

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

JAMES MICHAEL KUDER for the DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Name) (Degree)

College Student
in Personnel Administration presented on July 14, 1969
(Major) (Date)

Title: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR MALE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
RESIDING IN FRATERNITIES AND RESIDENCE HALLS AT
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract approved:

Redacted for Privacy

Arthur L. Tollefson /

The purpose of this research was to determine if significant differences existed in college performance and in selected areas of attitude and opinion between male upperclassmen residing in fraternities and non-fraternity male upperclassmen living in residence halls.

Two samples consisting of (a) 86 upperclassmen from the residence halls and (b) 100 upperclassmen from the fraternities were selected. The data were gathered from the sample member's permanent files in the Office of the Dean of Men and from the administration of the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, to the samples. The results were subjected to statistical analysis to determine the validity of the following hypotheses: a) there is no significant difference in

college grade point average for the freshman and sophomore years between those upperclassmen living in residence halls and those residing in fraternities when any differences in ability as indicated by high school grade point average and college aptitude test scores are taken into account; b) there is no significant difference on any one of the following areas, as measured by the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, between those upperclassmen living in residence halls and those residing in fraternities: satisfaction with the faculty; satisfaction with the administration; satisfaction with major; satisfaction with students; study habits; extracurricular involvement; family independence; peer independence; liberalism; social conscience; and cultural sophistication.

Findings indicated that there were statistically significant differences at the five percent level of confidence favoring the residence hall men in the areas of social conscience and satisfaction with major and at the one percent level of confidence in the area of peer independence. Significant differences favoring the fraternity upperclassmen were found in the area of extracurricular involvement at the one percent level of confidence.

Analysis of other demographic data obtained from the College Student Questionnaire indicated two areas that were significantly different: (1) a significantly greater number of fraternity men were going steady, pinned or engaged; and (2) a significantly greater number

of residence hall men utilized parents, jobs and loans as their main source of financial support while a greater number of fraternity men utilized scholarships, trust funds and savings.

A Comparative Study of Selected Characteristics of Junior
and Senior Male University Students Residing in Fraternities
and Residence Halls at Oregon State University

by

James Michael Kuder

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

June 1970

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education

U
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

July 14, 1969

Typed by Clover Redfern for

James Michael Kuder

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is deeply indebted to Dr. Arthur L. Tollefson for his assistance throughout the development of this study. His interest and constructive criticism were of the utmost help during all stages of the work. Additional gratitude is extended to the author's graduate committee: Dean Robert Chick, and Professors W. R. Crooks, Lester Beals and Carl Anderson.

Appreciation is extended to Dean Dan Poling and the staff of the Dean of Men's Office for their cooperation. In addition, the help of Mr. Edward DeForest and Mr. John Davenport was of great aid in the development of parts of this study.

Thanks are due to my wife, Doris, for her encouragement throughout my entire graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	3
Statement of the Problem	3
Statement of the Hypotheses	4
Importance of the Study	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms Used	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Background to the Review of the Literature	12
Generalized Studies	13
Studies Dealing with Scholarship	17
Early Research Dealing with Scholarship	18
Recent Research Dealing with Scholarship	22
Studies Involving Attitudes and Values	27
Studies Involving Students' Attitudes Toward Social Fraternities	31
Other Research Pertaining to Fraternities and Residence Halls	33
Summary of the Review of the Literature	35
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE	38
Criteria for Sample Selection	38
Selection of Samples	38
Sources of Data	41
Official University Records	41
The College Student Questionnaire, Part II.	42
Collection of Data	42
Analysis of the Data	49
IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	51
Findings Related to the Hypotheses Under Investigation	51
Findings Related to the First Hypothesis	51
Findings Related to the Second Hypothesis	53
Summary of Results	60
Demographic Data	61
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	71
Definition of the Sample	72

Chapter	Page
Method and Procedure	72
Analysis and Findings	73
Conclusions	74
Suggestions for Further Research	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX	85
Appendix A	85
Appendix B	86
Appendix C	87
Appendix D	88
Appendix E	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of junior and senior men living in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	39
2. Distribution of junior and senior men living in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University who met criteria for sample selection.	40
3. Distribution of junior and senior men in the fraternity and residence hall samples.	41
4. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of high school grade point average.	43
5. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of high school grade point average.	44
6. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of high school grade point average.	44
7. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Verbal.	45
8. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Mathematical.	45
9. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Verbal.	46

Table	Page
10. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Mathematical.	46
11. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Verbal.	47
12. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Mathematical.	47
13. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of college grade point average.	52
14. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of college grade point average.	52
15. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of college grade point average.	53
16. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with faculty.	54
17. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with administration.	54
18. Summary data for the t-Test on the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with major.	55

Table	Page
19. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with students.	56
20. Summary data for the t-Test on the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of study habits.	56
21. Summary data for the t-Test on the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of extracurricular involvement.	57
22. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of family independence.	57
23. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of peer independence.	58
24. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of liberalism.	59
25. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of social conscience.	59
26. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of cultural sophistication.	60
27. Summary table pertaining to the retention or rejection of the null hypotheses.	61
28. Range of ages for upperclassmen sample from fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	62

Table	Page
29. Summary of data pertaining to marital status of the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	63
30. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and marital status.	63
31. Summary data pertaining to major field of the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	64
32. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and choice of major.	64
33. Summary data pertaining to when vocational decision was made by the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	66
34. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and time of vocational decision.	66
35. Summary of data pertaining to number of fields considered in choice of a major of the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	67
36. Summary of data pertaining to expectation of graduate work for the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	67
37. Summary data pertaining to main source of financial support for the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	68
38. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and main source of financial support.	69

Table	Page
39. Summary data pertaining to expected employment during college from the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.	70
40. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and expected employment.	70

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR MALE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
RESIDING IN FRATERNITIES AND RESIDENCE HALLS
AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher education today, more than ever, is concerned with the welfare and growth of the individual student in a complex and ever changing society. This is due, in part, to a changing viewpoint concerning the place and importance of the individual in the total scheme of higher education. Further, in recent years, the American college student has become more and more of a vocal proponent of change, not only in these institutions, but change in and for society in general. College officials and the general public have come to realize that today's college student seems to hold certain values and differ in certain ways from those students of a few years ago and that these values and the student who holds them cannot be separated or ignored.

That the student population of a given institution is made up of a number of subcultures or subgroups has been well documented in such studies as those conducted by Newcomb (1963) and Eddy (1959). Studies such as these have also pointed to the fact that the character of a particular college, and the effect it will have on those students who pass through it, are both very highly affected by the kinds and relative strengths of the subcultures that exist within its student body.

Two such subcultures which seem worthy of a more intensive examination are those upperclassmen residing in fraternities and those non-fraternity upperclassmen living in residence halls. One needs to be in contact but a short time with institutions that have such groups to hear a great variety of speculative statements being made concerning their characteristics. One commonly held notion seems to be that fraternities have a positive effect on their members, both academically and socially. On the other end of the scale, some expression of concern had been made that the factors which tend to make fraternities appear to benefit students are primarily related to selection and not to what the fraternity does to or for the student. Little appears to be known, however, about such students, particularly those who have completed their first two or three years of college in such a living group, either in terms of the characteristics of such groups or the kinds of attitudes and opinions they hold concerning their living experience and toward the greater whole of their college experience.

Oregon State University offers an unusual opportunity to study such groups of students. Both a large and growing fraternity system and an even larger residence hall program exist on the campus. The fraternity system at Oregon State appears to be an exceptionally strong one in academic performance, in leadership on campus and in social responsibility to the needs of the University community. The residence hall program houses approximately 25 percent of the total

male enrollment and offers many programs in such areas as student government, educational and social activities and cultural events.

While it is true that an increasing number of students are moving to off-campus living accommodations, a large number of students still remain in organized living units and present many facets that are worthy of study.

The purposes of this study, then, is to compare and contrast two groups of college students at Oregon State University on a variety of definable characteristics to determine if measurable differences do exist.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study can be stated in the following questions:

1. To what extent do junior and senior male university students residing in fraternities, and junior and senior non-fraternity students living in residence halls differ on college grade point averages for their freshman and sophomore years when any differences in ability as indicated by high school grade point average and college aptitude test scores are taken into account?

2. To what extent do these two groups of men differ in the following areas, as measured by the College Student Questionnaire, Part II:
 - a. satisfaction with the faculty
 - b. satisfaction with the administration
 - c. satisfaction with major
 - d. satisfaction with students
 - e. study habits
 - f. extracurricular involvement
 - g. family independence
 - h. peer independence
 - i. liberalism
 - j. social conscience
 - k. cultural sophistication

Statement of the Hypotheses

The questions posed in the statement of the problem can be stated in the following series of null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in college grade point average for the freshman and sophomore years between those upperclassmen living in residence halls and those residing in fraternities.
2. There is no significant difference in any one of the following

areas, as measured by the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, between those upperclassmen living in residence halls and those residing in fraternities:

- a. satisfaction with the faculty
- b. satisfaction with the administration
- c. satisfaction with major
- d. satisfaction with students
- e. study habits
- f. extracurricular involvement
- g. family independence
- h. peer independence
- i. liberalism
- j. social conscience
- k. cultural sophistication

Importance of the Study

As clearly stated by Williamson (1956) and others, in working with college students it is imperative to know not only that differences do exist from student to student and from group to group, but also to understand the kinds of differences that do exist and how they affect the student and his college experience. This study is designed to add to a growing body of knowledge concerning students at Oregon State University and more specifically to clarify information concerning

upperclassmen living in residence halls and those upperclassmen residing in fraternities. Particular attention will be given to the college performance of these two groups and to the college achievement related abilities they bring with them into the University. Further, this study should contribute to knowledge concerning certain attitudes and opinions these groups of men may hold. The study should also provide data which can be used for comparative analysis regarding upperclassmen residing in fraternities and those living in residence halls in different years.

Limitations of the Study

Any conclusions formulated from this study would pertain specifically to junior and senior male students residing in fraternities and those non-fraternity junior and senior male students living in residence halls at Oregon State University. The actual comparison of any group of college students with the groups used in this study would necessitate the establishment of the similarities and differences in the nature of the groups being compared in order to prevent faulty generalizations from such comparisons.

