

2012

Conduct issues with fraternities and sororities: university processes evaluated at four-year universities

Jonathan Burnard Sanders

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Jsanders@lsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sanders, Jonathan Burnard, "Conduct issues with fraternities and sororities: university processes evaluated at four-year universities" (2012). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 2725.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/2725

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

CONDUCT ISSUES WITH FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES:
UNIVERSITY PROCESSES EVALUATED AT FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITIES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Education

by

Jonathan Burnard Sanders

B.B.A., Middle Tennessee State University, 2003

M.B.A., Middle Tennessee State University, 2006

December 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Reflecting back on my journey through higher education there are so many people who have assisted me in getting where I am today. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank a few of those individuals that have assisted me in this journey. First and foremost, I would like to thank my mom and dad, Judy and Steve Sanders, whose support and wisdom have set me up for success. From an early age my mom taught us that education was important and did everything in her power to make sure we had a positive educational experience. My dad taught us that hard work pays off and that to work for someone is an honor and should not be taken for granted. It has taken both of these life lessons to get where I am today and I cannot thank them enough. Both of you have made personal sacrifices in order to have the best for your children, and for that I am forever grateful.

I would also like to thank both of my sisters, Melissa Galligani and Jessica Sanders, for their support during my educational pursuits. Melissa has been an older sister that I have looked up to and assisted me with not only my educational journey, but also with life as well. I can remember her being a big sister and taking time working with me in scheduling my classes for my very first semester of college. Jessica has been a younger sister that I have learned a great deal from and has also assisted me during this experience. Who knew that by correcting our grammar when we were younger, she would be assisting me later when it was time to edit this research. I have been very blessed to have two of the best sisters one could imagine.

My extended family has been very supportive of me in this journey. I appreciate the love and support each of them have given me over the years. I would like to specifically

recognize my grandmother, Montie Lee Robinson, or also known as “Granny” for her wisdom, support, and openness. I appreciate the phone calls of checking in on me to see how I was doing and if I was still working on that “paper”. We are all better people because of you. Overall, I could not have asked for a better family.

My LSU family has been very supportive throughout this process. I could not have done this without my friends in the Greek Life office or colleagues I interacted with on a regular basis. I want to specifically acknowledge my boss and friend, Angela Guillory, for creating an environment where I was able to be successful in completing my Ph.D. while working full-time. I know that she personally made sacrifices in order for me to be able to have the time to dedicate to my studies and I know I would not have been able to do this without her support.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge my MTSU family for my career direction and motivation to work in higher education. I would have never embarked on this journey without their support and the positive experiences that were afforded to me. Specifically my dear friend and fraternity brother Rob Patterson for being instrumental in my decision to work in the field of higher education and Jackie Victory for the opportunity to capitalize on that interest and work as a professional. I would not have found the love and joy of working with college students in a university environment without your guidance and encouragement.

I would like to formally recognize Dr. Brian Bourke for his direction and leadership throughout this process. As my dissertation chair, you were able keep me on course and give me the foundational tools to be able to be successful in completing this journey. I think some of our meetings might have just been counseling sessions for me in trying to

deal with working on this research and balancing my other responsibilities. You were always there to put things back into perspective for me and I am forever grateful to you for your support. I would also like to thank Dr. Krisanna Machtmes for her wisdom and assistance with quantitative research. You were able to guide me past the “ok, I have data, now what...” stage and give me confidence in being able to complete this research. I would also like to thank the rest of my committee, Dr. Roland Mitchell, Dr. Ken Denny, and Dr. Edward Song. Your feedback and guidance throughout this process was instrumental in allowing me the opportunity to complete this journey with a quality research study.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my close friends in assisting me in being able to complete this journey. At times it has been very tough, but each of you have stood by me in the good times and in the bad. I appreciate the motivation and support from each of you. The social outlet to manage the stress during the rough times was much appreciated. I also want to thank my friends for excusing me from their important life moments when I was working to complete this experience. I believe that we become who we are based on the people we interact with, and it is for that reason I have become the person I am today. I look forward to our continued friendship, the additional memories we will make, and important life moments we will share.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Fraternity and Sorority Concerns.....	1
Recent Incidents.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Conclusion.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	9
History of Fraternities and Sororities.....	11
Post World War II Era.....	16
Period of <i>In Loco Parentis</i>	18
Lowering the Age of Majority.....	19
Changes in the Drinking Age.....	20
Hazing.....	20
New Member Process.....	22
Fraternity and Sorority Values.....	24
Moral and Ethical Development.....	25
Humanizing of Values.....	28
Critical Thinking.....	30
Group Development.....	34
Fraternity and Sorority Conduct.....	37
Legality.....	39
Due Process.....	40
AFA Student Conduct Resource Guide.....	41
Conclusion.....	44
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY.....	46
Research Questions.....	46
Instrumentation.....	47
Validity.....	48
Reliability.....	49
Sample.....	49
Data Collection Procedures.....	50
Data Analysis.....	54
Summary.....	58

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	59
Response Rate.....	59
Demographic Characteristics.....	60
Data Specific to the Research Questions.....	65
Additional Findings From the Research.....	81
Significance of Demographics For Alcohol, Hazing, or “Other” Category	86
Summary	91
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	93
Summary of Results and Interpretation of the Findings.....	93
Implications For Further Research.....	103
Implications For Practice and Recommendations.....	106
Limitations.....	110
Summary and Conclusion.....	113
REFERENCES	117
APPENDIX	
A IRB EXEMPTION APPLICATION.....	124
B SURVEY OF GREEK CONDUCT PROCESSES.....	127
C REQUEST TO STUDY ASCA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION.....	135
D INITIAL EMAIL SENT TO ASCA MEMBERS.....	140
E FIRST REMINDER EMAIL SENT TO ASCA MEMBERS.....	142
F FINAL REMINDER EMAIL SENT TO ASCA MEMBERS.....	144
VITA.....	146

LIST OF TABLES

4.1	Institutional Type.....	60
4.2	Enrollment Level.....	61
4.3	Institution's Geographic Region.....	62
4.4	Total Number of Fraternities and Sororities Recognized.....	63
4.5	Overall Percentage of the Greek Population.....	64
4.6	Fraternity and Sorority Housing.....	65
4.7	Conduct Process for Hazing Violations.....	66
4.8	Conduct Process for Alcohol Violations.....	67
4.9	Conduct Process for "Other" University Violations.....	69
4.10	Private v. Public Example Prior to Collapsing Data.....	70
4.11	Hazing Violations Crosstab with Private v. Public Recoded.....	71
4.12	Hazing Violations with Private v. Public Chi-Square Test.....	72
4.13	Alcohol Violations Crosstab with Private v. Public Recoded.....	73
4.14	Alcohol Violations with Private v. Public Chi-Square Test.....	73
4.15	"Other" Violations Crosstab with Private v. Public Recoded.....	74
4.16	"Other" Violations with Private v. Public Chi-Square Test.....	75
4.17	General Student Org. Process for Hazing, Alcohol, and "Other"	76
4.18	General Student Org. Process Compared to Fraternities and Sororities.....	77
4.19	Individual Student Process for Hazing, Alcohol, and "Other"	79
4.20	Individual Student Process Compared to Fraternities and Sororities.....	80
4.21	How Likely Change is to Occur in Fraternity and Sorority Process.....	82
4.22	Elective System for Hazing, Alcohol, and "Other" Violations.....	83

4.23	Student Involvement in Conduct Process for Hazing, Alcohol, and “Other”	85
4.24	Alcohol and Geographic Region Chi-Square Test.....	87
4.25	Alcohol and Number of Chapters Chi Square Test.....	88
4.26	Hazing and Housing Chi-Square Test.....	89
4.27	Alcohol and Housing Chi-Square Test.....	89
4.28	“Other” Violations and Housing Chi-Square Test.....	90
4.29	Alcohol and Percent of Greek Population Chi-Square Test.....	91

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to discover the types of conduct processes that are being utilized when fraternities and sororities violate alcohol, hazing, and other policies at four-year universities. Many negative issues have been tied to Greek letter organizations and have become a national concern, such as hazing, alcohol consumption, and other types of risky behavior (Bruce & Keller, 2007). Research on the type of processes being used by universities is needed in order to analyze current practices and whether there needs to be a change in conduct processes. A survey instrument was developed by the researcher and sent out via e-mail to 797 university administrators, of which 260 responded. The study was sent to institutions that did not recognize fraternities and sororities and those participants were not included in the research. Out of those that responded, the researcher was able to use 201 total respondents for this study.

University administrators reported the conduct process that is most often utilized by institutions for hazing violations by fraternities and sororities was the “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students”. Addressing alcohol and “other” violations by fraternities and sororities, institutions most often utilized the “Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)” to address these concerns. Based on the results of this research, it was determined that most institutions utilize the same conduct process for general student organizations and individual students as fraternities and sororities.

Implications for this research include a need for universities to analyze whether current processes are achieving desired outcomes and goals. University conduct processes also need to look at ways in which they can begin to incorporate additional stakeholders, to

include headquarters, local alumni, and chapter leaders. It was determined that further inquiry is needed on this topic to include qualitative research. Now that we know what type of conduct processes are being utilized, researchers need to determine why certain differences occur in conduct processes depending on different demographics of the institutions and whether desired outcomes or goals are being achieved.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Fraternities and sororities epitomize the highs and lows of collegiate behavior: from service and friendship, to alcohol and hazing. Greek letter organizations have been a part of college campus environments since the early 1800s. Many negative issues have been tied to Greek letter organizations and have become a national concern, such as hazing, alcohol consumption, and other types of risky behavior (Bruce & Keller, 2007). While universities would rather see fraternities and sororities emulate the highs of collegiate behavior, often times universities have to deal with the lows of collegiate behavior and address conduct issues with Greek letter organizations.

Fraternity and Sorority Concerns

Universities have been working with fraternities and sororities in conduct matters since their inception and some have “questioned their relevance to campus life as well as the relationship between the Greek system and the institution” (Whipple & Murphy, 1996, p. 313). Research shows that even though campus administrators have invested time, energy and resources toward reducing these problems, these efforts are yielding few results (English, Shutt, & Oswalt, Decreasing use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs on a college campus: Exploring potential factors related to change, 2009). Conduct issues continue to plague Greek-letter organizations despite the efforts universities, local alumni, National Organizations, and other stakeholders have spent time in attempting to change.

Fraternities and sororities draw media attention to themselves in today's society for negative behaviors on a regular basis. Often times these events include

“underage drinking or a hazing episode resulting in bodily injury or worse” (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996, A68). Evidence suggests that there is a negative relationship between Greek membership and moral or ethical behavior and development (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Unfortunately, each year fraternities and sororities continue to add to these negative statistics and perceptions based on incidents that continue to occur and receive ample media attention.

Recent Incidents

In the past year and half, we have seen numerous cases that demonstrate that we still have a ways to go in addressing conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. Within two weeks in the fall of 2011, three universities took action in an attempt to control the Greek system. Lipka (2011) writes:

The last two weeks brought three edicts: The University of South Carolina suspended fraternity rush; Princeton University barred fraternities and sororities from recruiting freshmen; and in an op-ed piece in the *New York Times*, the president of Cornell University declared the end of pledging” (p.1).

The University of South Carolina suspended fraternity recruitment after six alcohol-related incidents occurred as a result of drinking at recruitment events sponsored by the fraternities (Hoover, 2011). These are three examples of universities attempting to eradicate the risky behavior that can be found in fraternities and sororities.

The Cornell University President calling for an end to pledging likely came about due to the death of a Cornell student. On February 25th, 2011, George Desdunes lost his life to hazing where he participated in a voluntary kidnapping in which several pledges bound him with duct tape. George was a sophomore and an active member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity at Cornell University. This can be

considered a unique case, as George was the active member that was being hazed by pledges or new members of the organization. The pledges were described as having Mr. Desdunes play a game where they asked him trivia questions about the fraternity in which he would have to consume alcohol for every missed question (Hoover, 2012). Later that morning, Mr. Desdunes was found on a couch still bounded by duct tape where he subsequently died later that day. This is another tragic story of where hazing led to a student death and a driving force for this study.

Hazing not only occurs in fraternities and sororities, but also other student organizations, and athletic teams. One example of this is the death of a band member at Florida A&M University. Robert Champion was a drum major on the prestigious Florida A&M University's Marching 100 band. In November 2011, Robert was pronounced dead after he boarded a bus with fellow members and the autopsy report stated that he suffered from hemorrhagic shock due to blunt force trauma sustained during a hazing incident (Hoover, 2012). Medical examiners found bruises on his arms, chest, shoulders, and back. As a result of the incident, Florida A&M suspended the band program, fired the director of the band, and ceased the recruitment of new members. The University created an anti-hazing committee where the members will examine how other colleges have handled violence against students (Hoover, 2012). This incident brought about two states, Florida and Georgia, to create new legislation to increase the punishment of students who have been found responsible for hazing. This incident will likely bring more attention to entrenched hazing that may be occurring in bands across the country to include those at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

Purpose of the Study

Hazing and other risky collegiate behavior is a concern not only with fraternities and sororities, but also with other areas of the university community, whether that is the band, athletics, or other student organizations. It is for this reason that all stakeholders must come together and address the issue at hand. Universities must look at current conduct processes and begin to analyze what is the most effective way to address these concerns. The researcher has narrowed his focus for this research to deal with fraternities and sororities and which he hopes will begin to open up conversations and dialogue on the conduct processes used to address hazing, alcohol, and other issues. Once we know what conduct processes are being utilized, we can then begin to research what is the most effective way to deal with these issues with fraternities and sororities.

Conduct issues with fraternities and sororities must be evaluated in order to determine if current practices are initiating change into Greek communities on college campuses. In order to do this, we must first take the time to analyze how universities are addressing conduct issues and what process is being used with fraternities and sororities. The purpose of this study is to research the processes that universities are using to address alcohol, hazing, and other conduct violations by fraternities and sororities. Existing research is absent that states the procedure that universities are using in the conduct process with fraternities and sororities. Research on the type of processes being used by universities is needed in order to analyze current practices and whether there needs to be a change in processes and whether the type of violation warrants a different approach. Schrage & Giacomini

(2009) explain “student development theories have paved the way for new and best practice models for administrators to meet the needs of students in appropriate developmental ways, and legal precedents have influenced procedural considerations in campus conduct codes” (p.1). This research is imperative in order to advance our fraternities and sororities and to ensure they are living up to their stated values and are positively contributing to the university experience.

