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Understanding Factors Influencing Members Expression of Hypermasculine Behaviors in Fraternities Serving Male-Identified Individuals at a Predominately White Institution

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of chapter one is to provide an introduction and explanation of the thesis research topic, a brief understanding of the significance of fraternity membership, an explanation of the significance of the research, an overview of common terminology, and outline of the thesis.

Personal Statement

As an undergraduate and member of a fraternity the researcher had many experiences, which shaped their view of fraternalism and masculinity within these organizations. The way in which members of the researchers fraternity interacted with each other, with women, and others within the Greek community provided a glimpse into the influence masculinity has on the activities and the image fraternity organizations have of masculinity. During the time of the research, the researcher worked as the graduate teaching assistant (GTA) within the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life at Greek University (GU), supporting the work of the Interfraternity Council (IFC) council and affiliated chapters. The GTA role required the researcher to consider the influence masculinity had on many current issues, sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol abuse, which were salient throughout the GU Greek community and the current fraternal movement. With these experiences and past advocacy with gender roles, the researcher sought to develop a research question that would support their graduate work and passion for both gender equity and Greek Life.

GU is a predominately White institution and overall the organizations within the Greek community mirror the demographics of the institution. The Greek community is
comprised of three governing councils, IFC, Panhellenic Council (PHC), and the Unified Greek Council (UGC), with one National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) sorority, and a group of independent organizations, consisting of 46 Greek organizations. Due to the socially constructed perception of masculinity within members of these organizations and the salience of community-wide issues, which are exacerbated due to hypermasculine behaviors, The researcher set out to understand the factors which impact why members of these fraternities express hypermasculine behavior (if, in fact, they do), in an effort to understand the opportunities and points of intersection for departments, professionals, and programs to influence these negative behaviors to more supportive and positive behaviors.

**Topic of Study**

Many students who join fraternities are looking to build social connection, community, a network, and brotherhood, while others are looking to recreate media constructed expectations of Greek life (Bronner, 2012; Cimino, 2011; Cohen & Kisker, 2009; Nuwer, 1999; Syrett, 2009). Whatever the reason a student joins a fraternity, the experience a student has as a member can shape their college and post-college experiences (Syrett, 2009). While fraternities offer many positive benefits, the current landscape of fraternity membership includes a perception in which members must meet the socially constructed standard of what it means to be a man (Gough & Edwards, 1998; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988; Spence & Hahn, 1997; Yeung, Stombler, & Wharton, 2006); these standards come in many negative forms, including alcohol and drug use, mistreatment of women, hazing, and physical violence (Cimino, 2011; Kolman, 2009; Martin & Hummer, 1989; Nuwer, 1990; Nuwer, 1999; Syrett, 2009). These behaviors and actions have become a part of the culture of
many of these organizations and many (both inside and outside these organizations) expect members to conform to these behaviors or be excluded (Cimino, 2011; Fierberg, 2012; Kolman, 2009; Nuwer, 1990; Nuwer, 1999). The research study examined the experiences of undergraduate students enrolled at a predominately White institution, who were affiliated members of fraternities, in order to gain insight into the factors that reinforce hypermasculine behaviors, in an effort to understand the potential points of intersection with campus resources, programs, and professionals.

The research study focused on understanding what factors impact the increased expression of hypermasculine behaviors of affiliated members of fraternity organizations, through an assessment of the self-reported beliefs of these members. Utilizing Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski’s (2004) Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI) for the research study, to collect quantitative data from new and initiated members of these fraternities. In addition to the ADMI, demographic information (initiation status, years in college, and years of involvement in their fraternity) was collected. Demographic data was helpful in understanding where students were in their fraternity experience and where there may be opportunities for intervention, based on length of time remaining in their university experience. The research study focused around the following overarching question: What factors influence a members expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution?

**Significance of Fraternity Membership**

On December 5th 1776, five students at the College of William and Mary met in the Apollo Room of the Old Raleigh Tavern in Williamsburg, Virginia (Voorhees, 1945). The
significance of meeting in the Apollo Room goes back to an era of campus culture in which students had little ability to engage in conversation and debate outside of the prescribed curriculum (Syrett, 2009; Voorhees, 1945). The meeting at the Old Raleigh Tavern would be considered the beginning of the Greek-letter fraternity movement, as the men in attendance were discussing the founding of Phi Beta Kappa fraternity (Voorhees, 1945). John Heath, the first Phi Beta Kappa president, was determined to develop a society that would be much more serious minded than other societies at the college (Current, 1990). The focus of Phi Beta Kappa was to be devoted to the pursuit of a liberal education and intellectual fellowship (Voorhees, 1945). Phi Beta Kappa would establish many of the traditions and rituals that would become the foundation for future Greek-letter fraternities; these included an oath of secrecy, badges, mottoes in Greek and Latin, a code of laws, an elaborate form of initiation, a seal, and a special handshake (Current, 1990).

Fraternity membership continues to support these traditions and the outcomes of fraternity membership have broadened to include the connection to alumni, the privilege of ‘door opening,’ and the benefit of status, which comes along with membership. The professional benefits of fraternity membership can be seen throughout business and government sectors, with a reported 50% of the Top-10 Fortune500 CEOs and 15% of Fortune100 CEOs being fraternity men (“Fraternity stats at a glance,” 2014).

Beyond the professional opportunities fraternity membership provides, the values, professional skills, and personal development gained, provides members a foundation for excellence. As values-based organizations, the purpose of fraternity organizations is to instill values, which lay the groundwork to produce members who impact the world and share the
values of the organization. Many students seeking fraternity membership are seeking opportunities for personal and professional growth upon which many of these organizations are founded. Often times, though, new students are faced with a different reality, the organization and its members are out of alignment with these values, resulting in negative behaviors such alcohol and drug use, hazing, and illegal activities (Fierberg, 2012; Kolman, 2009; Nuwer, 1999).

Significance of Research

The research study sought to examine factors influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternity organizations serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution in a predominately White state in the United States of America. Utilizing current measures of masculinity, which include contributing factors of expression of hypermasculine behaviors, alongside years in school, initiation status, and years involved in their fraternity, the research study sought to better understand the points of intersection at which university professionals, programs, and resources can positively influence the hypermasculine behaviors and culture, which often exists within fraternities.

Much of the current research around hypermasculinity focuses on hypermasculinity in relation to sexual assault (Martin & Hummer, 1989; Peralta, 2007), binge drinking (Gough & Edwards, 1998; Martin & Hummer, 1989; Peralta, 2007), and hazing (Kolman, 2009; Nuwer, 1990; Nuwer, 1999), but fails to consider the factors that might influence the root of the problem, the hypermasculine culture of the organization. Findings from the research study will contribute to current research, focusing on the influence of hypermasculinity on the membership within fraternities and it will expand the literature and data available to higher
education professionals seeking to understand areas of intersection for intervention opportunities to possibly curb hypermasculinity. Ultimately, the research study seeks to provide further research, specific to higher education, which can be utilized in supporting students, reducing high-risk behavior, and positively influencing the experiences of students with membership in fraternity organizations.

**Definition of Terminology**

The following list contains key terms, which are utilized throughout the subsequent research. The list contains common terminology within fraternity communities and higher education.

**Active member.** Active member refers to a student who has completed his new member education program and/or has been initiated into the fraternity utilizing the predominately secret ritual of the organization. Active membership often includes all of the benefits and privileges of member, including access to resources/networking through the inter/national organization, scholarship opportunities, and leadership opportunities. Once initiated into fraternity organization, there is a well-known gentleman’s agreement (most commonly between NIC members organizations), which signifies another fraternity organization would not initiate the same individual. Fraternity members commonly know, once you are initiated into a fraternity organization, membership in another fraternity organization is not allowed.

**Bid.** A bid refers to the initial invitation for a potential new member to join the membership of the respective fraternity. When a student signs a bid he is acknowledging he is interested in gaining a more in-depth understanding of the organization. It is important for
students to consider all aspects of an organization before signing a bid, as well as the formalities behind signing a bid. Some fraternities do not have a new member education period, and initiation is often completed soon after bids are signed. On many campuses, signing a bid commits a student to the respective organization for a period of one year; preventing students from committing to multiple fraternities, as well as preventing a student from beginning in multiple new member education programs, which may contain secret rituals of the organization. Additionally, some campuses utilize bids as a way to track students who are entering the Greek community.

**Chapter.** A chapter is an institutional level organization, most often connected to an inter/national fraternity headquarters, though there are still many locally established chapters who do not have a connection to a larger fraternal organization. Most chapters are established through an expansion/colonizing process, which includes the recruitment of members, establishment of governing documents, and completion of a new member education and colonization program. After the colonization process is complete, the chapter will receive a charter from their respective organization, signifying their relationship with the inter/national fraternity headquarters. Chapters are comprised of a group of dues-paying students, from a respective university, who provide leadership, financial management, and membership expansion direction for the organization. Inter/national organizations have multiple chapters on campuses throughout the United States of America and aboard.

**Fraternity.** For purposes of the research this study utilized the definition provided by Merriam-Webster Dictionary for the definition of fraternity, which is “a men's student organization formed chiefly for social purposes having secret rites and a name consisting of
Greek letters” (“Fraternity,” 2014). While the definition of fraternity utilized by the research study is textbook, fraternity in a broader sense is built and defined around the missions, values, and membership requirements of each respective organization. A common misconception of fraternities is they only includes predominately White men’s organizations, but in fact fraternities encompasses women’s organizations, honor societies, multicultural groups, special interest groups, and social groups.

**Gender Identity.** Estelle Disch (2009) in her book *Reconstructing Gender: A Multicultural Anthology*, defined gender identity as an identity, which individuals identify with, and defines for themselves. Oftentimes individuals assume there are only two genders, male and female, where in fact there is a spectrum of gender identity; representing a more nuanced, and ultimately truly authentic model of human gender, often not based on physical characteristics (“Understanding Gender,” 2015). Because of the binary nature of the fraternity/sorority community, often those who fall outside of the gender binary do not feel welcome in these organizations (“How homophobia hurts the college sorority,” 2015). For purposes of the research study, gender identity was not examined outside of the male female binary due to the potential risk of harm for participants.