Definition of Terms Used

High School Grade Point Average: For purposes of this study, high school grade point average was defined as the total accumulative

grade point average for the student as presented to the University by the high school from which the student was graduated.

College Grade Point Average: College grade point average was defined as the student's accumulative grade point for his first two academic years of study, including at least 90 hours of credit.

Upperclassmen: Upperclassmen were defined as those male students who had completed more than five terms in college and had earned at least 90 hours of credit.

Fraternity Upperclassmen: Fraternity upperclassmen were defined as those junior and senior male students at Oregon State University who were residing in fraternities at the time of the study.

Residence Hall Upperclassmen: Residence hall upperclassmen were defined as those junior and senior males students at Oregon State University who were residing in residence halls at the time of the study.

Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores: The total raw verbal and total raw mathematical score obtained from the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) which is administered to all incoming freshmen students at Oregon State University.

The following definitions were taken directly from the College Student Questionnaire - Technical Manual (1965, pp. 16-18) and should be considered working definition of what each section of this instrument attempts to measure.

Satisfaction With Faculty (SF): Refers to a general attitude of esteem for instructors and the characteristic manner of student-faculty relationships at the respondent's college. Students with high scores regard their instructors as competent, fair, accessible, and interested in the problems of individual students. Low scores imply dissatisfaction with faculty and the general nature of student-faculty interaction.

Satisfaction With Administration (SA): Defined as a generally agreeable and uncritical attitude toward the college administration and administrative rules and regulations. High scores imply satisfaction with both the nature of administrative authority over student behavior and with personal interactions with various facets of the administration. Low scores imply a critical, perhaps contemptuous view of an administration that is variously held to be arbitrary, impersonal, and/or overly paternal.

Satisfaction With Major (SM): Refers to a generally positive attitude on the part of the respondent about his activities in his field of academic concentration. High scores suggest not only continued personal commitment to present major field, but also satisfaction with departmental procedures, the quality of instruction received, and the level of personal achievement within one's chosen field. Low scores suggest an attitude of uncertainty and disaffection about current major field work.

Satisfaction With Students (SS): Refers to an attitude of approval in relation to various characteristics of individuals comprising the total student body. High scores suggest satisfaction with the extent to which such qualities as scholastic integrity, political awareness, and particular styles and tastes are perceived to be characteristic of the student body. Low scores imply disapproval of certain characteristics that are attributed to the overall student body.

Study Habits (SH): Refers to a serious, disciplined, planful orientation toward customary academic obligations. High scores represent a perception of relatively extensive time devoted to study, use of systematic study routines and techniques, and a feeling of confidence in preparing for examinations and carrying out other assignments. Low scores suggest haphazard, perhaps minimal, attempts to carry through on instructional requirements.

Extracurricular Involvement (EI): Defined as relatively extensive participation in organized extracurricular affairs. High scores denote support of the wide involvement in student government, athletics, religious groups, preprofessional clubs, and the like. Low scores represent disinterest in organized extracurricular activities.

Family Independence (FI): Refers to a generalized autonomy in relation to parents and parental family. Students with high scores tend to perceive themselves as coming from families that are not closely united, as not consulting with parents about important personal

matters, as not concerned about living up to parental expectations, and the like. Low scores suggest "psychological" dependence on parents and family.

Peer Independence (PI): Refers to a generalized autonomy in relation to peers. Students with high scores tend not to be concerned about how their behavior appears to other students, not to consult with acquaintances about personal matters, and the like. They might be thought of as unsociable, introverted, or inner-directed. Low scores suggest conformity to prevailing peer norms, sociability, extraversion, or other-directedness.

Liberalism (L): Defined as a political-economic-social value dimension, the nucleus of which is sympathy either for an ideology of change or for an ideology of preservation. Students with high scores (liberals) support welfare statism, organized labor, abolition of capital punishment, and the like. Low scores (conservatism) indicate opposition to welfare legislation, to tampering with the free enterprise system, to persons disagreeing with American political institutions, etc.

Social Conscience (SC): Defined as moral concern about perceived social injustice and what might be called "institutional wrongdoing" (as in government, business, unions). High scorers express concern about poverty, illegitimacy, juvenile crime, materialism, unethical business and labor union practices, graft in government,

and the like. Low scores represent reported lack of concern, detachment, or apathy about these matters.

Cultural Sophistication (CS): Refers to an authentic sensibility to ideas and art forms, a sensibility that has developed through knowledge and experience. Students with high scores report interest in or pleasure from such things as wide reading, modern art, poetry, classical music, discussions of philosophies of history, and so forth. Low scores indicate a lack of cultivated sensibility in the general area of the humanities.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Background to the Review of the Literature

A review of the literature relative to fraternities and residence halls revealed a lack of published work concerning these two areas. In addition, the studies that have been reported deal almost exclusively with freshman and sophomore members, and have little or no relevance to those upperclassmen who remain in such living arrangements. Since both areas involve a relatively large number of students on campuses throughout the country, it seems somewhat strange that so little appears to be known about them.

Because of this lack of published research concerning upper-classmen living in residence halls and in fraternities, a wide variety of studies dealing with these two groups has been included in this chapter. For the sake of clarity, the Review has been divided into five basic areas. These include (1) large or generalized studies; (2) studies dealing with scholarship or academic achievement; (3) studies involving attitudes and values; (4) studies involving student attitudes and opinions towards social fraternities; and (5) other research pertaining to fraternities and residence halls that did not lend itself to classification in any of the four other areas.

Generalized Studies

A few large or generalized studies relating to fraternities and/or residence halls have been reported in the literature. Because of their nature and scope, difficulties were encountered in categorizing these studies into smaller units and they have therefore been placed in this section.

One of these large studies is that reported by Goldsen (1960) involving a research program conducted by the Cornell Values Study and based on a sample of 4,585 cases from major universities across the country. Findings which have pertinence to this review include:

1. Fraternity members were more likely to get somewhat poorer grades although there was no convincing evidence that fraternity members were less capable than other students.
2. A majority (75 percent) of the fraternity members studied took part in two or more extracurricular activities as opposed to less than half (42 percent) of the independent students.
3. The fraternity system constituted a social system whose political and social norms were in general clearly conservative. The fraternities in this study tended explicitly to socialize any members who deviated from those conservative norms, away from liberalism and toward conservatism.

Wise (1963) studied the influence of fraternities at the Pennsylvania State University utilizing two groups each from fraternities and residence halls. One of these groups was taken from the sophomore level and the other from the senior level. The results indicated that the fraternity system, in contrast to the residence hall system:

1. Had no differentiating influence upon students' allegiance to the University;
2. Exerted a much larger positive influence upon students' intent to contribute to the Alumni Fund;
3. Exerted a negative influence upon students' academic average;
4. Did not alter students' attitudes concerning conduct situations;
5. Exerted approximately the same degree of influence upon students' knowledge of art, literature and music;
6. Exerted a significantly less positive influence upon students' knowledge of national affairs;
7. Did not exert a great positive influence upon students' knowledge of social usage;
8. Did not influence attitudes toward civic responsibility in the University community.

A systematic attempt to compare the characteristics of college freshmen who pledge and who do not pledge social fraternities was

carried out by Jackson and Winkler (1964). From freshmen entering the University of North Dakota in the fall of 1962, a random sample was drawn from both groups. This sample was given a variety of interest and personality tests and a biographical inventory constructed by the investigators. The results suggest that pledges were different from those students who did not pledge fraternities on a number of characteristics, values and expectations. The pledge was described as having more dominance needs; more needs to seek the aid of others; fewer needs to be introspective and empathic; fewer needs to be orderly; and more needs for heterosexual relationships than the independent freshman male. In addition, Jackson and Winkler found that potential pledges participated in more social activities in high school and that these pledges had unfulfilled expectations of the role fraternities would play in their academic lives.

Chase (1949) investigated various aspects of the fraternity system on the campus of Wesleyan University. The study took into consideration many aspects of fraternity problems and covered the period between the two world wars. Findings indicated that the fraternity men who received some type of academic honor in college engaged in 25 percent more activities than did those fraternity men whose academic standings were low. The number of dropouts among fraternity men was lower than that of non-fraternity groups. The scholastic standing of a fraternity seemed to have a direct relationship on the

graduation of its members. Other evidence indicated that alumni fraternity members contributed almost twice as much money to the university loyalty fund as did the non-fraternity group.

Kaludis and Zatkin (1966) conducted an investigation of fraternity pledges and non-fraternity freshmen at the University of Maryland utilizing information from an official student information questionnaire, ACT scores and first semester grade point averages. Among the many findings of this study, results indicated that:

1. Fraternity groups expected to attain a higher education level, especially in the area of professional schooling;
2. Non-fraternity groups indicated a greater degree of certainty of vocational goals;
3. The non-fraternity group was more concerned with the cost of college and lack of ability in giving possible reasons for leaving the University. The fraternity group, on the other hand, indicated a greater need for the bachelor's degree as a requisite for graduate school as the possible reason for staying at the University;
4. Fraternity students came from homes with higher incomes and from homes with higher status positions;
5. The non-fraternity groups were more dependent on their own means to finance their education;
6. There was no significant difference between the two groups

in ACT scores and in first semester grade point averages.

Finally, an investigation of student characteristics and choice of housing was carried out by Dollar (1966). In an investigation of the characteristics of fraternity, residence hall and off-campus freshmen males, he found no significant differences in first semester grade point averages or in the areas of valuing support, conformity or leadership. However, the fraternity group valued recognition more than other groups and had a mean composite ACT score that was significantly higher than those of both other groups. On the other hand, the residence hall group valued independence more than both other groups. The data indicated that the fraternity group had a more favorable socio-economic background, both in terms of fathers' education level and in family income.

Studies Dealing with Scholarship

Published research dealing with fraternities, and to some extent with residence halls, has focused largely on scholastic achievement and seems to have followed close upon the criticism of 'anti-intellectualism' that has been leveled against the fraternity system from time to time. To a great extent, this focus appears to have been confined to two periods; the first centering around the decade 1927-39 and the second from 1954 to the present.

Early Research Dealing with Scholarship

For the most part, the research conducted during this period limited itself to the comparison of scholarship records of fraternity and non-fraternity men.