Conclusion

This research will allow university professionals a chance to look at how peers are addressing alcohol, hazing, and other conduct violations by fraternities and sororities in hopes of being able to improve those processes in the future. These issues have plagued universities and fraternity and sorority communities since their origins. University professionals and other stakeholders cannot allow students to continue to be harmed and possible deaths to occur without exhausting all efforts to attempt to change behavior and cultures with students and evaluating current practices in hopes of improving them for the future. If we do not exhaust all efforts to do this, University presidents all over the country will be faced with similar issues as Cornell, Princeton, and the University of South Carolina did this past year, and the fraternity and sorority experience we know today maybe a thing of the past.

Definition of Terms

The researcher created a definition of terms section in order to identify key terms that are used throughout the dissertation and in the research instrument. Some of the terms listed below could have contextually different meanings depending on the institution and the vernacular that is used to describe certain processes. Therefore, the researcher has listed the intended definition of the terms used throughout the research.

- *Administrative Conduct Hearing* – A conduct proceeding that typically includes a single administrator that hears the case, considers all the information presented, renders a decisions, and if appropriate, levies sanctions against the individual student or student organizations, such as fraternities and sororities (Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 2010).
- *Alcohol violation* – refers to a violation of a code of student conduct that pertains to alcohol use or consumption.
- *Conduct Board* – is defined as a board comprised of either students, staff, or faculty where the group is convened to hear conduct cases against individual students or student organizations, such as fraternities and sororities (Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 2010).
- *Elective system* – Is defined as a process where the same disciplinary process can be addressed either through a conduct board, administrative hearing, or a partnership process. Note that some institutions may allow the student or

organization choose the process that is utilized, or the choice may be at the discretion of the administrator(s) that is involved in the process.

- *Governing Council* - is defined as the umbrella organization on respective campuses that individual fraternities and sororities are recognized by. On some campuses, this would include organizations such as the Interfraternity Council (IFC), National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), and the Panhellenic Council (PHC).
- *Hazing* – Hazing is defined by HazingPrevention.org (2012) as “any action taken or situation created intentionally: that causes embarrassment, harassment or ridicule, risks emotional and/or physical harm to members of a group or team, whether new or not, regardless of the person’s willingness to participate” (“Hazing Definitions,” para. 1).
- *“Local” fraternities and sororities* – is defined as fraternities and sororities that do not belong to a National organization and may not be represented on other campuses.
- *National or International fraternities and sororities* – Is defined as fraternities and sororities that have an umbrella organization that they are members of and have recognized chapters on other campuses.
- *Non-Greek organization* – is defined as any student organization that is not considered a “social” Greek organization.
- *“Other” violation* – refers to a violation of a code of student conduct that includes, but not limited to, items reported in the Clery Act, but not including hazing or alcohol.

- *Partnership Process* – is defined as a conduct process that involves a partnership between university administration, alumni of the organization, national organization, and/or chapter members where all parties agree upon the outcome of the conduct process for the organization.
- *Social Fraternities or Sororities* – Are fraternities and sororities that focus on social development (Owen, 1991). Groups that are identified as a social fraternity and/or sorority are single sex-based groups that can either be a local group or belong to national umbrella organizations. The national umbrella groups could belong to a coordinating conference or association. These organizations include the National Panhellenic Council (NPC), National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), National Interfraternity Conference (IFC), National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO), and National AIPA Panhellenic Association.
- *Student* – is defined as an individual that is enrolled in academic classes at an institution of higher education (Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature review for the proposed study covers the following topics; history of fraternities and sororities, fraternity and sorority values, moral and ethical development, humanizing of values, critical thinking, group development, fraternity and sorority conduct, legality, due process, and the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) student conduct resource guide. The literature review covers these topics as they all have relevance to either the processes in which universities address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities or the behavior of college students in general. It is imperative to look at all aspects of the literature that might have ties to this topic in order to create a foundation of information for the proposed research.

“The institution’s educational authority and legal ability to discipline individual students is essentially unquestioned, but dealing with student groups and collective student behavior is problematic” (Dannells, 1997, p. 72). Student discipline in university settings derived from the American tradition in our criminal system of adjudicating personal responsibility for wrongdoing (Dannells, 1997). American case law has established that a university has the legal authority to sanction student groups who violate university policies (Kaplin & Lee, 2007).

Higher education administrators in the United States have been struggling with addressing conduct issues with college students since the days of Thomas Jefferson and his University of Virginia and even before. The issues of today may not be that different from what Thomas Jefferson was dealing with during his time.

This is stated with the following:

Since the era when Thomas Jefferson wrote to Mr. Cooper, higher education administrators have struggled with the task of responding to the spirit of insubordination of college and university students in ways that were not only developmentally sound but that also were effective to create an environment in which all members of the academic community could live, work, and learn together. (Stoner & Lowery, 2004, p. 2)

Thomas Jefferson writes a letter to Thomas Cooper, who was the president of South Carolina College, and describes the struggles of dealing with college students. Even now, higher education continues to struggle with ways to address conduct issues in a way that is educational and gives back to the community in which was affected by the incident. Even in 1822, when Thomas Jefferson was dealing with this same issue, universities were struggling with how to deal with conduct violations by students and for the students to learn from those violations, since we are in an educational environment. Thomas Jefferson writes:

The article of discipline is the most difficult in American education. Premature ideas of independence, too little repressed by parents, beget a spirit of insubordination, which is the greatest obstacle to science with us, and a principal cause of its decay since the revolution. I look to it with dismay in our institution, as a breaker ahead, which I am far from being confident we shall be able to weather. (Peterson, 1984, p. 1465)

Thomas Jefferson knew of the difficulty in addressing conduct issues associated with higher education and where students are developmentally when they enter the walls of higher education. Students are in a difficult transition period from child to adulthood and have to begin making choices without the guidance of their parental figures. Over the years, higher education officials have attempted to provide educational leadership to students who want to better themselves into productive citizens and, at the same time, to respond to the behavior that negatively impacts

the living/learning environment of the campus. Just as Thomas Jefferson struggled with this issue, even today campus officials continue to struggle with these same issues (Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

History of Fraternities and Sororities

Since the early days of higher education in the United States, students' have been forming groups or organizations. The first groups established were the traditional class breakdowns between students, such as first and second year students, which were soon followed by literary societies. Since the establishment of these groups, universities have had problems with behavior, as early as 1667 occurring at Harvard College. During this time, the Harvard Board of Overseers disciplined groups of students for participating in what they termed as predatory adolescent aggression (Maloney, 1998). Such challenges grew as student groups continued to flourish.

The establishment of fraternities and sororities grew out of the literary societies. The original founding's of social fraternities in the early 19th century, or why students joined them, is described as to establish "literary/intellectual pursuits or camaraderie/brotherhood" (Syrett, 2009, pp. 27-28). Phi Beta Kappa was founded in 1776 at the College of William and Mary, the second oldest college in America, and is believed to be the first American society bearing a Greek-Letter name. Phi Beta Kappa was formed for social and literary purposes and possessed many of the characteristics of modern day fraternities, including: secrecy, a prescribed ritual, an oath, motto, a fraternity badge, a strong connection to friendship, and willing to share its values on other campuses by expansion (Owen,

1991). Phi Beta Kappa, about 30 years after its founding, became and has remained a scholarly honor society (Owen, 1991). Phi Beta Kappa was preceded by a society known as the Flat Hat, which was founded in 1750 and operated for at least 20 years (Owen, 1991).

In the fall of 1825, five men of the senior class at Union College in New York formed a secret society named Kappa Alpha Society, and many would argue this would begin the history of college fraternities (Syrett, 2009). Within two years of the founding of Kappa Alpha Society, students at Union College would form two more societies, Sigma Phi and Delta Phi (Binder, 2003). These three fraternities, sometimes referred to as the “Union Triad”, created the footprint for the American fraternity system (Owen, 1991). From this point forward, these societies began to create other chapters on college campuses outside of Union College, with Sigma Phi leading the way by establishing a chapter at Hamilton College in 1831 (Syrett, 2009). “By the 1850s, secret societies with Greek letter names had a firm footing on virtually every college campus in New England and the mid-Atlantic region, as well as some in the South and the Midwest” (Syrett, 2009, p.13). During this period of fraternity growth, students would be excluded from one fraternity, and as a result, would turn around and create their own fraternity, which would spread to other colleges. Beta Theta Pi was founded by John Reily Knox, a student at Miami University of Ohio, who was inspired by the Alpha Delta Phi fraternity in establishing the new organization in 1939 (Syrett, 2009).

The first house established by a Greek-letter organization was established in 1845 by Chi Psi fraternity at the University of Michigan (Binder, 2003). “Few

changes in fraternities have brought about more change on campuses than the rise of the “fraternity house” (Binder, 2003, p. 37). With the increase in fraternity and sorority housing, increased interaction of members would occur and have an impact on Greek-letter organizations. Binder (2003) describes this movement that occurred in the mid to late 1800s:

The movement to establish houses coincided with the beginning of the shift in American higher education from the English model, with its emphasis on the moral as well as the intellectual development of the student (*along with the concept of in loco parentis*) to the German model, with its emphasis on intellectual development alone. (p. 37)

Because of this change in educational philosophy, restrictions on living off-campus were modified and students were given the opportunity to live in fraternity and sorority housing (Straw, 1996).

Fraternities would continue to expand through the 19th century establishing chapters in the Deep South and to the west. Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity was founded at the University of Alabama in 1856, and is being credited as the second fraternity founded in the south, but the only one still in existence today (Owen, 1991). “When the Civil War broke out in 1861, twenty-two different fraternities had 299 chapters at seventy-one colleges in a total of twenty-five states” (Syrett, 2009, p. 26). Fraternities were well established before the Civil War, thus their return afterwards was inevitable.

The Civil War weakened fraternity activities in the North and suspended activities in the South. After the conclusion of the Civil War, many of the Northern fraternities were undecided as to whether they should re-establish their Southern chapters (Owen, 1991). This then lead to the establishment of new Southern

fraternities, such as Alpha Tau Omega fraternity founded at the Virginia Military Institute in 1865 and Kappa Alpha Order founded in the same year at Washington and Lee University (Owen, 1991). During this time, most Greek-letter organizations were being founded at private institutions, as these were the primary institutions available during the 1800s. “As states began to expand higher education after the *Morrill Act of 1862* (1862) and the *Morrill Act of 1890* (1890) the number of state sponsored postsecondary institutions increased greatly”, thus increasing the number of organizations being founded at these institutions (Binder, 2003, p. 36).

Fraternities saw the need to formally band together in order to promote common aims and interests when the Department of Universities and Colleges of the Religion of Education Association pulled together 17 fraternity representatives in Chicago at an annual meeting in 1909 (Owen, 1991). This group developed what was considered a “Panhellenic Union” (Owen, 1991). This was the foundation of what was eventually formed with the establishment of the Interfraternity Conference, that later became known as the National Inter-fraternity Conference (NIC) (Owen, 1991).

The establishment of women’s fraternities began in the mid to late 19th century. There are three organizations that claim to be the first fraternity founded for women. Alpha Delta Pi is considered the first sisterhood with the founding of the Adelphean Society in 1851. Pi Beta Phi was established in 1867 as the first organization for college women established as a women’s fraternity, previously named I.C. Sorosis. Kappa Alpha Theta was originally established in 1870 as the first Greek-letter society for women and still bears the same name (Owen, 1991).

Even though there are a couple of cases where women obtained membership in the men's fraternities, it was established that women would have similar, but separate organizations. Originally, each of the women's groups were called fraternities, until in 1882 when Gamma Phi Beta established itself as a sorority as one of their founders believed that the word "fraternity" did not fit with a group of young women (Owen, 1991). The National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) was established in 1902 and currently has twenty-six women's fraternities that are part of the organization (HazingPrevention.org, 2012).

The establishment of Black Greek-letter fraternities and sororities began in the early 1900s. Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity claims to be founded first in 1906 at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. However, Walter Kimbrough (2003) states, "the Black fraternal movement for collegians was attempted first in Bloomington, Indiana, which would eventually become the birth place of Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity" (p 22). Alpha Kappa Nu was founded in 1903 at Indiana University and may have had ties to Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity. Kimbrough (2003) states that William Crump, Kappa Alpha Historian, claims this organization disbanded and that Kappa Alpha Psi was founded perhaps as a tribute to the original students who founded Alpha Kappa Nu in 1903. Kimbrough (2003) goes on to state that Sigma Pi Phi, also known as Boule', was the first Black Greek-letter organization that is still in existence today. Sigma Pi Phi was founded in 1904 as primarily a graduate organization geared towards an elite class of Black citizens.

The original founding groups of Black-Greek letter organizations "were formed during a period when Blacks were being denied essential rights and services

afforded to others” (Owen, 1991, p. I-42). These organizations created an umbrella organization in 1930 for both fraternities and sororities, that would provide a coordination of philosophies and activities to better serve the organizations (Owen, 1991). The umbrella organization became known as the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) and each of the original eight fraternities and sororities that comprised this organization pledged to devote their resources and services to enhance their communities (Owen, 1991).

Post World War II Era

Greek-letter organizations continued to flourish in the 1900’s and the twentieth century organizations outnumber the groups established in the century and a quarter preceding the 1900s (Owens, 1991). World War I & II and the Great Depression were each significant events that had a profound impact not only on higher education, but also fraternities and sororities. During these tough times for the United States, higher education and Greek-letter organizations were able to persist, but were molded by these events (Owens, 1991). Higher education was increasingly expanding like never before after World War II, partly due to the G.I. Bill. “It is estimated that 325,000 fraternity men and women were in uniform” for World War II (Owen, 1991, p. I-22). At the conclusion of World War II, many colleges and universities were deliberately marketing programs to GIs to take advantage of the stimulated interest in higher education. “The net result of such efforts was that many colleges and universities experienced a doubling in enrollments between 1943 and 1946” (Thelin, 2004, p.264). Due to the increasing demand for higher education, states decided to expand state institutions and

established universities associated with the state universities in regional cities across states. As a result, Greek-letter organizations also experienced significant growth during this time period “as inter/national organizations sought to expand to these institutions, often converting local organizations into chapters of the existing inter/national organizations” (Binder, 2003, p. 36). During this significant growth for higher education, fraternities experienced “the greatest development in size in its history: more campuses opened to national fraternities; more chapters were installed than in any previous period; more members initiated, more chapter houses were built and remodeled; more foundations and endowment funds were established” (Owens, 1991, p. I-22).

During the post World War II era for higher education, universities began to change their relationship with fraternities and sororities. “Universities coming to realize the potential of Greek chapters began to employ advisors in student personnel who concentrated their attention to this field” (Owens, 1991, p. I-22). With the growth of university advisors for Greek-letter organizations, the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) was formed in 1976. The AFA mission states, “enhances its members’ abilities to foster impactful fraternity/sorority experiences” (Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 2010). AFA meets annually and provides support for university professionals and graduate students, inter/national organization staff members, volunteers, and other constituents vested in the Greek experience. As of 2001, AFA consisted of approximately 1,200 members (Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 2010).