**Hypermasculinity.** Mosher and Sirkin (1984) defined hypermasculinity as “exaggerated masculinity, including callous attitudes toward women and sex, and the perception of violence as manly and danger as exciting.” Hypermasculinity has been linked to many negative behaviors including sexual assault, overconsumption of alcohol, drug use, physical violence, and negative perceptions of women (Connell, 1993; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Mosher and Sirkin, 1984). Masculinity simply, is a social construct,
which has developed into a single-dominant narrative of the “perfect man” (Connell, 1993; Mosher and Sirkin, 1984).

Furthermore, Burk, Burkhart, and Sikorski (2004) defined hypermasculinity and hypermasculine behaviors as:

“Hypermasculinity is a construct that describes men who exhibit an exaggeration of the traditional male gender role, including characteristics such as a super-valuation of competitive, aggressive activities and a devaluation of cooperative, care-taking activities. In general, status and pride are highly valued, self-reliance or mistrust of others is evident, violence is perceived as necessary to maleness, women are predominantly seen as sexual objects or conquests, and sensation seeking is vital to life. Additionally, the expressed emotions of these individuals are likely constricted to displays of anger, disgust, and contempt, whereas the expression of emotions such as fear or love is perceived as weak.”

The above definition provides context for the research study’s definition of hypermasculinity and the expression of hypermasculine behaviors in connection to fraternity membership.

**Hypermasculine behaviors.** Hypermasculine behaviors, consistent with the definition of hypermasculinity and for purposes of the research study, will be defined consistent with the information presented above in the definition of hypermasculinity (Connell, 1993; Mosher and Sirkin, 1984).

**Independent organizations.** Affiliation with a governing council is not a requirement of fraternity or sorority organizations at GU. All of the organizations are structured the same as other fraternities and sororities, often, emphasizing, but not as a requirement, membership
based on college major, local creation, or multicultural students. There are currently 8
independent organizations at GU.

**Interfraternity Council (IFC).** The IFC is a student leadership-supported, campus-
based organization, comprised of an executive board and delegates from each of the IFC’s
dues-paying chapter members, often comprised of chapters who are affiliated with the North-
American Interfraternity Conference (“About the North-American Interfraternity
Conference,” 2014). Membership in the NIC is not a requirement for membership in a
campus-based IFC (“About the North-American Interfraternity Conference,” 2014). The
executive board of the IFC is made up of leaders from members of the dues-paying chapter
membership of the IFC. They are tasked with providing leadership, direction, and advocating
for the programs and services offered on the campus level by the IFC and university (“About
the North-American Interfraternity Conference,” 2014). There are currently 19 affiliated IFC
organizations at GU.

**National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC).** The National Pan-Hellenic Council, also
known as NPHC, is an organization consisting of nine historically African-American,
international Greek-lettered fraternities and sororities (“National Pan-Hellenic Council,
Incorporated,” 2014; Ross, 2001). Supporting the mission of its affiliates, NPHC, serves as a
connection and independent organization promoting the ideals of its affiliates (Ross, 2001).
GU currently only has one NPHC sorority on its campus and no fraternities.

**New member/pledge.** New member refers to a student who as gone through
recruitment and has signed a bid with a chapter. Most fraternity organizations have a new
member education program, typically lasting 8-15 weeks, through which new members are
taught the history, values, traditions, and finally the secret ritual, upon initiation, of the fraternity. The new member education period is also often where new members experience hazing activities, including consumption of alcohol, completion of inappropriate tasks, etc. The new member period is also where the culture of the fraternity is engrained into the new members. Pledge is widely considered inappropriate when referring to new members. Utilization of the word pledge in reference to new members is often associated with stereotypic, media-driven hazing activities; as such many students will come into an institution with these expectation, which includes pledging activities.

North American Interfraternity Conference (NIC). The NIC is an international trade association the currently represents 74 inter/national men’s fraternities (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2014). Providing advocacy for the enrichment, advancement, and enhancement of the fraternal experience, the NIC supports its member organizations, while supporting relationships on the campus level through student leadership-supported, campus-based Interfraternity Council affiliates.

Potential new member (PNM) – PNM refers to a student who is not currently affiliated with a fraternity but is interested in joining. It is common practice within fraternity recruitment to have PNs attend information sessions, as well as social events, to learn about the organization and its current members prior to signing a bid and becoming a new member.

Predominately White Institution (PWI). A PWI is defined as an institution of higher education with a racial profile, which is composed of a majority of individuals who identify as White (Gusa, 2010). Based on Fall 2014 enrollment, GU is considered a PWI with a majority, 78.1%, of students identifying as White (“GU Enrollment Summary - Fall Term 2014,” 2014).
Recruitment/Rush. Recruitment refers to the process of gaining and increasing membership of the respective fraternity organizations. Most often recruitment is referred to in two ways: formal recruitment and informal (sometimes year-round) recruitment. The difference is in the process new members go through in order to gain a bid to join from the respective fraternity. Formal recruitment refers to the large-scale structured recruitment activities taking place during the beginning fall and spring term, typically lead by an IFC executive dedicated to recruitment. The current process at GU would be considered semi-formal due to the lack of structure in the schedule for PNMs recruitment activities are planned by various chapters and PNMs self-select to attend events. Informal or year-round recruitment refers to activities, which take place throughout the year and engage PNMs in the process of learning about the organization organically. Current best practices suggest informal recruitment is most effective for men’s fraternities. Rush is widely considered to refer to the stereotypic, media driven view of recruitment. As such many students come into an institution with an expectation/perception of recruitment to be similar to what they have seen in movies or on the Internet.

Sex. Sometimes referred to as biological gender, includes the physical attributes, such as genitalia, sex chromosomes, sex hormones, and internal reproductive structures (“Understanding Gender,” 2015). For purposes of the research study, the definition of sex is defined as the sex someone is assigned at birth.

Unified Greek Council (UGC). The Unified Greek Council is a student leadership-supported, campus-based organization, which is comprised of an executive board and affiliated group of multicultural fraternity and sorority organizations. The executive board
members are tasked with providing leadership, direction, and advocating for the programs and services offered on for its members and the broader campus community. There are currently 6 affiliated organizations at GU.

**Organization of Thesis**

The following thesis is organized into the following five chapters: Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, and Discussion and Conclusion. Chapter one focuses on the introducing the topic of the thesis, providing background regarding the thesis topic, and setting a baseline understanding of common terminology. The second chapter focuses primarily on a history, current literature, and theories, which support the research. Additionally, the second chapter discusses the significance of the research study. The third chapter goes in-depth on the methodology utilized in order to conduct and complete the research study. Quantitative data was collected utilizing Qualtrics survey tool and analyzed accordingly. The final two chapters focus on the results, discussion, explanation of finding, and a conclusion of the thesis.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of the following chapter is to provide a review of current literature around the history of the fraternal movement, definition and literature on hypermasculinity and hypermasculine behaviors, and an understanding of theories impacting the research topic. Additionally, the following chapter discusses the relevance of the research study.

Overview of the History of the Fraternal Movement

Merrim-Webster.com (2014) defines a fraternity as “a men’s student organization formed chiefly for social purposes having secret rites and a name consisting of Greek letters.” Students in the colonial and emergent nation sought to escape the dull college experiences of the era, seeking camaraderie, other intellectuals, and the opportunity to separate from the control of the college, thus fraternal organizations were founded (Cohen & Kisker, 2009). Much of student life during the years surrounding the founding of fraternities was around religious teaching, which allowed little time for socializing and student opinions within the teachings of the time (Rudolph, 2011).

Many of the current issues facing fraternity organizations today, such as hazing, alcohol use, and the moving away from core fraternal values, are derived from social change, deeply rooted traditions, and changes of expectations from colleges (Bronner, 2012; Cimino, 2011; Fierberg, 2012). These changes are often the product of media driven expectations of fraternity and college life (i.e. movies such as Animal House and Neighbors) and the distanced relationship many institutions of higher education have taken. Much of the history of fraternities is around a sense of privilege and influence, which many of these organizations
have at institutions where they operated (Bronner, 2012). Fraternities shape the experience undergraduate students have through their time in college, offering independence, developing values congruence, structuring individual development, and providing leadership opportunities, in addition to creating a sense of community and brotherhood, which is still true today (Bronner, 2012; Syrett, 2009).

The experience a student has within a fraternity has an effect on both the students’ involvement in the campus community and their involvement in the fraternity (Bronner, 2012). Fraternities have used their influence to place members in leadership roles within colleges in order to help advance the student experience on their campus (Bronner, 2012; Rudolph, 2011). The students who began the fraternal movement believed they were not being given opportunities to freely learn. Their experiences influenced the start of many fraternal organizations, which were founded on values of academics, service, and independence (Bronner, 2012).

Modern fraternities began on December 5th 1776, when five students at the College of William and Mary met in the Apollo Room of the Old Raleigh Tavern in Williamsburg, Virginia, forming Phi Beta Kappa (Voorhees, 1945). John Heath, the first Phi Beta Kappa president, was determined to develop a society in which would be much more serious minded, than other societies at the college (Current, 1990). The focus of Phi Beta Kappa was to be devoted to the pursuit of a liberal education and intellectual fellowship (Voorhees, 1945). The formation of Phi Beta Kappa came out of a need the founders identified for a place and a group for members to be able to converse freely about any topic and escape the strict authority of the college (Ames, 2003; Voorhees, 1945).
Soon after the formation of Phi Beta Kappa, there was a boom in the establishment of college fraternities with the establishment and founding of Sigma Phi Fraternity, Alpha Delta Phi Fraternity, Psi Upsilon Fraternity, Beta Theta Pi Fraternity, and Alpha Sigma Phi Fraternity (Rudolph, 2011; Bronner, 2012). Many of these organizations evolved from literary and debate societies of the time, and aimed at providing fellowship outside of the college faculty and administrators control (Bronner, 2012).

Most of the organizations were established the next 125 years and served White, upper-class males (Nuwer, 1999; Syrett, 2009). The climate of the fraternity experience changed dramatically with the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the large influx of military men coming to college campuses (Syrett, 2009). These new students were looking for a connection to the brotherhood and camaraderie they had experienced during their military service, and joined fraternities in record numbers (Nuwer, 1990). The increase in military men brought with it an increase in the frequency and significance of hazing practices of many fraternity organizations (Cimino, 2011; Nuwer, 1990; Syrett, 2009). Increases in hazing practices is believed to be a result of the hypermasculine culture, cultivated as a result of military service and war time, which continues to saturate fraternity communities (Cimino, 2011; Syrett, 2009). Even after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 44 state Anti-Hazing laws, and multiple publications describing the epidemic of hypermasculinity, many of these fraternities continue to perpetuate hypermasculine behaviors through their new member education practices, initiation rituals, daily activities, and interactions with the community around them (Syrett, 2009).