In what appears to be the earliest of these studies, Warnock (1914) compared the scholastic averages of fraternity and non-fraternity students at the University of Illinois. The fraternity men in this study, as a group, had the lowest scholastic averages of all men in the University. Further, they seemed to be more content with grades between 70 and 80 than did the non-fraternity men.

The scholastic ranking of fraternity and non-fraternity students in ten universities and colleges was surveyed by Worcester (1923), utilizing the registrar's records from each institution. Results indicated that sorority groups ranked highest scholastically and fraternity groups ranked lowest. The average grades of sorority members were above the average of all students while those of fraternity groups were below the averages of non-fraternity groups.

At the University of Maine, no essential difference was found to exist between the fraternity men and non-fraternity men as reported in a study by Eurich (1927). He concluded that the poorer student had a better chance if he did not belong to a fraternity and the better student appeared to be able to do superior work within a fraternity

system. His findings suggest that a fraternity environment did not affect the scholastic achievement of the average college student.

An investigation of fraternity and non-fraternity freshmen at the University of Oregon was conducted by Constance (1929). Data on entering freshmen were compared in terms of high school grades, American Council on Education Psychological Examination scores, and their relation to living group affiliation. While there was no apparent difference between fraternity and non-fraternity groups on the basis of psychological test scores, the fraternity group produced superior performance, even with inferior expectation both in terms of ACE scores and high school records. However, the non-fraternity group demonstrated a slightly higher high school scholastic average.

In a study at the University of Wisconsin covering a period of eight semesters, Byrns (1930) investigated the relationship of grades to the student's living group. He found that the scholastic averages of women students were significantly higher than those of men students during every semester of the four-year period studied. However, fraternity men received higher grades than non-fraternity members. Both men and women who lived in the dormitories which were under the jurisdiction of university officials received lower grades than did the fraternal groups living in their own houses.

In a study of class attendance and college marks of 869 freshmen and sophomores at the State University of Iowa, Jones (1931)

found a positive correlation between student's grades and attendance. Fraternity men in this study were absent from their classes more frequently than were the non-fraternity men, thus leading Jones to conclude that one possible reason for lowered scholastic achievement in fraternities was the attitude of these groups toward such class activities.

MacPhail (1933) compared the quality of academic work done at Brown University over a four-year period by 100 fraternity men and a like number of non-fraternity men. The non-fraternity group made an average grade slightly, but not significantly, higher than did the fraternity men. The lowest quartile in both groups did about equally as well during their freshmen year, but the fraternity members tended to decline in performance, whereas the non-fraternity members tended to improve markedly. For the four-year period the men in the highest quartile of the two groups did not differ to any great degree.

In a study conducted by Lehman (1935) at Ohio University, the effects of fraternity initiation on scholarship were examined. Scholastic records covering a period of ten consecutive semesters were obtained for fraternity and non-fraternity students. Findings indicated that after the fraternity initiation academic requirement had been met, the mean point-hour ratios (marks) tended to drop. Further results of the study revealed that non-fraternity freshman men

earned higher marks the spring semester than the fall semester; that during the first semester the pledges did a better quality of work than in any other succeeding semester. The non-fraternity men's performance was at its lowest point during their first semester on campus.

Lehman concluded that college students correlated only moderately well with their probable scholastic aptitude. He felt that the initiation requirement was not unlike other extrinsic devices in motivating scholarship in that the effect tended to cease as soon as the external pressure or artificial incentive had ceased.

In another investigation of motivational aspects of fraternity pledge academic requirements, Riggs (1937) found that the pledge groups tended to make better marks during the time they were pledged than during the semester following their initiation. Findings indicated that even though the percentile scores of the fraternity group on intelligence tests were lower than those of non-fraternity students, there were no significant differences in the grades of the two groups.

At Southern Methodist University, Hooker (1936) compared the academic marks of fraternity and non-fraternity students for the first semester of 1936-37. Findings indicated that both non-fraternity men and women made higher averages than did fraternity affiliated men and women. He further found that the non-fraternity group excelled in each class, with the exception of the senior men. At this level

fraternity and non-fraternity averages were the same.

In another study of academic achievement, Carter (1934) attempted to determine the effect of college fraternities on scholarship. Some 114 fraternity men and 65 non-fraternity men from Albion College were surveyed and the following comparisons were made: the relationship between an index of promise based on a student's high school record; the score on the intelligence test taken upon entrance to college; and the index of achievement. The study revealed that those with lower promise indexes were more likely to make higher achievement indexes if they joined a college fraternity. The index of promise, however, was about the same for the two groups studied.

Utilizing high school and college marks, Van Alstine (1942) studied 1026 students at the University of Minnesota in relation to their place of residence. When these students were divided into their particular Colleges, significant differences in only one area--that of Pharmacy--were found, being in favor of those living in private residences. No other significant differences could be established.

Recent Research Dealing with Scholarship

The second period of research involving scholarship in fraternities and residence halls once again generally substantiated earlier studies in reaffirming that no significant differences existed in this area. However, some of these later studies went a step further than

their earlier counterparts by comparing the scholastic achievement between various fraternity groups.

A study by Butler (1959) attempted to get at differences between individual fraternities rather than comparing fraternity members' scholarship against that of non-members. Butler observed that of 27 fraternities at the University of Kansas, several groups were consistently high and several groups consistently low in scholastic rating. He then compared the "climate" in three high and three low achieving groups using a non-quantitative approach involving tape recordings of 46 semi-structured, informal interviews. His findings pointed to the productive and cooperative atmosphere of the high achieving fraternities, where the expectations and examples of the members positively influenced those of the pledges. Such conditions seemed to be greatly or totally lacking in the low achieving groups.

Crookston (1961), in a study done at the University of Utah, observed that over a ten year period (1946-56) two fraternities were consistently high scholastic achievers while two other fraternities were consistently low achievers. Using these two groups, Crookston attempted to discover if the high achieving fraternities selected better students as pledges than the low achieving fraternities and if the pledges of the high achieving fraternities performed better academically than the pledges of low achieving fraternities when predicted achievement was controlled. The results indicated that the pledges of

the high achieving groups were significantly higher than the pledges of the low achieving fraternities both in predicted grade point average (.001 level) and in grade point average with the predicted grade point average controlled (.01 level). In addition, he found that the low groups achieved lower (.05 level) than their predicted grade point average.

In another study conducted at the University of Utah by Crookston (1960), the first quarter academic performance of the fraternity freshman pledge class was compared to that of the non-fraternity freshmen in an attempt to discern if significant differences did exist. The results bear out those of many previous investigations in that there was no significant difference in performance of the comparison groups in relation to their academic achievement. In addition, there were no differences in mean credit hours taken by the comparison groups.

A study to determine if fraternity and residence hall living environments differentially affected or influenced the first semester college scholarship of freshman male students was carried out by Buckner (1961). Subjects for this study included 216 freshman fraternity pledges and 266 residence hall freshmen at the University of Missouri. The pledge group and the residence hall group were each divided into five subgroups by the level of potential of the students for college scholarship or achievement. The first semester mean grade

point averages of the pledges and residence men falling at each level of college scholarship potential were independently computed and compared. No significant differences were found between the first semester achievement of the fraternity group and the residence hall group.

In a similar study done at Georgia Tech, Willingham (1962) compared fraternity members and independent students with regard to freshman attrition, freshman grades and four-year grades. The results indicated that (1) fraternity pledges had somewhat lower attrition rates during the freshman year and (2) fraternity members earned grades which were as high if not slightly higher than those of independent students. When using four-year averages, corrected for level of freshman performance, the over-all average of senior fraternity members was essentially the same as that of senior independent students.

Matson (1963) studied the influence of fraternity, residence hall and off-campus living on students of high, average and low college potential at Indiana University. In comparing these groups he further divided the fraternities into three groups; those of high, middle and low prestige. Matson found that the high prestige fraternities had students of higher academic potential when the total group membership was compared with that of the other four groups. Further, when the academic achievements of the high potential students were

compared, the high and middle prestige fraternities and the residence hall groups showed a tendency to achieve higher grade averages than the low prestige fraternities and the off-campus group. Finally, Matson found that the percentage of students who dropped out of school at each of the four potential levels showed that a much higher proportion of the students in the three fraternity groups remained in school as compared with the residence hall and off-campus groups.

Prusok and Walsh (1964) investigated three hypotheses relevant to the relationship between living condition and academic achievement for a sample of freshman men at the State University of Iowa. When academic ability was controlled, the results of this study indicated that (1) there was no significant difference in adjusted grade point average among freshman men living in fraternities, residence halls, living at home or off-campus; (2) there were no differences in adjusted grades among the 19 fraternity pledge classes; and (3) there were no differences in adjusted grades among the pledge classes subjected to "good", "mediocre", or "poor" scholarship programs.

The differential effects of fraternity and sorority membership upon academically promising students was studied by Bradshaw and Kahoe (1967). Comparative studies were made of official academic records for a four-year period of a sample of fraternity and non-fraternity members. All the members of this sample were university freshmen who were initiated into the national scholastic honor

societies following their first freshman semester. Findings included that fraternity men declined from a statistically significant higher mean grade point average the first semester to a significantly lower mean grade point average the second semester. Non-fraternity men continued to maintain academic superiority for three semesters following the freshman year. There was no significant difference between the grade point averages for the sorority and non-sorority women for any semester.

Studies Involving Attitudes and Values

After studies involving scholarship in fraternities and residence halls, no other area has received as much attention in reported research as that of the attitudes and values held by the members of these two groups. Interestingly enough, no reference to such studies could be found prior to 1955 and the great majority of this type of investigation seems to center around the period of the mid-Sixties.

In a doctoral study conducted by Shutt (1955), changes in attitude among residents of college fraternities and residence halls were investigated. A sample consisting of 50 pledges and 49 residence hall freshmen enrolled at the University of Illinois was drawn and a test battery consisting of Woodruff's "A Study of Choices", the Minnesota Personality Scale, and a Modified Thematic Apperception Test was administered. This same test battery was again administered to the

sample the following spring term. Analysis of the resulting data revealed changes in morale, social life, emotionality, acceptance of adults, acceptance of peers, and acceptance of self for both groups, although the extent of change did not reach the five percent level of confidence. Statistically significant findings included changes by pledges in group selection; an increase in scores on family relations for both fraternity and residence hall men; and the presence of less conservative attitudes in both groups, particularly those of economic conservatism.

