore petition,” 1874).

Administrative Response to Incident

President Angell and the faculty of the university decided to give the students time to settle down and think about their actions. The petitions from the freshman and sophomore classes were left in the hands of the university steward, an early administrator appointed by the Board of Regents. The faculty gave students the option of either withdrawing the petitions altogether or removing their names from the documents individually. Several students took advantage of this opportunity, and 22 students withdrew their names and avoided any type of punishment from the university. However, it is likely that these students lost the respect of their classmates for this action.

After a five-day waiting period, the faculty took action against those whose names remained on the petitions. As a result, President Angell and the faculty of the university decided to suspend an additional 81 students from the University of Michigan on May 4, 1874. The formal suspension order contained the following explanation of the measures taken by the faculty:

The public voice of the State demands that the university faculties, which are but the servants of the State, shall eradicate from

the university the practice of hazing and every other form of disorder which may bring upon it harm and disgrace, whether it costs the suspension or the absolute exclusion of a hundred or hundreds of those who have been admitted to its privileges. The university can better afford to be without students than without government, order, and reputation. This action of the faculty is nonetheless imperative because the traditions with which they have to deal have so lowered the tone of sentiment in this as in other institutions that practices which at home and away from college would be thought by students shameful and criminal are regarded as innocent amusement in the university. ("A Splendid Institution," 1886)

The suspension letters were mailed to each student's father, informing him of his son's punishment and providing a summary of the situation; Angell personally signed the suspension letters. Students were expected to leave campus for the remainder of the academic year and return in late September. At that time, students would be expected to pass exams covering all of the material that their classmates would have covered in their courses, except for botany, and give a written pledge to abstain from hazing or any other interference with the government or operations of the university (Angell, 1874).

Angell's approach was more tempered than that of the faculty during the University of Michigan's "Fraternity War" of 1847, when students were given the choice of renouncing membership in all secret societies or leaving the institution permanently. The effort of the faculty was ultimately unsuccessful, and all fraternities were reinstated at the institution in 1850 (Shaw, 1920).

Parent and Student Reaction

Several parents responded writing letters to President Angell, most of whom praised (or

at least supported) his decision and apologized for the indiscretions of their sons. One mother from Colorado wrote:

After all our self sacrifice to give our son the advantages of an education, it would be the most severe trial of my life to have these privileges prove his ruin, it would be poor encouragement to parents [to] send sons where their morals are perverted and their good names blacked. I do not know how under the circumstances you could have yielded the point and maintained authority and I hope this step will forever put a stop to the barbarous practice of hazing; I hope Lyndon will make suitable apology for all that he did wrong in the matter, and be prepared to go on with the course without giving any further trouble. (Smith, J. S., 1874, pp. 3-4)

Predictably, the students were not as supportive of the university's action. An international student, M. S. Tayama of Japan, wrote a lengthy letter to the faculty of the university, which was published in full by *The Chicago Times*. In the letter, he protested his suspension, arguing:

Only three ways were left to us—either to turn informers, to be hazed without self defense and retaliation, or to reserve to ourselves the primitive right of defending ourselves and retaliating, *in the absence of a due protection by the proper authorities, you, the faculty of the university* [original emphasis]. To turn informers seemed to us not only disgraceful but futile, for the reason stated above. As to the second recourse, we were no more Christians than the faculty and the people in general; we did not feel like turning our left cheeks when the right were smitten. You would have us to invite the sophs to smoke us when they had pumped us. If

such is your preaching, I should think you would do a great good if you would set the example yourselves. (Tayama, 1874)

Inter-institution Interest: Presidential Correspondence

The news of the suspension was reported nationwide, and drew attention from many other institutions of higher education. Particular interest was given by White at Cornell. President White, of course, knew all too well the serious implications of hazing on campus, as a Cornell student had been killed in a fraternity initiation ceremony just months earlier. In fact, White wrote to President Angell after the first six men had been suspended from Michigan, requesting their names. "Will you be so kind," he wrote, "if you think there is any possibility of their coming Eastward as to send me a list of their names. I should feel greatly ashamed to have our institution entrapped in this case as we were once before" (A.D. White to J. B. Angell, April 28, 1874). This letter demonstrates the high level of direct communication between university presidents, in this case cooperating to block the transfers of trouble-makers and alleged hazers.

Upon reading the news of the larger suspension, White sent a Western Union telegram to Angell, stating briefly: "Accept congratulations of our Trustees and faculty on determined stand of your University against hazing. Please send full list" (A.D. White to J. B. Angell, May 5, 1874; see p. 20). Angell also received congratulatory letters from Presidents Sill at the Detroit Female Seminary, Smith at Dartmouth College, Potter at Union College, Magill at Swarthmore College, and Estabrook at the Michigan State Normal School. The communications from Dartmouth, Swarthmore and Union Colleges indicate that those institutions had also received a list of the suspended students from Dr. Angell (Estabrook, 1874; Heyward, 1874; Magill, 1874; Sill, 1874; A. D. Smith, 1874).

The Temperance movement was well underway in the United States at this time, and ad-

herents perceived that alcohol was a major contributor to the behavioral problems on campus. Joseph Estabrook, who was a member of the University of Michigan Board of Regents as well as the President of the Michigan State Normal School (now Eastern Michigan University) in neighboring Ypsilanti, was particularly pleased with the progress made in early 1874. He wrote to Angell in early April, prior to the hazing incident in question, "I learn that the saloons are all closed in Ann Arbor. If so one of the greatest sources of lawlessness, among students, is dried up. I trust they will never be allowed to commence their ruinous business again" (Estabrook, 1874, p. 2).

Cornell's efforts to prevent the suspended men from Michigan from enrolling there were successful, although some of the suspended students did attempt to enroll. In late May, President White wrote to Angell:

Returning to Ithaca, I find that your lists and my precautions served a very good purpose. Some of your young men, it appears, have applied here to find whether any arrangements could be made with regard to receiving them, but were met with refusal and good advice. (A.D. White to J. B. Angell, May 30, 1874)

It appears that the administrative strategy employed by the university presidents was effective in this instance.

Resolution

The suspended students ultimately left University of Michigan without further protest. The Class of 1877 history describes the 39 freshmen suspended as preparing for a vacation and notes that prior to their departure there were "a few private suppers, songs prepared for the occasion were sung, then the final hand-shaking, and 'away they sped with gamesome minds and souls untouched by sin.'" The remainder of the

class completed the rest of the term without interruption (Orcutt, 1877, p. 264).

The suspended students were eligible to rejoin the University of Michigan in September 1874. However, not all returned. Also missing from the campus that fall were some who had avoided suspension. The class history recounts that the cohort dwindled to just 62 students at the beginning of the sophomore year, slightly less than half who had begun studies as freshmen the year before (Orcutt, 1877).

Upon returning to campus, each of the suspended students was required to sign a printed pledge, which read: "I hereby promise that, during the period of my connection with the University, I will abstain from hazing and from any attempt to interfere with the government of the University" ("Hazing Abstention Promise," 1874; see p. 21). This administrative intervention was not universally supported. One of the university regents commented in a speech that the suspended freshmen, now sophomores, had served their punishment and should be treated impartially at the institution. Although the opinion was applauded by students, absolution was not forthcoming, and the students signed their pledge cards (Orcutt, 1877).

The incident did not pass into oblivion with the signing of the pledges. Hazing still posed a problem on Michigan's campus. Just a month after the suspended students returned, on October 15, 1874, a rush occurred between the Classes of 1877 and 1878. The sophomores claimed victory over the freshmen, who reportedly were well organized and had started the rush. Predictably, the incident was regarded by the faculty as interference of the university government, and actions of the students involved were called into question. This situation was resolved more amicably than the previous spring's rush. "The next week the olive branch of peace was waved in the chapel, and all tumultuous collisions were prohibited. This command was ever after strictly and rigidly obeyed—with some exceptions" (Orcutt, 1877, p. 264).

Furthermore, each year members of the class held elaborate celebrations at the University of Michigan to mark the anniversary of the mass suspension, complete with bonfires, heavy alcohol consumption, and drunken processions (Orcutt, 1877).

As graduating seniors, the Class of 1877 did not have a change of heart toward the way university administrators handled the original suspension. Their class history in the yearbook, *The Chronicle*, aired an apparently common class attitude toward the incident, blaming both classmates and the administration:

Three years of reflection have strengthened our belief that the suspension of the first six for a fault which had always been winked at was wrong and unjust; that the invitation to signers to take their names from papers in which they had confessed their participation in hazing, and the exemption from punishment of those who did so, were inconsistent and temporizing measures. (Orcutt, 1877, p. 264)

Hazing incidents diminished after 1877, and the administrative response of Angell and his colleagues was proven effective. The University of Michigan received a great deal of praise from the media regarding its stance against student lawlessness. Newspaper clippings found among President Angell's personal papers compare the action taken at Michigan to similar measures taken at other higher education institutions, including the United States Naval Academy. Rear Admiral Worden, who served in that post from 1872 to 1875, suspended Midshipmen for the offense of hazing and supported a bill introduced in Congress that would immediately dismiss any cadet found responsible for hazing and render him ineligible for any future appointment or service within the U.S. Navy ("Student Hazing," ca. 1874; "Worden," 2001).

Hazing was not the only reason for student suspension in the 1870s. The model of a strong

president and administration was employed in response to a number of student behaviors at several institutions in the United States. In an attempt to assert more control over student behavior, college and university administrators sanctioned students for rebellion and general disobedience. Following the lead of the Naval Academy and the University of Michigan, Bowdoin College in Maine suspended 100 students in June 1874. Known as the "Drill Rebellion" of 1874, students protested against a mandatory drill established by college president and Union Civil War hero Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain. When three quarters of the students refused to participate in the drill, they were all sent home and given one week to return to campus and participate. All but three returned, and a year later the military drill became voluntary ("Bowdoin rebellion," 1874; Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain, Administrative Records, n.d.).

THE ENDURING NATURE OF HAZING

Although the findings discussed in this article chronicle events nearly 150 years ago, the student behavior is likely familiar to higher education leaders today. Once the purview of class rivalries and rowdy fights, hazing behavior diffused to smaller, secretive student organizations, including fraternities and sororities, as campus activities diversified and administrators took aim at public, campus-wide hazing events. Recounting this history may leave some higher education administrators frustrated that despite more than a century of efforts to eradicate hazing from college campuses, the practice endures. Today, fraternities and sororities receive much of the attention in regard to hazing practices, though many incidents occur within athletic teams, school bands, and church or service-related student organizations (Hoover, 1999; Nuwer, 1990; Nuwer, 1999).

Despite centuries of attempts to eradicate the practice of hazing, it has marched strongly into the 21st century at institutions across the

United States. In 2011 alone, at least two American university students died as a result of hazing incidents (Nuwer, 2012). While diverting student energy into other physical activities such as organized athletics was successful as a tactic for reducing dangerous hazing in the late 19th century, hazing has become a large part of entry into collegiate athletic teams at modern colleges and universities. A 1999 nationwide study conducted by Alfred University and the National Collegiate Athletes Association (NCAA) found that over 75% of athletes experienced some sort of hazing to join a college athletic team; 50% of athletes reported that alcohol was involved in hazing (Hoover, 1999). Allan and Madden (2008) found hazing behavior to be pervasive in campus culture with 55% of students participating in clubs, teams, and organizations experiencing hazing. However, 95% of these hazing cases were not reported to campus officials.

At the University of Michigan, nine fraternities and sororities were investigated for hazing during the fall 2004 semester. This was in part the result of heightened awareness as an anti-hazing law was enacted in the state on August 21, 2004, making hazing a criminal offense. Matney and Taylor (2008) chronicled the administrative response to the 2004 Michigan incidents, which included creation of a comprehensive Community Education and Development Model (CEDM). The CEDM was designed as a customized intervention to prompt cultural change by identifying and eliminating harmful traditions within organizations and leveraging the community-building potential of fraternities and sororities. This administrative response has been successful, and incidents of hazing have declined since implementation of the CEDM.

In February 2011, a Cornell University student died from alcohol poisoning in an alleged hazing incident at Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity. Later that year, David Skorton, president of Cornell, published an editorial in *The New York Times* calling for an end to fraternity hazing.

Skorton attributes hazing at Cornell to circumstances reminiscent of those in 1874:

Why would bright young people subject themselves to dangerous humiliation? Multiple factors are at play: the need of emerging adults to separate from family, forge their own identities and be accepted in a group; obedience to authority (in this case, older students); the ineffectiveness of laws and other constraints on group behavior; and organizational traditions that perpetuate hazardous activities. (Skorton, 2011, ¶8)

New York established an anti-hazing law in 1894, making it the first state in the nation to criminalize hazing (Chambers, 2010). Unfortunately, the legal system has not been as effective in preventing hazing fatalities as the local newspaper had anticipated following the first hazing fatality at the institution: "If the college authorities cannot protect the lives and limbs of students, the law can and will" ("Fatal Ceremony," ca. 1873).

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Hazing in the late 19th century was a public ritual of induction into an organization or institution. At a time when the university population was growing and diversifying at an unprecedented rate, hazing was viewed by students as a means of rebellion and solidarity against authority. At Michigan, new students admitted to the university were tested through hazing rituals to prove their physical strength, ability to work together as a cohesive unit, and their loyalty to their student peers over the faculty and administrators. In reflecting on the details of the 1874 incident, three items are offered for consideration by modern higher education administrators.

Changed Landscape for Administrators

One of the noteworthy findings in research-

ing the 1874 Michigan hazing incident is the personal correspondence among college presidents. The personal letters related to the incident document the genuine concern they had about combatting hazing on their campuses. This administrative frame is often tangential in historical accounts of campus life, and these letters provide valuable information about how campus leaders such as Presidents Angell and White conceptualized administrative responsibility and their role in student conduct.

The landscape is very different for administrators today. Faculty and executive leaders would rarely be first-responders to a hazing incident; this task would more likely be the purview of a fraternity/sorority advisor or a dean of students. Sanctions today are seldom as sweeping as Angell's response and infrequently come directly from the president of the institution. The nature of student records and privacy has changed significantly such that a university president or any administrator today who sent letters about a student conduct matter to parents without the student's consent would be in violation of federal law (FERPA: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act). Likewise, it would be unlikely that a university president would release the names of sanctioned students to his or her peer presidents in an effort to restrict students from enrolling elsewhere.

However, today's landscape of student attitudes bears more resemblance to examples from the 1800s; a sense of rebellion against authorities appears inherent in many hazing incidents. Administrative sanctions may be successful for a limited amount of time but often lack permanence given a revolving student population with little institutional memory. Many students feel a need to establish a culture of exclusion, for which hazing is the entry, in an attempt to create smaller communities and fashion a student culture over which they have control. In effect, a struggle exists in terms of who constructs culture and community on campus; this struggle pits administrative power against student power.

Migration of Hazing in Student Culture

Hazing is not endemic to fraternities and sororities. The vast majority of fraternal organizations are founded on values inconsistent with hazing behaviors. Hazing may not have been a part of the early chapters in operation in the 19th century, but hazing was clearly a part of the campus context by the 1870s. Fraternity and sorority lore passed down to incoming generations of students through new member handbooks and educational programs asserts that hazing had no place in the founders' ideals. This may be true, but it should not be forgotten that hazing existed in the early years of fraternities and sororities. Early chapter members certainly would have been aware of hazing and perhaps even participants in class rivalries and rushes.

The 1873 hazing death in Cornell's Kappa Alpha Society and the 1874 Michigan freshman-sophomore rush may provide a glimpse at a transition period for college hazing behavior. As public hazing incidents such as the class rushes came under more scrutiny and the administrative response to such activities became bolder, hazing practices diffused to smaller, exclusive, secret organizations such as fraternal groups. The secrecy provided cover for the practice of hazing and remains a challenge today in the fight against hazing. Fraternity and sorority professionals need to understand the origins of hazing within our organizations to educate students about the historical context of hazing in fraternities and sororities; professionals and advisors should be careful not to omit hazing from the environment of early fraternal groups.

Students at Michigan, and most likely other colleges and universities in the late 19th century, were aware of the public and institutional disdain for hazing. Their scrapbooks contain newspaper clippings and references to hazing events taking place on their own campus and across the nation. Still, hazing persisted. Some students believed that hazing was a good-natured welcome to new students, a rite of passage (for men at least) required to gain admission to the

student society. Regardless of injuries or fatalities attributed to hazing, the mentality of "boys will be boys," couples with a belief in immunity to the harmful or fatal effects of hazing.

A similar pattern continues in the 2010s, with significant public outrage against hazing and bullying in high school and college contexts. However, incidents of rookie hazing in professional sports (notably the National Football League), including personal servitude and public humiliation, are widely broadcast and rarely questioned. This sends mixed messages to students as well as to the educators and administrators who are charged with preventing hazing.