Rudolph (1990) states “fraternities institutionalized...drinking, smoking, card playing,
singing and seducing…that the fraternity gave a new meaning to a cigar, a drink, a girl, a song and in time it was not really possible to distinguish purpose from manifestation” (p. 147). The behavior continued to be reinforced because as fraternities involved faculty and institutions struggled to respond to organizations with influential alumni, members began to view themselves as being entitled to decision making, privilege, and influence (Rudolph, 1990; Syrett, 2009). The rebellious, womanizing, and privileged lifestyle laid the groundwork for the privileged, entitled, and hypermasculine fraternity environments, which exist within many housed fraternity organizations still today.

**Defining Masculinity, Hypermasculinity, and Hypermasculine Behaviors**

Donald Mosher and Mark Sirkin (1984) first developed the definition of hypermasculinity in their article, *Measuring a Macho Personality Constellation*. Mosher and Sirkin (1984) defined hypermasculinity as “exaggerated masculinity, including callous attitudes toward women and sex, and the perception of violence as manly and danger as exciting.” Hypermasculinity has been linked to many negative behaviors including sexual assault, overconsumption of alcohol, drug use, physical violence, and negative perceptions of women (Connell, 1993; Mosher and Sirkin, 1984). Masculinity is just a social construct, which has developed into a single-dominate narrative of the “perfect man” (Connell, 1993; Mosher and Sirkin, 1984). The dominant narrative instills a sense of entitlement amongst men who meet the standard of masculinity and evokes a fear of being outcast amongst those who do not meet the standard. Those who fall outside the gender spectrum often feel isolated and distanced from those who express hypermasculine behaviors (Disch, 2009). Ben-Zeev et.al explained, men are socialized/culturally encouraged to express hypermasculine behaviors
(Ben-Zeev, Scharnetzki, Chan, & Dennehy, 2012). Further, Ben-Zeev et al. further expressed, men struggle with expressing feminine behaviors because of the perspective they will be labeled as a lower status group, such as homosexual (Ben-Zeev, Scharnetzki, Chan, & Dennehy, 2012). Burk, Burkhart, and Sikorski (2004) further defined hypermasculinity and hypermasculine behaviors as:

“Hypermasculinity is a construct that describes men who exhibit an exaggeration of the traditional male gender role, including characteristics such as a super-valuation of competitive, aggressive activities and a devaluation of cooperative, care-taking activities. In general, status and pride are highly valued, self-reliance or mistrust of others is evident, violence is perceived as necessary to maleness, women are predominantly seen as sexual objects or conquests, and sensation seeking is vital to life. Additionally, the expressed emotions of these individuals are likely constricted to displays of anger, disgust, and contempt, whereas the expression of emotions such as fear or love is perceived as weak.”

In the context of fraternity, hypermasculinity is rooted in many traditions and rituals of fraternity organizations, including new member education, initiations, interaction with women, and many others (Syrett, 2009). Often, even before beginning a new member education program, a PNM is inundated with messages of what it means to be a fraternity man (Ben-Zeev, Scharnetzki, Chan, & Dennehy, 2012). Media driven expectations of what it means to be a man and what it means to be a fraternity man are a subconscious reminder for young men as they seek or don’t seek to gain membership in a fraternal organization (Ben-Zeev, Scharnetzki, Chan, & Dennehy, 2012). Movies like Animal House and Neighbors,
along with websites like *Total Frat Move*, promote a negative and unhealthy standard of masculinity and fraternity through their satirical humor. Many potential new members (PMNs) have shaped their view of fraternity around these media driven stereotypes before ever interacting with an organization (Ben-Zeev, Scharnetzki, Chan, & Dennehy, 2012).

Research suggests that students who seek membership within fraternities may already exhibit behaviors that would be considered hypermasculine (Cimino, 2011; Kolman, 2009). New member education programs often include hazing activities, which seek to reinforce hierarchal difference between older members and new members (Cimino, 2011; Kolman, 2009; Nuwer, 1990). Hazing activities reemphasize the belief there needs to be dominance and aggression within a group of men (Cimino, 2011; Kolman, 2009; Nuwer, 1990). These hazing activities also involve degrading, unsafe, and illegal activities, often cause resentment and remove the trust that should exist between fraternity members.

**Explanation of Use of Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory**

Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski’s (2004) research article *Construction and Preliminary Validation of the Auburn Differential Masculinity Inventory* (ADMI) utilize many of the commonly recognized behaviors for understanding masculinity expression to construct a modernized version of Hypermascularity Index (HMI). The HMI, which was developed in 1984 included a number of statements which were outdated and were no longer relevant to the current generation of students (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988). The ADMI was selected for use because of its use of modernized statements, ease of scoring, and ease of transferability to a survey tool research instrument. Additionally, the ADMI allows for the identification of multiple sub-factors that influence an individual’s expression of masculine behaviors.
Student Development Theories

In an effort to better inform the researchers understanding of student development theory in connection to the research study, the following theories will be discussed: Astin’s Theory of Involvement, Chickering’s Theory of Identity Development, and Schlossberg’s Transition Theory. These three theories help construct a picture of the developmental needs of fraternity members in their development in fraternity environments. Additionally, they help to further explain the impact of a student’s involvement in connection to their identity development around masculinity.

Astin’s Theory of Involvement. Astin’s Theory of Involvement considers how involvement is central to increasing a student’s experience value of their time in college (Evans, Forney, Guido, & Patton, 2010). Evans, Forney, Guido, and Patton (2010) explained Astin’s theory had five basic assumptions, including:

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects; 2. Regardless of the object, involvement occurs along a continuum; 3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features; 4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program, and; 5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement.

These assumptions provide a framework for understanding the impact a student’s involvement has on their development.
For fraternity members, involvement is often a result of seeking friendships, community, and professional development opportunities. Increasing their opportunities for involvement comes through community service opportunities, leadership roles, and community engagement. Fraternities promote themselves as providing these opportunities and students looking for these prospects are provided the ability to engage in a community that offers them development, both emotionally and morally.

**Chickering’s Theory of Identity Development.** Chickering’s Theory of Identity Development consists of seven vectors, including: (1) developing competence, (2) managing emotion, (3) moving through autonomy towards interdependence, (4) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (5) establishing identity, (6) developing purpose, and (7) developing integrity (Evans, Forney, Guido, & Patton, 2010). The theory explains, students move through the seven vectors at variable rates and they can examine different vectors without actually having gone through the vectors in order (Evans, Forney, Guido, & Patton, 2010).

Chickering noted, in relation to environmental factors, which often affect a student’s ability to move through the vectors, the best teacher is a students peers. Friendships, such as those formed through fraternity membership, encourage a student’s development through the seven vectors. When it comes to organizations, which promote and express hypermasculine behaviors, these negative behaviors are often reinforced and students struggle to make it past the first four vectors. Students who continue within these environments and move into the establishing identity vector, often struggle with relationship building, express aggressive behaviors, and have a sense of dominance after completing college. These experiences stunt
development for some individuals, who can continue to perpetuate the negative behaviors often associated with fraternity membership.

**Schlossberg’s Transition Theory.** Schlossberg’s Transition Theory focuses on a student’s ability to cope and move through the process of transition (Evans, Forney, Guido, & Patton, 2010). It considered the “4S’s”, self, situation, support, and strategies, to be the factor affecting a student’s ability to cope with these events (Evans, Forney, Guido, & Patton, 2010). The three types of transition, each being defined by the student, include: (1) anticipated, (2) unanticipated, and (3) non-events.

For many students joining a fraternity comes at a time when there are a number of large transitions happening, including transitioning to college, living in a residence hall, and developing new social groups. Fraternity membership provides opportunities for increasing support, being included in a group, and the opportunity to build friendships. It also has the ability to add additional stress to a student’s transition due to new member program requirements, balance of academic and fraternity commitments, and changes in expectations from both their family and living in a residence hall. Often fraternity members have the opportunity to live in a chapter house, participate in social events, and take on leadership roles, which can add to the stress of a transition.

In the context of fraternity and specific to masculinity, fraternity members are often faced with navigating the transition to their behaviors prior to membership and the expectations of the often hypermasculine culture of fraternity membership. Often members are pushed to conform to the expectations of masculinity and to act in a certain way. Through Schlossberg’s theory, there is the opportunity to create a change in the expression of
hypermasculine behaviors. The change comes in the type of support given to a student. Positive, less stereotypical, support can result in the student having the voice to be able to navigate these pressures and ultimately develop a strategy for separating themselves from these pressures. They also may have the opportunity to create strategies for creating change around these hypermasculine behaviors.

**Study Relevance**

The research study sought to examine factor influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution in a predominately White state in the United States of America. Utilizing current measures of masculinity, which includes contributing factors of expression of hypermasculine behaviors, alongside years in school, initiation status, and years involved in their fraternity, the research study seeks to better understand the points of intersection at which university professionals, programs, and resources can positively impact the hypermasculine behaviors and culture, which often exists within fraternities. Another goal of the research is to provide research, which can be utilized in student support, reduce high-risk behavior, and positively influence the experiences of students within fraternities, associated with many of the current national media attention.

Much of the current research focuses on hypermasculinity in relation to sexual assault (Martin & Hummer, 1989; Peralta, 2007), binge drinking (Gough & Edwards, 1998; Martin & Hummer, 1989; Peralta, 2007), and hazing (Kolman, 2009; Nuwer, 1990; Nuwer, 1999), but fails to consider the factors influencing the root of the problem, hypermasculine culture of the organization. Findings from the research will contribute to current research focusing on the
influence of hypermasculinity on the membership within fraternities and expand the literature and data available to higher education professionals seeking to understand areas of intersection, which can be used as an intervention opportunities aimed at curbing hypermasculinity.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of the following chapter is to provide an overview of the methodology and research design for the research study. The chapter will include an understanding of the researcher’s perspective, research questions, and explanation of the overall research design, including site, sampling, participant recruitment, data collection and analysis, and study limitations.

Research Perspective

The methodology is quantitative and was selected because of its ability to gather a broad range of data from multiple students in multiple fraternity organizations. Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski (2004) shared “a supposition supported by observations that male college students are less likely to express overt sexism than in the past and that men alter their presentation of gender attitudes according to the situation” (Gough, 2001; Spence & Hahn, 1997). These observations encouraged the utilization of a research method allowing students to feel they could share their thoughts freely and without constraint or outside influences.