Mahler (1962), in a study of freshmen at Occidental College, found that those freshmen who became pledges to fraternities exhibited strong external orientations, being primarily responsive to group values and demands. Those students who expressed no desire to join a fraternity were more internally oriented, more introverted and exhibited a greater capacity to inhibit and suppress impulses.

An extensive study of values as they pertained to the fraternity system was conducted by Scott (1965a) at the University of Colorado. As the result of a one year, longitudinal research study conducted in six fraternities and four sororities, Scott found that the initial values of freshmen help determine whether or not they will pledge a Greek organization. An analysis of the data revealed, however, that the value changes of pledges were not substantially different from the changes that occurred in the control group of non-pledging freshmen.

Other findings indicated that the attractiveness of membership in the fraternity system was higher in early stages than in late stages of affiliation and that the attractiveness of this membership was correlated with the person's status within the organization. Data indicated that the most satisfied members of an organization were those whose values were compatible with the dominant group's functions and that the departure of a member from a group was likely to reflect an incompatibility between his values and the group norms.

In an article subsequent to the above study, Scott (1965b) summarized the findings of this study and stated:

Paradoxically, perhaps, these allegedly adoptive values (those values allegedly fostered by Greek organizations, including loyalty, kindness, social skills, leadership and self control) were not generally enhanced by continued group membership. Instead, they may actually have been reduced and replaced by other values which were dominant within the organization or within the wider academic community (Scott, 1965b, p. 191).

The effect of the living group upon attitudes and values was further demonstrated in a study carried out by Dressel and Lehman (1965). Through the use of interviews and questionnaires, the effects of various living group arrangements were studied at Michigan State University. Data indicated that the most significant reported experience in the collegiate lives of the subjects studied was their association with different personalities in their living unit. Analysis of the interview and questionnaire data suggested that the discussions and

"bull sessions" were a potent factor in shaping the attitudes and values of these students.

Newcomb (1966), in discussing the effects of living groups on the individual student, stated that:

We already know that a good many freshmen quickly team up with others very much like themselves, and we do not expect to find much value change with persisting peer groups initially formed in such ways, our assumption being that their members will tend to reinforce one-another's existing values. If so, we shall be able to demonstrate a general phenomenon, of which fraternities and sororities ... are merely a special case, in that they tend to select homogeneous recruits and, relatively speaking, to insulate them from influences that might induce significant attitude change.

Chickering (1967) takes a somewhat different view. In an article concerning college residences and student development, he feels that:

... college residences do provide a significant context for student development. It is there that close associations with other students occur. The student's opportunities for contact with different kinds of persons can lead to increased ease and freedom in his relationships with others (Chickering, 1967, p. 179).

Chickering, however, adds this qualification:

It is also clear that some college housing units develop distinctive characteristics - "subcultures" in the jargon of the social scientists - which may persist at length and be resistant to change. The evidence suggests, too, that these different subcultures have an influence on the student (Chickering, 1967, p. 181).

Studies Involving Students' Attitudes Toward
Social Fraternities

Another area that has received some attention in the literature is that of attitudes and opinions held both by fraternity and non-fraternity men concerning the place and importance of the social fraternity in the college or university structure. While these reported studies are somewhat limited in number and scope, they do add some much needed information concerning the role of the fraternity as viewed by the student himself.

Sherman (1967), in a study of attitudes toward men's social fraternities at the University of Colorado, attempted to determine if the various groups that go to make up a campus community held differing opinions concerning the place and importance of fraternity living. Using a summated-rating scale, the attitudes of fraternity and sorority members, independent students, faculty, administration, townspeople and high school students were sampled. Of the seven respondent groups, the faculty appeared to hold the least favorable attitudes, followed by the administration and the independent students. Townspeople and high school students appeared to register neutral responses. Sorority students expressed generally favorable attitudes, but not as favorable as those of fraternity respondents. Of the areas investigated, rush procedures, membership policies, and social behavior seemed to be areas of greatest concern.

The student's attitude toward the help offered by his fraternity was a factor in the comparison of fraternity and non-fraternity groups in a study by Devesta and Woodruff (1949). Using an opinion check list of 15 statements, the study attempted to determine the effect college fraternities and sororities had on members and non-members during and after college. Results indicated that members felt that their organizations would be highly beneficial to them socially, financially and morally in the years after college, although membership during college was financially detrimental. Non-members' responses were generally neutral, expressing the feeling that fraternity and sorority membership had neither beneficial nor detrimental effects on their members during or after college attendance.

In a similar study of the attitudes of independent men toward social opportunities at a fraternity oriented college, Thomson and Papalia (1964) felt that it was possible to conclude that independent men at fraternity-oriented institutions saw themselves as socially deprived.

Finally, in a study at the University of Vermont conducted by the fraternity system itself (1965), findings indicated that students in general showed more favorable attitudes toward fraternities than did the faculty, even when former fraternity members among the faculty were excluded. Over one-half the faculty, and a lesser proportion of the students felt that fraternities would decline in importance in the

future. One-fourth of the faculty felt that fraternities fostered values not in line with the purpose of the university. While few suggestions were brought forth to improve the fraternity system, those who did make suggestions mentioned most frequently the need for stronger leadership and for more control by the university.

Other Research Pertaining to Fraternities and Residence Halls

Several other references to fraternity and residence hall studies were found in the literature. For the most part, these studies investigated one particular aspect of these living groups and because of their diversity, these studies are reported in this section of the Review.

Two studies appear in the literature relative to extracurricular activities and student leaders. Maney (1934), in a study at Transylvania College, found that the fraternity group had relatively many more memberships in organizations representing extracurricular activities than did the non-fraternity group. Williamson (1948) surveyed the "most important" campus functions on the University of Minnesota campus and found that a total of over 25 percent of these positions were held by students who were fraternity members, although such students made up less than 10 percent of the entire student body.

Only one study could be found that dealt specifically with personality characteristics of fraternity and non-fraternity members.

Lepley (1946) administered the Personal Audit to 508 undergraduate students at Pennsylvania State College. Results indicated that sorority women were somewhat more sociable than non-sorority women. There was some suggestion that non-fraternity men were more intolerant with regard to other people than were fraternity men. The fraternity population as a whole tended to be somewhat the more emotional of the two groups.

Finally, the review of the literature revealed two studies which touched upon the relationship of a student's housing arrangements to his ability to stay in college. Drasgow (1958), in a study of differences between college students at the University of Buffalo, found that students who lived in residence halls tended to stay in college longer than the students living in other housing arrangements. He postulated that the motive to succeed through college was greater among residence hall students and it was likely that these students had a potentially greater degree of concern, worry and anxiety among them.

Alfret (1966) investigated the relationship of 153 students' housing arrangements to the frequency of dropping out of college. The results of this study indicated that dropping out was related to the living situation, the highest rates occurring for students living in rooms, boarding houses and at home; the lowest for those in sororities, men's

residence halls, and cooperatives. The frequency of the drop out rate for fraternity members lay within the middle of the distribution. Alfret concluded that since students spend a major amount of their time at the place where they live and their immediate surroundings can be a source of satisfaction or discontent, that the living arrangement could well be a contributing factor to failure or withdrawal from college.

Summary of the Review of the Literature

In reviewing the literature relative to upperclassmen residing in fraternities and those living in residence halls, no specific references could be found pertaining solely to upperclass groups. In a more general review encompassing college men, both lower and upperclassmen living in fraternities and residence halls, several areas of commonalities and differences were found.

A few generalized studies relating to residence halls and fraternities were reported in the literature. Findings of these studies indicated some measurable differences between the two groups, particularly in the areas of involvement in extracurricular activities, incidence of dropping out of college, socio-economic background and social and political viewpoints. Little or no difference was found in the area of college scholastic achievement--any differences found being in favor of the residence hall group--or in predicted college

achievement.

Several studies dealing specifically with the scholastic achievement of the fraternity and residence hall groups were reported. The vast majority of these studies found no significant difference or only a slightly significant difference in favor of the residence hall group on this factor. Fraternity pledge academic requirements appeared to have some positive motivating effects during the time such requirements were enforced. However, once the pledge was accepted as a member, grade point averages tended to decline.

A number of studies involving attitudes and values of fraternity and residence hall men were reported in the literature. Results pointed to changes within the fraternity groups particularly in the areas of becoming more responsive to group values and becoming somewhat more conservative politically and socially. Changes in the residence hall group were not as definitive. Changes in both groups were noted in such areas as social life, acceptance of adults, acceptance of peers and acceptance of self.

A few studies involving students' attitudes toward social fraternities were found. In comparing the attitudes of the various groups that make up a university community, research results indicated that the faculty appeared to hold the least favorable attitudes toward fraternities while the fraternity respondents themselves held the most favorable views. Most often, non-fraternity living groups held

somewhat neutral attitudes towards fraternity living.

Other studies indicated that the fraternity group had relatively many more memberships in organizations representing extracurricular activities than did the non-fraternity groups; that non-fraternity men were more intolerant with regard to other people than were fraternity men; and that students who lived in residence halls tended to stay in college longer than students living in other housing arrangements.

The findings of this review of the literature relative to men living in residence halls and those residing in fraternities would appear to have some implications for this present study. It would seem that the two groups under investigation might well have measurable differences in several areas, particularly those of attitudes and values, scholastic achievement and involvement in university life. From this review it might be tentatively concluded that some of these differences could be attributed to the effects of the type of housing itself and to the selection processes involved.

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

For this study, the sample subjects were junior and senior male students residing in fraternities and junior and senior non-fraternity male students living in residence halls at Oregon State University.

Criteria for Sample Selection

Since this study is concerned with comparing these two groups of upperclassmen on a variety of characteristics, two sample groups (fraternity upperclassmen, residence hall upperclassmen) were established. To be eligible for sample selection, the student:

- a. had to meet the criteria for upperclassman standing
- b. must have been residing in one of the two living groups at the time of the study
- c. must have had high school cumulative grade point averages and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores on record.

Selection of Samples

Both the fraternity sample and the residence hall sample were established in the following manner:

- a. Through the use of official University records located in the Office of the Dean of Men, it was determined that 299 upperclassmen were living in residence halls and that 618

upperclassmen resided in fraternities (see Table 1).