The post World War II era also brought about many challenges and issues for Greek-letter organizations. Some of these issues included, the departure of *in loco parentis*, lowering the age of majority, changes in the legal drinking age, hazing, and other liability and risk management issues. These changes have brought about increased legal responsibility for not only the Greek-letter organizations and its' members, but also the host institutions.

Period of *In Loco Parentis*

When the period of *in loco parentis* came to an end, this had a major effect on how colleges and universities treated their students and student organizations. *In loco parentis* originated with the colonial college model of higher education where the faculty were free to develop and enforce rules acting as the parent for the students (Nuss, 2003). Lake (2009) describes why *in loco parentis* was developed “as a judicial tool in the period of legal insularity as a direct result of a shift to trustee governance and contract law rationales so as to continue to protect higher education from judicial review of internal decision-making” (p.54). Lake (2009) goes on to describe that colleges and universities rarely had to answer to the law in regards to internal decision making dealing with students prior to World War II. This all changed after the case of Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, where courts stated that students have due process and other constitutionally defined rights at public institutions, later described in this chapter. After the Dixon case *in loco parentis* dissolved, as a new way of discipline was being crafted by universities with the changes in the legal environment driving this change. Binder (2003) describes this change in legal philosophy as a time in which rules that were deemed

arcane were lifted and students were given more freedom. Binder (2003) goes on to describe that during this time period, on many campuses, house mothers were removed from fraternity houses, as most instances this was the only adult figure that had inherent control over the behavior in fraternity and sorority housing, thus leaving the students with more control over their own behavior in those environments.

Lowering the Age of Majority

Lowering the age of majority occurred in the beginning of the 1970s, just after the Dixon case, and had an impact on students and higher education. The lowering of the legal age of adulthood went from 21 to 18 during this time period and had a tremendous effect on how most college students were able to interact with society (Binder, 2003). This change meant that as an 18 year old, you could now vote, enter into legally binding contracts, and be treated as an adult. Binder (2003) states “ this also meant that college students could be charged as adults with crimes, and could be sued for tortuous acts, thus slowly ushering in the era of liability and risk management” (p. 41). This meant that most college students could be held accountable for criminal charges of adult behavior and the excuse of being a youth was no longer tolerable. This change brought about the need for liability insurance for students that were members of Greek-letter organizations, as they now could be liable for their actions.

Changes in the Drinking Age

During the same time as the age of majority was decreased, so was the drinking age from 21 to 18. It would remain this way through the 1970s and 1980s for most of the country (Binder, 2003). This meant that the majority of college students could now possess and consume alcohol without repercussions. This in turn meant that chapters could allow residents of Greek-letter organization houses to possess and consume alcohol and now alcohol was allowed at social events hosted by the organizations. This changed the types of parties that Greek-letter organizations were hosting and increased the focus on consuming alcohol at these events (Binder, 2003). During the 1990s, the drinking age began to switch back to 21 in states all across the country. Consequently, this criminalized some of the behavior with the parties that Greek-letter organizations were hosting. Furthermore, fraternities and sororities may be subject to social host liability when hosting events with alcohol and an injury or death occurs (Gehring, 2000). Since this time, alcohol and fraternities have had issues that are now being brought to public scrutiny with increased litigation.

Hazing

Hazing is a concern that many stakeholders have with Greek-letter organizations and has been forbidden by most national organizations for decades. Hazing has plagued not only Greek-letter organizations, but higher education as a whole since the time of medieval schools in Greece, North Africa, and Western Europe (Finkel, 2002). Hazing is defined by Allan and Madden (2008) as “any activity expected of someone joining or participating in a group that humiliates,

degrades, abuses, or endangers them regardless of a person's willingness to participate" (p. 2). Even though the term "hazing" was not used until the mid-1800's, hazing incidents occurred in the U.S. as early as 1657 at Harvard (Nuwer, 1999). Nuwer (1999) describes the first death associated with hazing recorded occurred at Cornell in 1873 where a pledge for Kappa Alpha Society was blindfolded in the woods and fell off a cliff. Hazing has been a part of higher education for some time as Kimbrough (2003) states "for over seven hundred years in higher education, and over two hundred years in American higher education, some form of hazing has existed, a systematic means of indoctrinating new members of the university community through a rite of passage" (pp 39-40). This rite of passage in today's terms for fraternities and sororities is formally known as pledging.

National research tells us that hazing continues to plague higher education. The National Study of Student Hazing conducted by Allan and Madden (2008) shows that fifty-five percent of college students involved in organizations or athletic teams have experienced hazing. The research also shows that many of these actions are in view of the public and twenty-five percent of the time an advisor or coach knew about the hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008). A large portion of the students do not even recognize they have been hazed, as nine out of ten students who have experienced hazing in college do not consider themselves to have been hazed (Allan & Madden, 2008). Often times hazing and alcohol consumption go hand in hand as research shows that close to fifty percent of hazing incidents alcohol was present (Finkel, 2002). Research also shows us that hazing is just not for college students as

forty-seven percent of college students reported that they have experienced hazing prior to college (Allan & Madden, 2008).

Higher education and society began to see some changes in regards to hazing in the 1980s. During this time, momentum occurred for states to begin adopting laws that made hazing illegal. By states adopting hazing policies, this has increased the perceived criminalization of this behavior. This in turn, has also increased the likelihood for civil lawsuits against individuals and chapters (Binder, 2003).

Consequently, this has increased “the need for liability insurance to protect the organization, its assets and volunteer advisors” (Binder, 2003, p.42). This also has brought about a new philosophy to remove the pledging process from organizations and focus on membership development plans that extend the learning throughout the collegiate years.

New Member Process

Pledging a fraternity has not always been a part of Greek-letter organizations’ process for obtaining membership. Originally when Phi Beta Kappa was founded and for many decades afterwards, when an individual was selected for membership, they were given full rights to the organization (Owens, 1991). Binder (2003) explains how this came about with the following:

Pledging has developed relatively recently, from two historical contexts. The first of this movement was by institutions to defer membership until second or third term of attendance. This resulted in fraternal organizations seeking promise, or pledge from students, to join the group once institutional rules permitted such membership. The concept of pledging also came from the times when veterans began returning to school after World War II and other conflicts. These men felt the need to establish some program with similarities to basic training. (p. 49)

Pledging has held strong with most NIC and NPC groups, but NPHC abolished the practice in 1990, when National Pan-Hellenic Council presidents agreed to end pledging by that fall semester (Kimbrough, 2003). The NPHC groups had experienced numerous lawsuits in regards to hazing and felt this was the only way in which to protect their organizations was to end pledging, which they believed was the root to the hazing problem (Kimbrough, 2003). The NPHC organizations then adopted a membership intake policy and as Kimbrough (2003) states “underground pledging became viewed as a legitimate means to continue the culture of pledging” (p. 64). So even though pledging had officially ended for NPHC groups, this created new issues and problems with underground activities taking place outside of the official National organization process.

Some NIC fraternities began to question the relevance of the pledging process in the 1970s, as having a power difference between pledges and actives seemed like the root to the issues they were facing with hazing. In 1970, Lambda Chi Alpha was the first group to abolish the pledging process and created their associate member program (Binder, 2003). This new program allowed the associate members to obtain all membership rights as the active members upon joining the organization. Other National groups have developed similar programs that contain membership development for its members continuously through college. Some examples of these groups include Sigma Phi Epsilon’s Balanced Man Program, Sigma Nu’s LEAD program, and Beta Theta Pi’s Men of Principle (Binder, 2003). Most of these programs are designed to teach the members how to live up to the stated values by the organizations. Even with these new programs from the NIC

organizations, hazing still continues in many of their chapters, as their members are not upholding the founding principles and values of the organization.

Fraternity and Sorority Values

From the original founding of Phi Beta Kappa in 1776 as a literary society, fraternities and sororities established a set of values and developed a ritual that captured these values that were passed down through initiation ceremonies year after year. Phi Beta Kappa was developed off of Masonic principles, as many of the original members were practicing Masons (Binder, 2003). Fraternities and sororities proclaim that they stand for values such as, “moral development, integrity, truth, goodness, social responsibility, sacred trust, and honor” (Early, 1998, p. 39). For example, Sigma Kappa Sorority Headquarters (2011) lists their values on their website as “personal growth, friendship, service and loyalty; bound by a promise”. Delta Upsilon fraternity (1971), which is a non-secretive fraternity, states their four founding principles as “the promotion of friendship, the development of character, the diffusion of liberal culture, and the advancement of justice” (p. 48). Both of these are examples of fraternities and sororities committing themselves to live by a set of values and expectations for those who are members. However, fraternities and sororities do not always uphold the values of the organization. Early (1998) states that “the Greek learning community’s development is hampered when fraternity and sorority members do not make their decision making behavior agree with stated ethical principles” (pp 39-40).

Fraternities and Sororities are often described as social organizations. The term “social” to describe fraternities and sororities was originally used to describe

social or personal development that members experienced during their collegiate years and not pertaining to social functions (Owen, 1991). The social term describing fraternities and sororities can mislead people to believe this is their primary purpose instead of to serve as values-based organizations. Many students choose to join a fraternity or sorority based on the social aspect, not knowing that the original founding of the organizations was that of a values-based organization. This can lead to tough conversations when a conduct issue arises with the fraternity or sorority and the behavior expectations the organizations are to be held to, by either alumni, university administrators, or Inter-National Organization representatives.

Moral and Ethical Development

Researchers have looked at moral and ethical development models and compared them to fraternities and sororities to see how students are developing ethical decision-making skills. Early (1998) looks at Rest's theory on moral development and how those processes within the model relate to fraternities and sororities. Rest (1986) proposed the following process of moral decision-making:

(1) Interpreting the situation in terms of how people's welfare is affected by possible actions of the subject; (2) figuring out what the ideally moral course of action would be; (3) deciding what one actually intends to do; and (4) executing and implementing what one intends to do (p.93).

Rest (1986) goes on to explain that you need each of these processes in order to perform a moral act and that you must become more proficient in each if you are going to continue to develop your morals. Early (1998) examines each of these processes in order to figure out why fraternities and sororities may not be living up to stated values of the organizations.

The first process that Rest (1986) describes in his theory involves thinking about the possible decisions a person can make and connecting those decisions to possible consequences for all parties involved. This can tie directly into what fraternity and sorority members go through when making decisions. The decision may not always be positive in nature, but the student does think about possible consequences for each possible decision. Early (1988) believes that fraternities and sororities can create ideal settings where members can consider the actions and moral implications as a result of those actions considering the commitments to their brothers and sisters. The added pressure from fraternity brothers or sorority sisters may not always elicit positive outcomes, as there could be pressure to do just the opposite. Kuh and Whitt (1988) examined fraternities and sororities as a student subculture and state:

Members of Greek organizations had constant contact with one another, the members' strong loyalty to the group made them susceptible to group influence, a clear distinction could be made between members and nonmembers, and group members shared values and definitions of right and wrong that could be used as consistent standards for judging actions. (p. 91)

As stated in their research, fraternities and sororities can have a strong connection with group members' shared values and can influence individuals to conform with the group's values.

The second process that Rest (1986) describes is figuring out which action is the more morally based action of the possible decisions. Early (1988) describes that fraternities and sororities develop norms that members are expected to uphold. Early goes on to state "these norms are so pervasive that they come to define the organization and shape members' values" (p. 41). Early goes on to describe that the

group think that is developed may or may not be in line with stated organizational principles.

The third process that Rest (1986) describes is the act where the person decides which action they are choosing by selecting among competing values that lead to different motives. Rest states, “it is not unusual for non moral values to be so strong and attractive that a person chooses a course of action that preempts or compromises the moral ideal” (p. 95). Early (1988) relates this act back to members of fraternities and sororities being under pressure and worried about how their peers will react to the action they have selected. Early also describes an example where a fraternity or sorority is under pressure to be competitive during recruitment and could lead the group to accept members that do not embrace fraternal principles. This would further hamper the fraternity or sorority from upholding the stated values of the organization if the members do not embody those characteristics.

The fourth process that Rest (1986) describes is the actual execution and implementation of the plan of action. Rest states that this “involves figuring out the sequence of concrete actions, working around impediments and unexpected difficulties, overcoming fatigue and frustrations, resisting distractions and other allurements, and keeping sight of the eventual goal” (p. 96). Early (1988) relates this back to fraternities and sororities and how their actions need to connect to the organization’s stated values.

Looking at Rest’s (1986) theory on moral development, the different processes describe the stages young adults may go through when making decisions.

This can be compared to young adults that are members of fraternities and sororities that go through similar stages when making decisions that could impact themselves or the organization. Scott (1965) researched social fraternities and sororities and found that Greek organization members' strong loyalty to the group made the members more susceptible to group influence. He also found that because the group members shared values that they may also share what is considered morally right and wrong, and could use this standard to judge actions. This assimilation of values by the fraternity and sorority members only strengthens the group dynamics that are at play within these organizations.

Humanizing of Values

Students in the collegiate environment may begin solidifying their beliefs through their experiences and the people with whom they surround themselves. Fraternities and sororities are examples of communities that students surround themselves with fraternity brothers or sorority sisters that may share similar beliefs and where humanizing of values can occur. Chickering (1969) refers to humanizing of values and states the following:

Humanizing of values is White's (1958) term; describing it he calls attention to Piaget's (1932) work, which "demonstrated a trend from a literal belief in rules, almost as if they had an independent physical existence, to an attitude or relativity, in which precepts were perceived in relation to the social purposes they were designed to serve....(p. 353)(as cited on p.127).

Chickering (1969) goes on to compare humanizing with urban development, where old buildings are torn down and demolished and perhaps this is the only way students are able to prepare themselves for new structures, which he terms as humanizing of values. Humanizing of values could occur in a Greek community

when new members join a fraternity or sorority and are instantly exposed to new cultural norms developed by the members of the organization. Chickering (1969), describes humanizing of values occurring “through objective analyses of existing conditions and through sound estimation of the consequences of given alternatives” (p.128). The beliefs of the new members could be challenged by these cultural norms and the student begins to analyze alternative values or beliefs.

Looking at different theories, such as humanizing of values, you need to take into consideration that “theories are socially constructed and that objects of theories and constructs incorporated within theories are also socially constructed” (McEwen, 2003, p. 169). This is based off of the premise that knowledge is never neutral. The object of theories, to include students and organizations of higher education, do not develop or exist in a vacuum (McEwen, 2003). When looking at theories, you must also consider the background and perspective of the theorist when analyzing the theory. McEwen (2003) states “ theorists have not usually stated who they are in terms of socially constructed characteristics, backgrounds, values, and other factors that may influence the development and presentation of their theory” (p. 170). Looking at theories as social constructions, you must analyze the theory to uncover the factors that may have influenced the theory that is not explicitly stated.