The research utilized the Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI) as the basis for gathering information on the hypermasculine traits expressed by affiliated members of fraternities serving male-identified individuals (Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski, 2004). As the researcher conducted the research, it was important to understand their background, the researcher is a cisgender White, gay identified, male. The researcher is an alumni member of an IFC fraternity. The researcher’s fraternity experience was at a small, regional public institution with a Greek community of about 800 students. The researcher believed these
Research Questions

The research study sought to examine the experiences of undergraduate students enrolled at a predominately White institution who are affiliated members of fraternities, in order to gain insight into the factors influencing hypermasculine behaviors and in an effort to understand the potential points of intersection with campus resources, programs, and professionals. Looking at three research questions, the research study sought to understand the overarching research question: What are the factors that influence fraternity members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors? For each of the three research questions independent variables, dependent variables, and null hypotheses are indicated below:

1. Do fraternity members in their first year of college demonstrate lower total and factor scores than those of their peers who have been in college longer periods of time (>1 years)?

   **Independent Variable:** Years in School (participants who indicated 0-1 years and all participants indicating 1-2 years or above)

   **Dependent Variables:** Five Factor Scores and Total Scores

   **Hypothesis:** Fraternity members in their first year have lower total and factor scores than their peers who have been in college longer periods of time (>1 years).

2. Do non-initiated fraternity members demonstrate lower factor and total scores than
initiated fraternity members?

**Independent Variable:** Initiation Status

**Dependent Variables:** Five Factor Scores and Total Scores

**Hypothesis:** Non-initiated fraternity members demonstrate lower factor and total scores than initiated fraternity members

3. Do factor and total scores for fraternity members plateau and stay constant after the first year of fraternity involvement?

**Independent Variable:** Years Involved in Organization (participants who indicated 0-1 years and all participant indicating 1-2 years or above)

**Dependent Variables:** Five Factor Scores and Total Scores

**Hypothesis:** Factor and total scores for fraternity members plateau and stay constant after the first year of fraternity involvement

**Research Design**

The design of the research tool will utilize Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski’s (2004) Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI) along with years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization information as the main research design. The research tool design consists of three questions (years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization) and 60 likert-scale questions. The ADMI demonstrated during its preliminary testing to be a self-report measure of hypermasculine behaviors of adequate reliability, convergent, and discriminant validity (Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski, 2004; Gamst, Liang, & Der-Karabetian, 2010). The rationale behind utilizing ADMI is to gain a clearer, less biased understanding, through self-reporting, of participants’ true attitudes and behavior in
connection to their expression of hypermasculine behaviors. Understanding these key attitudes and behaviors will provide professionals with the areas of greatest intersection in creating cultural change within fraternities.

The ADMI was converted into a Qualtrics survey tool to allow the survey to be disseminated to all affiliated members of fraternities. The survey tool included all required consent information and information about the purpose of the survey. Data was housed and managed through the Qualtrics survey library and was only accessed by the study team.

Data collected through the research survey tool was analyzed utilizing an ordinary least squares regression model in Stata. Additionally, data was broken down by years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization to determine if intervention techniques can be focused to these factors.

Study Site

The research study was conducted at a large public research university in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States of America. The institution will be referred to as Greek University (GU). GU aligns with the research study due to the demographics of the student population and the region and the size and make-up of the fraternity community at GU. The Pacific Northwest demographic profile indicates the population is predominately White and the university’s demographics are reflective of the region’s demographics. GU has a U.S. Minority population of 21.9%, with the total institutional enrollment at GU being 28,886 students (“GU Enrollment Summary- Fall Term 2014,” 2014). At the time of the research there were 23 fraternities at GU, of which two are multicultural fraternity organizations.
Sampling

Selection of participant sample group was based on registration in the Student Leadership and Involvement annual recognition database. Information for participants (Name and Email) was requested from the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life on February 9th, 2015. Data was pulled and received by the student researcher from the student clubs and organization database on February 10th, 2015. The data included name and email information for 959 fraternity participants. With a population size of 959 and a confidence interval of +/- 5 with a confidence level of 90%, the sample size required would be a minimum of 212 completed survey submissions. The 959 participants pulled from the database were sent the survey for the research study.

Potential participants who were sent the survey met the following criteria: (1) currently enrolled GU undergraduate student; (2) at least 18 years of age, and; (3) an affiliated member, initiated or not initiated, of a fraternity organization at GU at the time of participation. Participant criteria is broad in regard to membership status to be inclusive of varying new member program models and to gain a broad perspective of the influence of fraternity based on time spent as a member or new member.

Participant Recruitment

Below is a detailed outline, following IRB approval, of the chronological sequence of how potential participants were identified and recruited, and how privacy was protected throughout the research process:

- Week 1
• A list of names and emails of students who are registered with a fraternity organization at GU was requested from the Student Leadership and Involvement Student Organization Database, through the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life (CFSL). Additionally, a list of fraternity presidents’ names and emails were requested from the CFSL.

• Upon receiving the fraternity participant list, the potential research participants were added as a panel to the Qualtrics survey tool, listed as “Thesis Research Participant Panel.”

• The day after receiving the participant lists, the approved email will be sent to the fraternity chapter president email list to inform about the purpose of the study and informing them of their members receiving an email about the survey.

• The same day, utilizing Qualtrics survey distribution tool, an email was sent to all potential participants. Participants will opted-into the study by completing the survey. Participants were provided a unique link to complete the survey. A unique survey link allowed communication with participants after distribution based on if the survey was completed or was not completed, but all responses will remain anonymous.

• Week 2

• Seven days following the initial invitation to participate in the survey to participants, the approved follow-up email was sent to participants to remind them of the deadline to complete the survey. The approved follow-up email was only sent to individuals who had not completed the survey.
• Week 3
  
  • Fourteen days following the initial invitation to participate in the survey the survey was closed at 5:00 PM.
  
  • After the survey was closed, the following day the approved thank you email was sent to all participants who completed the survey utilizing the Qualtrics survey tool.

Data Collection

All data collection was collected through an anonymous Qualtrics survey tool and stored within the Qualtrics system. The Qualtrics survey format will allows the survey to be distributed broadly to the 959 participants pulled from the Student Leadership and Involvement database. The format of the survey included multiple pages divided by the number of likert-scale questions to 10 questions per page, in addition to the three demographic questions at the beginning of the survey. The beginning page of the survey included an explanation of the research study and a question to confirm participation requirements. Additionally, the values for the likert scale questions were changed to the 0 through 4 scale in the following manner: E = 0, D = 1, C = 2, B = 3, A = 4. For each of the items participants are asked to utilize the following scale to rate how well the statement describes them: A: very much like me, B: like me, C: a little like me, D: not much like me, E: not at all like me. Reversed scored items (Questions 22, 24, 38, 40, and 42) were recoded after the final survey data was downloaded from Qualtrics.
Data Cleaning and Coding

Following the close of the survey, there were 230 completed submissions of the survey out of the 959 maximum participant total. The raw data was downloaded from Qualtrics as a .CSV file. The file was then saved as .CSV, .XLSX, and .PDF files to be stored for future research. Copies of the .CSV file were created so the data could be cleaned up and coded for use in the research study. Cleaning of the data included removing the following fourteen columns from the data: (1) ResponseID; (2) ResponseSet; (3) StartDate; (4) EndDate; (5) Finished; (6) “Explanation of Research Study…”; (7) Page 2/8; (8) Page 3/8; (9) Page 4/8; (10) Page 5/8; (11) Page 6/8; (12) Page 7/8; (13) Page 8/8; (14) “You have indicated that you…” Additionally, once these columns were removed, the column headers were recoded to represent their corresponding question number or name of the columns data (yearsinschool, yearsinvolved, initiationstatus). Six columns were created at the end of the question scores to represent the five factors and total scores (Hypermasculinity, sexualidentity, dominanceandaggression, conservativemasculinity, devaluationofemotion, totalscores).

The factor scores were created by summing the following questions scores for each participant submission, as defined in the ADMI (2004):

*Hypermasculinity* – Include questions: 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47, 48, and 59

*Sexual Identity* – Include questions: 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 36, 42, 48, 56, and 57
Dominance and Aggression – Include questions: 1, 2, 22, 23, 26, 33, 34, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, and 60

Conservative Masculinity – Include questions: 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 49, 52, 53, 54, and 55

Devaluation of Emotion – Include questions: 4, 5, 6, 8, and 22

For each participant submission, the totals for the factor scores above were summed to create the total score. The researcher looked through the data to identify if there were any responses related to participant error (question scores are the same throughout, question scores are consistent with the reversed scored guidelines, etc.).

With total and factor scores calculated, demographic, factor score totals, and total scores columns were copied to a new worksheet to prepare the data to be utilized in Stata. Values for initiation status were recoded from 1-2 values to 0-1 and values for years in school and years involved were recoded from 1-6 values to 0-5 values to ensure ease of usability in Stata.

Data Analysis and Interpretation of Data

As stated previously, there were 230 completed submissions of the survey out of the 959 maximum participant total. With the demographic scores, total scores, and factor score data, Stata was utilized to consider the statistical significance of the total and factor scores based on the research questions of the research study. A linear regression was performed on the data utilizing Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). OLS was selected because of the simplicity of the test and the relatively continuous nature of the dependent variables, and the ability to test the significance of these relationships. Additionally, the researcher utilized basic
descriptive statistics to gain additional perspectives into the distribution of scores amongst participants and show what scores come up as high or low compared to the range.

Utilizing the analysis of participants’ responses, the researcher considered which of the demographics had higher or lower total and factor scores in connection to the research questions presented in the research study. Based on these findings, the researcher pulled upon current research, student development theory, and past experience to connect the data findings with opportunities for possible intervention with university resources, professionals, and departments.

**Strategies to Ensure Protection of Human Participants**

It is important to ensure with all research involving human participants, all participants and institutional privacy and confidentiality expectations are met. In preparation for the research study the student researcher participated in the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) to ensure the personal and institutional expectations for ethical research were understood.