Table 1. Distribution of junior and senior men living in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

	Fraternity	Residence hall	Total
Junior men	334	210	544
Senior men	284	89	373
Total	618	299	917

- b. Foreign student upperclassmen living in residence halls and fraternities were not included in either population group because of their small number and the apparent inappropriate use of the College Student Questionnaire in measuring their attitudes and opinions. Resident Assistants who met the criteria for the upperclassman sample selection (total number 18) were excluded from the residence hall population because it was felt that the training and indoctrination for their particular job would tend to bias the results of the total response of the larger group of men.
- c. Within the two sub-population groups, 145 residence hall upperclassmen and 484 fraternity upperclassmen met the criteria for sample selection. This combined group of 629 upperclassmen constituted the original population from which the sample was drawn (see Table 2).

Table 2. Distribution of junior and senior men living in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University who met criteria for sample selection.

	Fraternity	Residence hall	Total
Junior men	271	109	380
Senior men	213	36	249
Total	484	145	629

- d. The population, separated as to respective living group, was further divided into junior and senior groups, thus making two groups within the fraternity population and two groups within the residence hall population. This separation was felt necessary for initial selection purposes. However, for final analysis, juniors and seniors were combined into their respective upperclassman living group.
- e. Sample members from each group were drawn by means of a table of random numbers (Peatman, 1947). A total of 186 upperclassmen were included in the sample for this investigation. Table 3 represents the distribution of the sample according to the number of junior and senior men from the residence hall and fraternity groups and the total number of upperclassmen in each group. While a minimum of 50 sample members from each group was felt to be desirable for purposes of analysis, there were but 36 senior residence hall men who met the criteria for sample selection. Since

sampling of this sub-population would have reduced its number further, the 36 senior residence hall men were therefore used as the sample group.

Table 3. Distribution of junior and senior men in the fraternity and residence hall samples.

	Fraternity	Residence hall	Total
Junior men	50	50	100
Senior men	50	36	86
Total	100	86	186

- f. In comparing the two groups of upperclassmen, it was felt that if a substantive difference in real ability between the two groups existed, that this difference would likely be reflected in all of the resulting data, including the attitudinal material obtained from the College Student Questionnaire. It was therefore decided to conduct a statistical analysis between the two groups on the variables of high school grade point average and Verbal and Mathematical Scholastic Aptitude Test raw scores once this data was collected.

Sources of Data

There were two main sources of data for use in this study:

Official University Records

From the official University records located in the Office of the

Dean of Men at Oregon State University, the following information was made available:

- a. High school grade point average: The student's cumulative grade point average reported by the high school from which he graduated.
- b. College grade point average: The student's cumulative grade point average for his first two years of college study.
- c. Scholastic Aptitude Test scores: The student's total raw Verbal and total raw Mathematical SAT scores.

The College Student Questionnaire, Part II.

A research questionnaire, designed by Educational Testing Service, to gather a diversity of biographical and attitudinal information about college student bodies. Part II of the Questionnaire contains questions about: (1) educational and vocational plans and expectations; (2) personal attitudes and (3) student functioning: activities, perceptions, and satisfactions as students at a particular college or university (Peterson, 1968).

Collection of Data

The procedure used to collect data for this study can be stated as follows:

1. The cumulative high school grade point average, cumulative

college grade point average and Verbal and Mathematical Scholastic Aptitude Test raw scores were obtained from each sample member's permanent file.

2. t-Tests were applied to each sample's high school cumulative grade point average and to the Verbal and Mathematical Scholastic Aptitude Test raw scores. Results of this analysis are presented in Tables 4-12. As the results of this analysis indicated no significant differences between the two groups on the two variables under consideration, it was concluded that there was no substantive difference in real ability, as measured by these two variables, between the two sample groups being studied.

Table 4. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of high school grade point average.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
High school grade point average	Residence hall seniors	36	3.107	.411	.513 ^a
	Fraternity seniors	50	5.154	.426	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 5. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of high school grade point average.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
High school grade point average	Residence hall seniors	50	3.169	.413	.473 ^a
	Fraternity seniors	50	3.132	.358	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 6. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of high school grade point average.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
High school grade point average	Residence hall upperclassmen	86	3.143	.410	.0017 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	100	3.143	.393	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 7. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Verbal.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Scholastic Aptitude Test scores-- Verbal	Residence hall seniors	36	524.472	94.592	.5467 ^a
	Fraternity seniors	50	513.780	78.845	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 8. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Mathematical.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores-- Mathematical	Residence hall seniors	36	572.027	104.285	1.7583 ^a
	Fraternity seniors	50	610.060	87.734	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 9. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores-- Verbal.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Scholastic Aptitude Test scores-- Verbal	Residence hall juniors	50	525.46	79.001	1.6052 ^a
	Fraternity juniors	50	498.52	86.945	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 10. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores-- Mathematical.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Scholastic Aptitude Test scores-- Mathematical	Residence hall juniors	50	589.28	81.895	.6048 ^a
	Fraternity juniors	50	580.78	54.514	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 11. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Verbal.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Verbal	Residence hall upperclassmen	86	525.046	85.8735	1.7639 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	100	506.150	77.7300	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 12. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Mathematical.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Scholastic Aptitude Test scores--Mathematical	Residence hall upperclassmen	86	582.058	92.1943	1.0697 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	100	595.420	74.487	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

3. Permission was obtained from the Office of the Dean of Men for use of their letterhead on the cover letter to be sent to members of the sample.
4. A letter of explanation was first sent to all members of the residence hall sample (see Appendix A), and their cooperation was asked in participating in the study.
 - a. The College Student Questionnaire, Part II, was administered to the group of residence hall upperclassmen who responded to the initial letter of request. The questionnaire was administered to this group at a centrally located residence hall cafeteria.
 - b. Follow-up on the administration of the College Student Questionnaire to the residence hall sample was carried out in two stages. Firstly, a second letter of request (see Appendix B) was sent to those members of the residence hall sample who had not responded to the first letter, and the Questionnaire was again administered to the group of men who responded to this second letter. Secondly, those men who had not responded to the second letter were contacted either by telephone or through the Head Resident of their residence hall, and the Questionnaire was then administered again to the group that responded.
5. A letter of explanation was then sent to all members of the

fraternity sample (see Appendix C).

- a. The College Student Questionnaire was administered to the group of fraternity upperclassmen who responded to the initial letter of request. The Questionnaire was given to this group in centrally located fraternity houses.
- b. Follow-up on the administration of the Questionnaire to the fraternity sample was carried out in the same manner as with the residence hall sample. A second letter of request (see Appendix D) was sent to those members of the fraternity sample who had not responded to the first letter, and the Questionnaire was once again administered. Those fraternity sample members who did not respond to the second letter were contacted either through their individual fraternity president or by telephone and the Questionnaire was administered again to the group that responded.

Analysis of the Data

Once the data for use in this study had been collected the following steps were undertaken for analysis of the results:

1. Upon completion of administration of the Questionnaire, the answer sheets were sent to Educational Testing Service for scoring. The scoring service from E. T. S. included IBM

data cards and a computer print-out of results, consisting of abstracted item stems and response alternatives, and scale scores: frequency distributions, means and standard deviations for the total group and the subgroups.

2. Upon receipt of the statistical data from Educational Testing Service, the data were punched on a standard punch card and analyzed for significant differences by the Control Data 3300 machine. In this study the statistical analysis involved the testing of hypotheses by use of: (a) means and (b) distributions. In testing equality of difference of means, the t-Test was used; in the case of distributions, the Chi-square test was used.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and a discussion of the results of the analyses of the two study hypotheses (see page 4). In order to test the validity of the hypotheses, the differences among means were tested by use of the t-Test--a statistical means to determine whether a difference between the means of two variables meets statistical criteria of stability or reliability (see Appendix E). This chapter also presents other demographic data obtained from the samples response to the College Student Questionnaire.

Findings Related to the Hypotheses Under Investigation

Findings Related to the First Hypothesis

In testing the hypothesis of no difference in college grade point average for the freshman and sophomore years between the two sample groups, the t-Test was used. It was found that no significant difference existed between residence hall juniors and fraternity juniors; that no significant difference existed between residence hall seniors and fraternity seniors; and that no significant difference existed between the combined upperclassmen groups in residence halls and fraternities (see Tables 13, 14 and 15). The hypothesis of no difference between the two groups on the variable of college grade point average was accepted as tenable at the five percent level of confidence.

Table 13. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall junior males and fraternity junior males on the variable of college grade point average.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
College grade point average	Residence hall juniors	34	2.7350	.4674	.1748 ^a
	Fraternity juniors	41	2.4929	.3620	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 14. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall senior males and fraternity senior males on the variable of college grade point average.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
College grade point average	Residence hall seniors	30	2.7376	.4457	.1165 ^a
	Fraternity seniors	46	2.6219	.3673	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Table 15. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of college grade point average.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
College grade point average	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	2.7362	.4684	.2456 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	2.5611	.3706	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

Findings Related to the Second Hypothesis

In testing the hypothesis of no difference in the two sample groups' response to the 11 areas covered by the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, the t-Test was applied to the results of each area. The results of this analysis are presented below:

- a. Satisfaction with the faculty. Table 16 presents the findings of this analysis. As no significant differences were found, the hypothesis of no difference between the two groups in the area of satisfaction with the faculty was accepted as tenable at the five percent level of confidence.
- b. Satisfaction with the administration. The findings of this analysis are presented in Table 17. No significant differences were found in this area and the hypothesis of no difference between the two groups in the area of satisfaction with

the administration was accepted.

Table 16. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with faculty (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Satisfaction with faculty	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	24.56	4.37	.3745 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	24.28	4.66	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a non-significant

Table 17. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with administration (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Satisfaction with administration	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	24.03	5.79	1.1331 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	25.02	4.92	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a non-significant

- c. Satisfaction with major. Analysis in this area revealed a significant difference between the two sample groups at the five percent level with the residence hall men expressing greater satisfaction. The hypothesis of no difference

between the two groups in the area of satisfaction with major was rejected. Table 18 presents the findings of this analysis.