Looking at Chickering’s humanizing of values theory, you must consider the theory could be socially constructed. Chickering (1969) goes on to describe humanizing of values and when “value differences” occur because the student can’t be completely objective about information that they receive. The student begins to

solidify their values “as conditions and consequences become clear and objectivity becomes high, these “values differences” diminish because the indicated behaviors are unarguable” (Chickering, 1969, p. 128). As students are solidifying their values, researchers also need to consider how this affects the development of their critical thinking skills and how those processes might be related.

Critical Thinking

Colleges and universities have often claimed their primary purpose is to help students develop their ability to critically think for themselves (Astin, 1991). Alan (2003) states “ in the early 1900s, prominent educators such as Sumner (1906) at Yale University and Dewey (1910) at Columbia University claimed that critical thinking should be a central aim of higher education” (p. 746). According to Kurfiss (1988), critically thinking for college students and/or graduates is to make judgments based on evidence, articulated values, and sound reasoning. Critical thinking can be traced back to Socrates in ancient Greece, where he developed a teaching method that encouraged students to question common beliefs and determine which ones were logical and those that lacked sufficient evidence (Paul, 1990).

Perry (1970) researched how college students interpret and make meaning of the teaching and learning process and developed nine positions that outline a continuum to help us understand where students are in the development process. These positions have been narrowed down into four main categories that include duality, multiplicity, relativism, and commitment (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, &

Renn, 2010). These categories are concepts that represent the differences in the meaning-making process.

The first category in Perry's (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development is dualism and represents a mode of meaning making where items are viewed dichotomously. Kurfiss (1998) describes that during this position "students believe that knowledge is a collection of discrete facts; therefore, learning is simply a matter of acquiring information delivered by the professor in concert with the text" (p. 52). During this position, students view information as either correct or incorrect and less likely to reason independently.

The second category in Perry's (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development is multiplicity and this is where disequilibrium is introduced into the meaning making process (Evans et al., 2010). Multiplicity is the process of respecting diverse opinions when the correct answer is not known. This is the position where students begin to analyze different opinions and begin to formulate their own based on the information (Kurfiss, 1998). Perry (1970) described multiplicity as the position in which the student departs from the dichotomous thinking and begins to think more independently and peers begin to be viewed as a possible source of knowledge.

The third category in Perry's (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development is relativism and is the position when the student begins to factor the source of information as to how valid it is and recognizes that good opinions are supported by reasons (Kurfiss, 1998). Evans et al. (2010) describes relativism as the position where "knowledge is viewed more qualitatively; it is contextually

defined, based on evidence and supporting arguments” (p. 86). Evans et al. (2010) go on to describe that relativism and dualism can appear to be very similar, where students express strong views, but what differs in the amount of thought and reflection that took place in order to formulate those views.

The fourth category in Perry’s (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development is commitment in relativism, which involves making choices in a contextual world. Evans et al. (2010) describe this position as a movement that initiates ethical development rather than increasing cognitive complexity. Kurfiss (1998) describes this position as a time when students have to take a stance or a commitment, even though they have no definitive sources letting them know if they are correct on what they choose to do or believe.

Students can enhance their learning and critical thinking skills throughout their collegiate experience. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found that by the time freshman advance through to their senior year, the student has improved their critical thinking ability by 34 percent. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) state the following:

College seniors have better oral and written communication skills, are better abstract reasoners or critical thinkers, are more skilled at using reason as evidence to address ill-structured problems for which there are no verifiably correct answers, have greater intellectual flexibility in that they are better able to understand more than one side of a complex issue, and can develop more sophisticated abstract frameworks to deal with complexity. (p. 156)

One of the most important ways to improve cognitive development during the collegiate years is for students to be involved on campus, where they are able to use the skills they have learned in the classroom with experiences outside of the classroom (Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994).

Fraternities and sororities are often faced with the question as to whether their outcomes support the universities primary purpose of developing critical thinking skills for members (Randall & Grady, 1998). A study conducted by the National Study of Student Learning found that Greek men scored significantly lower than non-Greek men at the end of the freshman year (Randall & Grady, 1998). The same study also found that sorority women also scored lower than their non-Greek counterparts, but only in a couple of areas and not as big of a difference as the men (Randall & Grady, 1998). However, the study indicated the negative effects were mostly with white men, as African American fraternity men had an increase in cognitive effects from their non-Greek counterparts (Randall & Grady, 1998). Researchers from the study offer one possible explanation for this negative effect for white fraternity men is that the involvement in the first year of fraternity membership actually takes time away from activities that support cognitive development (Randall & Grady, 1998).

In a study conducted by Pike (2000) found that Greek membership actually had a positive impact on general cognitive abilities through higher levels of social involvement. However, the research conducted by Pike was only at one institution and was not a national study. Pike (2000) concluded that “whether membership in a fraternity or sorority hinders student development by deemphasizing academic experiences/achievement and emphasizing behaviors that are not conducive to learning, may depend on the institutional culture within fraternities and sororities exist” (p. 137). Additional research is needed in this area to confirm whether Greek

membership has a positive impact on critical thinking skills and if this varies from institution to institution, with different fraternity and sorority cultures.

The years in which college students are persisting through the university is an important time for students to figure out who they are and what values they stand for. Joining a fraternity or sorority can have a major effect on the student as they are exposed to group norms and beliefs that may be different from the student's original beliefs. It is imperative that the experiences the students are having in the fraternity or sorority are positive.

Group Development

Looking at fraternities and sororities, there is little research that has been conducted on the group development process for the organizations. However, business organizations have been well studied and most of the research on this topic deals with those organizations. Greek-letter organization stakeholders can learn from research conducted on business organizations and relate it back to how an organization may change and go in and out of stages over time. One of the most common group development theories is described in five common stages of team or group development and is credited to Tuckman (1965) who created the model. The Tuckman (1965) model includes five stages described as forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. Tuckman and Jensen (1977) believe that these stages are necessary for the team or group to grow and develop.

The first stage in the Tuckman (1965) group development model is forming and this stage is described as orientation, testing, and dependence making up this stage and occurs when the group is new or has been reorganized. With the group

members being new with one another, Tuckman and Jensen (1977) describe the group in this stage as having uncertainty about the group's purpose; have feelings of anxiety and awkwardness. However, the group in this stage may be motivated to achieve and be successful. Weaver and Farrell (1997) describe some of the problems associated with groups in this stage as not being able to recognize the resources available in the group and people are often going in different directions. This could be related to Greek-letter organizations as they are going through the colonization or recolonization process. Another way in which this stage could be viewed with Greek-letter organizations is looking at it when a new member class is brought into the organization, they could be considered in the forming stage as it relates to their new member class.

The next stage in the Tuckman (1965) model is storming and is described as the point in which the group begins its' work and starts to compete for different ideas, approaches, and work styles to be considered by the group. Weaver and Farrell (1997) state that the group in this stage may have common behaviors, such as frustration, possible formation of cliques, uncertainty about roles, and conflict both within the group and outside of the group. Weaver and Farrell (1997) go on to state that group leaders must be cognizant of people getting upset because their expectations are not met, group members not feeling as if they are not important to the group or doing too much of the work. This stage could be related to Greek-letter organizations when conflict arises after the initial establishment of the group. The fraternity or sorority could also go through this stage when new energy or thought processes are instilled into the group and group conflict arises.

The third stage of the Tuckman (1965) model is norming and is described as the stage in which the group begins to resolve differences and establishes procedures of how the group will work together to accomplish its goals or objectives. Weaver and Farrell (1997) describe the group in this stage as identifying commonly held purposes, group members working together, members supporting one another, with harmony and respect developing for one another. You could see this stage in a Greek-letter organization when the chapter is beginning to be on the same page with one another and members agreeing to the goals and objectives of the chapter.

The fourth stage of the Tuckman (1965) model is performing and is described as the point in which the group is performing at a consistent high level and group members are satisfied with one another. Weaver and Farrell (1997) describe the group in this stage as collaboration among members, interdependence, and clear role clarification of each of the members. This would be the stage in a Greek-letter organization when the group is performing at peak levels and is able to achieve the goals of the chapter.

The last stage of the Tuckman model was not actually in the original model in 1965, but was introduced later with Tuckman and Jensen (1977) in an updated model based on new research that included the “life cycle model” where an ending to the group is established. During this stage, group members are no longer concerned with the task performance as the group is wrapping up their time functioning as a group. Members of the group may sense mixed emotions as they may be sad about the loss of friendship from working in the group, but may also feel happy about

what the group was able to accomplish (Draft & Marcic, 2009). Adjourning can be tied back to a Greek-letter organization when members graduate and their time in the chapter as an undergraduate comes to an end. This stage could also be emulated when a chapter closes or loses recognition by the International organization or the university.

The Tuckman (1965) model can be a helpful way to view Greek-letter organizations and the group dynamics that may occur as the organization progresses through different stages of the model. Since little research has been related to this model and Greek-letter organizations, there needs to be more efforts to study how this model can be used more effectively with the organizations. One problem with this study and its relation to Greek-letter organizations is that when it was developed the researchers did not take into consideration the addition of new members to the group and that would need to be addressed for future research (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977).

Fraternity and Sorority Conduct

Universities have been dealing with conduct issues associated with fraternities and sororities since their inception. Syrett (2009) explains that fraternities in the early 1900s rebelled against the administration, whether this was to prove their independence from the university or by providing themselves with entertainment and activities that were forbidden. It is for this reason that Syrett (2009) states “secret societies were forbidden on most college campuses until the middle of the nineteenth century and at some until the century’s final decades” (p. 31), thus pushing the fraternity membership and activities into greater secrecy at

some universities. Several of the common university rules that were broken during secret meetings as described by Syrett (2009) included the consumption of liquor, use of profanity, and other rules on immorality. It is these activities that would drive universities to address the behavior of the fraternities in the early 1900s, with some of these activities being very similar to ones that university officials have to deal with today.

Today university administrators are faced with dealing with the negative behaviors associated with fraternities and sororities. These negative behaviors can challenge university professionals in trying to change the culture of the Greek community. Whipple and Sullivan (1998) state “senior student affairs staff must also be cognizant of these challenges as they formulate policies and procedures; these regulations should help fraternities and sororities develop their own learning communities and enhance their members’ educational experiences” (p. 13). This recommendation encourages universities to implement policies and procedures in order to regulate the Greek community. There are conflicting views with this topic when looking at it from a legalistic perspective. Hennessy and Huson (1998) state “from a strictly legalistic perspective, it is better for universities to maintain distance from any entity, including Greek letter organizations” (p.72). This is a tough decision for universities and the authors go on to state this can be difficult with Greek organizations serving as such an integral part of the University community. Historically, Colgan & Hopper (1987) describes that the hands off approach originally came from the departure of the *in loco parentis* philosophy.

Kaplin & Lee (2007) describe the doctrine of *in loco parentis* as a status established by the courts in the mid twentieth century as a way:

To shield colleges from liability in tort claims brought by students or their parents, that doctrine fell out of favor when the age of majority for students was lowered to eighteen, making virtually all college students “adults” in the eyes of the law. (p.91)

Colgan and Hopper (1987) also note that since a hands off approach was used by the university, the university had to rely on under skilled local alumni to now engage in the operations of the fraternities and sororities. During this time the national organizations were also in positions where resources were stretched thin in giving the support the local chapter needed. Due to the different constituents not being able to adequately support the chapters, they had to collectively work together in order to manage the fraternities and sororities.

Legality

Looking at the way universities address conduct issues, there is evidence that colleges and universities have given the same rights and responsibilities to fraternities and sororities as they would individual students. In fact, recent court cases have shown that registered student organizations do not need the same due process rights as individual students. The reason for this is because disciplining an organization does not necessarily deprive individual students of liberty or property rights (AFA, 2010). The AFA (2010) state “it is strongly recommended that institutions provide due process to all student organizations, including fraternities and sororities, not only to avoid potential lawsuits, but because fairness is a fundamental ingredient in the success of any conduct process” (p.8). These rights are termed due process and are protected by the federal Constitution. Kaplin and

Lee (2007) state, “the primary external source of procedural requirements for public institutions, however, is the due process clause of the federal Constitution, which prohibits government from depriving an individual of life, liberty, or property without certain procedural protections” (p. 459). The courts have assumed that there is property interest in continued enrollment at an institution and is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). Campus officials then give these same rights to fraternities and sororities, even though an individual student’s enrollment may not be at stake, but rather the official recognition of the Greek organization is at stake.

Due Process

The rights for individual students were ultimately defined by the *Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of Education*, 294 F.2d 150 (5th Cir. 1961). The case is described as:

Several black students at Alabama State College had been expelled during a period of intense civil rights activity in Montgomery, Alabama. The students supported by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), sued the state board, and the court faced the question “whether (the) due process (clause of the Fourteenth Amendment) requires notice and some opportunity for hearing before students at a tax-supported college are expelled for misconduct.” On appeal this question was answered in the affirmative, with the court establishing standards by which to measure adequacy of a public institution’s expulsion procedures. (Kaplin & Lee, 2007, p. 459)

This case has been described as “the birth of due process in the context of the student-university relationship” (Bickel, 2008. p. 3). Another case that established due process in the greatest detail is *Estban v. Central Missouri State College*, 277 F. Supp. 649 (W.D. Mo. 1967). Kaplin and Lee (2007) describe this case as:

The plaintiffs had been suspended for two semesters for engaging in protest demonstrations. The lower court held that the students had not been accorded procedural due process and ordered the school to provide the following protections for them:

1. A written statement of the charges, for each student, made available at least ten days before the hearing;
 2. A hearing before the person(s) having power to expel or suspend;
 3. The opportunity for advance inspection of any affidavits or exhibits the college intends to submit at the hearing;
 4. The right to bring counsel to the hearing to advise them (but not to question witnesses);
 5. The opportunity to present their own version of the facts, by personal statements as well as affidavits and witnesses;
 6. The right to hear evidence against them and question (personally, not through counsel) adverse witnesses;
 7. A determination of the facts of each case by the hearing officer, solely on the basis of the evidence presented at the hearing;
 8. A written statement of the hearing officer's findings of fact; and
 9. The right, at their own expense, to make a record of the hearing
- By and large, courts have been sufficiently sensitive to avoid such detail in favor of administrative flexibility. (Kaplin & Lee, 2007, pp. 460-461)

These guidelines would be the extreme that the court may require of a university, but at a minimum, universities should afford students with notice and a hearing per Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of Education ruling.

AFA Student Conduct Resource Guide

The AFA (2010) Student Conduct Resource Guide describes three different models for fraternity and sorority conduct processes. The first model is a governing council conduct board. In this model, AFA (2010) describes that the governing council have responsibility and authority to hear cases involving council violations or in some cases, university violations. The governing council mentioned could be the Interfraternity Council, National Pan-Hellenic Council, the Panhellenic Council, or other governing council established by the university comprised of students who are members of organizations who respectively belong to one of the councils

described. AFA (2010) goes on to state “at the governing council conduct board level, available sanctions may or may not include the most severe, such as loss of recognition” (p. 7).