There were multiple steps taken to ensure confidentiality of the participants, organizations, and institution. The institution is referred to using a pseudonym, to ensure there is less concern for the potential impact the results may have within the Greek or broader communities. Additionally, demographic questions were chosen specifically because they will not yield results identifying participants. All submissions of the survey were made anonymously to additionally ensure participant confidentiality. Any data omitted will be indicated within chapter four.
The research study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to any participation recruitment. IRB reviewed and approved all protocol, participant emails, consent information, survey questions, and methods on February 9th, 2015. Test instrument, participant recruitment, and explanation of research study documents reviewed and approved by the IRB are included in appendixes I, II, III. Finally, the researcher’s thesis committee chair and members served as resources and provided oversight to ensure the proper completion of these procedures.
Chapter 4: Results

Chapter Purpose

The following chapter presents the results of the research study seeking to understand the factors influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male identified students. Additionally, the chapter will discuss the results of the research study through descriptive statistics, sample, and demographic in order to better understand those participating. Finally, the chapter will discuss the statistical and mean score results of the participants’ responses in order to better understand the validity of the three research questions presented for the research study.

Descriptive Statistics

Given the purpose of descriptive statistics to provide a way to clearly look at data in the simplest way, they will assist in providing context to the data collected for the research study (Schuh, 2009). Descriptive statistics were collected to provide context in the following ways: (1) sample and (2) demographics. Sample section is presented first to provide context of the research studies sample size. For purposes of this research, descriptive statistics allowed the researcher to better understand where factor and total scores fell for within the range, high or low.

Sample. A number of potential participants to whom the survey was sent to did not complete the survey. A request to participate in the survey was sent to 959 potential participants, all of whom were registered as a member of a fraternity at GU. Out of the 959 potential participants 232 survey responses were recorded, of which 2 indicated they did not meet the criteria to participate and were not asked to complete the survey. The total number of
participants who completely participated in the research study is 230. Of the 230 participants who completed the survey, 14 survey responses were removed from the data set due to participant error. Participant errors included results that only included one value throughout the participant’s submission. There were 216 participants who completed the survey without errors and a 22.52% participant response rate for the research study. The participant response rate was calculated by dividing the number of potential participants (959) by the total number of participants who fully completed a survey (216). While the response rate could be considered low when compared to potential participants and is just over the sample size minimum of 212, the researcher felt, given many outside factors described later in chapter 4, the response rate was reasonable and appropriate to precede with analysis.

Demographics. For the demographics of the research study, only those who selected they met the research study criteria, completed the entire survey, and had no participant errors were included in the total. As such, none of the data utilized for descriptive statistic includes partial data. Table 1 describes the characteristics of the respondents for the three demographic variables utilized in the research study. While not asked as part of the survey or included in the criteria, all potential participants were member of single-sex male-identified serving organization and as such all participants are assumed to identify as men. Student who indicated they had been in college 0-1 years (30.1% / \( n = 65 \)) and 1-2 years (24.1% / \( n = 52 \)) represented over half (55.2%) of the total participant responses. The remainder of the participants indicated years in college as follows: 2-3 years (15.7% / \( n = 34 \)), 3-4 years (19.4% / \( n = 42 \)), 4-5 years (8.8% / \( n = 19 \)), and 5+ years (1.9% / \( n = 4 \)).
Similar to years in college, students indicating they were involved in their fraternity 0-1 years (36.6% / n = 79) and students involved 1-2 years (26.9% / n = 58) represent nearly two-thirds (63.5%) of the total participants responses. The remainder of the demographics around years involved includes: 2-3 years (12.5% / n = 27), 3-4 years (19.0% / n = 41), 4-5 years (3.7% / n = 8), and 5+ years (1.4% / n = 3). The data distribution is consistent with many students complete their involvement with their organization after the fourth year.

Finally, non-initiated members only represented 10.19% (n = 22) of the total participant responses while initiated members (89.81% / n = 194) represented the remainder. Given the time of year the survey was conducted, many new members had been initiated.
Encouragement for conducting the survey during fall term will be indicated in the recommendations for future research section in chapter 5.

In summary, the research study included a total of 216 fraternity member participants who completed the research survey. Table 1 provides a snapshot of the demographics for the participants, of which the majority of students are in their first or second year in college (54.2% \( n = 117 \)) or in their first two years of involvement (63.5% \( n = 137 \)) within their fraternity, with only 10.19% \( n = 22 \) of students being non-initiated.

**Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory**

The Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI) includes 60 likert-scale questions, each involving a statement, to which participants are asked to self-report how well the statement describes them. Each of the questions relate to one or multiple of the five factors related to masculinity. For each of the items participants are asked to utilize the following scale to rate how well the statement describes them: A: very much like me, B: like me, C: a little like me, D: not much like me, E: not at all like me. In alignment with the ADMI (2004), each of these answers are scored according to the following guidelines: E = 0, D = 1, C = 2, B = 3, A = 4. Questions 22, 24, 38, 40, and 42 respectively are reverse-scored (Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski, 2004). Upon completion of index, each participant’s total and factor scores are calculated following the guidelines described in Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski’s (2004) paper. The consistency reliability, mean, standard deviation, and ranges were calculated utilizing the participant data collected for the research study.

**Internal Consistency Reliability.** To ensure a question’s internal consistency reliability was consistent with those described in the ADMI (2004), utilizing Cronbach’s
alpha. The Cronbach’s alpha test with standardized items was ran in Stata and resulted in Cronbach’s alpha scores, which were consistent with those in Burk, Burkhart, and Sikorski (2004), demonstrating high internal reliability. Table 2 demonstrates each of the dependent variables resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha score of above $a = 0.92$ (Hypermasculinity ($a = 0.9368$); Sexual Identity ($a = 0.9468$); Dominance and Aggression ($a = 0.9422$); Conservative Masculinity ($a = 0.9347$); Devaluation of Emotion ($a = 0.9582$); Total Scores ($a = 0.9229$). Indicating the degree of reliability, Cronbach’s alpha scores above .90 are considered excellent (Cortina, 1993). Additionally, the overall test resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha score of $a = 0.9500$. Given these results, the factors included in the research study are reliable and demonstrates support for further statistical analysis on these factors as dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>item-test correlation</th>
<th>item-rest correlation</th>
<th>average interitem correlation</th>
<th>alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypermasculinity</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.9178</td>
<td>0.8788</td>
<td>0.7477</td>
<td>0.9368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.8565</td>
<td>0.7923</td>
<td>0.7805</td>
<td>0.9468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance and Aggression</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.8852</td>
<td>0.8324</td>
<td>0.7652</td>
<td>0.9422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Masculinity</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.9299</td>
<td>0.8964</td>
<td>0.7412</td>
<td>0.9347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaluation of Emotion</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.6896</td>
<td>0.8211</td>
<td>0.9582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scores</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.9966</td>
<td>0.9948</td>
<td>0.7054</td>
<td>0.9229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7602</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means, Standard Deviations and Range of Total and Factor Scores. The mean and standard deviation was calculated utilizing basic statistical analysis for each of the factors and the total scores, or the dependent variables. The mean represents the average scores for each of the given dependent variable. Standard deviation is also included, showing the variability of the results for each of the dependent variables.
For each of the dependent variables in Table 3, a range is given to better understand the range of the results of each. Each of the mean scores listed in Table 3 are representative of all 216 participant responses. Hypermasculinity had a mean of 12.22 (SD = 9.02) representing the majority (67%) of responses fell below 21.34 with a standard distribution. The remaining factors had the following means: Sexual Identity (M = 19.24 / SD = 8.08), Dominance and Aggression (M = 29.29 / SD = 10.89), Conservative Masculinity (M = 19.49 / SD = 7.41), Devaluation of Emotion (M = 5.99 / SD = 3.33). Finally, total scores, with a range of 9 to 227, had a mean of 86.23 (34.44). The hypermasculinity factor had the lowest mean respective to the other factors in their ranges, whereas Dominance and Aggression had the highest, falling close to the middle of its range respectively.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (N = 216)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypermasculinity</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>0 to 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>0 to 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance and Aggression</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>4 to 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Masculinity</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>3 to 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaluation of Emotion</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scores</td>
<td>86.23</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>9 to 227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Total scores are calculated by summing the factors scores of each participant*

### Analysis

To better understand the data collected about fraternity members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors the research study utilized a regression analysis with Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). OLS allowing the researcher to better understand the statistical significance of the each of the factor scores and total score (dependent variables) in
connection to the demographic questions (independent variables). For each of the
demographic variables a regression was conducted in Stata utilizing each of the factor scores
and the total score variables. These results are highlighted in Table 4. Additionally, where
appropriate, an OLS and/or a mean score breakdown was provided utilizing dummy variables
based on each research questions.
Explanation of full OLS results. Overall the regression analysis indicated none of the demographic information reached a level of significance utilizing a 90% confidence level.
As can be seen, hypermasculinity within Table 4.1, for years in college, shows the P value came close to reaching the threshold of statistical significance with a P value of 0.131. What is suggested is that among those who responded to this research study, there was no significant difference among the scores based on these factors, thus failing to reject the null hypotheses.

**Heteroscedasticity and variance inflation tests.** To ensure all of the assumptions of OLS were met, the researcher ran tests for both heteroscedasticity and multicollinearity after each regression test indicated in table 4. The White test for heteroscedasticity ensures the variables in a data set have the same finite variance throughout the data set. An inflation test looks for multicollinearity, or if two independent variables are highly correlated, within the data set. After running the variance inflation test, the test indicated no multicollinearity was present.

In terms of heteroscedasticity, none of these tests were significant, which would indicate the data would not follow this key assumption of OLS. For the Initiation Status demographic variable, most of the factor score tests indicated heteroscedasticity levels were close to, but not beyond, levels in which theoretical assumptions could be questioned. Due to these results, none of the regressions from Table 4 were run with robust standard errors, which would have been utilized to ensure significance was not overstated were heteroscedasticity.
Research Question One

The first research question discussed is: do fraternity members in their first year of college demonstrate lower total and factor scores than those of their peers who have been in college longer periods of time (2+ years)?

Ordinary Least Squares. Below is the OLS test with a two-factor grouping of the years in college demographic variable. Respondents who indicated their years in college was 0-1 years were grouped together in a dummy group and all respondents who indicated 1-2 years or more were group in a separate dummy group, creating a new dummy variable. The new dummy variable was utilized to run an additional regression on factor and total scores. The results are highlighted in Table 5 below.

| Variables (N = 216) | P > |t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|---------------------|-----|------------------|---------------------|
| Hypermasculinity    | 0.321 | -1.308076 | 3.968493 |
| Sexual Identity     | 0.761 | -2.000361 | 2.733117 |
| Dominance and Aggression | 0.503 | -4.274622 | 2.102844 |
| Conservative Masculinity | 0.619 | -1.622142 | 2.718015 |
| Devaluation of Emotion | 0.968 | -0.9948073 | 0.9550722 |
| Total Scores        | 0.824 | -8.955479 | 11.23301 |

Note: Total scores are calculated by summing the factors scores of each participant

As demonstrated in Table 5, none of the factor scores or total score produced significant results. Hypermasculinity based on the new dummy variable was less significant than what was demonstrated in Table 4, with a difference of 0.19.