Table 18. Summary data for the t-Test on the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with major (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Satisfaction with major	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	27.59	3.98	2.0185 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	26.12	4.72	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a significant

- d. Satisfaction with students. Results of the analysis in this area revealed no significant differences between the two groups. The hypothesis of no difference between the two groups in the area of satisfaction with students was accepted. Table 19 presents the findings of the analysis in this area.
- e. Study habits. The findings of the analysis in the area of study habits are presented in Table 20. No significant differences were found on this factor for the two groups and the hypothesis of no difference was accepted.
- f. Extracurricular involvement. Analysis in the area of extracurricular involvement revealed a significant difference

between the two study groups at the one percent level with the fraternity men having a greater involvement. Therefore the hypothesis of no difference was rejected. Table 21 presents the findings of this analysis.

Table 19. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of satisfaction with students (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Satisfaction with students	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	26.03	4.18	.3119 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	26.23	3.67	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a non-significant

Table 20. Summary data for the t-Test on the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of study habits (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Study habits	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	25.08	4.60	.6643 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	24.62	3.89	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a non-significant

Table 21. Summary data for the t-Test on the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of extracurricular involvement (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Extracurricular involvement	Residence Hall upperclassmen	64	20.69	4.40	4.2991 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	23.47	3.54	

$t_{(.01)} = 2.58$

^a significant

g. Family independence. Analysis in the area of family independence revealed no significant difference between the two groups and the hypothesis of no difference was accepted. A summary of the analysis is presented in Table 22.

Table 22. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of family independence (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Family independence	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	24.86	4.89	.1544 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	24.98	4.59	

$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$

^a non-significant

h. Peer independence. The findings of the analysis in the area of peer independence revealed a significant difference between

the two study groups at the one percent level with the residence hall men expressing greater independence. Therefore the hypothesis of no difference was rejected. Table 23 presents the findings of this analysis.

Table 23. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of peer independence (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Peer independence	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	26.69	5.04	3.5546 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	24.28	3.28	

$$t_{(.01)} = 2.58$$

^asignificant

- i. Liberalism. An analysis of the responses of the two groups in the area of liberalism revealed no significant differences and the hypothesis of no difference was accepted as tenable. A summary of the analysis in this area is presented in Table 24.
- j. Social conscience. The findings of the analysis in the area of social conscience revealed a significant difference between the two groups at the five percent level with the residence hall men having higher scores. Therefore the hypothesis of no difference was rejected. The analysis of the findings in

this area is presented in Table 25.

Table 24. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of liberalism (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Liberalism	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	27.19	5.45	1.6191 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	25.84	4.76	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a non-significant

Table 25. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of social conscience (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Social conscience	Residence Hall upperclassmen	64	28.63	4.26	2.1868 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	27.10	4.24	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a significant

k. Cultural sophistication. The findings of the analysis in the area of cultural sophistication are presented in Table 26.

No significant differences were found for the two groups on this factor and the hypothesis of no difference was accepted as tenable.

Table 26. Summary data for the t-Test of the mean difference between residence hall upperclassmen and fraternity upperclassmen on the variable of cultural sophistication (CSQ).

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Cultural sophistication	Residence hall upperclassmen	64	22.58	5.41	1.7313 ^a
	Fraternity upperclassmen	87	21.14	4.77	

$$t_{(.05)} = 1.976$$

^a non-significant

Summary of Results

Residence hall male upperclassmen were compared to fraternity upperclassmen in 12 areas. Statistical analysis revealed no significant difference between the two groups on the factors of college grade point average, satisfaction with the administration, satisfaction with students, study habits, family independence, liberalism, and cultural sophistication. Residence hall men had significantly higher scores in the areas of social conscience, satisfaction with major, and peer independence; fraternity men had significantly higher scores in the area of extracurricular involvement.

Table 27 presents a summary pertaining to the acceptance or rejection of the 12 null hypotheses under study.

Table 27. Summary table pertaining to the retention or rejection of the null hypotheses.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Corresponding hypothesis</u>
College grade point average	Accepted
Satisfaction with the faculty	Accepted
Satisfaction with the administration	Accepted
Satisfaction with major	Rejected
Satisfaction with students	Accepted
Study habits	Accepted
Extracurricular involvement	Rejected
Family independence	Accepted
Peer independence	Rejected
Liberalism	Accepted
Social conscience	Rejected
Cultural sophistication	Accepted

Demographic Data

In addition to sampling students' attitudes and opinions in the 11 different areas already covered in this chapter, the College Student Questionnaire, Part II, also provides descriptive or demographic data in several areas not included in the 11 sub-sections of the Questionnaire. In order to provide more depth and breadth of information concerning the two upperclassmen groups being studied, summaries of that data are provided in the following pages. In those cases where the data appeared to differ from expected values, the Chi-square test was used.

Range of Age: Table 28 presents a summary of the data pertaining to range of age for the two sample groups. As this study is

dealing with upperclassmen exclusively, the age range of 19 to 24+ years with a concentration in the 20 and 21 year old age level could well be expected.

Table 28. Range of ages for upperclassmen sample from fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Age	Residence hall		Fraternity		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
19	1	2	4	5	5	3
20	23	36	27	31	50	33
21	29	45	40	46	69	46
22	8	13	16	18	24	16
23	1	2	--	--	1	1
24 or older	1	2	--	--	1	1
Total	64	100%	87	100%	151	100%

Marital Status: A summary of the marital status of both groups is presented in Table 29. While a clear cut majority of both the fraternity upperclassmen and residence hall upperclassmen were single or unattached, a relatively higher percentage of fraternity upperclassmen were either going steady, pinned or engaged. The Chi-square test of independence was applied to a combination of these categories (unattached, attached), revealing a significant difference between the two groups at the one percent level of confidence. Table 30 presents a summary of the findings of this analysis.

Table 29. Summary of data pertaining to marital status of the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Marital status	Residence hall		Fraternity		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single or unattached	51	80	48	55	99	66
Going steady	3	5	11	13	14	9
Pinned or equivalent	4	6	12	14	16	11
Engaged	6	9	16	18	22	15
Total	64	100	87	100	151	100

Table 30. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and marital status.

Group	Marital status		χ^2
	Single N	Attached N	
Residence hall upperclassmen	51	13	9.8153 ^a
Fraternity upperclassmen	48	39	

$$\chi^2_{(.01)} = 6.64$$

^a significant

Major Field: Major field concentrations for each sample group are presented in Table 31. As Oregon State University concentrates rather heavily in the science and technological areas, the higher percentages of majors for both the sample groups in these areas would seem to be a normal expectation. As fairly large differences appeared to exist in other areas, particularly in the area of Business, the Chi-square test of independence was applied to four combined

major areas (science based majors, humanities and social science, business, and education). Results of this analysis revealed no significant differences between the two groups. Table 32 presents a summary of this analysis.

Table 31. Summary data pertaining to major field of the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Major Field	Residence hall		Fraternity		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biological Science	7	12	8	9	15	10
Physical Science	7	12	12	13	19	13
Mathematics	5	8	3	3	8	6
Social Science	3	6	8	9	11	7
Humanities and Arts	4	7	3	3	7	5
Education	6	10	5	5	11	7
Business	4	8	15	17	19	13
Engineering	18	29	20	23	38	26
Other professions	8	12	9	11	17	11
Total	62	98	83	93	145	96*

*Note: The College Student Questionnaire does not require response to all items.

Table 32. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and choice of major.

Group	Major field area				χ^2
	Science based N	Humanities, Social Sci. N	Business N	Education N	
Residence hall upperclassmen	37	7	4	6	4.8019 ^a
Fraternity upperclassmen	43	11	15	5	

χ^2
(.05) = 7.82

^anon-significant

Time of Vocational Decision: Summary data pertaining to when a vocational decision was made by the two sample groups is presented in Table 33. While the decisions appear to be fairly equally distributed over time for both groups, residence hall groups would appear to have been slightly earlier in their reported time of vocational choice. However, as indicated in Table 34, the Chi-square test of independence revealed no significant differences in this area.

Number of Fields Considered: Table 35 indicates the number of fields considered in the choice of a major by both sample groups. A fairly equal distribution would appear to exist as to the number of fields considered.

Expectation of Graduate Work: A summary of the two sample groups' expectation of graduate work is presented in Table 36. From the data reported, both groups' expectation of graduate work would appear to be relatively equal. It is interesting to note that both groups had a fairly high expectation of doing some sort of academic work beyond their initial degree, with a total positive response (probably yes, definitely yes) of 63 percent.

Main Source of Financial Support: Table 37 presents the summary data relative to main sources of financial support for the two sample groups. When the sources were combined into two groups (economically advantaged, no advantage) and the Chi-square test of independence was applied, a significant difference at the one percent

Table 33. Summary data pertaining to when vocational decision was made by the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

When decision was made	Residence halls		Fraternities		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
In past six months	1	2	1	1	2	1
Between six months and a year ago	1	2	4	5	5	3
About a year ago	3	5	9	10	12	8
About two years ago	13	20	21	24	34	23
Three years ago	16	25	20	23	36	24
Four years ago	5	8	11	13	16	11
Five to seven years ago	17	27	15	17	32	21
More than seven years ago	5	8	3	3	8	5
Total	61	97	84	96	145	96*

*Note: The College Student Questionnaire does not require response to all items.

Table 34. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and time of vocational decision.

Group	Time of vocational decision			χ^2
	1 yr/less N	2-3 yrs N	4 yrs/more N	
Residence hall upperclassmen	5	29	27	3.1182 ^a
Fraternity upperclassmen	14	41	29	

$$\chi^2_{(.05)} = 5.99$$

^a non-significant

Table 35. Summary of data pertaining to number of fields considered in choice of a major of the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Number of fields	<u>Residence halls</u>		<u>Fraternities</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	7	11	14	16	21	14
Two	22	34	28	32	50	33
Three	25	39	33	38	58	38
Four or more	10	16	10	11	20	13
Total	64	100	85	97	149	98*

*Note: The College Student Questionnaire does not require response to all items.