Connections to Identity and Community Development

Although hazing carries an increasingly negative and sadistic connotation in 21st century America, and is illegal in 44 states (StopHazing.org, 2010), the underlying conceptualization of hazing remains steady. Hazing on American campuses has long been about identity and exclusivity, first exhibited through class identity (freshmen versus sophomores) and later shifting to fraternity identity and other organizations.

However, college and university administrators today have a much better understanding of the complexity of college student development, in particular identity development and community building. Notions of self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 1999, 2001, 2009; Kegan, 1994), gender identity (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Handler, 1995; Harper & Harris, 2010), and intersectionality (Abes, Jones, & McEwen, 2007; Jones & McEwen, 2000) should be utilized to help student groups such as fraternities and sororities conceptualize identity without a hazing experience. Likewise, community building can play a powerful role in combating hazing, as evidenced by the Community Education and Development Model employed at Michigan in 2004-05 (Matney & Taylor, 2008). The residential component that exists in many fraternities and sororities provides a prime environment for

establishing a robust learning community, building on the foundation of decades of research on college student housing, student organizations, and group dynamics. Student affairs professionals are expertly trained and well positioned for these tasks.

Certainly some of the motivations remain the same as they were in Ann Arbor and Ithaca in the late 19th century. Hazing today is still an outward illustration of a power struggle in a college students' social hierarchy on campus and a form of rebellion against faculty, administrators,

and any type of institutional authority. Hazing persists as a means of controlling aspects of student culture and perpetuating power differentials similar to those established by the Freshman Laws at colonial colleges. In an institutional context characterized by diversity and specialization unthinkable in 1874, the challenge for current administrators and educators is to find ways to guide students in developing identity and constructing healthy community(ies) on multiple scales without putting student safety at risk.

REFERENCES

- A splendid institution: The University of Michigan and its half century's record. (1886, November 20). *The Chicago Tribune*.
- Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(1), 1-22. doi:10.1353/csd.2007.0000
- Adelphos. (1872, November 12). Saturday's rush at the university [Letter to the editor]. *The Detroit Post*. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Edward Chauncey Hinman scrapbook, Call number: 88391 AA.
- Allan, E. J. & Madden, M. (2008). *Hazing in view: College students at risk. Initial findings from the National Study of Student Hazing*. Retrieved from http://www.hazingstudy.org/publications/hazing_in_view_web.pdf
- American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Angell, J. B. (1874, May 5). [Letter to fathers of suspended students]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Bartlett, N., & Koehler, K. (1997). *A book of days, 150 years of student life at Michigan*. Ann Arbor, MI: Alumni Association of the University of Michigan.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1999). *Creating contexts for self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2009). *Authoring your life: Developing an internal voice to navigate life's challenges*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Bethell, J., Hunt, R., & Shenton, R. (2004). *Harvard A to Z*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bordin, R. (1999). *Women at Michigan: The "dangerous experiment," 1870s to the present*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Bowdoin rebellion. (1874, June 3). [Article clipped from unknown newspaper]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

- Chambers, J. (2010). *Matter of Khalil H.* 2010 NY Slip Op 08110 [80 AD3d 83]. Retrieved from http://www.nycourts.gov/reporter/3dseries/2010/2010_08110.htm
- Choate, W. (ca. 1873). *Wayne Choate scrapbook*. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Call number: 88184 Aa 1.
- Dedication of the new University Building at Ann Arbor. (1873, November 5). [Article and illustration clipped from unknown newspaper]. Wayne Choate scrapbook (Call number: 88184 Aa 1), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50, 210-228. doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0063
- The emeute at Michigan University. (ca. 1874, May). *The Boston Journal*. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Estabrook, J. (1874, April 19). [Letter to President J. B. Angell]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- The fatal ceremony of the Kappa Alpha Society. (ca. 1873). [Article clipped from unknown newspaper]. Wayne Choate scrapbook (Call number: 88184 Aa 1), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Finnegan, D. E., & Alleman, N. F. (2009, November). *Absorbing slack: An historical analysis of central and peripheral campus YMCAs*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, Vancouver, BC.
- Freshman petition. (1874, April 27). James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Geiger, R. L. (Ed.) (2000). *The American college in the 19th century*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Handler, L. (1995). In the fraternal sisterhood: Sororities as gender strategy. *Gender and Society*, 9(2), 236-255. doi:10.1177/089124395009002006
- Harper, S. R., & Harris III, F. (Eds.) (2010). *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hazing: Collection of letters to the editor. (1873, October). *The Detroit Post*. Student Life and Customs, Hazing (Call number: Flmu F1, Vertical file), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Hazing abstention promise. (1874). Class of 1876 Papers (Call number: 8764 Bimu F992, Hazing folder), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Heyward, B. (1874, May 11). [Letter to President J. B. Angell from Union College]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Hoover, N. (1999). *National survey: Initiation rites and athletics for NCAA teams*. Alfred University [Electronic version]. Retrieved from http://www.alfred.edu/sports_hazing/docs/hazing.pdf
- Horowitz, H. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the 18th century to the present*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Jackson, L. (2000). The rights of man and the rights of youth: Fraternity and riot at 18th-century Harvard. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *The American college in the 19th century*, 46-79; 287-297. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41, 405-413.

- Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain, Administrative Records. (n.d.). George J. Mitchell Department of Special Collections & Archives. Bowdoin College Library. Retrieved from <http://library.bowdoin.edu/arch/archives/jlclg.shtml>
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Leslie, W. B. (1992). *Gentlemen and scholars: College and community in the "Age of the University," 1865-1917*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Magill, E. H. (1874, June 12). [Letter to Angell]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Matney, M. M., & Taylor, S. H. (2008). Framing the dialogue: A new, collaborative approach to the hazing dilemma. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 3(2), 1-15.
- Maxwell, L., Thomas, C., Warner, J. D., Challis, D., Campbell, J. C., Davis, L., Ford, H. C., & Parker, J. W. (1874). [Card]. Student Life and Customs, Hazing (Call number: F1mu F1, Vertical file), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- The Michigan University hazing. (1874). *The Chicago Tribune*. Student Life and Customs, Hazing (Call number: F1mu F1, Vertical file), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Nuwer, H. (1990). *Broken pledges: The deadly rite of hazing*. Atlanta, GA: Longstreet Press.
- Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Nuwer, H. (2012). *Hank Nuwer's list of deaths by hazing*. Retrieved from <http://www.hanknuwer.com/hazingdeaths.html>
- Orcutt, G. N. (1877). Class of 1877 records: Class history. *The chronicle*, 263-268 (Call number: 8767 Bimu F992), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Peckham, H. H. (1994). *The making of the University of Michigan: 1817-1992*. Ann Arbor, MI: Bentley Historical Library of the University of Michigan.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Shaw, W. B. (1920). *The University of Michigan*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Howe.
- Sheldon, H. D. (1901). *Student life and customs*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.
- Sill, J. M. B. (1874, May 5). [Letter to President J. B. Angell from Detroit Female Seminary]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Skorton, D. J. (2011, August 11). A pledge to end fraternity hazing. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/24/opinion/a-pledge-to-end-fraternity-hazing.html>
- Smith, A. D. (1874, May 11). [Letter to President Angell from Dartmouth College]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Smith, J. S. (1874, May 12). [Letter to James B. Angell, L. L. D.]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Sophomore and Freshman Classes. (1874). A card from the students. Student Life and Customs, Hazing (Call number: F1mu F1, Vertical file), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Sophomore petition. (1874). Class of 1876 Papers (Call number: 8764 Bimu F992, Hazing folder), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

- StopHazing.org. (2010). *State anti-hazing laws*. Retrieved from <http://www.stophazing.org/laws.html>
- Student hazing. (ca. 1874, May). *The New York Independent*. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of white college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Tayama, M. S. (1874, May 5). [Letter to the most respected faculty of the University of Michigan, Those frisky boys]. Reprinted in article clipped from unknown newspaper. Student Life and Customs, Hazing (Call number: Flmu F1, Vertical file), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Theelin, J. (2004). *A history of higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Those frisky boys: Collection of letters to the editor. (1874, May). Article clipped from unknown newspaper. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, vertical file, Student Life and Customs, Hazing, Call number: Flmu F1.
- Townsend, K. (1996). *Manhood at Harvard: William James and others*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Turk, D. B. (2004). *Bound by a mighty vow: Sisterhood and women's fraternities, 1870-1920*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Veneziano, J. (2002). *America's oldest intercollegiate athletic event*. Retrieved from <http://www.fhiplan.com/ctrowing/harvardyle.htm>
- White, A. D. (1874, April 28). [Letter to Doctor Angell]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- White, A. D. (1874, May 5). [Western Union Telegraph to President Angell]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- White, A. D. (1874, May 30). [Letter to Doctor Angell]. James B. Angell Papers, 1845-1916 (Box 1, Folder 18), Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. White, Andrew Dixon. (2001) *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 6th ed. New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.bartleby.com/65>
- Worden, Rear Admiral John L. (2001). Naval Historical Center, Department of the Navy website. Retrieved from <http://www.history.navy.mil/photos/pers-us/uspers-w/j-wrdn.htm>

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHY

James P. Barber (Ph.D., University of Michigan) is an assistant professor of education at the College of William and Mary. His research interests include college student learning and development. Barber is a member of Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity, and currently serves as the Faculty Fellow for the chapter at William and Mary. He may be contacted at jpbarber@wm.edu.

To the Faculty of the University of Michigan.

Whereas, - Some of our class-mates have recently been suspended from the University for the offense of hazing, and

Whereas, - The undersigned desire that justice shall be done to all

Therefore, We respectfully request the attention of the Faculty of the University to the fact that we also have been engaged in hazing.

✓ E. S. Regal	✓ Fred K. Austin
✓ C. M. Rötter	✓ L. H. Shaw
✓ G. H. Aile	✓ C. H. Heley
✓ J. R. Ramey	✓ F. R. Buel
✓ Ed. C. Swift	✓ C. W. Woodruff
✓ B. Saffley	✓ L. C. Kruhl
✓ Chas. Marshall	✓ E. F. Thomas
✓ W. W. Sherwin	✓ J. H. Tuttle
✓ Ben. C. Richards	✓ Albert C. Stevens
✓ J. Dana Sanders	✓ D. G. Allen
✓ S. V. R. Troobridge	✓ A. C. Puring
✓ B. B. Campbell	✓ E. F. Babcock
✓ W. G. Campbell	✓ W. H. Haire
✓ J. D. Devo	✓ C. W. Hulse
✓ W. P. Hensley	✓ G. L. Boynton
✓ M. H. Phelps	✓ A. J. Cooper
✓ G. H. Farlan	

First page of the petition from members of the University of Michigan sophomore class (Class of 1876) informing the faculty of their involvement in hazing. Reprinted with permission of the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. ("Sophomore petition," 1874)

Blank No. 1.

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

The rules of this Company require that all messages received for transmission, shall be written on the message blanks of the Company, under and subject to the conditions printed hereon, which conditions have been agreed to by the sender of the following message.

ANSON STAGER, Gen'l Sup't., }
CHICAGO, ILL. }

WILLIAM ORTON, Pres't, } NEW YORK.
GEO. H. MUMFORD, Sec'y. }

Dated *Ann Arbor Mich May 5 1874*

Received at *Ann Arbor Mich*
J. Trust-Angell

*Accept congratulations
of our Trustees and
faculty on determined
stand of your University
against hazing please
send full list
W S White*

Telegraph from President White at Cornell to Michigan's President Angell requesting "full list" of students suspended from the University of Michigan for hazing, May 5, 1874. Reprinted with permission of the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. (White, 1874b).

Buffalo N.Y. -
~~Ann Arbor, Sept.~~ May 24, 1874. 6

TO THE FACULTY:

I hereby promise that, during the period of my connection with the University, I will abstain from hazing and from any attempt to interfere with the government of the University.

Albert B. Stevens

Card promising to abstain from hazing signed by a student at the University of Michigan, May 24, 1876. These cards were originally printed for suspended students returning to campus to sign in September 1874. Reprinted with permission of the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. ("Hazing abstention pledge," 1874).

TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF FRATERNITY/SORORITY PROGRAMS: A CONTENT ANALYSIS

PIETRO A. SASSO

Fraternity/sorority standards have been represented as the answer to the Call for Values Congruence authored by the Franklin Squared Group (2003). The outcome of this document was a proliferation of various styles and models of standards programs utilized to establish community practices with the overarching goal of facilitating values-based fraternity and sorority campus communities. However, fraternity/sorority standards programs answering this call have established higher standards through different methods. This study solicited standards programs from institutions from across the United States. Data from 31 standards programs were collected, cataloged, and analyzed through qualitative inquiry with the use of a rubric developed to establish a typology. Five categories resulted from analysis: evaluation, minimum standards, accreditation, awards, and comprehensive. Implications of the study are included along with future directions for research.

Within the last 20 years, fraternities and sororities have continued to be featured in a number of high-profile incidents leading to negative perceptions of the organizations. News reports of incidents of alcohol-related deaths and other issues resulting from fraternity and sorority alcohol abuse lend credibility to these perceptions (Wall, 2005). For fraternities, these include racially charged party themes, hazing incidents, and most recently offensive comments about women (Kaplan & Lee, 2006; Marcus, 2011). For sororities, hazing, public displays of intoxication, as well as destruction of public property during formal chapter events are commonplace themes (Cornwell, 2010). Previous research indicated these problems exist within the cultures of fraternities and sororities on American college campuses because of their strong association with alcohol (Pascarella, Edison, & Whitt, 1996). Issues associated with sorority and fraternity membership such as sexual assault, binge drinking, and hazing within fraternities and sororities persist regardless of their value to individual members and society (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996; Wall, 2005).

One of the more pragmatic attempts to address misbehavior among fraternity and sorority

members at the campus level has been to require individual chapters to align with a set of community standards structured by a procedural program or through a relationship statement. The relationship statement was originally intended to serve as a method to create space between fraternity/sorority chapters and their host institution, given their existence as a source of institutional liability. It was also the first documented attempt to address their relevance and viability as positively contributing to the campus community (Shonrock, 1998). Historically, the relationship statement was developed out of the premise that previous attempts to curb the negative aspects of the social culture of fraternities and sororities largely were not effective (Milani & Nettles, 1987). Colleges and universities chose this more drastic and proscribed approach in an attempt to bring fraternities and sororities back in alignment with university standards and expectations (Hauser, 1997).

Purpose of the Study

Without any basis for universal characteristics or guidelines, fraternity/sorority standards programs have been campus-based. This study employed the use of qualitative research

methods, utilizing content analysis, to identify universal characteristics of fraternity/sorority standards programs to provide a framework for categorization. In creating a categorical framework through qualitative inquiry, this study sought to add to the research and produce a pragmatic resource for student affairs practitioners advising fraternities and sororities.

BACKGROUND

Many institutions previously found that the development of community standards was a singular best-fit policy for addressing behaviors (Harvey, 1990). The relevancy question of fraternities and sororities, therefore, was answered and further made distinct through a relationship statement. Relationship statements defined the scope of the association between the host institution and the fraternity or sorority chapter. Such statements may have included a description of the limited purpose of recognition; acknowledgment that the fraternity/sorority letter organization was independently chartered; confirmation that the college assumed no responsibility for supervision, control, safety, security, or other services with respect to the fraternity/sorority organization; and a requirement that the fraternity or sorority provide evidence that it carried sufficient insurance to cover its risks (Gulland & Powell, 1989).

A relationship statement can be restrictive and can be overbroad in its scope. This has led to several issues on college campuses questioning the actual relationship between the fraternity/sorority community and the institution (Harvey, 1990). Although the existence of such a recognition statement might defeat a claim that the institution has assumed a duty to supervise fraternity and sorority chapters, it might also limit the institution's authority to regulate the organization's activities (Kaplin & Lee, 1995). However, the poor design and implementation of relationship statements led to several institutions facing liability issues because they failed

to narrow or define the scope of their relationship with fraternities and sororities (Kaplin & Lee, 2006; Pavela, 1995). Thus, the relationship statement has been deemed an ineffective singular policy approach (Pavela). The response to the failure of relationship statements, persistence of high-profile incidents, and research findings indicating the negative outcomes associated with membership facilitated a new multifaceted approach, the values-based movement.

Fraternity and sorority leaders and campus-based professionals launched the values-based movement in an attempt to refocus organizations on their founding values. These values are unique to each organization, however; there are elements that are common and shared across all organizations such as friendship, service, scholarship, and leadership. These values hold the underlying notion that acquaintance and loyalty to one another helps to advance the furthering of lifelong camaraderie also commonly associated as brotherhood and sisterhood. Additionally, it is also common that rites of passage further mark the transition and progression of membership. Service and leadership within the institution as well as scholarship are the essential and valued characteristics of a traditional fraternity and sorority experience. The values-based movement was spearheaded by the Franklin Square Group, an assembly of 20 college and university presidents and inter/national fraternal organization leaders representing several organizations, campus representatives, and academic consortia, which met in Washington, D.C. to consider and address the state of fraternities and sororities (Franklin Square Group, 2003).