The second conduct process described by AFA (2010) is a College/University Conduct Board comprised of faculty, staff, and/or students who would hear cases involving fraternities and sororities. Students who are represented on the conduct board may or may not be a member of a fraternity or sorority. Fraternity and sorority members may prefer that the students be affiliated, but generally these boards are formed to hear all types of cases, not only ones dealing with fraternities and sororities (AFA, 2010). The college/university conduct board should be able to levy any sanction included in the university’s code of student conduct, to include loss of university recognition for the organization.

The third conduct process described by AFA (2010) is an administrative hearing/disciplinary conference using a single administrator. In this process the administrator involved in this process, either the dean of students, a staff member in the conduct office, or a fraternity/sorority advisor, would hear the case and would impose sanctions against the fraternity or sorority. The fraternity or sorority would be allowed the opportunity to present any witnesses or provide any additional information, and then the administrator would come to a decision based on the information presented.

Each model for the conduct process should include an opportunity for the fraternities and sororities to appeal the decision based on a set of criteria determined in advance of initiating the process. “The grounds for appeal must be

clearly articulated along with a timeframe for doing so, as should the policy regarding whether or not the sanction levied will be held in abeyance pending the outcome of the hearing” (AFA, 2010, p. 8). The appeal could either be in writing or in front of an appellate body/officer.

The AFA (2010) student conduct resource guide also shares some guidelines that they feel are important in developing the fraternity/sorority conduct process. These guidelines include that organizations should be given due process as mentioned earlier. The guide also states that chapter leaders should be informed of the conduct process in advance so that students are not blindsided by the conduct processes proceedings. The following list is suggestions to ensure the chapter members know the process:

Publish the conduct board constitution and policies on the fraternity/sorority section of the institutions website and provide copies during all trainings for students and advisors. Work with council and chapter leaders to educate their respective members of the process. Include fraternity/sorority leaders in crafting or review of the conduct board constitution and conduct procedures. Make policies clear and easy to understand. Remember that student conduct is an educational process and not a legal process. (AFA, 2010, p. 9)

Even if the university was to implement each of these suggested practices in educating the members of the fraternity sorority community; students may still claim they “didn’t know” (AFA, 2010).

AFA (2010) describe three possible options that universities may use in the conduct process with fraternities and sororities. However, universities are not limited to just these options. The researcher has had the fortunate opportunity to work with fraternities and sororities for the past six years as the Associate Director of Greek Life at Louisiana State University, (LSU). Through his experience working

with fraternities and sororities in conduct matters, Universities need to rethink the best way in which to address conduct issues with these types of organizations. From the researchers experience, working with organizations in this capacity, he has been able to be part of a change in the University's process in dealing with conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. The process in which LSU uses to address conduct issue within the fraternity and sorority community is much different from the traditional process used five to six years ago. The researcher has seen a change in the way in which these organizations react to the conduct charge depending on the process that is used to address the issue. LSU is still able to achieve a similar outcome as what was hoped for using the traditional process, with a modified version, that allows the student leaders and chapter advisors to be apart of the solution. According to Holmes, Edwards, and DeBowes (2009), "the common model of adjudication may not always be equipped to bring about effective resolution of conflict when the institution's principles and the student's behavior are in discord with each other" (p. 58).

Conclusion

In order for us to be able to analyze whether current conduct processes are working on college campuses, we must first determine how four-year universities are addressing conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. Does this process differ depending on the type of violation? Does the process differ depending on the size of the university or Greek System? Or is there a difference between private versus a public university? Or perhaps there is not a set process established within the university community to deal with these issues. Does the university simply

replicate the student process for the fraternities and sororities? All of these questions need to be asked in order to determine which process is used most often and in what circumstances. Answering these questions will then give researchers an opportunity to further investigate whether the current practices are effective or if they need to be revamped, in order to be more effective in initiating change into our fraternity and sorority communities.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Chapter three highlights the research methodology and procedures that are used in the research study. The following sections are included in this chapter: research questions, instrumentation, validity, reliability, sample, data collection procedures, and data analysis. The purpose of this study was to examine the processes used in addressing conduct issues with fraternities and sororities at four-year colleges and universities. The study identified the different processes used to address conduct issues and allowed stakeholders to evaluate these processes in hopes of improving them for the future.

Research Questions

RQ 1- What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy?

RQ 2- What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy?

RQ 3- What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies?

RQ 4- Is there a difference in the fraternity or sorority conduct process that is used based on the institutional type (private v. public)?

RQ 5- Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from general student organizations?

RQ 6- Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from the conduct process used to address the same behavior with individual students?

Instrumentation

In order to research this question, the researcher created an instrument in order to find out what type of process is used with fraternities and sororities in conduct matters. The researcher chose to use survey research in order to answer the questions with this study. A survey was sent out online to conduct officers serving at four-year universities that host fraternities and sororities would be the best way to achieve the answers to these questions. Survey research is described by Johnson and Christensen (2007) as “a nonexperimental research method in which questionnaires or interviews are used to gather information, and the goal is to understand the characteristics of a population” (p. 222). Some of the advantages to survey research online include the ability to access difficult to contact participants, access individuals in a wide range of locations, and automated data collection that saves the researcher time and effort (Wright, 2005). Some of the disadvantages to online survey research according to Wright (2005) include “uncertainty over the validity of the data and sampling issues, and concerns surrounding the design, implementation, and evaluation of an online survey” (para. 3).

Data was collected using the survey of Greek Conduct Processes that was specifically developed for this research. The researcher has created his own instrument, as he was unable to find a current instrument that addressed the research questions for this study. When developing the survey instrument, the researcher looked at the research questions and developed questions that would allow the researcher to collect information that would answer the questions. Demographic questions were added in order to see if there are differences on how

universities addresses conduct issues with fraternities and sororities based on differences in institution type, size of the institution, Greek system size, and other variables.

Validity

Validity is a concern when the researcher has developed an instrument to answer research questions that cannot presently be answered by any existing instrument with established psychometric properties known to the researcher. The researcher has used face validity to assist in the validity concerns with this research. Face validity for the instrument was established prior to administering. Face validity is defined by Anastasi and Urbina (1997) as “whether the test “looks valid” to examinees who take it, the administrative personnel who decide on its use, and other technically untrained observers” (p. 117). Nevo (1985) states face validity “is an important feature of any psychological or educational test intended for practical use” (p. 288). Face validity can play an important indirect role in the construction and use of predictor instruments (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). For instance, if the researcher did not use vernacular that the person taking the survey was familiar with, this could skew the responses.

With this research, three different parties established face validity. Face validity for the instrument was established by peers in the field of conduct administration, the ASCA research committee, and was reviewed by the faculty of the researcher’s dissertation committee. The researcher had three current conduct staff members at three different four-year universities and current members of ASCA review the instrument and provide feedback prior to implementation. The

combined conduct experience by the staff is a total of 30 years in the field of higher education and representing the University of Texas at Austin, Middle Tennessee State University, and Louisiana State University.

Reliability

Researchers must also be concerned with reliability when constructing their own instrument. Reliability of a scale refers to how free it is from random error. Anastasi and Urbina (1997) state “reliability is the consistency of scores obtained by the same persons when retested with the identical test or with an equivalent form of the test” (p. 8). The researcher was unable to look at how the survey has been administered over time since this is the first time it was utilized. The data that was collected during this research does not lend itself to reliability.

Sample

The population that the research deals with is conduct officers at four-year universities that contain Greek organizations. In this research, the researcher is not manipulating an independent variable and universities would not be assigned to random groups, so this would be considered nonexperimental research. Since the researcher used an instrument to research this question, quantitative research methods were used. The researcher used the Association of Student Conduct Administration, “ASCA”, to be the clearinghouse for this survey. The researcher believes this was the best method to send out the survey and the knowledge gained would contribute back to the Association.

In order to obtain the assistance of ASCA with the distribution of this survey, the researcher had to submit the “Request to Study ASCA Membership Application”.

According to the ASCA website (2011):

Determinations as to whether the study will be accepted are guided by the following characteristics of the study: (a) advancement of ASCA’s mission, (b) contribution to basic knowledge in the field of conduct administration, (c) potential to not compromise the ethics of ASCA members, (d) timeliness of the topic, and (d) appropriate use of research design. (Procedures for Requesting Permission to Study ASCA Membership)

The website goes on to explain that priority will be given to current ASCA members and that there is an expectation to publish the results in the ASCA Journal and to present the findings at the ASCA Annual Conference. The researcher is a current member of ASCA and has presented at the Annual Conference in the past on the process that is used by LSU to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. The researcher received positive feedback from the presentation. The researcher received confirmation from ASCA on Monday, May 14th, 2012 that the research review committee, consisting of six members of the association, accepted the research request.

Data Collection Procedures

After receiving approval from ASCA, the researcher loaded the survey into Zoomerang, an online survey software. The researcher followed Dillman’s, Smyth’s, and Christian’s (2009) method of survey implementation. The researcher has included e-mails that were sent to the ASCA membership and can be found in Appendix D, E, and F. The researcher sent the initial e-mail with the survey link out on Monday, June 18th, 2012 with a reminder email sent to those that have not responded two more additional times. The dates of contact are as follow: initial e-

mail sent on Monday, June 18th, second e-mail to non-respondents on Wednesday, June 26th, the third and final e-mail sent to non-respondents on Tuesday, July 10th, and the survey was closed on, July 25th. The researcher believes that by sending the survey in June helped with the survey response rate, as most conduct officers have wrapped up most of their cases from the spring semester by this time.

The survey was sent to a total of 775 total members of the Association of Student Conduct Administration who represented different four-year universities. The researcher asked the members if they were not the appropriate person to respond to the survey to send him the name and e-mail address of the appropriate person for their respective campus. The researcher sent the survey to an additional 22 people who were recommended by the ASCA members. Thus, the survey was sent to a total of 797 people to include the additional recommended participants.

In survey research, the researcher must analyze the wave or responses from participants in order to establish the best number of points of contact. However, the researcher was limited in his points of contact with ASCA members due to the stipulations put in place by the ASCA research committee in only being allowed three different points of contact with the members as part of the agreement to support the research. The first wave of responses after the initial e-mail on June 18th was 155 total responses. After the second e-mail was sent out on June 26th to non-responders of the first e-mail, the researcher received an additional 72 responses. The last reminder e-mail sent on July 10th to non-responders elicited an additional 33 responses for a total of 260 responses. With 260 responses out of the total 797 university administrators who received the survey meant the researcher

achieved a 32.6% response rate.

In survey research, the researcher has to be able to handle the issues concerning the nonresponse error. Using information only from those that respond to the survey could introduce error (Miller & Smith, 1983). This error is described as nonresponse error. Lindner, Murphy, and Briers (2001) describe nonresponse error as the type of error that “exists to the extent that people included in the sample fail to provide usable responses and are different than those who do on the characteristics of interest” (p. 44).

One of the first ways that the researcher can control for nonresponse error is for the researcher to attempt to get back as many responses to the survey as possible. The researcher for this study included language in the initial, and subsequent reminders, describing the importance of the research and how the ASCA member responses are vital to the success of this research. The researcher also included in the e-mail that by responding to the survey will assist a fellow member of the association out with their research. The researcher should plan a follow-up procedure to encourage responses (Miller & Smith, 1983). The researcher in this study has done this with the multiple e-mails reminders that were sent to non-responders of the survey to capture as many responses to the survey as possible.

Even with these steps, the researcher may not obtain a 100% return on the survey. If this is the case, the researcher will be faced with several decisions on how to handle the non-respondents. The first option would be to ignore the nonresponses to the survey and be faced with criticism by researchers in the field. Miller and Smith (1983) describe this option as limiting the generalizability of the

results and is not recommended.

A second option the researcher could execute with the nonresponses to the survey is to compare respondents to that of the late responders. Miller and Smith (1983) state “research has shown that late respondents are often similar to nonrespondents” (p.48). The researcher used statistical analysis and determined there was no difference between late respondents and those that responded to the initial point of contact, as there were no statistically significant differences. Since they did not appear to be different, then the results could be generalized for the sample and population (Miller & Smith, 1983).

A third option the researcher could initiate after the survey has closed is to contact non-respondents via telephone. The researcher could contact a random sample (10% -20%) of non-respondents to the survey and administer the survey over the telephone. The results of the survey administered over the telephone with the initial non-responders could be compared to that of the responders of the survey and determine if there is a statistical difference between a set of predetermined questions. If statistically significant differences are not found between the telephone respondents and the initial respondents to the e-mail survey, then the researcher could conclude there are no statistically significant differences between the respondents of the study and the non-respondents (Miller & Smith, 1983). The data from those surveyed over the telephone would then be added to the original data set. The researcher would have initiated this procedure had he not received at least a 23% response rate from those that received the survey invitation.

According to B. McNair (personal communication, June 14, 2012) from ASCA, a 20% to 25% response rate is typical for surveys sent out through the association.

Data Analysis

After receiving the results of the survey, the researcher used statistical analysis in order to examine the data. The researcher has identified four objectives when looking at the data that allowed the researcher to answer the research questions. The first objective was to look at demographics of the data to include frequencies, means, and standard deviations to examine the different institutions that responded to the survey. The second objective of the research was to identify the score of the survey and run reliability tests on each of the three sections of data, hazing, alcohol, and the “other” category. The third objective was to look at the Greek conduct processes by the different demographics and determine if there is a significant difference based on institutional type, size, Greek population, and other variables.

A chi-square test was used to determine if there were any significant differences, at the .05 level, in the type of process that is used by the University depending on the different variables listed before (i.e. size of institution, Greek system, private v. public, etc.). The chi-square test is considered a nonparametric test and can be used when the researcher is collecting data that is classified into categories instead of numerical scores (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008). The researcher had participants pick from different options in categories as it relates to their institutions conduct process in this study. Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003) state,

“nonparametric tests can be used when the parametric assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance are not met” (p. 546).

The researcher specifically used the chi-square test for independence, as the researcher tested hypothesis about corresponding population frequency distributions. For instance, the researcher used the chi-square test to see if public and private universities are independent of each other based on the type of process the respondents to each category used for alcohol, hazing, and “other” violations by fraternities and sororities. The two categories are independent when there is no predictable or consistent relationship between them (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008). In the previous example, this would be a private university as compared to a public university would not have a bearing on what type of process that is utilized by the institutions. Based on the results of running the chi-square test the researcher was able to determine whether there is a significant difference with university processes that are used by universities taking into account the different demographics.

The researchers hypotheses were the following:

RQ 1- What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy?