Table 36. Summary of data pertaining to expectation of graduate work for the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Expectation	<u>Residence hall</u>		<u>Fraternity</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Definitely yes	21	33	25	29	46	30
Probably yes	19	30	31	36	50	33
Probably not	17	27	24	28	41	27
Definitely not	2	3	2	2	4	3
Not thought enough to say	5	8	4	7	9	6
Total	64	100	86	98	150	99*

*Note: The College Student Questionnaire does not require response to all items.

level was found. A significantly greater number of residence hall men in the sample received their main support from parents, jobs and loans while a significantly greater number of the fraternity sample relied on scholarships, savings, the GI bill and ROTC and trust funds and insurance. Table 38 presents a summary of this analysis.

Table 37. Summary data pertaining to main source of financial support for the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Main source	Residence hall		Fraternity		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parent or parents	24	38	26	30	50	33
Job	17	27	15	17	32	21
Scholarship	2	3	8	9	10	7
Loan	4	6	2	2	6	4
Previous personal earnings or savings	11	17	26	30	37	25
GI bill, ROTC etc.	3	5	6	7	9	6
Trust fund, insurance	1	2	3	3	4	3
Other	1	2	--	--	1	1
Total	63	98	86	98	149	98*

Expected Employment During College: A summary of the two sample groups' expectation of employment for the following college year is presented in Table 39. An analysis of three groups of combined expected hours of employment (six hours or less, six to fifteen hours, sixteen hours or more) utilizing the Chi-square test of independence revealed no significant differences between the two groups. Table 40 presents the findings of this analysis. It is clear however,

that a majority of both groups (68 percent) did not expect to be employed during the following academic year.

Table 38. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables-- living group and main source of financial support.

Variable	Group		χ^2
	Residence hall upperclassmen N	Fraternity upperclassmen N	
<u>No advantage</u>			
Parent	24	26	8.0083 ^a
Job	17	15	
Loan	4	2	
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>--</u>	
Total	46	43	
<u>Economically advantaged</u>			
Scholarship	2	8	
Savings*	11	26	
GI Bill, ROTC	3	6	
Trust fund, insurance	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	
Total	17	43	

$$\chi^2_{(.01)} = 6.64$$

^a significant

*Note: Savings are included in this category because young people normally cannot save much if they are even partially self-supporting. Therefore, previous savings, life insurance and trust funds represent an economic advantage not available to the average student.

Table 39. Summary data pertaining to expected employment during college for the two sample groups: upperclassmen residing in fraternities and residence halls at Oregon State University--1968-69.

Employment: hours per week	Residence hall		Fraternity		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	42	66	61	70	103	68
Less than six	2	3	9	10	11	7
6 to 10	8	13	5	6	13	9
11 to 15	3	5	4	5	7	5
16 to 20	6	9	4	5	10	7
21 to 25	1	2	3	3	4	3
26 to 30	--	--	--	--	--	--
More than 30	1	2	--	--	--	--
Total	63	98	86	98	149	98*

*Note: The College Student Questionnaire does not require response to all items.

Table 40. The Chi-square test of independence of the two variables--living group and expected employment.

Group	Expected employment per week			χ^2
	6 hr/less N	6-15 hrs N	16 hrs/more N	
Residence hall upperclassmen	44	11	8	2.7078 ^a
Fraternity upperclassmen	70	9	7	

$$\chi^2_{(.05)} = 5.99$$

^a non-significant

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to compare and contrast upperclassmen males residing in fraternities and upperclassmen males living in residence halls at Oregon State University on a variety of definable characteristics to determine if measurable differences did exist.

This study dealt with the following specific questions:

1. To what extent did junior and senior male university students residing in fraternities and junior and senior non-fraternity students living in residence halls differ on college grade point average for their freshman and sophomore years when any differences in ability as indicated by high school grade point average and college aptitude test scores were taken into account.
2. To what extent did these two groups of men differ in the following areas, as measured by the College Student Questionnaire, Part II:
 - a. satisfaction with the faculty
 - b. satisfaction with the administration
 - c. satisfaction with major
 - d. satisfaction with students
 - e. study habits

- f. extracurricular involvement
- g. family independence
- h. peer independence
- i. liberalism
- j. social conscience
- k. cultural sophistication

For purposes of statistical analysis, 12 null hypotheses were established relative to the variables under study.

Definition of the Sample

The sample for this study consisted of a random selection of members from the two populations: (1) all those upperclassmen residing in fraternities at Oregon State University at the time of the study who had the necessary study data available in their permanent files located in the Office of the Dean of Men and (2) all those upper-class non-fraternity men living in residence halls at Oregon State University at the time of the study who had the necessary study data available in their permanent files. Included in the sample were 86 residence hall men and 100 fraternity men.

Method and Procedure

After the samples had been selected, data, in the form of high school cumulative grade point averages, Scholastic Aptitude Verbal

and Mathematical Test scores and college grade point averages for the first two years of college, were obtained from the official records of the Office of the Dean of Men. Comparisons were then made to determine if differences in real ability between the two sample groups existed. If real differences were found to exist, it could account for other differences found between the groups including any differences in the attitudinal material obtained from the College Student Questionnaire. Statistical analysis was conducted between the two groups on the variables of high school grade point average and SAT test scores. The results of this analysis indicated no significant differences between the two sample groups on these factors.

The College Student Questionnaire, Part II, was then administered to both sample groups, resulting in a 74 percent return from the residence hall sample (64 sample members) and a 87 percent return from the fraternity sample (87 sample members). The Questionnaires were then set to Educational Testing Service for scoring.

Analysis and Findings

Upon return of the data from ETS, the 12 hypotheses under consideration were tested by use of the t-Test.

Findings indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the areas of: (1) college grade point average, (2) satisfaction with the faculty, (3) satisfaction with the administration,

(4) satisfaction with students, (5) study habits, (6) family independence, (7) liberalism, and (8) cultural sophistication. Significant differences for the residence hall men at the five percent level of confidence were found in the areas of: (1) social conscience and (2) satisfaction with major and at the one percent level of confidence in the area of (3) peer independence. Significant differences for the fraternity upperclassmen were found in the area of extracurricular involvement at the one percent level of confidence.

Analysis of other demographic data obtained from the College Student Questionnaire indicated two areas that were significantly different: (1) a significantly greater number of fraternity men were going steady, pinned or engaged and (2) a significantly greater number of residence hall men utilized parents, jobs and loans as their main source of financial support while a greater number of fraternity men utilized scholarships, trust funds and savings.

Conclusions

From the results of this study, the following conclusions and implications were drawn:

1. As supported by much of the literature, including such studies as those done by Eurich (1927), MacPhail (1933), Crookston (1960), Willingham (1962) and others, it can be concluded that there were no significant differences in

ability or academic success between those upperclassmen living in fraternities and those upperclassmen residing in residence halls at Oregon State University.

2. It can be concluded that while many similarities existed among the two groups in their attitudes and opinions, there were certain significant differences which separated and distinguished the two groups from one another. Of the two sample groups under study, the fraternity group was significantly more involved in organized extracurricular affairs, including student government, athletics, religious groups, preprofessional clubs and the like. Residence hall upperclassmen were significantly more positive about their activities in their field of academic concentration and exhibited a more personal commitment to their present major field, a greater satisfaction with the instruction received, with departmental procedures and with the level of personal achievement within their chosen fields. In addition, residence hall upperclassmen studied were significantly more independent with their peer group; being less concerned about how their behavior appeared to other students and were not as apt to consult with acquaintances about personal matters as were the fraternity group. Finally, the residence hall group exhibited a significantly greater moral concern about perceived

social injustice and "institutional wrongdoing" than did the fraternity group.

In addition, analysis of the demographic data obtained from the College Student Questionnaire indicated that other measurable differences existed between the two groups. Results of analyses in several areas indicated that residence hall men relied more heavily on help from parents, employment and loans for financial support which suggests that they may tend to bear an economic disadvantage when compared with the fraternity group, who relied significantly less on parents, employment and loans and significantly more on scholarships, savings and trust funds.

Analysis in the area of dating habits and marital status revealed that a significantly greater number of the fraternity sample was either going steady, pinned or engaged when compared to the residence hall sample.

One of the main purposes of this study was to determine if there were significant, measurable differences between upperclassmen residing in fraternities and non-fraternity upperclassmen living in residence halls at Oregon State University. Results of this investigation would tend to indicate that such differences do indeed exist, that they are measurable and significant, and that differences between the two groups may lie in areas that are not commonly thought as characteristic of one group or the other. Commonly held notions concerning

characteristics of fraternity men or residence hall men may well not hold up under research investigation and a fair amount of re-evaluation of institutions' points of view may be needed.

Suggestions for Further Research

Since some statistically significant differences in the two groups' activities, attitudes and opinions as well as in some areas of the demographic data were found, it would be most valuable to replicate such a study as this, utilizing as stringent controls as possible, in an attempt to determine more reliably the cause of these differences and if they could be attributed to the living group itself.

Studies, utilizing upperclassmen samples from other living groups such as cooperatives, sororities and off-campus residences, would add a good deal of interesting and useful information on these groups of students and better aid the University in meeting their total educational needs.

Finally, studies involved in attempting to determine groups of students' perceptions of the University and its various components would seem to be advisable, if the faculty, administration and the students themselves are to fully understand what the University can do to and for the community it serves.

It would seem relevant to speculate on some of the possible reasons behind the findings of this study in order that specific questions

leading to further research might be established. Some of the questions that this investigation has raised include the following:

1. With residence hall upperclassmen being more independent from their peers and with a significantly greater number of fraternity upperclassmen being either pinned or engaged, is there something in the psychology of fraternity men that makes them need to "belong" more than do the relatively independent residence hall men? While studies by Jackson and Winkler (1964), Mahler (1962) and Newcomb (1966) all tend to indicate that living group experiences have some effect on the values of the members involved, more definitive research would be useful in this area.
2. The fraternity program at Oregon State University is both large and well organized, tending to stress academic achievement as well as extracurricular and social involvement. And while the fraternity group was significantly more involved in extracurricular affairs, the fact that there were no significant differences in such areas as academic ability and achievement raises several questions. Do the selective procedures the fraternity system invokes in choosing of members do any more of an adequate job than the self-selection process that takes place with residence hall men? What effects does the fraternity system really have upon its member's

achievement, success and self-growth? A fair amount of research, including such studies as those by Worcester (1923), MacPhail (1933), Crookston (1960) and Willingham (1962) in the academic areas; studies by Scott (1965b) and Newcomb (1966) in the area of attitudes and values; and studies by Wise (1963) and to some extent that by Dollar (1966) in broad comparisons, have all pointed to the possibility that there are, in actuality, relatively few differences between fraternity and non-fraternity men. The relative value of the fraternity system as it now exists would seem to be in question.