In 2003, the Franklin Square Group issued *A Call for Values Congruence* to express concerns over the focus of the "liquid culture" of the fraternity/sorority system and to establish recommendations regarding the sustainability of fraternity and sorority chapters across the nation. The authors supported the notion that fraternities and sororities were a bastion for alcohol misuse that caused a dichotomy between their stated mis-

sions and their actual behaviors. The report also supported the notion that fraternities and sororities impact student culture in ways that no other student organization can through experiential learning opportunities outside the classroom. This juxtaposition led the authors to call for “the development of programs and policies addressing alcohol abuse based upon research findings and established best practices and oversee their implementation” (p. 6). It is through this recommendation for the use of best practices that *A Call for Values Congruence* advocated for the use of a periodic “certification process” to involve multiple external stakeholders ranging from local alumni to faculty. This certification process is reflected within the Collegiate Greek Community Standard (CGCS).

The CGCS is a framework for creating minimum policy and programming standards processes that fraternity and sorority chapters must meet to be recognized annually. It is a certification process for which each fraternity and sorority chapter must show how it has respectively met the listed standards. An external committee of alumni, faculty, and staff volunteers reviews this evidence. The Franklin Square Group (2003) devised a certification process model for fraternity/sorority standards programs within *A Call for Values Congruence*. It was the goal of this program to provide an active approach for programming and community standards for a campus system to address and ultimately reduce binge drinking and other related negative effects of fraternity/sorority involvement.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF FRATERNITY/SORORITY STANDARDS PROGRAMS

Dartmouth College established the first documented set of fraternity/sorority standards in 1983 (Norman, 2003). These policies, entitled “Constitution and Minimum Standards for Co-Ed, Fraternity & Sorority Organizations” (Hokanson, 1992, p. 20), included categories for leadership, membership, budgets, program

development, alumni, student conduct, and housing appearance. There were no clearly set criteria on what determined standards or benchmarks. The categories were open to judgment by evaluators as to whether organizations had effectively “passed” the review. While this program was simply a categorical review, other institutions began to set standards through engagement in self-study utilizing survey data, academic status measures, and recruitment statistics to gauge the condition of its fraternity/sorority community during the 1980s and into the early 1990s (Boyle, 1992).

Colby College and Franklin and Marshall College conducted summative self-studies on early standards programs in the 1980s (Boyle, 1992). Rutgers University engaged in a series of three self-studies beginning in 1980 and ending in 1992. Self-studies through formative evaluation were conducted by Middlebury College and Bucknell University in 1988 and 1990 respectively. The University of Minnesota also engaged in self-study to better increase retention of fraternity members and increase membership in 1987. In 1991, Duquesne University also engaged in an academic year self-study to gauge the health of its community. These self-studies were based on specific need and only established additional community standards or policies. None outlined any measures, methods, or strategies for improvements in individual chapters (Boyle, 1992). More comprehensive programs were developed in the early 1990s that addressed the needs of individual chapters through measuring their performance against specific standards.

Fraternity/sorority standards programs, more comparable to the model proposed by the Franklin Square Group (2003) originated from an earlier effort, Utah State University’s Five Star Program. This program evaluated each chapter yearly in several categories: academics, financial management, college relations, community relations/service, and campus involvement (Norman, 2003). The categories were weighted with 100 points for academic activi-

ties and 50 points for all others. Specific point totals were assigned to certain achievement levels ranging from one to five stars. This was used as a barometer for chapter well-being. While the objective for the program was to simply assess the overall health of the chapter based upon criteria, there were no minimum standards. Therefore, there were no consequences for failing to meet any minimum standards. There also were no established criteria for improvement. A similar, but more complex program was developed by the University of Delaware (Norman).

The University of Delaware established the Five Star Chapter Evaluation Program for its entire community that had significantly more depth and breadth than the Utah State University program. Delaware's program objectives established criteria for improvement and ramifications regarding recognition from the university. Consequences included removal of recognition for noncompliance and removal of recruitment privileges for failure to comply with minimum standards (Norman, 2003). The program evaluated each chapter based upon specific criteria: academics, financial management, university/community relations and service, campus involvement, and membership intake/pledge program. Points were based upon each performance indicator or standard that when totaled, equaled 350 points. The program was weighted toward the academic and membership intake/pledge program categories, each worth 100 points; the remaining categories were worth 50 points each. Chapters received a number of stars ranging from one to five based on their total number of points. Those chapters with the highest point totals (four or five stars) received cash awards, and those with one or two stars lost social or recruitment privileges (Norman).

By 2000, many other colleges had adopted Delaware's Five Star Chapter Evaluation Program including Clemson University, the University of Toledo, Central Michigan University, the University of Texas San Antonio, the University

of Central Arkansas, Shippensburg University, the University of South Dakota, and even Utah State University. Other colleges and universities developed similar programs as well (Farrell, 2006). For example, Oklahoma State University developed the Chapter Quality Achievement Program in 2000. This was a point-based, voluntary program that sought to encourage participation through improvement over time. The program was designed to have two award levels, exemplary performance and commended performance, to reward those individual chapters that exceeded minimum standards. In 2001, Bucknell University began a compliance-based accreditation program similar to that proposed by the Franklin Square Group.

In the Bucknell program, each chapter must achieve 90 percent of points to be in good standing (Bucknell University, 2002). Chapters that fail to achieve 90% are placed on "Conditional Recognition" and face sanctions that include a \$500 accreditation review fee and must receive special permission to have events with alcohol, recruit, participate in intramurals, and participate in fraternity/sorority week. If the chapter continues to fail to meet compliance standards, the chapter is placed into "Stayed-Suspension Status" in which the chapter is charged \$1,000 and loses most recognition privileges. If noncompliance continues, the chapter is closed for up to three years. The Bucknell program also offers awards to those chapters that go beyond the standards. These chapters are eligible for silver and gold levels that featured the ability to receive \$2,500 to \$5,000 grants for non-alcohol related events and a recognition plaque. The incentive portion of the program is optional if chapters choose to exceed the 90% compliance minimum (Bucknell University).

In 2006, the University of Rochester established the Expectations for Excellence program. This accreditation-style program encourages chapters to become college-centered through co-sponsorship of programming between other

campus organizations and facilitating increased use of campus services. Each fraternity and sorority chapter creates an individual plan with proposed events and strategies for the academic year. This plan is presented and approved by an advisory board and later outcomes from this approved plan are presented again to another board. A chapter receives accreditation if the outcomes are congruent with the original individual chapter plan. The University of Rochester plan is significantly different than others because it is not based on a sliding scale or levels like those aforementioned, but instead functions through a certification process.

These programs, overall, were developed with no true guiding typology. Their individual institutional nature and best-fit development has created the absence of a true model because they are so diverse in delivery and in user experience. Therefore, a typology is needed to help practitioners navigate the diverse differences of style among fraternity and sorority standards programs.

METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Dataset

This study employed a homogeneous purposeful sampling procedure to obtain a representative sample reflective of the different styles of fraternity/sorority standards programs. One hundred nine fraternity/sorority-advising professionals were solicited via e-mail to submit their standards program for use. Forty-one responses were received over a three-week period, for a 37.6% response rate. Thirty-one respondents, consisting of college and university representatives from seven states in the Pacific Northwest, Mid-Atlantic, Midwestern, Southern, and Northeastern regions of the United States, sent programs. Additionally, the sample was found representative when checked against 31 colleges and universities selected at random from the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors member database.

Overview of the Instrument

The Greek Standards Project Rubric (GSPR) was developed to measure the characteristics of each program (see Appendix A). The rubric examined fraternity/sorority standards programs on five sectional levels. These levels were: theoretical orientation, policy, process, procedure, and outcomes. A description of each level follows.

Theoretical orientation considered evidence of administrative frameworks, use of student involvement theory, leadership development initiatives, chapter management initiatives, housing management initiatives, and clear program goal articulation. Policy categorized incentive or reward, residential/housing policy, minimum standards for continued recognition, generation of competition for resources, a ranking or sliding scale, accreditation-style processes, use of a metric or standard rating scale, community standards or values, consequences for noncompliance, formation of judicial council specific only to the campus fraternity/sorority system, compliance or mention of federal or state law, and evidence of language regarding mandatory or voluntary participation.

Process considered the end user's experience of the program on two levels: administrative and chapter. On the administrative process level, the GSPR sought evidence of specificity among chapters or governing councils, involvement of alumni councils or chapter alumni boards, extension of program to fraternity/sorority housing, use of resources, use of staff, number of staff necessary to implement the program standards, number of stakeholders involved with the program, expenditure of resources, and administration. On the chapter process level, the GSPR sought evidence of duplication of forms to international and/or national headquarters, number of chapter members involved, and expenditure of resources. Procedure considered to what extent the program was implemented and rewards were distributed. Finally, outcomes observed the deliverables of the program, existence of

proposed learning outcomes, archival of results for future use, and sharing of the results.

Procedure

Each participant was e-mailed individually confirming receipt of submission and was debriefed utilizing a standard message. The 31 programs received were downloaded and analyzed for content and language. The GSPR was used in the analysis of each program within the sample to develop salient themes. Content analysis was selected as the appropriate qualitative inquiry method. Patton (2002) defined content analysis as, “any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings” (p. 453). An inductive procedure was used to condense raw data into categories or themes based on valid inference and interpretation (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This inductive procedure was the directed content analysis method. When utilizing directed content analysis, initial coding starts with a theory or relevant research findings. Then, during data analysis, the researcher becomes immersed in the data and allows themes to emerge from the data (Hsieh & Shannon). The purpose of this approach traditionally is to validate or extend a conceptual framework or theory (Berg, 2001).

In this study, the researcher utilized the GSPR as a rubric to generate a guiding theoretical framework. Low, moderate, and high levels were assigned in response to each criterion. Submitted programs were then coded and recoded until saturation utilizing the individual criteria from the GSPR. Themes were then created utilizing a constant comparison method.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Analysis of 31 programs resulted in five program categories. These included: evaluation ($n = 4$), minimum standards ($n = 6$), awards ($n = 4$), accreditation ($n = 10$), and comprehensive ($n = 7$). Within each category, the programs dis-

played significant commonalities and characteristics (see Table 1). Descriptions of each follow.

Evaluation

Evaluation programs were mandatory, singular-level programs that offered a grade for chapter performance. Evaluation programs displayed significantly strong administrative frameworks with every evaluation plan within the sample utilizing chapter management initiatives. There was a low level of student development theory use, and not all the programs had clear goals. There was virtually no mention of federal law or evidence of compliance with hazing and alcohol state law. Evaluation programs were completely mandatory and points-based. There was evidence of a standard grading rubric for each. There were outlined consequences for noncompliance in two phases: probation and then removal of recognition. Evaluation programs were also not resource-intensive.

The evaluation program took only one staff member to implement and usually involved between two and four other constituencies. The most common constituencies of evaluation were the chapter, the student conduct office, and the alumni advisor. The cost of the program was limited to the cost of paper and time. The fraternity/sorority campus-based practitioner typically administered the evaluation. Chapters typically involved their membership and invested resources on an as-needed basis.

Chapters typically submitted a three-ring binder at the end of the year demonstrating completion of the program criteria and its associated forms. There was also a rolling submission of forms throughout the academic year for membership rosters and event registration forms as these programs had a very high administrative framework. The outcomes of evaluation programs did not include learning outcomes, however; typically these outcomes were chapter-level programming that resulted from compliance with the standards, submission of forms, and the end of year evaluation. The re-

sults were archived for future use and shared with each chapter via conference or an e-mail notification.

Minimum Standards

Minimum standards programs were mandatory, singular-level programs that offered a high level of requirements with no option for advancement. Chapters were required to complete the program to retain recognition annually. Minimum standards programs featured a strong administrative framework with specific deadlines for submission of forms. There was limited use of student development theory and leadership initiatives but a high level of chapter management initiatives. There was also a moderate amount of housing initiatives involving student conduct and facility management. There was strong program goal articulation with an administrative basis for the existence of the programs.

Minimum standards programs were typically, like evaluation programs, not incentive-based. Minimum standards programs were used for residential and nonresidential fraternity/sorority communities. Minimum standards programs did not rank or grade chapters, however; they did include standard checklists for requirements. There was a moderate level of compliance with federal law regarding housing and a strong compliance with state law involving alcohol, housing codes, and hazing. Minimum standards programs displayed moderate use of fraternity/sorority judicial board with removal of recognition as the only penalty for noncompliance. There were no options for probation or lesser penalties. Like evaluation programs, there was little involvement from external constituents beyond the alumni advisor.

Minimum standards programs required one staff member and included the costs of paper and time to implement. The fraternity/sorority campus-based practitioner typically administered the evaluation. Chapters typically involved their membership and invested resources on an

as-needed basis. Chapters submitted required documents and forms on a rolling basis. The outcome of the program included submission of forms and recognition for the following academic year. There were no proposed learning outcomes for any minimum standards program. Results were archived for future use and shared with chapters via conference or not at all.

Awards

Awards programs were voluntary, singular-level incentive programs that encouraged participation and distributed rewards to the highest achieving chapters. Awards programs had a low administrative framework, as each chapter must simply submit documentation for each award for which they choose to apply. There was no evidence of student development theory and low existence of chapter management, housing, and leadership initiatives. The goals of these programs were clearly evident. The basis of existence of these programs was to recognize "model" chapters.

These programs featured a high level of competition for resources and chapters received rewards based on a ranking/sliding scale or via a standard metric utilized to determine eligibility. Awards programs did not comply or even mention state or local laws, involve alumni, nor offer minimum standards. However, awards programs did cater to a significantly broader range of constituencies that included alumni advisors, individual members, chapters, governing councils, or faculty advisors. Awards programs required at least two staff members to administer, usually from the fraternity/sorority involvement office, and required resources such as the cost of paper, awards, and time invested. Many of the awards included monetary compensation. Chapters utilized their membership on an as-needed basis to facilitate submission of awards applications.

Chapter members typically experienced awards programs through submission of supporting documents via a three-ring binder.

Awards were distributed at the end of the year, often at a large event. Awards established equity as all chapters were eligible and encouraged to apply. The outcome of the awards programs was the presentation of rewards. Award winners were documented and archived for future use, and results were shared utilizing a variety of methods such as via a banquet or ceremony.

Accreditation

Accreditation programs were mandatory, multilevel programs that offered recognition on a yearly basis. Chapters were expected to submit a plan at the beginning of the year and submit an end-of-year report that documented how they implemented their proposed plan. These plans were typically based on minimum standards or expectations set by the institution. If their plan met the basic expectations or minimum standards and resulted in at least a satisfactory rating, chapters retained full recognition privileges. Accreditation programs featured a heavy administrative framework and strong use of leadership, housing, and chapter management initiatives. Goals of the accreditation programs were well articulated and there was a moderate use of student development theory.

Accreditation programs did not offer awards as a part of the certification process. Instead, they offered minimum standards for continued recognition. If there was noncompliance, a chapter was put on probation and if noncompliance continued recognition was revoked. Several programs incorporated referrals to a fraternity/sorority judicial board. Chapters were usually certified by a ranking/sliding scale or simple status designation utilizing a standard rubric. No formal evaluations were assigned, unlike evaluation programs. Accreditation programs showed strong support for local and state level alcohol and hazing regulations and for federal laws regarding housing.

Accreditation programs were resource-intensive. The cost of paper and time was heavier than those of the aforementioned programs.

Additional staff and human capital was usually required. Accreditation programs were submitted via a three-ring binder to a committee of faculty, staff, and alumni for review. These individuals were usually volunteers. Accreditation programs were implemented by one to four staff members and varied depending on the resources of the individual program. These programs typically included four to seven reviewers such as residential life staff members, student conduct officers, senior administrators, housing boards, alumni councils, or student activities staff. The fraternity/sorority campus-based practitioner typically administered the evaluation. Chapters typically involved their membership and invested resources on an as-needed basis of the program. Chapters submitted forms and documentation on a rolling basis, however; all information was presented in aggregate at the end of the year.

The outcomes of accreditation programs were chapter-level programming and yearly assessment. There were few, if any, proposed learning outcomes. All results of the programs were archived for future use and shared to a committee via a presentation, letter/e-mail notification, conference, and Web site.

Comprehensive

Comprehensive programs were mandatory, multilevel programs that featured the characteristics of evaluation, minimum standards programs, or accreditation coupled with awards. Comprehensive programs had strong administrative frameworks with moderate integration of student development theory. They had high levels of leadership and chapter management initiatives. Housing initiatives were apparent in a few of the programs. The goals of the program were clearly stated. The existence of the program was to provide incentive for chapters to exceed minimum expectations and standards.

As previously mentioned, every comprehensive program was incentive- or rewards-based. Comprehensive programs were also two-tiered.