Ho: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

H1: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

RQ 2- What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy?

Ho: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

H1: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

RQ 3- What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies?

Ho: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

H1: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

RQ 4- Is there a difference in the process that is used based on the institutional type (private v. public)?

Ho: Institutional type has an effect on which type of conduct process is used.

H1: Institutional type does not have an effect on which type of conduct process is used.

RQ 5- Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from general student organizations?

Ho: Conduct process is the same for general student organizations as fraternities and sororities.

H1: Conduct process is not the same for general student organizations as fraternities and sororities.

RQ 6- Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from the conduct process used to address the same behavior with individual students?

Ho: Conduct process is the same for individual student violations and fraternities and sororities.

H1: Conduct process is not the same for individual student violations and fraternities and sororities.

The researcher believes that many of the Universities may use a similar process as to how they handle student code of conduct violations for individual students. It is important to ask whether this is the case or not on the survey to see if the hypothesis is correct. The researcher believes the results will be varied depending on the type of Institution and demographics of the Greek System. If Universities simply use an altered version of how they address conduct issues with individual students, the researcher believes this will create a greater argument that this process needs to be reevaluated. The researcher also wants to look at what type of due process is afforded to the fraternities and sororities.

Summary

This chapter focused on the research methodology and procedures that are used in addressing the research questions that examine how universities address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. The research will serve as a stepping-stone to greater inquiry into the topic of addressing organizational behavior on college campuses. There has been an increased spotlight placed on organizations over the years and behavior that was tolerated ten years ago, may not be tolerated in today's society. Higher education officials, National Organizations, alumni, students, and other constituents, all have an invested interest in the welfare of the Greek community and preservation of its continued relevance on college campuses all across the Nation. The results of this research will lead us to continued evaluation of current practices and whether they need to be modified in order to implement organizational change for the future.

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Chapter four highlights the findings of this research study. This chapter is divided up into three sections. The first section describes the overall response rate for this study, to include the number of campuses who responded with Greek organizations. The second section of this chapter describes the demographic characteristics of the institutions and their corresponding Greek system that participated in this study. The third section of this chapter includes data specific to the six research questions outlined in this study.

Response Rate

As mentioned previously, the survey was sent to a total of 797 university administrators, of which 260 completed the survey. The overall response rate for the research was 32.6 percent. Out of the 260 that completed the survey, 203 answered the first question on the survey that their institution recognize and/or have registered social fraternities and sororities with a yes response. The participants who responded with a no response were removed from the survey, as they did not meet the sample frame for the research.

Out of the 203 responses, the researcher removed two participants from the study, response number 133 and 129. Response number 133 was removed because the participant responded to question number 29 that the institution did not have any fraternities or sororities, so it was decided to remove this institution to limit error in the responses. Respondent number 129 was also removed due to the fact that the respondent did not answer questions 2 through 25 and only responded to the demographic questions. This leaves a total of 201 responses the researcher was

able to use for the data analysis and a response rate of 25.2 percent compared to the original 797 that received the survey.

Demographic Characteristics

The researcher added demographic questions to the instrument in order to get an understanding of the type of institutions and their Greek system that were responding to the survey. The demographic questions were the following: institutional type, enrollment level, institutions geographic region, total number of fraternities and sororities, number of National or International fraternities and sororities, number of local fraternities and sororities, overall percentage of Greek population, considered faith based and/or have a religious affiliation, considered an HBCU, and the type of housing for fraternities and sororities at the institution. A summary of the respondents' demographic information is listed below.

Institutional Type

The respondents were asked to identify their institutional type as private or public. Looking at the respondents that participated, 67.7% were representing public institutions (see table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Institutional Type		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Private	65	32.3
	Public	136	67.7
	Total	201	100.0

Enrollment Level

The respondents were asked to identify the range in which their institutions enrollment falls within. The highest frequency was the more than 20,000 category as 26.9% 54 (n) selected this category. The lowest frequency was the less than 2,000 category as 8.5% or 17 (n) selected this category. All other categories were in the 20.9% to 21.9% range for respondents as reflected in table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Enrollment Level		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	less than 2,000	17	8.5
	Between 2,000 and 5,000	42	20.9
	Between 5,001 and 10,000	44	21.9
	Between 10,001 and 20,000	44	21.9
	More than 20,000	54	26.9
	Total	201	100.0

Geographic Region

The participants were asked to identify their institution's geographic region based on the location of the state in which their institution is located using the ASCA designated regions for their association. The South region had the largest number of institutions representing this category with 78 (n) or 38.8% of the respondents (see table 4.3). The region with the lowest number of responses was the West region with 29 (n) responses consisting of 14.4% of the respondents. Notice that one participant chose not to answer this question.

Table 4.3

Institution's Geographic Region		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	East Region	41	20.5
	Midwest Region	52	26.0
	South Region	78	39.0
	West Region	29	14.5
	Total	200	100.0
Missing	System	1	
Total		201	

Total Number of Fraternities and Sororities

The participants were asked to identify the range in which the total number of fraternities and sororities recognized by their institution. The highest frequency was the 11 to 20 chapters option with a frequency of 68 (n) and the second most was the 1 to 10 chapters option with a frequency of 57 (n), with both of these categories consisting of just over 62 percent of the total responses. The lowest frequency was the 41 or more chapters option with a frequency of 22 (n) and the second lowest frequency was the 31 to 40 option with a frequency of 24 (n), with both of these categories consisting of 23 percent of the total responses (see table 4.4). Also note that three participants did not respond to this research question and are not included in the frequency distribution.

Table 4.4

Total Number of Fraternities and Sororities Recognized			
		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1 to 10 Chapters	57	28.8
	11 to 20 Chapters	68	34.3
	21 to 30 Chapters	27	13.6
	31 to 40 Chapters	24	12.1
	41 or more	22	11.1
	Total	198	100.0
Missing	System	3	
Total		201	

Overall Percentage of Greek Population

The participants were asked to identify the overall Greek percentage compared to the undergraduate enrollment at the institution by selecting from a range of options. The highest frequency was the 8% to 15% Greek percentage option with a frequency of 80 (n) and the second most was the 0% to 7% Greek percentage option with a frequency of 55 (n), with both of these categories consisting of just over 67 percent of the total responses. The lowest frequency was the 40% or more Greek percentage category option with a frequency of 8 (n) and the second lowest was the 24% to 31% Greek percentage option with a frequency of 6 (n), with both of these categories consisting of 10 percent of the total responses (see table 4.5). Also note that two participants did not respond to this question and are not included in the frequency distribution.

Table 4.5

Overall Percentage of the Greek Population		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	0 % to 7%	55	27.6
	8% to 15%	80	40.2
	16% to 23%	27	13.6
	24% to 31%	12	6.0
	32% to 39%	17	8.5
	40% or more	8	4.0
	Total	199	100.0
Missing	System	2	
Total		201	

Fraternity and Sorority Housing

The respondents were asked select the response that best identifies the fraternity and sorority housing at their institution (see table 4.6). The highest frequency was “no fraternity and/or sorority houses, lodges, or residence halls on or off campus” with a frequency of 58 (n) consisting of 29 percent of the total responses. The second highest frequency was “off campus houses, lodges, or residence halls for fraternities and/or sororities” with a frequency of 50 (n) consisting of 25 percent of the total responses. The lowest frequency was “none of the above reflects my Institution and the housing for fraternities and sororities” with a frequency of 9 (n) consisting of 4 percent of the total responses. The second lowest frequency was “on campus houses, lodges, or residence halls for fraternities and/or sororities” with a frequency of 37 (n) consisting of 18.5 percent of the total responses.

Table 4.6

Fraternity and Sorority Housing

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	No fraternity and/or sorority houses, lodges, or residence halls on or off campus	57	28.5
	On campus houses, lodges, or residence halls for fraternities and/or sororities	37	18.5
	Off campus houses, lodges, or residence halls for fraternities and/or sororities	49	24.5
	Mixed on campus and off campus houses, lodges, or residence halls for fraternities and/or sororities	48	24.0
	None of the above reflects my Institution and the housing for fraternities and sororities.	9	4.5
	Total	200	100.0
Missing	System	1	
Total		201	

Data Specific to the Research Questions

In this section, the researcher has presented the corresponding data to the six research questions.

Research Question One

The first research question was, "What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy?" The answer to this question can be identified by the SPSS print out in table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7

Conduct Process for Hazing Violations		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)	11	5.5
	Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council	7	3.5
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	84	41.8
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	9	4.5
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	52	25.9
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	31	15.4
	None of the above	7	3.5
	Total	201	100.0

Table 4.7 demonstrates that the conduct process that is most often used by universities when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy was the “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students” with a frequency of 84 (n) and consisting of 41.8 percent of the total responses. Notice that this option does include students as part of the conduct process. The second highest frequency for this question was the “Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)” with a frequency of 52 (n) and consisting of 25.9 percent of the total responses. Notice that the second highest frequency does not include students to be a part of this conduct process.

Research Question Two

The second research question was, “What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy?” The answer to this question can be identified by the SPSS print out in table 4.8 below

Table 4.8

Conduct Process for Alcohol Violations

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)	28	14.0
	Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council	16	8.0
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	45	22.5
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	10	5.0
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	71	35.5
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	20	10.0
	None of the above	10	5.0
	Total	200	100.0
Missing	System	1	
Total		201	

Table 4.8 demonstrates that the type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy is the “administrative conduct hearing (single administrator involved)” with a frequency of 71 (n) and

consisting of 35.3 percent of the total responses. Notice that this option does not include students or peers to be a part of the conduct process. The second highest frequency for this question was the “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students” with a frequency of 45 (n) and consisting of 22.4 percent of the total responses. Notice that the second highest frequency does include students to be a part of this conduct process.

Research Question Three

The third research question was, “What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies?” The answer to this question can be identified by the SPSS print out in table 4.9. Table 4.9 demonstrates that the type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” policies is the “administrative conduct hearing (single administrator involved)” with a frequency of 65 (n) and consisting of 32.3 percent of the total responses. Notice that this option does not include students or peers to be a part of the conduct process. The second highest frequency for this question was the “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students” with a frequency of 48 (n) and consisting of 23.9 percent of the total responses. Notice that the second highest frequency does include students to be a part of this conduct process. The “other” category has the same two highest frequencies as the alcohol question.

Table 4.9

Conduct Process for “Other” Violations

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)	27	13.4
	Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council	15	7.5
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	48	23.9
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	9	4.5
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	65	32.3
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	27	13.4
	None of the above	10	5.0
	Total	201	100.0

Research Question Four

The fourth research question was, “Is there a difference in the process that is used based on the institutional type (private v. public)?” When separating the data between private and public institutions, the researcher encountered a situation where a couple of the response categories had less than five responses when attempting to answer this question. In order to meet the assumptions for a chi square test, the researcher had to recode some of the data into different variables and collapse the data. The researcher chose to combine the categories of “Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other

council)” with the response category “Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council” and created a broader category of a Peer Conduct Board, whether that be with a governing council or just simply peers. The researcher also took out the “None of the above” response category, as this was also an area that consistently had less than five responses once the researcher separated the data into different variables, such as public and private institutions. The SPSS print out in table 4.10 is an example of what the table looked like before recoding and collapsing the data.

Table 4.10

Private v. Public Example Prior to Collapsing Data

			Question 26: Demographic Section	
			Institutional Type	
			Private	Public
	Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)	Count	6	5
	Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council	Count	1	6
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	Count	28	56
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	Count	5	4
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	Count	16	36
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	Count	7	24
	None of the above	Count	2	5
Total		Count	65	136

As you can see in table 4.10, the “peer conduct board” response for private schools only had one response and did not contain at least five needed to run the chi square test. The answer to the fifth research question can be identified by the SPSS print out in tables 4.11 through 4.16, where the researcher has recoded and collapsed the data.

Table 4.11

Hazing Violations Crosstab with Private v. Public Recoded				
		Question 26: Demographic Section Institutional Type		Total
		Private	Public	
Hazing Question Two Recoded	Peer Conduct Board	7	11	18
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	28	56	84
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	5	4	9
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	16	36	52
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	7	24	31
Total		63	131	194

Table 4.11 is the output from SPSS that shows the crosstab for the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate the hazing policy separating out private and public institutions and comparing them

together to see if there is a significant difference between the two types of institutions.

Table 4.12

Hazing Violations with Private v. Public Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.005 ^a	4	.405
N of Valid Cases	194		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.92.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate the hazing policy. As you can see in table 4.12, the calculated Chi-square was not significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 4.005$, $p = .405$) indicating that the variables of private or public institutions were independent and there is no significant difference between the two for hazing violations.

Table 4.13 is the output from SPSS that shows the crosstab for the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate the alcohol policy separating out private and public institutions and comparing them together to see if there is a significant difference between the two types of institutions

Table 4.13

Alcohol Violations Crosstab with Private v. Public Recoded

		Question 26: Demographic Section Institutional Type		Total
		Private	Public	
Question 9 Recoded	Peer Conduct Board	15	29	44
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	12	33	45
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	3	7	10
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	25	46	71
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	5	15	20
Total		60	130	190

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate the alcohol policy.

Table 4.14

Alcohol Violations with Private v. Public Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.477 ^a	4	.831
N of Valid Cases	190		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.16.

As shown in table 4.14, the calculated Chi-square was not significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 1.477$, $p=.831$) indicating that the variables of private or public institutions were independent and there is no significant difference between the two for alcohol violations.

Table 4.15

“Other” Violations Crosstab with Private v. Public Recoded

		Question 26: Demographic Section Institutional Type		Total
		Private	Public	
Question 16 Recoded	Peer Conduct Board	16	26	42
	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	15	33	48
	College/University conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members	3	6	9
	Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)	23	42	65
	Process involving partnership btw Univ. Admin., alumni, Nat Org, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (pp)	6	21	27
Total		63	128	191

Table 4.15 is the output from SPSS that shows the crosstab for the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate “other” policies separating out private and public institutions and comparing them

together to see if there is a significant difference between the two types of institutions.

Table 4.16

“Other” Violations with Private v. Public Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.146 ^a	4	.709
N of Valid Cases	191		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.97.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate “other” policies. As shown in table 4.16, the calculated Chi-square was not significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 2.146$, $p=.709$) indicating that the variables of private or public institutions were independent and there is no significant difference between the two for “other” violations.

When answering the fifth research question the researcher had to run multiple tests. The researcher used the Chi-square Test of Independence and found that none of the violations (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) were significantly different when separating out private and public institutions. Thus, there is no difference in the type of process that is used whether the institution is private or public.

Research Question Five

The fifth research question was, “Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from general student organizations?” To answer

the research question, the researcher looked at two different questions for each category (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) to answer this question. The first question asked participants to indicate whether non-Greek organizations, found in violation of the three different policies, followed the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at their institution. Table 4.17 depicts the response percentage by the participants for each of the violations with a response of either yes, no, or n/a.