Mean score. To better understand, the distribution of scores amongst the factor and
total scores for the dummy variables created above was looked at for their mean scores. The distribution gave the researcher the ability to see the changes in the averages between students in their first year of college and students past the first year. The mean scores distribution between the factor and total scores can be found in table 6.
### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% Hypermasculinity</th>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
<th>Mean Scores - Years in College (Two Factor: First Year &lt; 1 Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviation of Emotion</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation of Masculinity</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6: Total scores are calculated by summing the factor scores of each participant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in the distribution of mean scores in table 6, there are slight differences in the mean scores between the two dummy groups. Hypermasculinity and total scores showed an increase of mean scores by >1 point difference, conservative masculinity and sexual identity scores showed an increase of <1 point difference, and dominance and aggression (>1 point difference) and Devaluation of Emotion (<.02 difference) decrease between the two dummy groups. While the dummy variable did not portray a significant difference between the two dummy groups within the regression, the mean scores allude to the potential some factors may increase between first year students and their older peers. While based on descriptive statistics, there is a small indication of members who have been in college longer having some higher factor and total scores than members in their first year. Due to the lack of significance of the difference amongst the demographics, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis for research question 1. There are many factors that may have changed this outcome, including a larger sample size, more explanation to fraternity members about the research, and making the research without any explanation about the tool.

**Research Question Two**

The first research question discussed is: Do non-initiated fraternity members demonstrate lower factor and total scores than initiated fraternity members?

**Ordinary Least Square.** Below are the OLS regression analyses with a dummy variable for initiation status, recreated from table 4.3. Respondents indicated whether they were initiated or if they were non-initiated. The results are high lighted in Table 7 below.
Table 7 indicates, as stated earlier in the chapter, the regression did not show a significant difference between the two initiation statuses.

**Mean scores.** Results in table 8 indicate non-initiated members overall have slightly higher factor scores on most of the factors and a slightly lower total score. Given the number of non-initiated participants \( n = 22 \) the researcher believes the small number of respondents affected the overall ability to interrupt the results of the research question effectively and with any level of confidence. Overall total scores were within about .05 points of each other, specifically providing no statistical or observational difference between the two demographic groups. Given these items and the low response numbers the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis for research 2. The addition of additional non-initiated students may have changed the outcome of the results for question 2 and opens the opportunity for future research.
### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean Scores - Initiation Phase</th>
<th>Initiation Status (N=216)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>86.6 94.3</td>
<td>19.3 39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypermasculinity</td>
<td>89.3 94.3</td>
<td>12.2 29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Emotion</td>
<td>19.3 39.6</td>
<td>30.9 59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>19.3 39.6</td>
<td>18.9 35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>12.3 24.9</td>
<td>21.0 42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>12.3 24.9</td>
<td>11.5 24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total scores are calculated by summing the factors' scores of each participant.
Research Question Three

The first research question discussed is: Do factor and total scores for fraternity members plateau and stay constant after the first year of fraternity involvement?

Ordinary Least Square. Below is the OLS regression with a years involved dummy variable, recreated from table 4.2. Participants were scored based on their responses to the years involved demographic variable question. The results are highlighted in Table 9 below.

| Variables (N = 216)       | $P > |t|$       | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Hypermasculinity         | 0.316       | -0.4533461          | 1.396113          |
| Sexual Identity          | 0.758       | -0.6995008          | 0.959678          |
| Dominance and Aggression | 0.533       | -0.7635138          | 1.472241          |
| Conservative Masculinity | 0.402       | -0.4364327          | 1.083271          |
| Devaluation of Emotion   | 0.851       | -0.3743831          | 0.3090383         |
| Total Scores             | 0.488       | -2.288093           | 4.781258          |

Note: Total scores are calculated by summing the factors scores of each participant

As demonstrated in Table 9, none of the factor scores or total score produced significant results. Hypermasculinity based on the new dummy variable is less significant than what was demonstrated in Table 4, with a difference of 0.26.

Mean score. To better understand, the distribution of scores amongst the factor and total scores for each of the groups within the years involved variable, the researcher looked at the mean scores for each. These scores gave the researcher the ability to see the changes in the averages between members in each of the groups. The mean scores groups between the factor and total scores can be found in table 10.
52 FACTORS INFLUENCING FRATERNITY MEMBERS EXPRESSION OF HYPERMASCULINE BEHAVIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean Scores - Years Involved</th>
<th>Total Scores (M)</th>
<th>Deviation (M)</th>
<th>Hypermasculinity (%)</th>
<th>Aggression and Dominance and Masculinity (%)</th>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.375</td>
<td>5.125</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.341</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.111</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.352</td>
<td>5.856</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.344</td>
<td>6.025</td>
<td>3.137</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total scores are calculated by summing the factor scores of each participant.
As can be seen in table 10, there is variability within the progression of mean scores within each of the factor scores, not demonstrating a clear pattern of plateauing after the first year. The conservative masculinity factor actually sporadically jumps up and down between the demographic groups. The total score mean scores consistently increase from the first year to the fifth year of involvement, increasing nearly 6 points over time involved. For the 5+ years mean score for years involved there is a large drop in mean score. The researcher hypothesized the dramatic difference is due to the small sub-sample size. Overall due to OLS not showing a statistical significance and because mean scores for both factor and total scores was either sporadic or constant in its increase, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis for research question 3.

**Analysis Summary**

For each of the three research questions, there was no statistically significant difference between the demographic groups utilized for the research study. The research study failed to reject the null hypothesis for research question 1 due to the lack of evidence to indicate there was a significant difference between members in their first year of school and older members. Due to a lack of significance and uneven sub-sample sizes research question 2’s null hypothesis was unable to be accepted or rejected. While research question 3 also resulted in no statistical significance between the demographic groups, the descriptive statistics’ mean scores indicated there was actually a constant increase in total scores and the hypermasculinity factor score. The remaining factor scores had sporadic changes between demographic groups. While the research failed to reject the null hypotheses, there are many opportunities for future research that could result in significant results.
Chapter 5: Discussion & Conclusion

Chapter Purpose

Currently, the climates in higher education and, in the national spotlight, have pushed fraternity organizations to grapple with the question of their relevance in the 21st century. Over the past academic year, there have been a number of fraternity organizations which have investigated for hazing, sexual assault, and culturally discriminatory behaviors. These incidents push professionals and members of these organizations to consider the environments they are creating, the traditions and practices of the organizations, and the need for preventative interventions to curb these behaviors in an attempt to create cultural change. Hypermasculine behaviors provide a catalyst for many of the incidents demonstrated in the current national climate around fraternities. This research study sought to understand the influences on these behaviors in order to understand the root causes of these behaviors.

This chapter will seek to summarize the findings of the research study, which is seeking to explain the factors influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male identified students. It will also discuss the implications for practice of student affairs professionals and student members. Additionally, the following chapter will discuss the research limitations, which are present due to a number of outside influences and nature of the research. Finally, the chapter will present recommendations for future research and provide a conclusion.

Summary of Findings

The research study found there was no statistically significant relationship between the chosen demographic variables and the total and factor scores the three proposed research
questions all failed to reject the null hypotheses. With 216 participants in the research study, the sample size utilizing a 90% confidence level indicated the number of participants required to have a statistically significant sample size was met. But, the majority of participants were in their first two years of school or involvement. Additionally, the survey was given after most participants had already had a term in the fraternity and had been initiated.

While all regression analyses produced results that were not statistically significant, observational analysis of the results suggested there was a consistent pattern of increase between the first and fifth years of involvement in regards to participants’ total scores (See table 10). While the OLS results require the researcher to fail to reject the null hypothesis for research question 3, that descriptive pattern may indicate the increased expression of negative masculine or hypermasculine behaviors over the time a member is involved in a fraternity. Based on the pattern, areas of future research may be identified to understand why these increases may be happening with members as they continue their involvement.

Throughout the research data collection there were many interactions, responses, and fraternity national news attention, which may have also influenced fraternity members willingness to actively, honestly, and courageously participate in the research study. The influence of sensibilities, stimulated by current events and media attention should be accounted for. Hypermasculinity, by its definition, states those who participate in these behaviors believe status and pride should be highly valued and mistrust of others is evident within their behaviors (Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski, 2004; Connell, 1993; Mosher and Sirkin, 1984). The researcher received many emotionally charged emails, which expressed frustration and confusion about the topic, many of which sought to invalidate the research tool and
questioned the researcher’s qualifications and knowledge of fraternity membership. Many student leaders shared about their members, who were frustrated and offended by many of the statements included in the research tool, while others shared many of the statements were not relevant to them or were misleading. Additionally, it was shared with the researcher by student leaders, within the fraternity community, many chapters told members not to participate in the research or to utilize the research tool design as a way to “game” the research tool. The feedback and interactions indicated to the researcher there is a need for a number of changes for future research both in the design of the survey and in the research protocol.

Research Limitations

Limitations of Study. There are a number of limitations present in the current research and these limitations should be considered for future research and utilization of the research study to inform practices. In addition to the limitations listed below, there are four possible limitations of the research study, which may be affected by the sample size and makeup of the participants and the confidence level of 90% (none of the results met this level of confidence).

Generalizability. The ability to generalize the results of the research study ultimately only have value at GU. The ability to translate the results of the research study to other campuses will be more reliable on campuses with similar campus and Greek community demographics, though implementation of the results of the research study on other campuses should be approached with an adequate level of trepidation. Additionally, with the lack of
significance in the statistical regression analysis, the results should be viewed no further than observational.

**Biases of researchers.** As discussed in the research perspective section of chapter three, the researcher is a member of a fraternity and during the entirety of the research study worked in the role of advising fraternity organizations at GU. Interactions with fraternity organizations and fraternity members’ interactions with the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life, presents inherent biases for the research study. Previous relationships with participants may have impacted the recruitment of students and their willingness to participate in the research study, because of concerns about confidentiality or the impact of the results may have on the interactions the researcher has with a student’s fraternity organization.