3. Finally, the fact that the residence hall group was at the same time significantly more independent of their peers, significantly more concerned about perceived social injustice and "institutional wrongdoing", and significantly more satisfied with their major, leads to several areas of speculation. Could the fact that the residence hall group appeared to be more questioning, less conforming, and more independent have led this group to the choosing of a major that was more in keeping with their actual style of life? Are the pressures of conformity within fraternity life such that while being more accepting of "the establishment" and its values, they are actually uncomfortable with their "conforming" choice of majors? Could there be a difference between the two groups

in the degree to which they have had to face the deeper levels of meaning in life styles?

It is evident that there is much need for additional objective information to provide a substantive basis upon which to evaluate the various claims and counter-claims concerning the relative merits of fraternity and residence hall living.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfret, Elizabeth. 1966. Housing selection, need satisfaction and dropout from college. *Psychological Reports* 19:183-186.
- Bradshaw, Homer L. and Richard Kahoe. 1967. Differential effects of fraternity and sorority membership upon academically promising students. *The Journal of Educational Research* 61:62-64.
- Buckner, Donald R. 1961. A comparison of the scholarship of freshman fraternity pledges and residence hall men. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 2:20-24.
- Butler, William R. 1959. Factors associated with scholastic achievement in high and low achieving fraternities. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 38:134-141.
- Byrnes, R. 1930. Concerning college grades. *School and Society* 31:684-686.
- Carter, T. M. 1934. The effect of college fraternities on scholarship. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 18:393-400.
- Chase, O. H. 1949. One man's opinion. *Banta's Greek Exchange* 34:279-282.
- Chickering, Arthur W. 1967. College residences and student development. *Educational Record* 48:179-186.
- Constance, C. L. 1929. Greeks on the campus. *School and Society* 30:409-414.
- Crookston, Burns B. 1960. Academic performance of fraternity pledges. *The Journal of College Personnel* 1:19-22.
- _____. 1961. Selectivity as a factor in fraternity scholastic achievement. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 40:355-357.
- DiVesta, F. J. and A. D. Woodruff. 1949. Students' concepts of fraternities and sororities. *Journal of Social Psychology* 29:119-122.
- Dollar, Robert J. 1966. Student characteristics and choice of housing. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:147-150.

- Drasgow, James. 1958. Differences between college students. *Journal of Higher Education* 29:216-218.
- Dressel, Paul L. and Irving J. Lehman. 1965. The impact of higher education on student attitudes, values and critical thinking abilities. *Educational Record* 46:248-257.
- Eddy, Edward D. 1959. The college influence on student character. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education. 183 p.
- Eurich, Alvin C. 1927. The relation of achievement between college fraternity and non-fraternity groups. *School and Society* 26:624-630.
- Fraternity self study: preliminary report. 1965. Burlington, Vermont, University of Vermont. 163 p.
- Goldsen, R. et al. 1960. What college students think. New York, Van Nostrand. 240 p.
- Hooker, Elbert L. 1936. A study of the fraternity system as it operates on the Southern Methodist University campus. Master's thesis. Dallas, Southern Methodist University. 75 numb. leaves.
- Jackson, Ronald and Ronald C. Winkler. 1964. A comparison of pledges and independents. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 1964, 43:379-382.
- Jones, L. 1931. Class attendance and college marks. *School and Society* 33:444-446.
- Kaludis, George and Gilbert Zarkin. 1966. Anatomy of a pledge class. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:282-284.
- Lehman, H. C. 1935. Motivation; college marks and the fraternity pledge. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 19:9-28.
- Lepley, W. M. 1946. A comparison of fraternity and non-fraternity populations with regard to certain personality characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 31:156-161.
- MacPhail, A. H. 1933. A comparative study of the quality of academic work done by fraternity and non-fraternity students at Brown University. *School and Society* 38:873-876.

- Mahler, Irwin. 1962. Yeasayers and naysayers; a validating study. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 64:317-318.
- Maney, C. A. 1934. The distribution of membership in the extracurricular activities of the liberal arts college. *School and Society* 39:63-64.
- Matson, Robert E. 1963. A study of the influence of fraternity residence hall and off-campus living on students of high, average, and low college potential. *National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors, Journal* 1963, 26:24-29.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. 1963. Administering studies of campus cultures. In: *The study of campus cultures*, ed. by Terry F. Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. p. 95-111.
- _____. 1966. Research on student characteristics: current approaches. In: *The college and the student*, ed. by Lawrence Dennin and Joseph Kauffman. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education. p. 101-116.
- Peatman, John G. 1947. *Descriptive and sampling statistics*. New York, Harper. 560 p.
- Peterson, Richard E. 1968. *College student questionnaire - technical manual*. Princeton, New Jersey, Educational Testing Service. 60 p.
- Prusok, R. E. and W. Walsh. 1964. College student's residence and academic achievement. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 5:180-184.
- Riggs, Melvin. 1937. Motivation in the arts college. *Journal of Higher Education* 8:101-102.
- Scott, William A. 1965a. Personal values in fraternities and sororities. *National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors, Journal* 28:187-192.
- _____. 1965b. *Values and organizations*. Chicago, Rand McNally. 290 p.

- Sherman, J. R. 1967. Attitudes toward the men's social fraternities at the University of Colorado. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 8:75-79.
- Shutt, Darold L. 1955. Attitude changes among first year college men living in fraternities and residence halls. Ed. D. thesis. Urbana, University of Illinois. 91 numb. leaves. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts*, 15:749-750. 1955)
- Thomson, Edward A. and Anthony S. Papalia. 1964. Attitudes of independent men toward social opportunities at a fraternity oriented college. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 6:88-89.
- Van Alstine, F. L. et al. 1942. The relationship between the housing of students and their scholarship. *School and Society* 56:388-392.
- Warnock, Arthur R. 1914. Fraternities and scholarship at the University of Illinois. *Science* 40:542-547.
- Williamson, E. G. 1948. The group origins of student leaders. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 8:603-612.
- _____. 1961. *Student personnel services in colleges and universities*. New York, McGraw-Hill. 474 p.
- Willingham, Warren W. 1962. College performance of fraternity members and independent students. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 41:29-31.
- Wise, Wilmer E. 1963. The influence of the greek-letter social fraternity system at the Pennsylvania State University. Ed. D. thesis. University Park, The Pennsylvania State College. 130 numb. leaves. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts*, 25:952, 1964)
- Worcester, D. A. 1923. Fraternities and scholarship. *School and Society* 18:147-148.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

CORVALLIS, OREGON 97331

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

Reply to: OFFICE OF DEAN OF MEN

Dear Residence Hall Upperclassman:

As you may be aware, we are presently involved in carrying out a research study, under the auspices of the Office of the Dean of Men, in an attempt to determine some of the attitudes and opinions toward the University of upperclassmen living in residence halls. To assess these areas, a nationally standardized questionnaire, which requires about an hour to take, is being administered to a small group of men who have been selected by random sampling techniques as representative of all residence hall upperclassmen.

Through this random selection process, your name was chosen as a member of this representative group. In order to make the findings of this study meaningful and useful, your cooperation is very much needed. If a sufficient number of the residence hall sample are unable to respond, the findings may present an inaccurate picture of the attitudes your group may hold.

In the next few days, your head resident will be contacting you and will tell you where and when the questionnaire will be administered.

It is very important that you participate in this study and the time you spend will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

James M. Kuder

JMK:le

APPENDIX B

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

CORVALLIS, OREGON 97331

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

Reply to: OFFICE OF DEAN OF MEN

Dear Upperclassman:

I was sorry you were unable to make the Upperclassmen Survey meetings last week. As you may recall, we are involved in a study of the attitudes and opinions toward the University of upperclassmen living in residence halls and a similar group of upperclassmen residing in fraternities.

In order to make the findings of this study meaningful and useful, your help is still very much needed. If a sufficient number of residence hall men do not respond, the findings may present an inaccurate picture of how you feel about such areas as the administration, the faculty, or your particular area of study.

If at all possible, could you take just one hour of your time on Monday, February 3, 7:00 p. m. at either the Weatherford Cafeteria or the McNary Cafeteria to respond to this questionnaire. Your efforts to attend would really be appreciated.

Most sincerely,

James M. Kuder

jg

APPENDIX C

OSU

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Dean of Men

Dear Fraternity Upperclassman:

As you may be aware, we are presently involved in carrying out a research study, under the auspices of the Office of the Dean of Men, in an attempt to determine some of the attitudes and opinions toward the University of upperclassmen living in residence halls. To assess these areas, a nationally standardized questionnaire, which requires about an hour to take, is being administered to a small group of men who have been selected by random sampling techniques as representative of all fraternity upperclassmen.

Through this random selection process, your name was chosen as a member of this representative group. In order to make the findings of this study meaningful and useful, your cooperation is very much needed. If a sufficient number of the fraternity sample are unable to respond, the findings may present an inaccurate picture of the attitudes your group may hold.

In the next few days, your fraternity president will be contacting you and will tell you where and when the questionnaire will be administered. It is very important that you participate in this study and the time you spend will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

James M. Kuder

MJK:le

APPENDIX D

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

CORVALLIS, OREGON 97331
Reply to: OFFICE OF DEAN OF MEN

Dear Upperclassman:

I was sorry you were unable to make the Upperclassmen Survey meetings last week. As you may recall, we are involved in a study of the attitudes and opinions toward the University of upperclassmen living in residence halls and a similar group of upperclassmen residing in fraternities.

In order to make the findings of this study meaningful and useful, your help is still very much needed. If a sufficient number of fraternity men do not respond, the findings may present an inaccurate picture of how you feel about such areas as the administration, the faculty, or your particular area of study.

If at all possible, could you take just one hour of your time on Wednesday, February 5, 7:00 p. m. at either the SAE house or at Sigma Chi.

Most sincerely,

James M. Kuder

le

APPENDIX E

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{(N_1 - 1)(SD_1)^2 + (N_2 - 1)(SD_2)^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \right] \left[\frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 N_2} \right]}}$$