At the first level, much like accreditation programs, there were minimum standards that all chapters should meet. If a chapter chose, it could exceed these standards to be eligible for rewards. These higher standards were the second level of the program. This level was either accreditation-style or an evaluation through a ranking/sliding scale. Each style of assessment was characterized by the use of a standard rubric or metric for evaluation. If a chapter failed to meet the minimum expectations, they were either given probationary status, removal of recognition, or referred to a fraternity/sorority judicial board. Referral to a fraternity/sorority judicial board was specific to those programs that integrated the use of judicial sanctions and hearing panels. Comprehensive programs also featured strong levels of compliance with state and local hazing and alcohol laws. However, there was poor compliance with federal law.

Like accreditation programs, comprehensive programs were resource-intensive. The costs to implement comprehensive programs included rewards, time, and paper. However, unlike accreditation programs, an ample supply of staff was not apparent. One to three was the range of staff members involved with the process. Typically responsibility of program administration was given to the fraternity/sorority office staff. There were high levels of duplication of forms and standards to the inter/national headquarters as well. Chapters participated through providing the necessary leadership as required by the programs through positions such as president, recruitment chair, membership educator, risk management officer, and other leaders. Chapters also involved members as needed to submit forms and end-of-year reports.

Comprehensive programs were implemented via rolling submission of forms and through submission of a three-ring binder. Rewards were given to those chapters who surpassed the minimum standards based on program-specific eligibility requirements. The rewards did not establish equity among chapters, as there was lim-

ited availability of awards. This instituted a high level of competition for resources. There was no evidence of proposed learning outcomes. Results were archived for future use and are shared with chapters and as well other constituencies via Web site, conference, and e-mail.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the spectrum of standards programs across the United States using qualitative methods. Through the employment of qualitative inquiry, five salient themes developed. These themes were used to develop a typology of standards programs, which was the intent of this study. The typology of standards programs as identified by this study is: accreditation, evaluation, minimum standards, awards, and comprehensive.

No additional research currently exists regarding fraternity/sorority standards programs. Therefore, this study serves as a foundational benchmark. While this study is merely a baseline for possible future research regarding fraternity/sorority standards programs, it does reveal the diversification of standards programs that involve complex systems of policies and procedures.

The complexity is evident in the accreditation and comprehensive models, which were the most common within the sample of the study. These were multilevel programs with multifarious groupings of thematic expectations. Expectations were grouped under specific core values associated with the fraternity/sorority community. This same complexity was also indicated in the measurement of performance.

As higher education professionals have evolved these programs from relationship statements into self-study as previously documented, each of these programs addresses the need to establish a set of minimum standards or set expectations regarding the performance levels of individual chapters. However, the distinct difference between comprehensive or accreditation programs and the other models is

how they measure this performance. The other models of minimum standards and awards, with the exception of evaluation, offered little measurement of performance. Comprehensive, accreditation, and evaluation all measured performance through a qualitative or quantitative designs. These programs have a point system for standards and include several levels upon which performance can be based. Additionally, others have introduced standards on a sliding scale with increasing standards implemented over a specific timeframe. The true distinction between the programs is that evaluation and accreditation measure chapter compliance and performance whereas awards and minimum standards enforce or encourage standards. Comprehensive programs encompass all the elements of incentives for minimum standards and evaluate chapter performance. One can conclude that whether performance of chapter is measured is the true determination of the type of fraternity/sorority program.

Regardless of the individual style or approach, this research study also provides advisors and other campus-based professionals a typology of programs. This typology can act as a compass with which they can navigate the vast landscape and offerings of standards programs with more ease. The typology found within this research also holds several implications for campus professionals.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Selecting a Typology

The typology this study generated can be utilized in discussions regarding the development of standards programs for a campus fraternity/sorority community. It can also serve as a guide in the classification of any program that can be applied to better clarify the purpose of an existing program. Additionally, the five typologies that emerged can be utilized and implemented with regard to the specific needs of the fraternity/sorority community.

An evaluation model can be utilized to measure the current performance of chapter during a single academic year. An evaluation model simply provides feedback data on performance. Campus professionals should employ such a program if they wish to provide a quantitative measure that demonstrates improvement or deficiencies within specific domains the program seeks to measure.

A minimum standards model could be developed when there is little institutional support for the fraternity/sorority community. Minimum standards can serve as an administrative framework to ensure compliance with a specific range of policies. This model would serve as a best-fit approach in a campus environment that facilitates little support for the fraternity/sorority community.

An awards model can be best employed to encourage progress toward an ideal chapter. In this study, submission for awards was voluntary to encourage competition for resources among chapters. Such a program should be implemented to encourage the submission of information and to reward chapters for specific accomplishments. These accomplishments should take the form of each award.

An accreditation model can be introduced when an institution can exert control over the recognition of fraternities and sororities. Accreditation models encourage chapters to set their own expectations based on minimum standards or agreed upon community principles. This can be used to offer continued recognition and then facilitate interventions for struggling chapters. An accreditation plan may be an effective method to ensure compliance and development of chapters through offering continued recognition and its associated privileges.

Albeit resource-intensive, a comprehensive model can be implemented when there is strong institutional support for the fraternity/sorority community. Within this study, a comprehensive model encouraged the development of chapters to exceed minimum expectations through

the use of incentives. Student affairs practitioners can use such a program type to facilitate increased development within their chapters.

Each of these five types of awards can be utilized specifically to meet a desired purpose: to measure performance, exert control, recognize accomplishment, or encourage development of chapters. Their specific nature simply limits their efficacy as programs and serves to restrain development of chapters as complex organizations. Individuals charged with authoring or revising standards programs should consider several additions based on the findings from this article. These suggestions will now be addressed.

Tailoring a Standards Program

The fraternity/sorority programs that comprised the sample failed to mention whether they were inclusive of all collegiate fraternal organizations. Fraternity/sorority standards programs, within this sample, appeared to develop the expectations based on traditional fraternities and sororities. Campus professionals should be mindful of all fraternities and sororities, including ethnic, service, and professional fraternities and sororities. Therefore, it is suggested that standards programs consider participation from all fraternal organizational types across the host institution.

Standards should express, in more detail, exactly what constitutes an exemplary chapter. The idea of a high-achieving chapter draws its origins from the work of Jelke (2001) and appears as well in the Franklin Square Group (2003). Programs should outline the specific tenets of a “model” chapter. Within the sample of this study, in comprehensive programs, many discussed the notion of a model chapter but failed to outline the programming, qualities, or achievements that define it as such. A model chapter can be communicated as simply as a listing of specific ideal achievements or categories with qualified values such as community service, programming, or academics.

Within many of these programs, especially

within the comprehensive model, there were only two achievement levels. This establishes a dichotomy—a chapter was either a model chapter or was not. Therefore, future programs should strongly consider applying a tiered approach and have emerging, foundational, intermediate, and advanced levels for each learning outcome or expectation in a standards program. It appears in many of the programs that an achievement gap is created as several offered privileges to high-performing chapters that others do not receive. In several instances this included the ability to recruit first-semester students if a chapter achieved a specific composite grade point average for both the new members and active membership. A developmental approach would provide better support for struggling chapters and chapters, as well as advisors, who can better conceptualize growth over a range of levels instead of simply examining a more dichotomous result.

Direction of noncompliance should also be made more distinctive and clear. There was little evidence of consequence for standards noncompliance within the sample of this study. In several programs when noncompliance was outlined, consequences were punitive. Student affairs practitioners should, when developing or amending these programs, consider offering rewards to establish better accountability measures rather than extend disciplinary measures related to a violation of a minimum standard (Sasso, 2008). Additionally, practitioners may wish to consider a more educational approach to affirm, within the program, that those chapters that minimally do not meet expectations from the standards program must work with their inter/national headquarters to improve. Such an educational intervention approach may ensure that struggling chapters are supported in their endeavors to align with the standards and meet the program expectations.

It has been aforementioned that the initial intent of fraternity/sorority standards programs was to exert control as an intervention

or response against negative behaviors scouring the student experience and causing significant institutional liability. This approach has been the ethos of fraternity/sorority programs as they have evolved; however, student affairs practitioners should consider a broader approach. This ethos is the notion that fraternities and sororities are slow to change and that an intervention must be facilitated to align with the institutional mission of the university (Gregory, 2003). However, these standards programs have simply encouraged the same homeostasis that they were initially designed to transform. Standards programs have been established simply to reduce negative behaviors but have evolved in an attempt to legitimize interactions with students as the programs have increased in complexity and delivery as demonstrated within the comprehensive model. This has led to greater bureaucracy as a majority of the programs were found to be resource-intensive and did not focus on developmental outcomes for both individual students as fraternity/sorority members and their chapters.

Campus-based practitioners should seek to establish fraternity/sorority standards programs that operate as a smaller component of an integrated curriculum utilizing student development theory. Individual students, within their chapter, should interface with a sequence of programming connected to developing their chapter as a learning organization. Programs, with clear measureable outcomes, should be focused and facilitated to support student learning and not used to establish more administrative protocol, procedure, and policy. Within the sample, only comprehensive, accreditation, and evaluation programs demonstrated even moderate use of student development theory in their application. There were virtually no references, though it was clearly evident it was applied and mentioned within the programs. However; one program did cite the Astin (1993) *Input-Environment-Output* (IEO) *model* and several cited Astin's (1984) Student Involvement Theory.

Standards programs should be construct-

ed with expected learning outcomes based on the values of the fraternity/sorority community. These programs should encourage chapters to set their own goals based on a set of agreed upon standards comprised within a rubric. For example, campus-based practitioners could easily utilize Magolda's (2004) Self-Authorship Theory and have chapters answer the questions across the continuous developmental areas of epistemological, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. These questions are: (1) how do I know; (2) who am I; and (3) how do I want to construct relationships with others (Magolda, 2004). One could develop an accreditation program where chapters answer these questions through a comprehensive report or presentation, critically reflecting on how they demonstrate their values and provide for the development of their members. While just an example framework, such as approach may demonstrate learning through documenting developmental outcomes in chapters and would help codify chapters as learning organizations.

LIMITATIONS

The GSPR is not a scientifically validated measure. It is merely a rubric devised to help guide qualitative inquiry to formulate a typology. It is intended to be utilized to comprehensively examine fraternity/sorority standards programs. Furthermore, though efforts were made to ensure representativeness, the sample size and sampling strategy limits generalizability. The results of this study should only be generalized to the population of college undergraduates who participated within these programs. One of the primary limitations of this study is the demand characteristics of the researcher. The researcher had extensive *a priori* knowledge and experience with fraternity and sorority administration and involvement. This may have unduly influenced participants to provide socially desirable responses in the submission of programs for the study.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The relationship statements set forth in broad terms the mutual responsibility of the institution and its recognized fraternity and sorority chapters. This approach led to even more serious liability concerns for institutions that poorly implemented them. What has worked is the development of fraternity/sorority standards programs effective in aligning the institution's mission with that of the fraternity/sorority system. This closes the gap that *A Call for Values Congruence* (2003) claims existed. Kohlberg (1984) echoed this notion when he stated, "right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and standards that have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society" (p. 39). Moreover, the current nature of standards programs for fraternities and sororities remains somewhat provincial. Measuring learning outcomes, the application of a developmental approach, and embedding a theoretical framework should be the next evolution of the traditional standards programs for a fraternity/sorority community.

Fraternity/sorority standards programs should work to frame their programs on student learning outcomes. Without this grounding, administrators may be merely encouraging programming and utilizing standards programs as a locus of control. However, the question remains what students are gaining from these programs. Incorporating tenets of fundamental student development theories would help frame desired learning outcomes embedded in a standards program. Documenting learning outcomes from participation would help address relevancy question raised by the Franklin Square Group (2003).

This research also provides advisors and other campus-based professionals a typology of programs with which they can navigate the vast landscape and offerings of standards programs with more ease. While this study is merely a baseline for the research regarding fraternity/sorority standards programs, it will hopefully generate future research. What exists currently with standards programs involves a complex set of policies and procedures. Thus, future research should examine the effectiveness of each of the categories within the typology established in this study.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. (1993). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student Involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Boyle, J. P. (1992). *Fraternities and sororities: The development and initial assessment of a model for institutional self-study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 9319143)
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bucknell University. (2002). *The plan for prominence in fraternity and sorority affairs*. Bucknell University: Lewisburg, PA.
- Cornwell, L. (2010). Associated Press: Sororities' antics spur school alcohol efforts. *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from: http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2012271946_apusororitiesgonewild.html
- Farrell, E. F. (2006). Putting fraternities in their place. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(25), A34-A36.
- Franklin Square Group. (2003). *A call for values congruence*. Carmel, IN: Association of Fraternity Advisors.
- Gregory, D. E. (2003). *The administration of fraternal organizations on North American campuses: A pattern for the new millennium*. St. Johns, FL: College Administration Publications.
- Gulland, D., & Powell, M. (1989). *Colleges, fraternities, and sororities. A white paper on tort liability issues*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Harvey, J. (1990). Fraternities and the constitution: University-imposed relationship statements may violate student associational rights. *Journal of College & University Law*, 17, 11-42.
- Hauser, G. (1997). Intimate associations under the law: The rights of social fraternities to exist and to be free from undue interference by host institutions. *Journal of College & University Law*, 24, 59-96.
- Hokanson, K. A. (1992). The changing status of fraternities at Northeastern, liberal arts colleges: Case studies of Bowdoin and Colby Colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 201.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Jelke, T. B. (2001). A cross-case analysis of Greek systems perceived to be high performing (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, AAT 3024170.
- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1995). *The law of higher education: A comprehensive guide to legal implications of administrative decision making* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (2006). *The law of higher education* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., Pascarella, E. T., & Wechsler, H. (1996, February 13). The questionable value of fraternities. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 43-45. Retrieved March 5, 2006 from Lexis-Nexis Academic.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages* (Vol. II). San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Magolda, M. B. (2004). *Making their own way*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Marcus, J. (2011). Schools for scandal: can fraternities shed their sinister image? *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=416566&c=1>
- Milani, T. E., & Nettles, W. R. (1987). Defining the relationship between fraternities and sororities and the host institution. In Winston, R. B., Nettles, W. R., & Opper, J. H., Jr. (Eds.) *New Directions for Student Services*, 40, pp. 57-74). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Norman, E. M. (2003). *Analysis of the Greek five star chapter evaluation program* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3100109)
- Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M. I., & Whitt, E. J. (1996). Cognitive effects of Fraternity/sorority affiliation during the first year of college. *NASPA Journal*, 33(3), 242-259.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pavela, G. (1995). Regulating fraternities. *Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education*, 7, 489-508.
- Sasso, P. A. (2008). *From administrator to educator: Facilitating student learning in greek affairs practice* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.
- Shonrock, M. D. (1998). Standards and expectations for Greek letter organizations. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: Transforming fraternities and sororities into learning communities* (New Directions for Student Services, 81, pp. 79-85). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wall, A. (2005). *Alcohol prevention efforts within Illinois institutions of higher education: Assessing the state of prevention*. Charleston, IL: Eastern Illinois University, College of Education and Professional Studies, Illinois Higher Education Center for Alcohol, Other Drug and Violence Prevention.
- Waugh v. Mississippi, 237 U.S. 589 (1912).
- Webb v. State University of New York, 125 S. Supp. 910 (1954).

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Pietro Sasso is a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Graduate Program and an adjunct instructor at Old Dominion University. He has previously served as a fraternity/sorority advisor on several campuses and as national vice president for Tau Delta Phi Fraternity.