**Current campus and national climate.** During the time of the research there was a perceived strained relationship between the fraternities and GU by members of fraternities. Many emails received by the researcher in response to the survey further validated the perception of a strained relationship with the university as being apart of the fraternity community at GU. Some students shared about the survey generating distrust towards the university and these perceptions may have impacted participants’ completion of the survey, either at all or in their answers to the survey. Additionally, current national media coverage around fraternity interaction and relationship with universities, sexual violence, and racial episodes may have influenced participants’ willingness to participate or their willingness to answers questions truthfully.

**Research data collection feedback.** The researcher believes the anecdotal information received in response to the data collection from participants and student leaders
Many student leaders expressed that some chapters had told members to not participate in the survey or some members may have utilized the research tool design information, found online, to “game” their response to the survey. These types of responses were seen through many of the participant responses, which were removed from the overall sample. These responses being the same response to each question, except for the exact opposite response on questions which would later be reverse scored, providing the final score with an extreme score of all “0” or “4”. It is suggested for future research to not include information about the research tool being utilized for the data collection design.

Overall, the researcher attempted to reduce the factors considered above through making the survey responses anonymous, the distribution of the survey via email to increase participation, and allowing the survey to be completed at a student’s own pace. For the factors above, which could not be addressed by the researcher directly prior to distribution of the survey, opportunities for changing the research protocol and areas of future research are offered later in the chapter.

**Implications for Practice**

With the current climate around fraternities being focused around the many negative, sometimes deadly, impacts these groups have on their members and communities, it is time to seek to understand the root cause for these issues. There is a clear misalignment of these behaviors with the values and mission of fraternity organizations and the campuses that host them. As was seen by the researcher as part of the anecdotal information received, many
members believe these behaviors do not represent them or are no longer relevant to current students. These two viewpoints contradict each other and indicate a need to further seek ways to engage fraternity members and college men generally, in discussions about the definitions of masculinities and the alignment of behaviors with the beliefs, values, and missions of fraternity organizations.

Professionals across student affairs functional areas have the opportunity to support the engagement of conversations and education around multiple issues related to combating hypermasculinity, especially as this dynamic may be increasing as students continue their involvement in a fraternity organization. Edwards & Jones (2009) discussed the need for supporting men in understand in their gender identity development to support their social development. Opportunities, such as healthy masculinities conferences, provide an opportunity to engage in conversations to understand the spectrum of how masculinity is presented and expressed. Often, these events do not receive high attendance from fraternity members. Seeking to create a conference style program around masculinity related to fraternity membership, led by Greek student leaders, would seek to increase engagement in these conversations.

Along with student health services at a university, providing education around alcohol use, hazing, and sexual assault provide avenues through which to instill knowledge of the impact and influences these activities have on both the health of individuals and communities. Additionally, these educational activities provide opportunities for deeper conversation about the connection these activities have with the development of hypermasculinity within fraternity organizations. The connection ensures the link between masculinities and negative
behaviors is understood, and provides students with an understanding how to better intervene within situations, which may be unhealthy or unsafe.

Understanding that fraternity members’ increasing overall total scores on the ADMI over the course of their involvement is an indicator of the need for the development of a two-tiered educational system around masculinity for new members. To assist in curbing these behaviors building a connection to the healthy masculinities conferences, providing internal (chapter specific) and external (community-wide) educational opportunities will be critical to creating cultural change within these organizations. Calling on the partnerships with national organizations for each chapter to create new member education modules addressing issues of masculinity, which connect to campus wide programming, is the first critical step in creating the cultural change internal to these organizations.

Recommendations for Future Research

There were a number of items the researcher would recommend for both future replication of the research study and for further research around the topic of hypermasculinity in fraternity organizations.

Future replication of the research study. Focusing on two aspects of the research study, protocol and research data collection tool, the following section will seek to further refine the research methodology after the completion the research study.

Protocol changes. The three major changes in terms of the protocol would be in the administration of the research collection tool, the demographic questions, and the time period of the research. Given the lack of significance found among the years in college, years involved, and initiation status demographic variables, the researcher proposes the use of race,
age range, initiation status (with a more balanced sample size), and years involved as demographic variables to allow researchers to further consider the factor and total scores connection to fraternity membership. A digital survey was believed by the researcher to be the best method for collecting data broadly, but because of the impersonal feel of emails the recruitment of participants resulted in feelings of misperceptions associated with the purpose of the survey. Delivering the survey tool at a chapter meeting in the form of a paper survey would allow for questions to be asked of the researcher by participants to clarify the purpose and could increase completion rate of the survey. Finally, collecting data during the first couple of weeks following the end of fall recruitment would provide a larger non-initiated member population and minimize the time members at the beginning of their involvement would be exposed to potential influences, which could impact their responses.

**Longitudinal surveying.** To better a deeper understanding of the participants development of masculine behaviors, surveying incoming fraternity students at the beginning of their experience, after initiation, and then once a year may provide further understanding. A longitudinal survey would allow the researcher to gain more understanding of the specific points of development within a fraternity members masculinity development and the potential development of negative behaviors.

**Research data collection tool.** Corprew, Matthews, and Mitchell (2014) in their article, *Men at the Crossroads: A Profile Analysis of Hypermasculinity in Emerging Adulthood*, proposed a condensed 28 question, 4 factor inventory utilizing Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski’s (2004) ADMI-60 inventory. The inventory provided a more condensed research tool, eliminating over half of the questions, many of which were questions students
anecdotally expressed not connecting with or found confusing within the current research. While the article was not widely available at the beginning of the research proposal, it is important to note the benefit that utilizing the revised ADMI proposed by Corprew, Matthews, and Mitchell (2014), may have increased the number of participants.

Direct observation. Considering the number of responses regarding concern for the tool, participating in a direct research opportunity that would require the researcher to live within a fraternity chapter facility may result in additional data. Direct observations of activities may result in results that further build upon the results of survey tools such as the ADMI.

Further research around the topic of hypermasculinity in fraternity organizations. As the national spotlight continues to get shined on fraternities, it is going to be important for educators to start collaborating with students and national partners to better understand the influence of hypermasculinity within fraternity organizations. Some of the areas that spurred thought for the researcher about future research are the impact of the different council structures on expression of masculinity, the impacts of LGBTQ identified individuals in connection to the expression of masculinity within fraternity organizations, and further explorations of intervention methods for supporting fraternity members in developing healthy masculinities. Seeking to collect more information such as fraternity membership, race, and other demographic information would further the scope of perspective that could be utilized to understand the results of these types of research studies. Finally, seeking a sample that would include non-Greek students would allow researchers to further develop a study that
would compare these two groups. This information could provide further understanding of where fraternity members levels of hypermasculinity fall compared to their non-Greek peers.

**Conclusion**

Many of the conclusions to be made about the research study focus around the need for change in the protocol and survey tool design are described in the recommendations section above. In the current campus climate at GU and the national new focus, the time period utilized to collect the data for the research study impacted the ability for the researcher to have a high level of confidence in the validity of the responses to the research tool.

The research study provided direction for future research about the potential significant of the demographics questions of years in college and an increase in the factor and total scores included in the research study. Additionally, it provided a clear understanding of the need for clear explanation of purpose and to provide participants with the ability to ask questions prior to completing the research survey.

While fraternity members, based on the mean scores discussed in chapter 4, showed an increase in total scores over the course of their involvement, the overall scores fell within the lower half of the possible scores possible for total scores. These increases may indicate that fraternity members, who completed the research survey, express lower factor scores than originally anticipated going into the research project. Additionally, the email communication and conversations with student leaders, which the researcher had during the data collection process may indicate the members completing the survey may have been individuals who would normally not have scored high within the research tool and the individual who would have scored higher did not participate or tried to “game” the research tool.
Overall, there continues to be a gap in the amount of unbiased research around the fraternity experience and practices. Future professionals, fraternity members, and fraternity national organizations must see the value in supporting data collection that seeks to better understand how fraternity organizations operate and how members develop, specifically in connection to the values of the organizations. Understanding these values is necessary to allow fraternities to continue to show relevance and commitment to the common mission of the fraternal movement.
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Appendix I: Explanation of Research Study

1. **Purpose.** The purpose of this research study is to understand what factors influence hypermasculine behaviors of affiliated members of social fraternity organizations. Utilizing the Auburn Differential Masculinities Index (ADMI) this survey will collect information from new and initiated members of these fraternities. This research will focus around the following question: What factors influence Members' Expression of Hypermasculine Behaviors in Fraternities Serving Male-Identified Individuals at a Predominately White Institution?

The purpose of conducting this research is for the completion of the student researchers masters’ thesis. Up to 1100 participants may be invited to take part in this study.

2. **Activities.** As a participant in this research study, you will be asked complete a survey that has you rate how well each of 60 statements describes you. Additionally, you will be asked to provide information about your year in school, years of involvement in your fraternity organization, and initiation status in your fraternity organization.

3. **Time.** The survey is expected to take a participant 5-7 minutes to complete.

4. **Risks.** The possible risks and/or discomforts associated with the being in the study include:
   - Internet and/or email. The security and confidentiality of information collected from you online cannot be guaranteed. Confidentiality will be kept to the extent permitted by the technology being used. Information collected online can be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. Any issues with viruses within the Qualtrics survey tool will be reported to Qualtrics and managed with the Qualtrics professionals.

5. **Benefits.** This research seeks to examine factor influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution in a predominately White state in the United States of America. Further, utilizing current measures, alongside years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization information, seek to better understand the points of intersection that university professionals can make an impact in combating the hypermasculine culture that exists within fraternities. Another goal of this research is to provide research that can be utilized in student support, reduce high-risk behavior, and positively influence the experiences of students within fraternities. This study is not designed to benefit you directly.

6. **Contact Information.** If you have any questions about this research study and/or your participant rights, please contact: Dr. Larry Roper, larry.roper@oregonstate.edu.

If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the
7. Voluntariness. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study. If you choose to withdraw from this project before it ends, the researchers will not keep information collected about you and this information will not be included in study reports.

The student researcher is the Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life and advisor to the Interfraternity Council. Any participation in this survey will not impact any relationship with these two groups. The final results of this survey may be shared with these two groups.