Table 4.17

General Student Org. Process for Hazing, Alcohol, and “Other”			
	Hazing	Alcohol	“Other”
Yes	85.1%	76%	77%
No	12.4%	21%	21%
N/A	2.5%	3%	2%

Table 4.17 depicts that for each of the violations (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) the highest response percentage was “Yes” ranging from 76 percent for alcohol violations and up to 85.1 percent for hazing violations. This means that most campuses follow the same conduct process for violations, whether the organization is a fraternity or sorority, or a non-Greek organization.

The follow up question the researcher included in regards to the same research question was, “If you selected no, please select the conduct process that is used for (hazing, alcohol, or “other”) violations for non-Greek organizations.” Table 4.18 depicts the response percentage underneath “Student Organization Conduct Process”, by the participants who selected “No” on the previous question for each of

the violations with which category had the highest frequency and the percentage listed below the category. The researcher has also included in table 4.18 the fraternity and sorority conduct process that had the highest frequency along with the percentage.

Table 4.18

General Student Org. Process Compared to Fraternities and Sororities

	Fraternity & Sorority Conduct Process	Student Organization Conduct Process
Hazing Process Utilized	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students
Hazing Process Percentage	41.8%	28.1%
Alcohol Process Utilized	Administrative Conduct Hearing	Administrative Conduct Hearing
Alcohol Process Percentage	35.5%	38.9%
“Other” Process Utilized	Administrative Conduct Hearing	Administrative Conduct Hearing
“Other” Process Percentage	32.3%	38.9%

Table 4.18 depicts that for each of the institutions who selected “No” that their non-Greek student organizations do not follow the same process as fraternities and sororities; the highest frequency is listed for each violation category. Based on the information in table 4.18, Hazing violations highest frequency was “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students”, which had 28.1 percent response. Alcohol and the “Other” categories highest frequency was the “Administrative Conduct Hearing”, with both having a 38.9 percent response. Also depicted in table 4.18, the fraternity and sorority conduct process with the highest frequency is the same as what the institutions that indicated the non-Greek organization process selected was different from that of the fraternity or sorority conduct process.

Research Question Six

The sixth research question was, “Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from the conduct process used to address the same behavior with individual students?” To answer the research question, the researcher looked at two different questions for each category (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) to answer the question. The first question asked participants to indicate whether individual students found in violation of the three different policies, followed the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at their institution. Table 4.19 depicts the response percentage by the participants for each of the violations with a response of either yes, no, or n/a.

Table 4.19

Individual Student Process for Hazing, Alcohol, and “Other”

	Hazing	Alcohol	“Other”
Yes	72.1%	63.7%	65.5%
No	27.4%	35.8%	33%
N/A	.5%	.5%	1.5%

Table 4.19 depicts that for each of the violations (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) the highest response percentage was “Yes” ranging from 63.7 percent for alcohol violations and up to 72.1.1 percent for hazing violations. This means that most campuses follow the same conduct process for violations, whether the organization is a fraternity or sorority, or an individual student.

The follow up question the researcher included in regards to the same research question was, “If you selected no, please select the conduct process that is used for (hazing, alcohol, or “other”) violations for individual students.” Table 4.20 depicts the response percentage underneath “Individual Student Conduct Process”, by the participants who selected “no” on the previous question for each of the violations with which category had the highest frequency and the percentage listed below the category. The researcher has also included in table 4.20 the fraternity and sorority conduct process that had the highest frequency along with the percentage.

Table 4.20

Individual Student Process Compared to Fraternities and Sororities

	Fraternity & Sorority Conduct Process	Individual Student Conduct Process
Hazing Process Utilized	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students	College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students
Hazing Process Percentage	41.8%	28.1%
Alcohol Process Utilized	Administrative Conduct Hearing	Administrative Conduct Hearing
Alcohol Process Percentage	35.5%	68.4%
“Other” Process Utilized	Administrative Conduct Hearing	Administrative Conduct Hearing
“Other” Process Percentage	32.3%	62.8%

Table 4.20 depicts that for each of the institutions who selected “No” that their individual students do not follow the same process as fraternities and sororities, the highest frequency is listed for each violation category. Based on the information in table 4.20, Hazing violations highest frequency was

“College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students”, which had 28.1 percent response. Alcohol and the “Other” categories highest frequency was the “Administrative Conduct Hearing”, with alcohol having a 68.4 percent response and “other” having a 62.8 percent response. Also depicted in table 4.20, the fraternity and sorority conduct process with the highest frequency is the same as what the institutions that indicated the individual student conduct process selected was different from that of the fraternity or sorority conduct process.

Additional Findings From the Research

The researcher added in additional questions to the instrument that were not directly tied into the research questions in order to capitalize on the opportunity to learn more regarding conduct processes at institutions surveyed. These questions dealt with general student organization processes, individual student processes, whether an elective system is used, is there a need for a change in current processes, and how likely change was to occur.

Overall Conduct Process

The respondents were asked if they perceived a need for a change in the current process used to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities at their institution. Based on the responses from the participants, 40%, or 81 (n) responded “yes” that they perceive a need for a change in the current process. Looking at the respondents who answered yes, they were asked in a supplemental question what their assessment was on how likely changes were to occur at their institution. Table 4.21 depicts the results of this question.

Table 4.21

How Likely Change is to Occur in Fraternity and Sorority Process

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very Likely	16	20
Likely	36	45
Unlikely	23	29
Very Unlikely	5	6
Total	80	100

Table 4.21 demonstrates that the participants have varied responses as to the assessment of the likelihood of changes occurring in their current conduct process used to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. The response with the highest frequency was “likely” with 36 (n) and consisting of 45 percent of the total responses. Overall the “Very Likely” or “Likely” categories had the highest frequency as both of those response categories combined were 52 (n) and consisting of 65 percent of the total responses. The “Unlikely” or “Very Unlikely” was the lowest consisting of a frequency of 28 (n) and consisting of 35 percent of the total responses. Notice that the lowest overall category was the “Very Unlikely” category with a frequency of 5 (n) and consisting of 6 percent of the total responses.

Elective System

The participants were asked if their institution utilizes an “elective system” when adjudicating the different violations (hazing, alcohol, and other) with

fraternities and sororities. The researcher described the “elective system” as a process where the same disciplinary process can be addressed through a conduct board, administrative hearing, or a partnership process. Table 4.22 depicts the results for all three categories (hazing, alcohol, and other) in regards to if the institution utilizes an “elective system” and if they do whether the fraternity and/or sorority choose, or administrators and/or faculty make that choice.

Table 4.22

Elective System for Hazing, Alcohol, and “Other” Violations

	Hazing %	Alcohol %	“Other” %
No	43	43.2	41.8
Yes, the fraternity or sorority may choose	25.5	24.6	24.5
Yes, administrators and/or faculty choose	31.5	32.2	33.7
Total	100	100	100

Table 4.22 demonstrates the results of the “elective system” question with responses to the three categories with the percentage of those responding listed. The response with the highest percentage for the hazing category was “no”, with 43 percent. However, if you add the two “yes” categories together, the percentage would be 57 percent, which collectively would be greater than the “no” category. The highest percentage for the “yes” category was the process where administrators

and/or faculty choose in the case of an institution having an “elective system”, which had a 31.5 percent response rate.

The response with the highest percentage for the alcohol category was “no” with 43.2 percent. As was the case for the hazing category, the alcohol two “yes” categories factored together is 67.8 percent, which collectively is higher than the “no” category. The highest percentage for the “yes” category was the process was the process where administrators and/or faculty choose in the case of an institution having an “elective system” with 32.2 percent.

The response with the highest percentage for the “other” category was “no” with 41.8 percent. The “other” category is the same as the hazing and alcohol where if you add the two “yes” categories together, this would be a higher percentage than the “no” category. The two yes categories added together for the “other” category is 58.2 percent, so just like in hazing and alcohol; this was collectively higher than the “no” category. This was also true with the highest percentage for the “yes” category, which was the process where administrators and/or faculty choose in the case of an institution having an “elective system” with 33.7 percent.

Student Involvement in Conduct Process

The participants were asked to estimate the percentage of fraternity or sorority disciplinary cases that violated the different violations (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) and were resolved by a process that included students since fall 2009. Table 4.23 depicts the results for all three categories (hazing, alcohol, and other) in regards to if the institution included students in their conduct process, and if so, what percentage of the cases included students.

Table 4.23

Student Involvement in Conduct Process for Hazing, Alcohol, and “Other”			
	Hazing %	Alcohol %	“Other” %
None	29.3	19.3	20.5
Between 1-25%	37.4	27.9	44.6
Between 26-50%	5.6	12.2	8.2
Between 51-75%	5.1	11.2	6.2
Between 76-99%	7.1	12.2	7.2
All 100%	15.7	17.3	13.3

Table 4.23 demonstrates the results of the estimated percentage of fraternity and sorority cases that were resolved with a process that included students compared to the total cases. The three categories (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) are listed in the table and each of the categories had 201 total responses. The response with the highest percentage for the hazing category was “Between 1-25%”, with 37.4 percent response rate. The second highest category was “none” indicating no students involved with hazing violations was 29.3 percent. The alcohol category was similar to that of the hazing category. For example, the response with the highest percentage for the alcohol category was “Between 1-25%”, with 27.9 percent response rate. The second highest alcohol category was “none” indicating no students involved with alcohol violations. The “other” category is similar to both the hazing and alcohol categories, as the highest percentage was “Between 1-25%”, with 44.6 percent. Just as it was in the hazing and alcohol categories, the second

highest category for the “other” violations was “none” with 20.5 percent, indicating no students are involved in the process.

Significance of Demographics For Alcohol, Hazing, Or “Other” Category

The researcher wanted to determine if there were significant differences based on some of the demographics that were included on the instrument. The researcher examined geographic regions, number of chapters represented on the campus, percentage of Greek population compared to undergraduate population, and fraternity and sorority housing. The researcher examined these demographics and ran the chi-square test to see if there were significant differences when looking at the hazing, alcohol, and “other” conduct processes that are utilized by the institutions. The researcher has included those that had significant differences below.

Alcohol and Geographic Region

The researcher examined whether there was a significant difference in the conduct process utilized based on where the geographic region the institution is located. Out of hazing, alcohol, and the “other” category, the only one that was significant was the way in which alcohol violations are addressed. Table 4.24 depicts the results of the chi-square test that was run with alcohol conduct violations and geographic regional differences. The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate alcohol policies compared to geographic regions.

Table 4.24

Alcohol and Geographic Region Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.556 ^a	12	.043
N of Valid Cases	189		

a. 7 cells (35.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.48.

As you can see in table 4.24, the calculated Chi-square was significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 21.566, p=.043$) indicating that the variables of geographic regions where the institutions are located were dependent and there is a significant difference for alcohol violations. Based on these results, where the institution is located has an effect on the type of conduct process that the institution utilizes to address alcohol violations. However, geographical differences were not discovered for hazing and “other” violations.

Alcohol and Number of Chapters

The researcher examined whether there was a significant difference in the conduct process utilized based on the number of fraternity and sorority chapters that were recognized by the institution. Out of hazing, alcohol, and the “other” category, the only one that was significant was the way in which alcohol violations are addressed. Table 4.25 depicts the results of the chi-square test that was run with alcohol conduct violations and number of fraternity and sorority chapters recognized by the institutions.

Table 4.25

Alcohol and Number of Chapters Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.070 ^a	16	.002
N of Valid Cases	187		

a. 9 cells (36.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.12.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate alcohol policies compared to number of fraternity and sorority chapters recognized by the institutions. As depicted in table 4.25, the calculated Chi-square was significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 37.070$, $p=.002$) indicating that the number of fraternity and sorority chapters recognized by the institutions were dependent and there is a significant difference for alcohol violations.

Hazing, Alcohol, and “Other” and Housing Significance

The researcher examined whether there was a significant difference in the conduct process utilized based on the type of housing fraternity and sorority chapters had either on, around, or lack there of on their respective campuses. Hazing, alcohol, and the “other” category all three were found to have significant differences when looking at the type of fraternity and sorority housing. Tables 4.26, 4.27, and 4.28 depict the results of the chi-square test that was run with hazing, alcohol, and “other” conduct violations, respectively, and the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters.

Table 4.26

Hazing and Housing Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.662 ^a	16	.003
N of Valid Cases	193		

a. 12 cells (48.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .42.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate hazing policies compared to the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters. As you can see in table 4.26, the calculated Chi-square was significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 35.662, p=.003$) indicating that the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters were dependent and there is a significant difference for hazing violations.

Table 4.27

Alcohol and Housing Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.804 ^a	16	.002
N of Valid Cases	189		

a. 11 cells (44.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .42.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate alcohol policies compared to the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters.

As you can see in table 4.27, the calculated Chi-square was significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 36.804, p=.002$) indicating that the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters were dependent and there is a significant difference for alcohol violations.

Table 4.28 “Other”

“Other” Violations and Housing Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.272 ^a	16	.003
N of Valid Cases	190		

a. 9 cells (36.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate “other” policies compared to the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters.

As you can see in table 4.28, the calculated Chi-square was significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 36.272, p=.003$) indicating that the type of housing for fraternity and sorority chapters were dependent and there is a significant difference for “other” violations.

Percent of Greek Population

The researcher examined whether there was a significant difference in the conduct process utilized based on the percentage of Greek students compared to the undergraduate population. The researcher examined hazing, alcohol, and the “other” category, and none of the categories showed significant differences in the conduct process utilized by the institution and the percentage of Greek students.

Table 4.29 is an example of one of these categories and depicts the results of the chi-

square test that was run with alcohol conduct violations and the percentage of Greek students compared to the undergraduate populations.

Table 4.29

Alcohol and Percent of Greek Population Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.235 ^a	20	.232
N of Valid Cases	188		

a. 18 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to compare the conduct process that is typically used with fraternities and sororities when they violate “alcohol” policies. As you can see in table 4.29, the calculated Chi-square was not significant ($X^2_{(1)} = 24.235$, $p=.232$) indicating that the variables of percentage of Greek students compared to the undergraduate population were independent and there is no significant difference between the two for “alcohol” violations. The researcher also found no significance this to be the case with hazing and “other” violations when comparing to the percentage of Greek students compared to the undergraduate population.