TABLE 1*Fraternity/Sorority Standards Summary*

Qualification	Minimum Standards	Accreditation	Evaluation	Awards	Comprehensive
Theoretical Orientation					
Administrative framework	High	High	High	High	High
Student involvement/engagement theory	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Leadership development initiatives	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	High
Chapter management	High	High	High	High	High
Housing management initiatives	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Are the goals of the program well articulated	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	High
Purpose of the program, if no theory for basis of existence	Administration	Accreditation	Assessment	Awards	Assessment Rewards
Policy Elements					
Incentive program/rewards based	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Residential (for Greek systems with housing)	Moderate	Moderate	Low	None	Moderate
Minimum standards for continued recognition	High	High	Low	None	High
Competition for resources	Low	Low	None	High	Moderate
Ranking/sliding scale	None	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Accreditation-style	Low	High	None	None	Moderate
Rating scale via standard metric	Low	High	High	High	High
Community standards	Low	Moderate	Low	None	Moderate
Are there consequences for noncompliance	High	Moderate	Low	None	Low

TABLE 1, CONTINUED

Judicial council specifically for Greeks	Moderate	Moderate	Low	None	Moderate
Compliance described with state law	High	High	High	None	High
Compliance described with federal law	Moderate	Low	None	None	Low
Mandatory or voluntary participation	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory	Voluntary	Mandatory
Process and Administration					
Participation of chapters or governing councils	Chapters	Chapters	Chapters or Council	Chapters	Chapters
Alumni councils or chapter alumni boards involvement	Low	High	Low	Low	High
Extended to Greek system housing	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	High
Resource intensive (requires additional staff members to coordinate)	Low	Moderate	Low	None	High
Number of staff members to facilitate	One	One to Three	One	One to Three	One
Constituencies are involved	Three or Four	Four to Seven	Two to Four	One to Four	Three to Six
Cost	Cost of paper	Cost of paper	Cost of paper	Cost of rewards; Cost of paper	Cost of rewards; Cost of paper
Administrator	Residence Life or Office of Greek Life	Office of Greek Life or Student Activities	Office of Greek Life or Greek Council	Office of Greek Life	Office of Greek Life

TABLE 1, CONTINUED

Chapter Level Experience

Duplication of efforts to both Inter/National headquarters and to administration	High	High	High	Low	High
--	------	------	------	-----	------

Chapter members involved	As Needed + Chapter President				
--------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------------------------

Resources expended (human, monetary, time)	As Needed				
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Procedure

Online process	Low	Low	None	Low	Low
----------------	-----	-----	------	-----	-----

Submission of three-ring, paper-based binder	Low	High	High	High	High
--	-----	------	------	------	------

Presentation	None	High	None	Low	Low
--------------	------	------	------	-----	-----

Gradual implementation with submission of forms over specific time interval	High	High	Low	Moderate	High
---	------	------	-----	----------	------

Rewards for compliance or participation	N/A	N/A	N/A	Participation	Participation
---	-----	-----	-----	---------------	---------------

Rewards distribution	N/A	N/A	N/A	End of year awards	To highest achieving chapters
----------------------	-----	-----	-----	--------------------	-------------------------------

Do rewards, if any, establish fair equality amongst chapters?	N/A	N/A	N/A	High	Moderate
---	-----	-----	-----	------	----------

TABLE 1, CONTINUED

Outcomes of the program	Recognition	Programming Certification Recognition	Programming Evaluation Administration	Awards	Administration Rewards Accreditation or Evaluation
Proposed learning outcomes	None	Low	Low	Low	Low
Results archived for future use	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Notification of Results					
Online posting	Low	Moderate	None	Moderate	Moderate
Conference	High	High	High	Moderate	High
Letter/E-Mail Notification	Low	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Presentation to a committee	None	Moderate	None	Low	Low

APPENDIX A

Fraternity/Sorority Standards Project Rubric (GSPR)

Theoretical Orientation

1. Student Development Theory?
2. Administration Framework?
3. Student Involvement/Engagement?
4. Leadership Development?
5. If no theory for basis of existence, then what, if any, is the purpose of the program?
5. What are the goals of the program?

Policy

1. What is the structure of the program?
 - Incentive program/rewards based?
 - Minimum standards for continued recognition?
 - Competition for resources?
 - Ranking/sliding scale?
 - Accreditation-style?
 - Rating scale via standard metric?
 - Community standards?
 - Residential (for fraternity/sorority systems with housing?)
2. What are requirements?
3. Are chapters superseding international or national policies for local college/university policies?
4. What are the consequences for noncompliance? Is there a judicial council specifically for fraternities/sororities?
5. What is the congruence with state and federal laws?
6. Is program mandatory or voluntary?

Process

How is the program is experienced at two levels: administrator and chapter?

1. Administration

- Economy of scale?
 - a. Specific to ALL specific chapters or to just specific governing councils?
 - b. Does program involve alumni councils or chapter alumni boards?
 - c. Does program extend to Fraternity/sorority system housing (if applicable)?
- Resource Intensive?
 - a. How many staff members does it take to implement?
 - b. How many constituencies are involved?
 - c. How many other resources (monetary and time) does

Program cause to be expended?

- Who administers the program?

APPENDIX A, CONTINUED

2. Chapter

- Redundancy? Is chapter duplicating forms to both international or national headquarters and to administration?
- How many chapter members must be involved?
- How many resources (human, monetary, and time) does chapter expend?

Procedure

1. How is the program is implemented?

Online process?

Submission of three-ring, paper-based binder?

Presentation?

Gradual implementation with submission of forms over specific time interval?

2. Are their rewards for compliance or participation?

3. How are the rewards, if any, distributed?

4. Do rewards establish fair equality amongst chapters?

Outcomes

1. What are the outcomes of the program?

2. Are there any proposed learning outcomes?

3. Are the results archived for future use?

4. How do people find out the results?

EXAMINING THE LINK BETWEEN PLEDGING, HAZING, AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG MEMBERS OF A BLACK GREEK FRATERNITY

SEAN ROGERS, CARMEN ROGERS, & TRESHAWN ANDERSON

Black Greek-Letter Organization (BGLO) members hold strong opinions about the purposes and efficacy of pledging and hazing as a means of member initiation. Those who argue in favor of the pledge process claim it is needed to help remove those not genuinely interested in membership, develop appreciation for and pride in the organization, and generate long-term organizational commitment and sustained participation. Those who call for an end to pledging argue that whatever benefit might be gained from such bonding experiences is overshadowed by the mortal, legal, reputational, emotional, and financial risks posed for both the associations and the individuals involved. Despite decades of conjectural debate on the efficacy of pledging and hazing, to the authors' knowledge, no empirical study has examined its impact on BGLO alumni-level membership continuance. To address this deficiency, the researchers conducted a logistic regression analysis of survey responses from alumni members of a BGLO fraternity (n = 285). Results revealed no statistically significant relationship between participation in a pledge process and alumni-level membership. The implication of these findings for BGLOs and their members and leaders are discussed.

For better or worse, Black Greek-Letter Organizations (BGLOs) have largely come to be known by their association with pledging and hazing—initiation rituals, rites of passage, and other time-bound processes intended to “make” interested individuals members by subjecting them to various activities of a symbolic, affective, and informative nature. Several authors of recent BGLO scholarship contend that pledging and hazing are among the most defining characteristics of these organizations (e.g., Parks and Brown, 2005), to the point of overshadowing the impressive organizational legacies and membership rosters that contain some of (Black) America’s leading achievements and figures (Foster, 2008).

BGLO participants who argue in favor of initiation practices as a prerequisite for membership claim that they help remove those not genuinely interested in membership, develop appreciation for and pride in the association, generate long-term organizational commit-

ment and sustained participation, and facilitate bonding among fraternity and sorority members (Foster, 2008; Kimbrough, 2003; Parks & Brown, 2005). Those who argue against, frequently cite initiation mishaps that have resulted in physical or mental harm to potential members, including death, and argue that whatever benefit might be gained from hardship experience requirements is overshadowed by the mortal, legal, reputational, emotional, and financial risks posed for both the associations and the individuals involved (Kimbrough, 2009; Parks & Brown, 2005).

Whereas most research on pledging and hazing in BGLOs has focused on individual outcomes, such as member interpretations of the events they endured; the historical, psychological, and sociological bases of initiation rituals; or issues of legal ramifications of hazing, the present study examined the impact of pledging and hazing from an organizational and administrative perspective. Specifically, this study questioned

whether BGLO members who had undergone a hazing-filled pledge process were more likely to remain financially and physically active with the organization once they graduate from college. This question was asked with a perspective toward understanding how pledging and hazing might impact organizational performance, capabilities, and well-being. As Parks and Brown (2005) noted, those who defend pledging point to its ability to strengthen ties between members and the organization, while those opposed “use anecdotal evidence of BGLO members who are not financially active to undermine this argument” (p. 453). The present study shines empirical light on these competing, and heretofore untested, hypotheses.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Pledging and Hazing in the BGLO Context

Actions and conditions constituting pledging and hazing vary widely, depending upon the individual defining the terms and relevance to the psychological, sociological, or legal bases from which their definition extends (for detailed definitions and discussions, see for example Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005; Crow & Rosner, 2004; Ellsworth, 2006; Jones, 2004; Nuwer, 1999; Nuwer, 2004). Pledging tends to refer to the overarching process potential members are subjected to, which may or may not contain elements of hazing, while hazing specifically refers to acts of violence including verbal and physical brutality, forced consumption, sleep deprivation, humiliation, intimidation, and similarly harsh activities.

However, as Foster (2008) explained, pledging and hazing are difficult to distinguish among BGLO members because the pledge process is often infused with, and perhaps primarily comprised of, hazing elements such as paddling or “taking wood” and being verbally, mentally, and physically abused. It is the experience of the authors that the two terms are understood synonymously, with most BGLO

members rarely referring to the term hazing. Rather, a common challenge when meeting an unfamiliar member is: “Where did you pledge?” That the two are perceived as synonymous is further highlighted by Parks and Brown’s (2005) proposal for a new, revised membership intake process, wherein they call for a non-hazing pledge process for BGLOs. In this article, the terms pledging and hazing are used interchangeably, and the BGLO pledge process, at least until reformed in a way suggested by Parks and Brown (2005), is assumed potentially to contain hazing elements.

Creating Members for Life – An Enduring Trait of BGLOs

Before proceeding, two important points concerning this study’s approach are highlighted. The first has to deal with the focus on post-college fraternal activity and why it matters. Particularly among BGLOs, membership is intended to be for life, and members are (at least ideologically) expected to remain active participants beyond their college years through financial and activity-based participation in locality-based “alumni” and “alumnae” chapters, and with the national organization. Post-college participation has been a focus of BGLOs since their earliest days, as was reflected by Alpha Phi Alpha’s establishment of an “alumni organization” in 1917, 11 years after its founding, to encourage the continued participation of members in fraternal activities once members passed the college ranks (Wesley, 1996). A unique and enduring feature of BGLOs is that their activities extend well beyond college halls and campus yards, influencing and shaping issues of civil rights, economic development, education at all levels, political action, and community and public service—all of which require an active membership at both the collegiate and, arguably *moreso*, alumni levels. These circumstances make post-collegiate membership trends, and the impact of hazing and pledging on them, salient for BGLOs and similarly-structured organizations

and their leaders. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that not all fraternal associations and societies follow this organizational model, and as such the present study's results necessarily have limited generalizability.

Focus on Organizational Outcomes

The second point has to deal with the organizational and administrative lens used to examine the impact of pledging and hazing in this study. The BGLO at the center of the present analysis is viewed as an organization that requires inputs and resources to properly function and produce outputs. This input-output description is akin to work organizations, in which firms use employees (inputs) to produce goods and services (outputs). For BGLOs and many member-driven associations, a key input is members (and the resources they bring with them, including financial support), who work to accomplish the mission of the organization, thereby producing such finished goods as educational enhancement programs, volunteer hours, and advocacy. In the same way that voluntary employee turnover is a major concern for managers of firms because it threatens the organization's ability to perform; membership persistence within fraternal organizations is an important concern for organizational leaders because it will likely directly affect the association's capabilities. To that end, in this study, the overarching concern is with hazing and pledging as a determinant of membership persistence, since persistence is likely to affect organizational capabilities and performance. While the complex historical, legal, psychological, sociological, and college administration-related issues tied to hazing and pledging are acknowledged (for detailed analysis see Brown, Parks, & Phillips, 2005; Jones, 2004; Kimbrough, 2003; and Nuwer, 2004), the present study does not focus on these matters, except as they might relate to membership persistence-related organizational performance.

Hazing and Organizational Commitment: Is There a Theoretical Link?

To situate this study, several theoretical perspectives are used to explore how hazing might influence organizational commitment. One theme present in the discussions of hazing and pledging among BGLO initiates is that of organizational commitment. Proponents argue that the pledge process builds the commitment link between aspirants and the organization, while dissidents claim that there exist scores of pledged members who do not remain active, and thus are no more committed to the group than someone who did not endure a hazing-filled pledge process. Although these competing views are anecdotal, several theories from the domain of psychology and organization studies suggest the former argument, providing clues as to how hazing and pledging might positively affect organizational commitment. These include cognitive dissonance theory, self-identity-related theories, and organizational socialization.

Cognitive dissonance. Building on Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory, Aronson and Mills (1959) tested the hypothesis that individuals who experienced a severe initiation process were more likely to be attracted to the group than those who had endured a less severe process or none at all. Findings were consistent with their predictions, which became especially true when group members encountered dissatisfying aspects of the group, and were thus presented with internally incompatible beliefs concerning the unpleasant experiences they endured to gain admission and the realities of their present state. One behavioral response to help reduce this dissonance was for members to exaggerate their liking for the group, with higher pre-initiation severity leading to greater expressions of group attractiveness. While group attractiveness is not the same as organizational commitment in psychological terms, the constructs of attractiveness and commitment have been shown to be strongly and positively relat-

ed (Klein, Wesson, Hollenbeck, & Alge, 1999). This suggests that fraternity members who underwent hazing might be more attracted to, and therefore more highly committed to, the organization than those who did not do so. One way in which this commitment may manifest itself is through long-term membership persistence.

Self-identity theories. Several identity-related perspectives provide more clues into how hazing and pledging might lead to enhanced organizational commitment and membership persistence. Sweet (2004) used a symbolic interactionist approach to describe the ways in which fraternity rituals reconstruct the personal identities of pledges, tearing down an individual's "old self" and replacing it with a new identity that contains new social relationships and group affiliations. The importance of group affiliations is highlighted in the work of Tajfel and Turner (1986) and Turner (1987), who found that individuals create and maintain positive self-image and esteem by casting themselves as members of distinct, personally important categories and groups. Tajfel and Turner (1986) also posited that people who categorize themselves into social groupings have strong preferences for groups that are based on these personally important categories, while Stephan (1978) demonstrated that people maintain a strong preference to interact with members of their own social group rather than with members of other groups. Further, research on workplace outcomes has noted that socially similar groups are more likely to experience higher levels of satisfaction and lower turnover (O'Reilly, Caldwell, & Barnett, 1989). In short, identity theories suggest that people act in ways to serve in-group interests as a means of enhancing their own self-concept. As Sweet's (2004) findings suggested, if participation in pledging and hazing creates an organization-centered self-identity, and that "new self" becomes an integral part of the initiate's self-concept, it follows that

a member who has endured such an initiation would not readily dispatch his or her organizational affiliation but would instead be motivated to maintain it, and in doing so, would reinforce his or her self-esteem.

Organizational socialization. Finally, organizational theories of human resource management practices can help inform an understanding of the initiation-commitment link. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) outlined several tactics organizations used to socialize newcomers. Each of these socialization strategies resulted in an orientation outcome that corresponded with an individual's fit and sustainability within the organization. Collectivism and divestiture were two common socialization strategies discussed in their analysis. Collectivism included putting individuals through a rigorous, common experience, and divestiture sought to strip away certain personal characteristics of a recruit and replace them with organizational values. The latter is conceptually related to the symbolic interaction process Sweet described (2004). These tactics focused on creating a custodial orientation wherein new members were anticipated to identify with and remain committed to the group. According to scholars who study workplace environments, creating and maintaining a high degree of organizational "fit" during the organization's socialization process is seen as crucial because voluntary turnover is an individual's most common response to poor fit within a group or organization (e.g., Wheeler, Buckley, Halbesleben, Brouer, & Ferris, 2005). Regarding fraternity member organizational commitment, if pledging and hazing processes resemble collectivism and divestiture forms of organizational socialization, such practices might well work to enhance the member's level of fit with the organization, decreasing their chances of "voluntary turnover" and increase the likelihood that they remain active members beyond their college years.

METHODOLOGY

Data and the Protection of Human Subjects

Data for this study were collected as part of a larger study of fraternity membership trends. This larger project was conducted during a term in which one researcher served as a fraternity administrator. Because none of the authors were affiliated with an academic institution at the time data were collected, the project and procedures were not submitted to a university Institutional Review Board (IRB); nevertheless, great care was taken to adhere to the principles of ethical research and protection of human subjects. Although gathering information on participation in hazing and pledging presents serious concerns for potential respondents, during data collection at least three factors helped mitigate potential harm to respondents.

First, participation was completely voluntary. The point was stressed both in the email invitation message and in the introductory paragraph of the survey. In addition, respondents were encouraged to skip any question to which they felt uncomfortable responding. Finally, respondents were informed that they could exit the survey and end their participation at any time by simply closing their Web browser window.

Second, the measure of participation in pledging was a single item within a questionnaire of more than 25 items. Because the focus of the primary study for which the data were collected was not hazing, a small percentage of the questionnaire brought attention to issues of pledging and hazing.

Third, the pledging-related questionnaire item, which is described in the sample section below, asked whether respondents had been subjected to pledging as a means of fraternity initiation, *not* whether they had committed hazing themselves. While this distinction may have little meaning in terms of the emotional effects on the individuals involved, there is a great difference from a legal standpoint. Since hazing is a crime in most states (Nuwer, 2004), asking respondents

to indicate whether they have committed a crime would have marked an admission of guilt. However, the question asked of respondents in the present study did not seek, nor did it obtain, admission of criminal activity on their part.