While study participation is voluntary, all questions must be answered in order for their individual responses to be included in the study results.
Appendix II: Research Survey Tool

After reading the Explanation of Research Study (Appendix I), participants were asked to answer the following question:

Please confirm below that you meet the following criteria:

- I am a currently enrolled, Oregon State University, undergraduate student, and;
- I am over the age of 18, and;
- I am an affiliated member, initiated or not initiated, of a fraternity organization at Oregon State University.

(0) Yes, I meet all of the above listed criteria
(1) No, I do not meet all of the above listed criteria

If the student indicated yes they were brought to the demographic questions, if the participant answered no, they were brought to a screen indicating that they would not be asked to complete the questions. The next group of questions was the demographic questions, found here:

Year in college/university study:
(0) 0-1
(1) 1-2
(2) 2-3
(3) 3-4
(4) 4-5
(5) 5+

Years involved in your fraternity organization:
(0) 0-1
(1) 1-2
(2) 2-3
(3) 3-4
(4) 4-5
(5) 5+

Initiation status in your fraternity organization:
(0) Not initiated
(1) Initiated
Finally, each of the following questions were grouped in order into groups of 10 statements and students were asked, “The following statements describe certain beliefs. Please read each item carefully and decide how well it describes you. Rate each item on the following 5-point scale: A = very much like me, B = like me, C = a little like me, D = not much like me, E = not at all like me.”

1. If another man made a pass at my girlfriend/wife, I would tell him off.
2. I believe sometimes you've got to fight or people will walk all over you.
3. I think women should date one man.
4. I think men who show their emotions frequently are sissies.
5. I think men who show they are afraid are weak.
6. I think men who cry are weak.
7. I don’t get mad. I get even.
8. Even if I was afraid, I would never admit it.
9. I consider men superior to women in intellect.
10. I think women who say they are feminists are just trying to be like men.
11. I think women who are too independent need to be knocked down a peg or two.
12. I don’t feel guilty for long when I cheat on my girlfriend/wife.
13. I know feminists want to be like men because men are better than women.
14. Women, generally, are not as smart as men.
15. My attitude regarding casual sex is “the more the better.”
16. I would never forgive my wife if she was unfaithful.
17. There are two kinds of women: the kind I date and the kind I would marry.
18. I like to tell stories of my sexual experiences to my male friends.
19. I think it’s okay for men to be a little rough during sex.
20. If a woman struggles while we are having sex, it makes me feel strong.
21. I am my own master; no one tells me what to do.
22. I try to avoid physical conflict.
23. If someone challenges me, I let him see my anger.
24. I wouldn’t have sex with a woman who had been drinking.
25. Sometimes I have to threaten people to make them do what they should.
26. Many men are not as tough as me.
27. I value power over other people.
28. If a woman puts up a fight while we are having sex, it makes the sex more exciting.
29. I don’t mind using verbal or physical threats to get what I want.
30. I think it is worse for a woman to be sexually unfaithful than for a man to be unfaithful.
31. I think it’s okay for teenage boys to have sex.
32. I like to be in control of social situations.
33. I prefer to watch contact sports like football or boxing.
34. If I had a son I’d be sure to show him what a real man should do.
35. If a woman thinks she’s better than me, I’ll show her.
36. I notice women most for their physical characteristics like their breasts or body shape.
37. I think it’s okay for men to date more than one woman.
38. I sometimes feel afraid.
39. I think men who stay home to take care of their children are just as weak as women.
40. I’d rather stay home and watch a movie than go out to a bar.
41. I like to brag about my sexual conquests to my friends.
42. When something bad happens to me I feel sad.
43. I can date many women at the same time without commitment.
44. I don’t mind using physical violence to defend what I have.
45. I think men should be generally aggressive in their behavior.
46. I would initiate a fight if someone threatened me.
47. Women need men to help them make up their minds.
48. If some guy tries to make me look like a fool, I’ll get him back.
49. I consider myself quite superior to most other men.
50. I get mad when something bad happens to me.
51. I want the woman I marry to be pure.
52. I like to be the boss.
53. I like to think about the men I’ve beaten in physical fights.
54. I would fight to defend myself if the other person threw the first punch.
55. If another man made a pass at my girlfriend/wife, I would want to beat him up.
56. Sometimes I have to threaten people to make them do what I want.
57. I think it’s okay to have sex with a woman who is drunk.
58. If I exercise, I play a real sport like football or weight lifting.
59. I feel it is unfair for a woman to start something sexual but refuse to go through with it.
60. I often get mad.
Appendix III: Recruitment Emails

Note: All emails were sent via the Qualtrics survey tool system

Initial Participation Email

Subject: Research Study Participation Request

Body:
Dear ${m://FirstName},

My Name is Richard Arquette and I am currently a masters candidate in the College of Education at Oregon State University. For my masters thesis, I am researching to understanding factors influencing members expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution. As part of the research, I am collecting data utilizing the Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI) to better understand points of intersection for university professionals and resources in supporting cultural change around hypermasculinity.

You have been identify as meeting the following criteria for participation in the survey:
- A currently enrolled, Oregon State University, undergraduate student, and;
- Over the age of 18, and;
- An affiliated member, initiated or not initiated, of a fraternity organization at Oregon State University

The estimated time to complete the survey is 5-7 minutes. Access to the survey will close on [Friday (include specific date and week) after IRB approval at 11:59 PM PST]. To access the survey please use the following links:

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

If you have any questions or concerns pertinent to this survey, please contact me via the email listed below. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu.

Thank you,

Richard Arquette
Masters Candidate
College Student Service Administration
College of Education
Oregon State University
arquettr@onid.oregonstate.edu
Title of the study: Understanding Factors Influencing Members' Expression of Hypermasculine Behaviors in Fraternities Serving Male-Identified Individuals at a Predominately White Institution

Name of the Principal Investigator: Dr. Larry Roper, PhD, larry.roper@oregonstate.edu

Estimated participant time commitment: 5-7 minutes

Benefits: This research seeks to examine factor influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution in a predominately White state in the United States of America. Further, utilizing current measures, alongside years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization, seek to better understand the points of intersection that university professionals can make an impact in combating the hypermasculine culture that exists within fraternities. Another goal of this research is to provide research that can be utilized in student support, reduce high-risk behavior, and positively influence the experiences of students within fraternities. This study is not designed to benefit you directly.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails: ${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}
Follow Up Email #1

Subject: Follow-up: Research Study Participation Request

Body:
Dear ${m://FirstName},

My Name is Richard Arquette and I am currently a masters candidate in the College of Education at Oregon State University. For my masters thesis, I am researching to understanding the factors influencing members' expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution. As part of the research, I am collecting data utilizing the Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI), a tool designed to identify where on the continuum of masculinity a participant self-identifies. Additionally, this research seeks to better understand points of intersection for university professionals in supporting fraternity members and resources in supporting positive cultural change towards expression of healthy masculinities.

As a reminder, you have been identify as meeting the following criteria for participation in the survey:
• A currently enrolled, Oregon State University, undergraduate student, and;
• Over the age of 18, and;
• An affiliated member, initiated or not initiated, of a fraternity organization at Oregon State University

I would like to ask you to support my thesis research efforts and complete the survey below. As a reminder, the estimated time to complete the survey is 5-7 minutes. As a reminder access to the survey will close tomorrow, February 24th, 2015 at 5 PM PST.

Finally, to access the survey please use the following links:
Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

If you have any questions or concerns pertinent to this survey, please contact me via the email listed below. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu.

Thank you for your support of my research,

Richard Arquette
Masters Candidate
College Student Service Administration
College of Education
Oregon State University
arquettr@onid.oregonstate.edu
Title of the study: Understanding Factors Influencing Members' Expression of Hypermasculine Behaviors in Fraternities Serving Male-Identified Individuals at a Predominately White Institution

Name of the Principal Investigator: Dr. Larry Roper, PhD, larry.roper@oregonstate.edu

Estimated participant time commitment: 5-7 minutes

Benefits: This research seeks to examine factor influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution in a predominately White state in the United States of America. Further, utilizing current measures, alongside years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization, seek to better understand the points of intersection that university professionals can make an impact in combating the hypermasculine culture that exists within fraternities. Another goal of this research is to provide research that can be utilized in student support, reduce high-risk behavior, and positively influence the experiences of students within fraternities. This study is not designed to benefit you directly.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
>${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}$
Final Reminder

Subject: Final Reminder: Research Study Participation Request

Body:
Dear ${m://FirstName},

My Name is Richard Arquette and I am currently a masters candidate in the College of Education at Oregon State University. For my masters thesis, I am researching to understanding the factors influencing members' expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution. As part of the research, I am collecting data utilizing the Auburn Differential Masculinities Inventory (ADMI), a tool designed to identify where on the continuum of masculinity a participant self-identifies. Additionally, this research seeks to better understand points of intersection for university professionals in supporting fraternity members and resources in supporting positive cultural change towards expression of healthy masculinities.

As a reminder, you have been identify as meeting the following criteria for participation in the survey:
- A currently enrolled, Oregon State University, undergraduate student, and;
- Over the age of 18, and;
- An affiliated member, initiated or not initiated, of a fraternity organization at Oregon State University

I would like to ask you to support my thesis research efforts and complete the survey below. As a reminder, the estimated time to complete the survey is 5-7 minutes. As a reminder access to the survey will close tomorrow, February 24th, 2015 at 5 PM PST. Finally, to access the survey please use the following links:

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

If you have any questions or concerns pertinent to this survey, please contact me via the email listed below. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu.

Thank you for your support of my research,

Richard Arquette
Masters Candidate
College Student Service Administration
College of Education
Oregon State University
arquettr@onid.oregonstate.edu
Title of the study: Understanding Factors Influencing Members' Expression of Hypermasculine Behaviors in Fraternities Serving Male-Identified Individuals at a Predominately White Institution

Name of the Principal Investigator: Dr. Larry Roper, PhD, larry.roper@oregonstate.edu

Estimated participant time commitment: 5-7 minutes

Benefits: This research seeks to examine factor influencing members’ expression of hypermasculine behaviors in fraternities serving male-identified individuals at a predominately White institution in a predominately White state in the United States of America. Further, utilizing current measures, alongside years in school, initiation status, and time involved in the organization, seek to better understand the points of intersection that university professionals can make an impact in combating the hypermasculine culture that exists within fraternities. Another goal of this research is to provide research that can be utilized in student support, reduce high-risk behavior, and positively influence the experiences of students within fraternities. This study is not designed to benefit you directly.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}$