Taken together, in the absence of an academic IRB review of the questionnaire used in this study, these factors helped to mitigate potential harm and risk to respondents. Some rudimentary analysis of the responses provided insight into whether the survey item on pledging and hazing was problematic for respondents. Less than 2% of all respondents, which included both currently inactive and active members, chose to skip the questionnaire item on their participation in pledging and hazing. In contrast, nearly four times that amount of respondents chose not to indicate their household income range. Among the individuals who did not answer the hazing/pledging item, it is plausible that those who were inactive with the fraternity would skip this item more frequently, since their lack of continued membership persistence in the fraternity might be a reflection of discontent with the process they endured. In this dataset, active fraternity members skipped the hazing and pledging item at a greater rate than did inactive members. All of this conjectural evidence suggests that asking respondents about their participation in hazing activities likely did not have seriously negative or unintended consequences.

Overview of the Dataset

Convenience sampling methods were used to invite members from one organization to participate in this study. In particular, a respondent-driven, snowball sampling approach was utilized. Snowball sampling is a common methodological approach used by organization management scholars to collect data for inferential quantitative analysis of organizational phenomena (e.g., Martins, Eddleston, & Veiga, 2002; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1987; Tepper, 1995). A Web-based questionnaire was sent to an email list of approximately 80 fraternity member

alumni contacts of one of the researchers, and those members were encouraged to forward the survey link to additional fraternity members in their social network, resulting in a total of 317 respondents. All participants were solicited from a single fraternal association. Because respondents were not selected from an *a priori* sampling frame, response rate measurements are incalculable and not meaningful when a snowball sampling method is used (Fiegener, Brown, Prince, & File, 1996).

The Web-based questionnaire remained open for data collection from August 2007 to February 2008. Both active and inactive fraternity members comprised the final sample. Membership activity was defined as being in good financial standing with the fraternity (i.e., currently paying membership dues), which reflected the organization's constitutional definition of membership standing. While this might be interpreted as a narrow conceptualization of membership activity and commitment (Parks & Brown, 2005), it reflects a form of participation that provides the organization with the financial inputs necessary to carry out its mission. As such, this conceptualization of membership activity was appropriate given our organizational and administrative conceptual approach to membership persistence.

Overview of the Instrument

Membership activity status was the dependent variable and indicated whether a member was active during the previous fraternal year. The independent variable was whether a member participated in a pledge line process of initiation, with respondents answering either "no" or "yes" to the following question: "Prior to being declared illegal by the fraternity as a manner of initiation, 'pledge lines' were processes used to initiate new members. Activities of such processes (which have never been endorsed by the national organization) included such practices as paddling, sleep deprivation, enduring physical brutality, and being required to maintain a spe-

cific appearance (such as shaving your head bald or cutting all facial hair). Did your membership intake process include your participation in a pledge line?" Several factors that might influence membership persistence of BGLO members at the alumni level, including marital status, parental status, education, income, whether the member is an active member of any other fraternal associations (the questionnaire specifically stated: "such as the [Benevolent and Protective Order of] Elks, the Boule, Freemasons, etc."), and whether the member was initiated while in college or via an alumni chapter, were statistically controlled in the analysis.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The final set of respondents consisted of 317 alumni affiliates (193 active members, 124 inactive members). A total of 32 surveys were excluded from analysis due to missing variables, resulting in a final sample of 285 respondents. No significant differences were found between the excluded cases and the final sample when tested for missing data bias. Table 1 reports the range, mean or proportion, standard deviation, and percentage of missing cases for all variables. Table 2 shows the results of a binary logistic regression used to test the impact of the initiation experience on membership persistence.

According to the model ($\chi^2 = 40.27$, $df = 12$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .183$), membership persistence was not statistically significantly related to having participated in a pledge process ($e^b = 1.594$, $p = .216$). Therefore, our findings did not support the hypothesis that members who participated in a pledge process during their fraternity initiation were more likely to be active alumni fraternity members compared to those who did not undergo such a process. Regarding the control variables, only education, membership in another fraternal association, and whether a member was initiated during or after college were significantly related to a member's current activity status. Compared to members with bach-

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics for the Sample

	<i>n</i>	Mean or Proportion*	Standard Deviation
<i>Dependent Variable</i>			
Membership activity status (1 = active)	317	0.67	0.471
<i>Independent Variable</i>			
Participation in a Pledge-Line Initiation Process (1 = yes)	311	0.73	0.443
<i>Control Variables</i>			
Marital status (1 = married)	314	0.75	0.431
Children (1 = yes)	313	0.68	0.467
Income			
Less than \$40K per year	53	0.18	
\$40K to \$70K per year	69	0.24	
\$70K to \$100K per year	62	0.21	
More than \$100K per year	110	0.37	
Education			
Less than a bachelor's degree	4	0.01	
Bachelor's degree	148	0.47	
Master's degree	130	0.41	
Professional degree	21	0.07	
Doctorate degree	14	0.04	
Membership in another fraternal organization (1 = yes)	317	0.20	0.397
Initiation during college or after graduation (1 = after)	317	0.28	0.450

*Proportions are reported for categorical variables

TABLE 2*Logistic Regression Predicting Post-College Fraternity Membership Activity*

	e^B	S.E.
<i>Control Variables</i>		
Marital status (1=married)	1.312	0.336
Children (1=yes)	1.034	0.313
Income		
Less than \$40K per year	--	--
\$40K to \$70K per year	0.555	0.419
\$70K to \$100K per year	1.406	0.455
More than \$100K per year	1.263	0.417
Education		
Less than a bachelor's degree	0.378	1.198
Bachelor's degree	--	--
Master's degree	2.153*	0.300
Professional degree	2.760	0.624
Doctorate degree	3.145	0.822
Membership in another fraternal organization (1 = yes)	2.818*	0.410
Initiation during college or after graduation (1 = after)	2.729**	0.386
<i>Independent Variable</i>		
Participation in a Pledge-Line Initiation Process (1 = yes)	1.549	0.377
Constant	0.508	0.529
n		285
χ^2		40.27
Nagelkerke R ²		0.183

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

elor's degrees, those holding master's degrees were more than twice as likely to be active members ($e^{\beta} = 2.153, p \leq .05$). While the results for members with even higher levels of education (i.e., professional or doctorate degree) were similar, they were not statistically significant. Members who were active in other fraternal groups were nearly three times more likely to be active in the focus organization than those who did not hold other memberships ($e^{\beta} = 2.818, p \leq .05$), as were those who were initiated after college rather than while in college ($e^{\beta} = 2.729, p \leq .01$).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to test whether participation in a pledging and hazing process during initiation into a BGLO was associated with increased fraternity participation at the alumni level. The study was motivated by anecdotal suggestions and theoretical predictions that hazing created stronger bonds between individuals and organizations, thereby leading to increased organizational commitment and sustained post-college participation (Parks & Brown, 2005). Controlling for demographic and familial characteristics, the results of the analysis did not find a statistically significant relationship between participation in a pledging and hazing process and membership activity status among BGLO alumni members.

These findings, contradictory to psychological theories of organizational commitment and perhaps surprising to proponents of a hazing-commitment link, might best be understood through the detailed treatment of BGLO member commitment. Parks and Brown (2005) argued BGLO member commitment is multidimensional and can be best understood as a series of concentric circles where members form commitments to several representations of fraternal life, including their "line brothers and sisters" and their chapter of initiation. The national organization, they noted, represents the outermost circle, the one farthest from the individual member.

Using this imagery, one might suspect stronger bonds to exist between BGLO members and the fraternal elements contained within those circles closer to the hazing and pledging process.

Additional data from the questionnaire used in this study also supported Park and Brown's theory. Of the inactive respondents in the current study's sample, 94% indicated they maintained close contact with their line brothers and other active and inactive members, 89% indicated that they continued to wear and display fraternity paraphernalia such as shirts, jerseys, and license plates, and 56% reported that they attended fraternity events, socials, and even official national conventions and regional and state-wide meetings. This disconnect may warrant further research, as highlighted in the following example.

As noted above, the educational, economic, political, and community-based works that BGLOs are engaged in extend well beyond the college campus and rely upon a financially and physically engaged membership at both the college and alumni levels. As an example, in October 2011, Alpha Phi Alpha dedicated the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. This \$120 million construction effort, spearheaded by the fraternity and its members, would have been likely impossible to achieve if a critical mass of the organization's member base was not committed at all levels of the concentric circles, including the national level via their financial support and physical activity. If members fail to remain committed to their BGLOs beyond their college days, the organization may miss key inputs that it needs (and that it expected to be available for lifelong use when it initiated the individuals) to effectively accomplish its mission and goals.

LIMITATIONS

The present study's findings are not without limitations and should be interpreted with caution. The sampling approach, particularly the use of convenience sampling, may have intro-

duced biases into the analysis. Further, the sample was based on members of a single fraternal association. Additionally, other potentially influential control variables, such as age, were not present. Future investigators should approach these and other issues that could affect the validity and generalizability of the findings with care.

CONCLUSION

The issue of hazing and pledging stirs intense emotions and passionate opinions from both opponents and proponents. The results of the present study suggest that participation in a pledge

process might theoretically influence more proximal dimensions of BGLO identity and attachment such as one's bond with their line brothers or sisters or their chapter of initiation. However, such participation does not guarantee membership persistence and continued financial and physical activity at the alumni and national levels. With this in mind, BGLOs and their members should carefully consider their organization's goals and objectives, and design and implement membership intake policies and programs that promote maximum organizational effectiveness and achievement and that work toward sustaining their positive legacies.

REFERENCES

- Aronson, E., & Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59*, 177-181. doi:10.1037/h0047195
- Brown, T. L., Parks, G. S., & Phillips, C. M. (2005). *African American fraternities and sororities: The legacy and the vision*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Campo, S., Poulos, G, & Sipple, J. (2005). Prevalence and profiling: Hazing among college students and points of prevention. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 29*, 137-149.
- Crow, B., & Rosner, S. (2005). Hazing and sport and the law. In H. Nuwer, (Ed.), *Hazing reader* (pp. 200-223). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Ellsworth, C. W. (2006). Definitions of hazing: Differences among selected student organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(1), 46-60.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fiegenger, M. K., Brown, B. M., Prince, R. A., & File, K. M. (1996). Passing on strategic vision: Favored modes of successor preparation by CEOs of family and nonfamily firms. *Journal of Small Business Management, 34*, 15-26.
- Foster, K. M. (2008). Black Greeks and underground pledging: Public debates and communal concerns. *Transforming Anthropology, 16*(1), 3-19. doi:10.1111/j.1548-7466.2008.00002.x
- Jones, R. (2004). *Black haze: violence and manhood in Black-Greek letter fraternities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (2003). *Black Greek 101: The culture, customs, and challenges of Black fraternities and sororities*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (2009, April 2). Sorry 'bruh,' but hazing is wrong. *The A&J Register*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncatregister.com/sorry-bruh-but-hazing-is-wrong-1.1640307>
- Klein, H. J., Wesson, M. J., Hollenbeck, J. R., & Alge, B. J. (1999). Goal commitment and the goal-setting process: Conceptual clarification and empirical synthesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 885-896.
- Martins, L. L., Eddleston, K. A., & Veiga, J. F. (2002). Moderators of the relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal, 45*(2), 399-409. doi:10.2307/3069354
- Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Nuwer, H. (2004). *The hazing reader*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., & Barnett, W. P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(1), 21-37.
- Parks, G. S., & Brown, T. L. (2005). "In the fell clutch of circumstance": Pledging and the Black Greek experience. In T. L. Brown, G. S. Parks, & C. M. Phillips, (Eds.), *African American fraternities and sororities: The legacy and the vision* (pp. 437-464). Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Stephan, W. G. (1978). School desegregation: An evaluation of predictions made in Brown v. Board of Education. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85(2), 214-238.
- Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1987). Characteristics of work stations as potential occupational stressors. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 30(2), 260-276. doi:10.2307/256273
- Sweet, S. (2004). Understanding fraternity hazing. In H. Nuwer, (Ed.), *Hazing reader* (pp. 1-13). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tepper, B. J. (1995). Upward maintenance tactics in supervisory mentoring and nonmentoring relationships. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 1191-1205. doi:10.2307/256626
- Turner, J. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw, (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 209-264). Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Wesley, C. H. (1996). *The history of Alpha Phi Alpha: A development in college life*. Baltimore, MD: Foundation Publishers.
- Wheeler, A. R., Buckley, M. R., Halbesleben, J. R. B., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2005). The elusive criterion of fit: Toward an integrative theory of multidimensional fit. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 24, 265-304.

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

Sean Rogers (B.S., M.B.A, Embry-Riddle; Ed.M., Illinois) is a Ph.D. candidate at the Rutgers University School of Management and Labor Relations. He studies volunteerism, organizational diversity, and labor and employment relations. He is a life member of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity; served as its district director (chief executive) in Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico from 2006-2008; and is a charter member of the fraternity's college chapter at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. He may be reached at serogers@rci.rutgers.edu.

Carmen Rogers (B.S., Bethune-Cookman; M.B.A., Robert Morris) is an Ed.D. candidate at the University of Arkansas College of Education and Health Professions. She studies workforce development and education, adult learning theory and practice, and nonprofit and voluntary association management. She is a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. She may be reached at cmr008@uark.edu.

Treshawn Anderson, M.A., is a Ph.D. candidate in Human Development and Family Studies at the Purdue University College of Health and Human Sciences. Her immediate research focus is centered on child care and teacher quality for children ages birth to three. She holds degrees in Child Development and Early Childhood Education from California State University, Long Beach. Treshawn is a proud member of Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, Inc. She may be contacted at treander@purdue.edu.

INTERACTIONAL DIVERSITY OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH INVOLVEMENT: FRATERNITY AND SORORITY STUDENT LEADERS' EXPERIENCES

HEATHER D. PORTER

This study examined the co-curricular experience of fraternity and sorority student leaders as it relates to their interactional diversity opportunities. Data were collected in the fall of 2008 from 75 students, representing four higher education institutions within the Southeast. Using quantitative and qualitative analyses, the researcher discovered differences in the ways fraternity and sorority student leaders involved themselves beyond the classroom and how that involvement impacted their interactional diversity experiences with peers. Further analyses revealed how fraternity and sorority student leaders perceive diversity affecting their co-curricular collegiate experience.

With the increasing number of minorities attending colleges and universities, diversity issues have become a more pressing concern for higher education institutions during the past years. As Taylor (2001) explained, "Since a primary goal of higher education is to create educated citizens, the demographic changes in the United States have spawned a reevaluation of [institutional] values and a growing emphasis on understanding the needs of diverse students" (p. 2). Researchers also have stressed the need for institutions to intentionally promote interactional diversity opportunities—defined as the chance for students to interact with others from diverse backgrounds—because college becomes the first time for many students to "encounter students with different perspectives, expand their own parochial views, and learn from peers with different cultures, values, and experiences" (Gurin, 1999b; Hurtado, 1999, p. 27).

College administrators can equip their students for lives in a pluralistic society after college by providing them with opportunities to interact with students of both similar and different backgrounds. Students' experiences in this diverse arena support them in gaining the

"skills and dispositions that are essential for living a productive, satisfying life after college in an increasingly multicultural world" (Umbach & Kuh, 2006, p. 170). This peer-to-peer contact can occur in a variety of ways on a college campus, including involvement and leadership in co-curricular organizations.

Social fraternity and sorority organizations foster an environment for their members to become involved within individual chapters and throughout the campus community. Much research has been conducted on the experience of being a fraternity- or sorority-affiliated student, in general; however, there is sparse literature on how specific subpopulations of these students, such as those holding leadership positions, are affected. Further, Hu and Kuh (2003) determined that there is not much literature on the contribution of beyond-the-classroom experiences to interactional diversity opportunities for college students. Specifically, further research is needed to understand how involvement in co-curricular and fraternity and sorority organizations foster or inhibit their members' opportunities to interact with diverse peers, and how these interactions, or lack thereof, influence the perceptions of the students involved.

The following questions guided this study:

1. What are the co-curricular experiences of fraternity and sorority student leaders?
2. Is there a difference in interactional diversity experiences of fraternity and sorority student leaders in terms of their institution type, gender, or level of leadership?
3. What is the perceived impact of fraternal and co-curricular experiences on interactional diversity opportunities?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Although there has been no past research on interactional diversity experiences of students involved in co-curricular organizations such as fraternities and sororities, there is much literature, albeit dated, on the individual concepts of diversity, involvement, and fraternity and sorority membership. The Conceptual Model of the Impact of Diversity (Gurin, 1999b) and Astin's (1984) Theory of Involvement help provide a framework and theoretical foundation for this study.

Conceptual Model of the Impact of Diversity & Benefits

Gurin's (1999b) three-tiered model of structural, classroom, and informal interactional diversity can be used to best understand how institutions create opportunities for students to become aware of diversity and participate in experiences with diverse content and individuals. Structural diversity refers to the racial and ethnic composition of the student body composition, whereas classroom diversity is defined by the varied content taught and discussed by students and faculty. Although this model focuses on the racial and ethnic characteristics of diversity, for the purpose of this study the researcher defined structural diversity to include religious beliefs, philosophies of life, family backgrounds and interests, along

with racial and ethnic characteristics (Gurin).

Past research has shown that for further diversity experiences to occur on campus, the foundation must be structural. "Research ... shows that structural diversity improves opportunities for interaction, which in turn, has positive effects on learning and democracy outcomes" (Gurin, 1999a, ¶3). Additionally, by incorporating diversity in the classroom through course content and discussions, students are able to communicate with their peers on various topics, hear viewpoints that may be different from their own, and identify commonalities and shared experiences among their peers (Yeakley, 1998). Additional opportunities for students to interact informally with diverse individuals beyond the classroom can be found through participating in academic and social organizations, cultural events, and peer groups (Gurin, 1999b).

The importance of this type of interaction across diverse groups of the student body can be seen through the effects this type of engagement has on individual students. Hurtado et al. (2003) found student involvement with diversity promoted learning outcomes, which include active and more complex ways of thinking; intellectual engagement and motivation; a range of academic skills; and democratic outcomes such as perspective taking, acceptance of difference and conflict as normal aspects of social life, and commitment to civic and racial/cultural engagement. Further, Umbach and Kuh (2006) emphasize the importance of diversity interactions by noting:

As a result of experiencing diversity in college, students learn how to work effectively with others and how to participate actively and contribute to a democratic society. Moreover, through engaging with people from different backgrounds and with different life experiences, students are adding to the foundation of skills and dispositions that

is essential for living in a productive, satisfying life after college in an increasingly multicultural world. (p. 170)

Fraternal organizations have been criticized for their lack of effort to engage in diverse experiences. Laird (2005) found that particularly white fraternities and sororities on predominantly white campuses support homogeneity and depress interactions across difference through their chapter structures and activities.

Involvement Theory & Its Benefits

Astin's (1984) Theory of Involvement defined involvement as "the amount of physical time and psychological energy that a student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 518). His theory posits that involvement is centered on a student's behavior, rather than the emotions or cognitive ability of the student (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Additionally, Astin (1977) provided an understanding for how students might benefit from their involvement in co-curricular organizations by the quantity and quality of their experiences.

Previous literature suggested students have significant and tangible benefits from involvement in co-curricular organizations. Researchers have found that students make significant gains in their cognitive and personal skill capacities including the ability to initiate responsibility, communicate, make decisions, establish and clarify perspectives and values, and manage peer influences and interpersonal relationships (Baxter-Magolda, 1992; Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994; Gellin, 2003; Huang & Chang, 2004; Hunt, & Rentz, 1994). Further, past research has indicated that these gains are further developed when students hold leadership positions within their organizations (Cooper et al., 1994). These developmental outcomes include: decision making, increased responsibility within a group (Kuh et al., 2000), inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way (Posner & Brodsky, 1995), developing purpose, civic responsibility

value development (Schuh & Laverty, 1983), dealing with diversity, values clarification (Sermensheim, 1996), community involvement, and citizenship (Eklund-Leen & Young, 1997). Furthermore, leadership roles have been shown to influence students' involvement in other campus organizations, as student leaders were more significantly more active on campus than non-leaders (Eklund-Leen & Young).

Outcomes of Fraternity and Sorority Affiliation

Previous studies have revealed both affirmative and challenging outcomes related to fraternity and sorority affiliation. Scholastically, affiliation appears to have conflicting affects on academic performance and dishonesty (McCabe & Bowers, 1996; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Misner & Wellner, 1970; Wilder, et al., 1986). Fraternity and sorority members show more persistence to graduation and a greater satisfaction with their collegiate experience compared to non-members (DeBard, Lake, & Binder, 2006). In regards to the relationship between members and alcohol, the research states that membership influences the intake of alcoholic beverages. In his review of literature, Andrew Mauk (2006), described the relationship as the following, "Greeks drink more often, in larger quantities, and suffer more negative consequences than their independent peers" (p. 245). Socially, involvement within fraternities and sororities has shown to have a widespread affect with members benefiting from developing interpersonal relationships and learning leadership skills; while, at the same time these students were also found to be less aware and concerned about social and moral injustices, less culturally sophisticated, and more dependent on family and peers (Wilder, et al., 1978; Winston & Saunders, 1987).

Ample research on the importance of co-curricular involvement and its benefits to college students is available; however, little exists on how fraternity and sorority student leaders

participate in co-curricular activities and the influence that has on their interactions with diverse peers. Fraternities and sororities afford their members with many additional involvement opportunities either within the organization alone or in conjunction with participation in other campus activities and/or organizations (Hunt & Rentz, 1994). Although these organizations promote involvement, past research on fraternity- and sorority-affiliated students has shown that members lack exposure to diversity due to the common homogenous composition of the individual chapters and the larger fraternal community (Pascarella, Kuh, & Wechsler, 1996). It is apparent there is a gap in the literature with regard to whether and how fraternity and sorority members gain experiences with diversity if their fraternal community is not affording them these opportunities. Therefore, this study sought to explore the diversity interactions of fraternity and sorority student leaders within their co-curricular involvement experiences.

METHODOLOGY

This study followed a sequential explanatory mixed method design, using a survey and follow-up interviews (Creswell, 2003). A mixed methods descriptive design allows the researcher to compile more complete data that can be used to inform theory and practice (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). While the survey data assists the researcher in identifying the distribution of this population's experiences, the qualitative information allows for a greater understanding of this distribution (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993).

Research Sites

This study was conducted at two large public and two small private institutions in South Carolina. The two public institutions and the two private institutions share similarities with regard to size and demographics. They were purposefully selected due to the variety of social fraternity

and sorority organizations and other co-curricular organizations available at these institutions, and the location proximity to the researcher. Tables 1 and 2 show institutional and student organization characteristics of the sample.

Instrumentation and Analysis

The researcher developed the Co-curricular Involvement and Interactional Diversity Survey for this study by using the frameworks and themes from two existing surveys, College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) and The Greek Experience: A Survey of Fraternities and Sororities, and by researching previous literature. Specifically, the researcher used the "Student Acquaintances" section of the CSEQ and used Questions 56, 57, and 59 from The Greek Experience survey. The survey was piloted with a small group of sorority members from a private institution in Virginia to build construct validity and to ensure the logistics of the survey were easy to understand in order to produce non-biased answers to the questions.

Directors of fraternity and sorority life at each institution were initially contacted via e-mail and asked to assist in recruiting study participants by sending the contact lists of chapter presidents to the researcher. The approval of the University of South Carolina's Institutional Review Board was granted before any of the students were contacted. From the compiled list of chapter presidents provided by the institutions' directors, the researcher requested additional student contact information for other members with leadership positions. From a total of 131 contacts, the researcher randomly selected 25 from each institution and sent the invitation to participate in the study, as well as the survey link, by e-mail. The survey was available online for eight weeks, and reminder e-mails were sent out one time each week to encourage participation. The survey was completed and submitted by 75 of the 100 affiliated student leaders (Table 3). The researcher used SPSS software to analyze the quantitative data.

TABLE 1*Participating Institution Characteristics (Fall 2008)*

Institution	Undergraduate Enrollment	Gender Enrollment	Minority Enrollment
Clemson University	14,270	45% female	11%
University of South Carolina	18,827	55% female	18%
Newberry College	918	47% female	32%
Wofford College	1,389	48% female	13%

TABLE 2*Fraternity & Sorority Population & Co-curricular Organizations by Institution (Fall 2008)*

Institution	Historically White Fraternal Organizations	Historically Black Fraternal Organizations	% Fraternity and Sorority Members	Total Campus Organizations
Clemson University	38	9	20%	305
University of South Carolina	32	8	17%	300
Newberry College	8	2	31%	50
Wofford College	14	4	52%	84

After the quantitative research was completed, the researcher conducted follow-up interviews with six students who had participated in the survey. Using a semi-structured interview protocol, each participant was questioned regarding his/her experiences with interactional diversity as it related to his/her involvement in co-curricular organizations. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed with the participants' permissions. The researcher used pattern coding to organize the qualitative data into themes to correspond to the research questions of this study.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Results showed that fraternity and sorority student leaders gained many interactional diversity experiences through multiple avenues of involvement within their fraternal community and co-curricular organizations. Although not extensively motivated to seek out these ex-

periences on their own, informal interactional diversity opportunities provided through organizations gave student leaders opportunities to explore not only their interests, but also their perceptions about themselves and diversity. Descriptive and narrative results evidencing these findings follow.

Descriptive Results

Descriptive statistics revealed that although fraternity and sorority student leaders were involved in other organizations on campus, the amount of participation they dedicated to this involvement was limited, confirming previous research (Asel, Pascarella, & Seifert, 2009). In particular, results showed an inverse relationship between the hours spent within each type of organization. In other words, as time commitments for their fraternity and sorority organizations increased, time to dedicate to other co-curricular organizations diminished (See Table 4).

TABLE 3
Survey Participant Demographics

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Sex (<i>n</i> = 75)		
<i>Male</i>	28	37.3
<i>Female</i>	47	62.7
Race/Ethnicity (<i>n</i> = 73)		
<i>African-American</i>	4	5.3
<i>Caucasian</i>	68	90.7
Institution Type (<i>n</i> = 75)		
<i>Four-year private</i>	29	38.7
<i>Four-year public</i>	46	61.3
Year in college (<i>n</i> = 75)		
<i>Freshman (1st year)</i>	4	5.3
<i>Sophomore (2nd year)</i>	20	26.7
<i>Junior (3rd year)</i>	19	25.3
<i>Senior (4+ years)</i>	32	42.7
Cumulative GPA (<i>n</i> = 75)		
3.5-4.0	34	45.3
3.0-3.49	25	33.3
2.5-2.99	14	18.7
2.0-2.49	2	2.7
Organizational Affiliation (<i>n</i> = 73)		
<i>National Panhellenic Council (NPC)</i>	39	52.0
<i>National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC)</i>	14	18.7
<i>North American Interfraternity Council (NIC/IFC)</i>	19	25.3
Fraternity/Sorority Leadership Position (<i>n</i> = 75)		
<i>President</i>	37	49.3
<i>Vice President</i>	9	12.0
<i>Treasurer</i>	5	6.7
<i>Secretary</i>	5	6.7
<i>Chair, Co-chair, Committee Head</i>	7	9.3
<i>Other Leadership Position</i>	12	16.0

TABLE 4*Hours per Week Spent on Fraternity/Sorority vs. Other Co-curricular Organizations by Role*

Leadership Role	Hours per Week %				
	0-2	3-5	6-8	9-11	12+
President (<i>n</i> = 37)					
<i>Fraternity/Sorority</i>	0.0	10.8	21.6	23.4	43.2
<i>Co-curricular</i>	35.1	32.4	18.9	5.4	8.1
Vice President (<i>n</i> = 9)					
<i>Fraternity/Sorority</i>	0.0	55.6	33.3	0.0	11.1
<i>Co-curricular</i>	22.3	44.4	11.1	22.2	0.0
Treasurer (<i>n</i> = 5)					
<i>Fraternity/Sorority</i>	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Co-curricular</i>	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secretary (<i>n</i> = 5)					
<i>Fraternity/Sorority</i>	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Co-curricular</i>	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Chair, Co-chair, Committee Head (<i>n</i> = 7)					
<i>Fraternity/Sorority</i>	0.0	42.9	42.9	0.0	4.2
<i>Co-curricular</i>	28.6	28.6	14.4	14.4	0.0
Other Leadership Position (<i>n</i> = 12)					
<i>Fraternity/Sorority</i>	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Co-curricular</i>	41.7	16.7	33.4	8.3	0.0

Additionally, as shown in Table 5 the majority of these student leaders reported participating, or at the very least being exposed to, various types of co-curricular organizations on campus. Specifically, the fraternity/sorority student leaders mostly participated in community service/service learning groups (79.7%) and intramural/club sports organizations (62.5%), while they were least involved in organizations seeming to promote diversity such as International/language-interest groups (87.0%) and minority/ethnic groups (82.4%). The students discussed their investment in service and athletic-based organizations as being a large focus of their chapters. This result is consistent with Schuh and Laverty's (1983) finding

that student leaders have increased participation in service-oriented groups.

A further interesting finding was in regards to the extent of involvement. Although more than half of the respondents reported being involved in these organizations, their involvement remained limited to "attending a meeting and/or event" or "active involvement," meaning that these students seldom pursued leadership positions. Other than student government organizations, less than 10% of these student leaders reported having additional leadership positions within each of the other co-curricular organizations. This lack of involvement suggests that a lack of interactional diversity opportunities also could be found, as these organizations could in-

TABLE 5*Fraternity/Sorority Leader Participation in Other Co-curricular Organizations*

Organization Type/Focus	% Not Involved	% Active		
		Attended a Meeting	Involvement	% Leader
Academic Major (<i>n</i> =74)	36.5	24.3	24.3	6.8
Community/Service Learning (<i>n</i> =74)	20.3	29.7	40.5	9.5
Honorary Societies (<i>n</i> =75)	38.7	30.7	22.7	8.0
Intercollegiate Athletics (<i>n</i> =70)	68.6	11.4	18.6	1.4
International/Language-Interest (<i>n</i> =69)	87.0	4.3	8.7	0.0
Intramural/Club Sports (<i>n</i> =72)	37.5	11.1	45.8	5.6
Media (<i>n</i> =74)	85.1	12.2	2.7	0.0
Minority/Ethnic (<i>n</i> =74)	82.4	4.1	5.4	8.1
Performing Arts (<i>n</i> =74)	67.6	16.2	12.2	4.1
Political/Social Action (<i>n</i> =73)	72.6	19.2	5.5	2.7
Pre-Professional Societies (<i>n</i> =73)	65.8	16.4	15.1	2.7
Religious/Interfaith (<i>n</i> =72)	61.4	14.7	19.4	4.2
Residence Hall Government (<i>n</i> =73)	89.0	5.5	1.4	4.1
Student Government (<i>n</i> =73)	71.2	6.8	9.6	12.3

clude a large amount of diverse peers. Further research needs to be conducted in order to investigate this finding.

Although the initial finding relates to Astin's (1983) proposition that involvement can be "multidimensional," meaning that students can be involved in a variety of ways within a collegiate setting, the prevalence of students holding leadership positions within organizations outside of their fraternal chapters was minimal. This second finding highlights an important aspect of Astin's (1977) description of involvement—that fraternity and sorority members may lack some important benefits from their participation due to the lack of prolonged time spent within the co-curricular organizations.

With regard to institutional contexts, results showed that demographic characteristics of

the student leaders were related to the amount of interactional diversity experiences they had. Specifically, the students from the two private institutions had more interactional diversity opportunities than those at the public institutions. This could suggest that due to the nature of small, private colleges, the amount of students participating in multiple organizations could influence these opportunities. This could also suggest that students at public institutions spend less time seeking out these opportunities or are less involved, on average, than their private institution counterparts. Further, with regard to sex and year in college, females and first- and second-year students reported higher levels of interactional diversity opportunities than their older male peers.

Finally, the students' leadership positions

TABLE 6*Correlations for Leadership Position and Interactions with Diverse Peers within Fraternal Organizations*

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Fraternity/sorority leadership role	—						
2. Interacted with students with different interests	-.066	—					
3. Interacted with students with different family backgrounds	.233*	.478**	—				
4. Interacted with students whose race/ethnicity is different from yours	.128	.435**	.461**	—			
5. Interacted with students from another country	.123	.228	.411**	.491**	—		
6. Interacted with students who have a different philosophy of life from you	.070	.378**	.440**	.377**	.401**	—	
7. Interacted with students whose religious beliefs were different from yours	.185	.360**	.411**	.239*	.358**	.604**	—

Note: $n = 75$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

were positively correlated with the frequency of interactional diversity opportunities they gained through their fraternities and sororities (See Table 6). This was also the case for the relationship between the amount of time spent in co-curricular organizations and frequency of interactional diversity experiences (See Table 7). In summary, student leaders who were more involved in their fraternities and sororities than other co-curricular groups did not have fewer frequent interactional diversity experiences. This finding further supported Astin's (1983) Theory of Involvement positing that as students gain more developmental experiences, they invest more time and energy into their overall involvement.

Table 6 shows that 5 out of the 6 interactions were positively related, although weakly, to the level of leadership a student holds within a fra-

ternal organization. This suggests that opportunities to interact with diverse peers increased with greater leadership responsibilities. However, one type of interactional diversity opportunity, "interactions with students with different interests," was weakly and negatively correlated suggesting that the relationship is inverted, $r_s(75) = -.066$, $p > .05$. Therefore, as the leadership level increased within a fraternal organization, the opportunities for these students to interact with students who have different interests from them decreased, suggesting that possibly these students did not have enough time to establish rapport with their peers due to the responsibilities of their leadership position.

In addition, several of the types of interactional diversity were significantly correlated with other forms of interactional diversity.

TABLE 7*Correlations for Co-curricular Involvement Hours and Interactions with Diverse Peers within Co-curricular Organizations*

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Co-curricular involvement hours	—						
2. Interacted with students with different interests	.268*	—					
3. Interacted with students with different family backgrounds	.227	.705**	—				
4. Interacted with students whose race/ethnicity is different from yours	.327**	.517**	.683**	—			
5. Interacted with students from another country	.319**	.309**	.307**	.576**	—		
6. Interacted with students who have a different philosophy of life from you	.289*	.480**	.585**	.630**	.464**	—	
7. Interacted with students whose religious beliefs were different from yours	.210	.517**	.549**	.514**	.523**	.756**	—

Note: $n = 75$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Specifically, strongly correlated forms of interactional diversity included: different religious beliefs and different philosophy of life, $r_s(75) = .604$, $p < 0.01$, students from another country and different races/ethnicities, $r_s(75) = .491$, $p < 0.01$, and different family backgrounds and different interests, $r_s(75) = .478$, $p < 0.01$. These findings suggest that various forms of interactional diversity, as they pertain to fraternity and sorority chapters, are inter-related. For example, a racially diverse peer could also be someone from another country. Therefore diversity seems to be a complex issue in that one individual may be perceived by others to exhibit more than one diversity characteristic, and therefore, an interaction with one person may result in an interaction with a variety of

diversity characteristics.

As is shown in Table 7, the amount of time the participants reported spending within their co-curricular organizations was positively correlated to the types of interactional diversity opportunities within co-curricular organizations. In particular, involvement hours and the following types of interactional diversity opportunities had the most significant correlations: students with different races and ethnicities, $r_s(75) = .327$, $p < 0.01$, students from another country $r_s(75) = .319$, $p < 0.01$, students with different philosophies of life, $r_s(75) = .289$, $p < 0.05$, and students with different interests, $r_s(75) = .268$, $p < 0.05$. These findings further highlight the importance of time spent in regards to student involvement, as these students gained more frequent inter-

actional diversity opportunities as they invested more time. Further, Table 7 also reveals that all types of interactional diversity opportunities were significantly correlated to each other. This finding is similar to the finding from the fraternity and sorority organizations' interactional diversity opportunities, as various types of diversity were found to be related.

Student Perspectives

Several factors contributed to quantity of interactional diversity opportunities: the size and structural diversity of the organization, formality, time commitment, and advisor influence within the groups. For example, several interviewees explained that size and the representation of multiple characteristics were very important to the overall amount of interactional diversity opportunities. Participants were hesitant to claim their fraternal and co-curricular organizations contained all characteristics of diversity, but all agreed that the structural composition of the group was contingent upon both the number of members, type of organization, and focus on recruiting diverse members. One participant noted his involvement with orientation was his most diverse experience because it allowed him the opportunity to interact with fellow leaders and incoming students. He described that group by saying, "It kind of seemed like everybody was represented." When articulating their fraternity and sorority chapter's structural diversity, the combination of large group sizes and variety of demographic characteristics represented within them signified for these students an example of an organization that was strongly diversified.

When discussing how interactional diversity opportunities were created within their chapters and other organizations, the participants articulated that the sense of community and informal time spent within organizations was essential. The consensus was that organizations such as academic honor societies and major interest groups limited the extent of interaction-

al diversity opportunities as they were too focused on content and did not allow consistent time for relaxed conversations. For example, one student leader stated, "I guess in my [public relations organization] meetings, which are like once a month, it is business casual. Like you come in, you listen to a speaker, and you leave." Further illustrating the value of unstructured time spent within an organization, several interviewees positively attributed their interactional diversity opportunities to the quantity of meetings and events that their fraternal organizations provided. One student described this perception by saying that he had known an international student who lived in his residence hall the previous year and only became good friends with him as a result of his fraternity's recruitment process. These findings support earlier research conducted by Gurin (1999a) linking structural diversity to informal interactional diversity experiences.

The concept of diversity was a complex and subjective term for participants. For most, race was an important component of diversity, but the concept was described more broadly to include difference. The types of diversity represented within this study were found to relate to one another both through correlation tests and the students' responses, suggesting that this concept is indeed a "melting pot" of many diverse characteristics coming together. Thus, as a student leader described interactional diversity experiences with another student of a different race, he/she tended to also describe other dimensions of diversity that were equally represented by the racially diverse peer.

Interviews also revealed that fraternity and sorority student leaders benefited from their interactions with diverse peers in ways that their interactions with similar peers cannot provide, signifying that there is a difference in the type of interaction that occurs between the individuals. One student leader explained his experience interacting with his homosexual fraternity roommate by saying, "That [being gay] was kind of forbidden territory growing up in the South.

You know people who are gay, you don't talk to them, don't associate with them. And I came here [to college] and I really didn't care either way ... I definitely understand that lifestyle more now." Another student leader reflected on her desire to become more open-minded to different ideas by being less "judgmental" and "not always being right." Further illustrating how these interactions can lead to positive benefits, one student stated: "I do believe that diverse peers are going to introduce you to things and give you some of their ideas that you didn't have. And for the most part, I do feel like they're going to define not you, but your values—help you define your values and help you define what you believe in." Although this study was not focused on racial diversity, this finding does relate somewhat to previous research that indicates diversity experiences lead to a multitude of developmental gains (Gurin, 1999b) including obtaining multiple perspectives that can influence students to reevaluate their own perspectives on the world and others (Gellin, 2003).

Student leaders discussed how their interactional diversity experiences were helping to prepare them for life and work in a pluralistic society (Umbach & Kuh, 2006) and learn to appreciate differences. One student described how she anticipates how her professional field will expect her to already have these experiences: "I want to work in international business, which means that I'm working with a lot of people who are extremely different from myself, and I need to have these experiences now." Further reflecting on the importance of diverse interactions, the student leaders spoke about how they embrace these opportunities now. One student leader explained how his experience has led him to realize that through accepting others, the opportunities for interaction are limitless. "By definition there are no boundaries, and by confining yourself to something by saying 'I'm this, I'm that,' you're really fooling yourself because you don't know who you are ever."

A final interesting contribution to these in-

teractional diversity opportunities came from the collegiate directors, national organizations, and chapter advisors of the groups. The student leaders interviewed shared how the knowledge and encouragement from advisory boards made an impact on changing the culture of the fraternity and sorority community to better embrace difference. In describing this experience in detail, one student commented how the intentionality of the fraternity and sorority office programming, officer retreats, and events brought the different groups together. Another student leader realized the importance of the advisor's influence because she acknowledged that "Greeks [sic] individually probably don't do as much as they could."

CONSIDERATIONS

The Co-Curricular Experience

Although past research has indicated that fraternity and sorority members are involved in co-curricular organizations outside of their chapters (Asel, Pascarella, & Seifert, 2009), this study revealed that their non-fraternal involvement is limited by the amount of time the students spend within these organizations. In particular, this study added new perspective on the co-curricular involvement tendencies of student leaders within fraternal organizations and other on-campus organizations. Participants reported an inverse relationship between the hours spent within each type of organization, meaning that as their time commitments for their chapters increased, their time to dedicate to other co-curricular organizations diminished. Further, using Astin's (1984) multidimensional involvement proposition, this study revealed that the majority of these student leaders reported participating, or at the very least being exposed to, various types of co-curricular organizations on campus.

As these students hold leadership positions within their fraternities and sororities, it makes sense that they would spend more time within

them. However, this could also mean that they do not believe they have enough time to be involved more in outside organizations. Further research is needed to clarify this finding. Regardless, fraternity and sorority advisors should encourage students to not merely be involved, but be engaged within an organization, through leadership positions or active participation during meetings and events, to fully experience the benefits of interpersonal development through membership.

Interactional Diversity Opportunities

Quantitative and qualitative data revealed that although diversity is traditionally defined through racial and gender terms, fraternity and sorority student leaders explained the term using broader examples. The types of diversity represented within this study related to one another, suggesting that this concept is indeed a “melting pot” of many diverse characteristics coming together. This finding could mean that although fraternity/sorority leaders consider race a component of diversity, it seems that they place a higher significance on broader diversity characteristics rather than maintaining a normative standard. Further research is needed to clarify this apparent generational shift of definitions and why these students interpret diversity in loose terms, rather than in physical characteristics.

Correlation results revealed that that many types of diverse peers were significantly related. This finding suggests that diversity characteristics are inter-related and that students interacting with racially diverse peers could also be interacting with individuals who have different religious beliefs as well. This is an important finding to note that as students reflect on their diversity experiences it is not necessarily quantity of diverse individuals that matters. Instead, it appears to be the quality of interaction among these students that lead to an understanding of difference.

Further, fraternity and sorority student

leaders articulated that increased involvement, through time or leadership position, within their fraternal and co-curricular organizations resulted in a greater frequency of interactional diversity experiences. Fraternal chapters afforded members more opportunities to interact with each type of diverse peer, with the exception of racially diverse individuals, than co-curricular organizations. Conversely, interactions with racially diverse peers were more frequent within co-curricular organizations. To explain this difference, the student leaders described how the structural composition, formality of the group, and their advisory boards were important factors. For example, interview participants discussed how academic and honor societies are too purpose-driven to focus on offering diversity interaction experiences. Thus the students felt that their interactional opportunities were limited. This supports earlier research by Gurin (1999a) that stated structural diversity impacts informal interactional diversity opportunities. Further highlighting Astin’s (1984) postulate that more involved students will have a higher quality experience; the participants described the frequency of meetings and unstructured time spent with their fraternal brothers and sisters as contributing to the availability of diverse interaction.

As evidenced from this study, interactional diversity opportunities should focus on the structural composition of the entities involved to ensure that student groups provide ample exposure to different perspectives. Students should be encouraged to seek out diverse opportunities to engage in discussions with peers, to be exposed to new perspectives, and to reflect on these experiences in and outside classroom settings.

Impact of Interactional Diversity Experiences

Reflecting on their experiences, the student leaders commented on how their abilities to understand others, be open to others’ perspec-

tives, and learn from their peers were positively affected by involvement. Although these findings are not specifically supported by the previous research, these findings do relate somewhat to Antonio's (1998) research that suggested cultural knowledge and understanding are increased through racial interaction; and Gurin's (1999b) finding that interactions with racially diverse peers leads to a multitude of developmental gains including perspective taking.

This study further illustrated Gellin's (2003) point that multiple opinions can influence student worldviews and cause students to reevaluate their own perspectives on the world and others. In addition to strengthening their own views, students also acknowledged the future importance of their dialogues. The majority of participants suggested that the ability to live and work in a pluralistic society is both expected from future employers and a desired personal attribute (Umbach & Kuh, 2006). As all participants articulated important gains from their interactional diversity experiences, fraternal and co-curricular organization administrators should continue to be intentional in providing these opportunities. This study showed that students interacted with diverse peers more often when they were informally involved in their student groups. Student groups should have more informal time set aside to support these interactions and connect the individuals. Further, all participants noted benefits from their experiences through some reflection. Administrators should influence both the interaction and the reflection of the interactional diversity experiences to support student development experiences.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The researcher broadly defined diversity as being inclusive of religion, family background,

philosophy of life, and interests, instead of limiting it to race and ethnicity. It is difficult to determine which type/s of diversity interaction that participants related to developmental outcomes. Further research is needed to understand how fraternity and sorority members identify and define diversity and to determine what affect, if any, their varied definitions have on their diversity awareness. Also, a study comparing the interactional diversity opportunities and co-curricular experiences of non-affiliated students with affiliated students could further clarify assumptions as to how these two groups differ from one another with regard to these two areas since this study only looked at the experience of one population of students.

Although the researcher used two public and two private institutions in South Carolina, generalizations should not be made for the co-curricular and interactional diversity experiences of fraternity and sorority student leaders. This study was intended to initiate future exploration into interactional diversity experiences of fraternity and sorority members. Further research encompassing students at colleges and universities across the United States could add additional information with regard to interactional diversity opportunities and co-curricular involvement experiences. Additionally, to fully understand the impact diversity has on college students, a study incorporating all three components of the Conceptual Model of the Impact of Diversity would be particularly helpful in determining their holistic experience of students within and beyond the classroom. Finally, as this study revealed differences with regard to student demographics, a deeper investigation of how student and institution characteristics influence the impact of diversity on college campuses and students would be particularly enlightening.

REFERENCES

- Asel, A., Seifert, T., & Pascarella, E., (2009). The effects of Greek affiliation on college experiences and outcomes: A portrait of complexity. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 4(2), 1-15.
- Astin, A.W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 518-529.
- Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (1992). Cocurricular influences on college students' intellectual development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(3), 203-213.
- Cooper, D. L., Healy, M. A., & Simpson, J. (1994). Student development through involvement: specific changes over time. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35(2), 98-102.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeBard, R., Lake, T., & Binder, R.S. (2006). Greeks and grades: The first-year experience. *NASPA Journal*, 38(4), 56-68.
- Eklund-Leen, S. J., & Young, B. R. (1997). Attitudes of student organization members and nonmembers about campus and community involvement. *Community College Review*, 24(4), 71-82.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E., (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (3rd ed). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(6), 746-762.
- Gurin, P. (1999a). Appendix B: The impact of structural diversity, classroom diversity, and informal interactional diversity on education: Social science research evidence. Expert report prepared for the lawsuits Gratz and Hamacher v. Bollinger, Duderstadt, the University of Michigan, and the University of Michigan College of LS&A, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Civil Action No. 97-75231; and Grutter v. Bollinger, Lehman, Shields, the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Law School, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Civil Action No. 97-75928. Retrieved from: <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert/gurintoc.html>
- Gurin, P. (1999b). Conceptual model of the impact of diversity. Expert report prepared for the lawsuits Gratz and Hamacher v. Bollinger, Duderstadt, the University of Michigan, and the University of Michigan College of LS&A, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Civil Action No. 97-75231; and Grutter v. Bollinger, Lehman, Shields, the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Law School, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Civil Action No. 97-75928. Retrieved from: <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert/gurintoc.html>
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2003). Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 320-334.

- Huang, Y., & Chang, S. (2004). Academic and cocurricular involvement: Their relationship and the best combinations for student growth. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 391-406.
- Hunt, S., & Rentz, A. L. (1994). Greek-letter social group members' involvement and psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 289-295.
- Hurtado, S. (1999). Reaffirming educators' judgment: Educational value of diversity. *Liberal Education, 85*(2), 24-31.
- Hurtado, S., Dey, E. L., Gurin, P.Y., & Gurin, G. (2003). College environments, diversity, and student learning. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 18, pp. 145-189). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kulwer.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 3*(7), 14-26.
- Kuh, G. D., Hu, S., & Vesper, N. (2000). "They shall be known by what they do": An activities-based typology of college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(2), 228-244.
- Laird, Thomas F. N. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(4), 365-87.
- Mauk, A. J. (2006). Students in Greek-letter organizations. In G. R. Albin, & G. A. Lyle (Ed.), *Understanding college student subpopulations: A guide for student affairs professionals* (pp. 239-265). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).
- McCabe, D. L., & Bowers, W. J. (1996). The relationship between student cheating and college fraternity or sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 280-291.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education, 38*, 379-396.
- Misner, M. S., & Wellner, W. C. (1970). Factors associated with scholastic productivity in high and low achieving sororities. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 14*, 126-129.
- Pascarella, E. T., Kuh, G. D., & Wechsler, H. (1996). The questionable value of fraternities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/art-42.dir/issue-32.dir/32a06801.htm>
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1995). Leadership practices of effective student leaders: Gender makes no difference. *NASPA Journal, 31*(2), 113-120.
- Schuh, J. H., & Laverty, M. (1983). The perceived long-term influence of holding a significant student leadership position. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 28-32.
- Sermersheim, K. L. (1996). Undergraduate Greek leadership experiences: A proven method for gaining career-related and life-long skills. *Campus Activities Programming, 29*(3), 56-60.
- Taylor, T. (2001). *A q-method study describing the diversity awareness of college students in theme housing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 169-192.
- Wilder, D. H., Hoyt, A. E., Doren, D. M., Hauck, W. E., & Zettle, R. D. (1978). The impact of fraternity or sorority membership on values and attitudes. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 19*(5), 445-449.
- Wilder, D. H., Hoyt, A. E., Surbeck, B. S., Wilder, J. C., & Carney, P. I. (1986). Greek affiliation and attitude change in college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 27*(6), 510-519.

- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Saunders, S. A. (1987). The Greek experience: Friend or foe of student development. In R. B. Winston, Jr., W. R. Nettles III, and J. H. Opper, Jr. (Eds.), *Fraternalities and Sororities on the Contemporary College Campus. New Directions for Student Services, 40*, (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Woo, T., & Bilynsky, J. (1994). *Involvement in extracurricular activities and adjustments to college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yeakley, A. (1998). *The nature of prejudice change: Positive and negative change processes arising from inter-group contact experiences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Heather Porter (B.A., Randolph-Macon College; M.Ed., University of South Carolina) is the Coordinator of Supplemental Instruction in the Student Success Center at the University of South Carolina. This study was completed in partial fulfillment of the degree requirements for the Master of Education in Student Affairs & Higher Education. She is a member of Delta Zeta sorority. She may be reached at porterh@sc.edu.