Summary

In conclusion, the researcher was able to analyze the data from the research in order to assist in answering each of the hypotheses for the research questions in the final chapter. The researcher was able to provide analysis of the research by using the chi-square test and examining frequencies. The researcher will use this

information in the final chapter to address the hypothesis for each of the research questions. By addressing the hypothesis for the research questions, the researcher will be able to add to the knowledge base regarding institutional conduct processes for fraternities and sororities.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As stated in chapter one, the researcher narrowed his focus for this research to deal with fraternities and sororities, which will begin to open up conversations and dialogue on the process used to address hazing, alcohol, and other issues, and if there needs to be a reevaluation of these processes. Based on this research, the researcher has discovered which conduct processes are being used to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. This research has added to the knowledge base regarding these questions. Now that we know this information, we can then begin to research what is the most effective way to deal with these issues with fraternities and sororities.

Summary of Results and Interpretation of the Findings

In order to summarize the results of the research, the researcher has divided the analysis based on the research questions and their hypothesis. This study has taken an in depth look at the hypothesis and the research questions and determined how these individual questions relate back to the broader topic of what type of processes are currently used to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. The researcher has also included additional findings and interpretation from the research and how this relates back to the original research questions. The additional findings were a result of additional questions the researcher included in the study.

Research Question One

The first research question was, “What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy?” The hypothesis constructed by the researcher for the first research question is listed below.

Hypothesis 1:

Ho: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

H1: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

Based on the results from this study the null hypothesis is rejected, as the conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference. Based on the research (table 4.7), the conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the hazing policy was the “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, and students.” Grounded in the results of this study, the process most often used for hazing includes additional university representatives, and not just a single administrator. Notice that this process does include students involved in the process.

Research Question Two

The second research question was, “What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy?” The hypothesis constructed by the researcher for the second research question is listed below.

Hypothesis 2:

Ho: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

H1: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

Based on the results from this study found in table 4.8, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis, as the conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the alcohol policy is the “Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.” Note that this is different from the hazing violation and only includes a single administrator involved in the process. The alcohol violation for fraternities and sororities does not include peers or fellow students involved in the process.

Research Question Three

The third research question was, “What type of conduct processes is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies?” The hypothesis constructed by the researcher for the third research question is listed below.

Hypothesis 3:

Ho: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

H1: The type of conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates “other” university policies is not the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference.

Based on the results from this study, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, as the conduct process that is most often used when a fraternity or sorority violates the “other” policies is the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference. The results for this question can be identified by table 4.9.

Looking at all three violations (hazing, alcohol, and “other”), hazing was the only one that the process used most often-included faculty staff, and students as part of the conduct board. Alcohol and the “other” violation both had the highest process of the Administrative Hearing Disciplinary Conference that is conducted by a single administrator.

One additional question that is created based on these results is, why are hazing violations handled differently than alcohol and the “other” category? The researcher believes that some may regard hazing as being subjective and different people may interpret hazing differently. Research discussed in chapter two shows that a large portion of the students being hazed do not considered themselves to have been hazed (Allan and Madden, 2008). This may be one reason institutions include additional input into the hazing allegation and outcome of the process by

using a conduct board versus a single administrator. By utilizing a conduct board, faculty, staff, and students would have the ability to weigh in on the outcome. In table 4.6, the research shows that the second highest category for the hazing violation was the administrative conduct hearing, which does not include students. Additional research will be needed in order to find out the reasoning as to why the hazing process is different from alcohol and “other” violations.

Alcohol or the “other” category may be viewed as more objective versus subjective. It may be viewed as easier to determine whether someone was in violation of the alcohol policy or “other” policies and able to render an outcome. For example, it may be easier to determine if a student was drinking alcohol or not and what their intents was compared to hazing and whether students knew they were engaging in hazing activities or not and if their intent to harm someone else. Additional research will need to be conducted in order to determine why certain processes are used for the different violations.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question was, “Is there a difference in the process that is used based on the institutional type (private v. public)?” The hypothesis constructed by the researcher for the fourth research question is listed below.

Hypothesis 4:

Ho: Institutional type has an effect on which type of conduct process is used.

H1: Institutional type does not have an effect on which type of conduct process is used.

Based on the results from this study the null hypothesis is rejected, as the institutional type has no effect on which type of conduct process is used. The researcher believed that there would be a difference between private and public institutions with the process used to address conduct issues, whether that be with hazing, alcohol or the “other” category. The researcher believed there would be a difference in the process based on the differences in governance and funding for private and public institutions. On average, endowment income and private gifts represent 10 to 15 percent of total revenues for private institutions (Hauptman, 1997). The researcher assumed this would make a difference in the process that was used to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities, as private universities are more dependent on alumni donors. The assumption was made that this would have an effect on the process, as private institutions would be more likely to use a peer or governing council board to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities to avoid the sanctions coming directly from the institution. The researcher assumed the private institutions would prefer this process in order to appease potential donors who may be alumni of the organization. However, this research determined this was not the case, as the institutional type had no effect on the conduct process that was utilized.

Research Question Five

The fifth research question was, “Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from general student organizations?” The hypothesis constructed by the researcher for the fifth research question is listed below.

Hypothesis 5:

Ho: Conduct process is the same for general student organizations as fraternities and sororities.

H1: Conduct process is not the same for general student organizations as fraternities and sororities.

Based on the results from this study the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, as the conduct process is the same for general student organizations as fraternities and sororities. According to table 4.17, the results were the same for all three categories (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) as each of them had the same highest response category as the process used by fraternities and sororities. The researcher included a follow up question to those that selected “no”, that their process was not the same for fraternities and sororities as general student organizations. The results are depicted in table 4.18 for both the student organization process and the original results for the fraternity and sorority conduct process. The researcher found it interesting that for those that selected “no”, when looking at their highest response category; it was the same as what was originally indicated by the institutions and their respective process for fraternities and sororities. This means that if the process was not the same for their institution, then the default for their general student organizations was the same for the overall results for fraternity and sorority conduct processes. This strengthens the results of the study to show that those respective processes are used more frequently than the other possible conduct options the institutions had to choose from for both fraternities and sororities and general student organizations.

Research Question Six

The sixth research question was, “Is the conduct process that is used for fraternities and sororities different from the conduct process used to address the same behavior with individual students?” The hypothesis constructed by the researcher for the sixth research question is listed below.

Hypothesis 6:

Ho: Conduct process is the same for individual student violations and fraternities and sororities.

H1: Conduct process is not the same for individual student violations and fraternities and sororities.

Based on the results from this study the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, as the conduct process is the same for individual students as fraternities and sororities. According to table 4.19, the results were the same for all three categories (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) as each of them had the same highest response category as the process used by fraternities and sororities. The researcher included a follow up question to those that selected “no”, that their process was not the same for fraternities and sororities as individual students. The results are depicted in table 4.20 for both the student organization process and the original results for the fraternity and sorority conduct process. The same outcome occurred with research question five, as the researcher found it interesting that for those that selected “no”, when looking at their highest response category, it was the same as what was originally indicated by the institutions and their respective process for fraternities and sororities. This means that if the process was not the same for their

institution, then the default for individual students was the same for the overall results for fraternity and sorority conduct processes. This strengthens the results of the study to show that those respective processes are used more frequently than the other possible conduct options the institutions had to choose from for both fraternities and sororities and individual students.

Additional Findings From the Research

As noted in chapter four, additional questions were added to the instrument that were not directly tied to the research questions in order to capitalize on the opportunity to learn additional information regarding conduct processes at institutions. The additional questions related to general student organization processes, individual student processes, whether an elective system is used, is there a need for a change current processes, and how likely change was to occur. The researcher felt these items were of importance in looking at the overall conduct processes for fraternities and sororities.

One of the most interesting aspects the researcher found from the additional findings was the question regarding a need for changes in the current processes. The researcher found it interesting that 40 percent or 81 participants responded “yes” that they perceived a need for a change in the current process working with fraternities and sororities at their institution. The researcher felt this was high and relates back to the importance of the research regarding conduct processes. The researcher also included a follow up question to those that answered “yes” that they perceive a need for a change in current processes by asking the participants to select how likely change was to occur. The results to this question are depicted in

table 4.21. The “Likely” and “Very likely” categories had the highest frequency consisting of 65 percent of the total responses, with “Unlikely” and “Very Unlikely” with 35 percent respectively. The lowest frequency was “Very Unlikely” with only 6 percent of the responses. This means out of those participants who perceive a need for change in their current conduct process for fraternities and sororities, change is at least likely to occur for most of them. The results of these two questions speak to the importance of this research and future research on this topic.

Significance of Demographics For Alcohol, Hazing, Or “Other” Categories

The researcher included numerous demographic questions in the research instrument. Some of the demographic questions included institutional type, enrollment level, geographic region, number of fraternities and sororities, overall percentage of the Greek population compared to undergraduate enrollment, and fraternity and sorority housing. The researcher used these demographics to run additional tests to see if significant differences could be found in respective processes used.

The researcher found that geographic regions for the different institutions made a difference in the alcohol conduct process that was utilized for fraternities and sororities. Table 4.24 lists the Chi-square test results in SPSS. The researcher found this interesting as where an institution was located had a significant effect on what type of conduct process was utilized for alcohol conduct violations for fraternities and sororities. Hazing or the “other” violations were not found to have the same significance.

Geographic regional differences were not the only demographic that had an effect on the process utilized for alcohol violations. The researcher also found that the number of chapters recognized by the institution also had an effect on the type of process utilized for alcohol violations by fraternities and sororities. Table 4.25 lists the Chi-square test results in SPSS. The number of chapters on a campus had a direct effect on the type of process that is utilized to address alcohol violations with fraternities and sororities. Similar to the geographic regional differences, the researcher found it interesting that hazing and the “other” categories had no effect on the conduct process utilized for fraternities and sororities, but just alcohol.

The researcher also found that the type of housing fraternities and sororities have at an institution had a significant effect on what type of process that is utilized for all three violations, hazing, alcohol, and “other”. Table 4.26, 4.27, and 4.28 lists the Chi-square test results for each category respectively. The researcher found it interesting that the type of housing affected all three violation categories for fraternities and sororities. Perhaps the lack of housing or off campus housing has a connection with how the institution enforces and adjudicates policy violations. Additional research will need to be conducted in order to determine if the results are valid and if so, then why this occurs.

Implications For Further Research

This research study was an effort to begin the inquiry process into a body of work that has been largely unstudied. The researcher believes this study will be a basis for future research on the topic of conduct processes for fraternities and sororities as well as general student organizations. Additional research is needed in

order to gain a better understanding of how to improve current conduct processes in order to make cultural change on campuses across the country. Future research on this topic will need to include other forms of inquiry in order to gain a better understanding of why certain processes are utilized. Researchers will also need to examine why some of the demographic questions yielded significant differences in conduct processes utilized.

Now that we know what conduct processes are utilized for fraternities and sororities, the researcher believes that additional studies on this topic will need to be conducted in order to gain a better understanding of why certain conduct processes are utilized over others. One way to find out the “why” for this topic is to conduct a qualitative study to learn additional information on why institutions utilize certain processes. One tradition of inquiry that could be utilized to assist in the research of this topic is to utilize a case study design for the research. Future researchers could utilize a case study design that would allow for a better understanding and a more in depth look at why certain universities utilize different conduct processes. The researcher believes that by utilizing a case study format for future research, the researcher will be able to gain a better understanding of the environment of the campus community and perhaps a more in depth look at why certain conduct processes are utilized. Merriam (2002) describes a case study as “an intensive description and analysis of a phenomenon or social unit such as individual, group, institution, or community” (p. 8). A case study would examine and describe the institution in depth and be able to zoom in on why certain conduct processes were utilized and their effects.

The researcher found significant differences in the conduct processes utilized by institutions using the Chi-square test and looking at demographic questions when doing an analysis of the research. The researcher believes that further research needs to be conducted on this topic to find out why these characteristics are significant and how they are significant to the overall research on conduct processes for fraternities and sororities. One example of a possible research study would be to do an in depth look to see why the number of chapters recognized by an institution has an effect on the conduct process that is utilized for alcohol violations with fraternities and sororities, as discovered in this research. The researcher would want to look at existing research to see if there are any possible connections with number of chapters and processes utilized. Additionally research would need to be conducted to see if this truly is the case and if so, then attempt to figure out why this occurs.

An additional example of a possible future research topic that came from this study would be to take a deeper look at why fraternity and sorority housing had a significant impact on what type of conduct process is utilized for hazing, alcohol, and “other” violations associated with fraternities and sororities. Additional research would need to be conducted on this topic to validate the connection between conduct processes and fraternity and sorority housing models. If this connection is validated, then the researcher would want to take a look at living environments for fraternity and sorority members to see how this has an impact on conduct processes utilized by institutions. Perhaps there are campus environmental factors that

influence conduct procedures or other possible connections the researcher would need to investigate.

This research study begins to contribute to the knowledge base on the conduct processes that are utilized with addressing university violations by fraternities and sororities. With this research, stakeholders are able to see what type of conduct processes are being utilized and then apply this information to begin to look at why these processes are in place. Additional research is needed on this topic for stakeholders to have a better understanding of why these processes are in place. Further research will also need to be conducted to determine why certain institutional demographics have an influence on the processes utilized. Once stakeholders have a better understanding of these items, they can then begin to analyze the processes more in depth to determine the best way in which to make organizational and cultural change in campus communities.

Implications For Practice and Recommendations

The implications for practice and recommendations for this research are directed toward university administrators and stakeholders in looking at current processes utilized for behavioral concerns with fraternities and sororities. Universities across the country continue to have conduct issues with fraternity and sorority students and these students and organizations not living up to their founding values and beliefs. Behavioral concerns and university violations continue to plague fraternity and sorority communities, and in worst case scenarios have led to student deaths. This study has opened up the door for research and conversations in taking a deeper look at how institutions across the country are

dealing with university violations. This is a major concern and should be at the forefront of future conversations with stakeholders and research, as negative behaviors associated with fraternities and sororities continue. University administrators must formulate policies and procedures that assist fraternities and sororities to enhance their own learning communities and their members' educational experiences (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998).

Based on the results from this study, we now know what types of processes are utilized for hazing, alcohol, and "other" violations. We also know that there is no difference in which conduct process is utilized with fraternities and sororities based on private vs. public institutional type, Greek conduct process compared to general student organization process, and the individual student process. The researcher believes these respective processes need to be further analyzed. Schrage and Giacomini (2009) explain:

Current campus adjudication models are not keeping pace with (a) stated individual and organizational core values, (b) tracked and reported diversity trends in our student bodies, and (c) our own developmental convictions to balance student learning with justice, not just in our practice, training, and language, but within our systems" (p. 7).

Institutions must begin to analyze what processes are best in changing the culture of a Greek organization and campus community. Institutions need to begin to analyze whether current processes are accomplishing the goals established by the institution.

University administrators must begin to have open and honest dialogue with university leadership on the topic of fraternity and sorority conduct processes.

According to this research, 40 percent of participants express a need for change in

their current conduct processes at their institution. Stakeholders should begin to have open dialogue with their campus leadership in determining what type of changes need to occur in the conduct processes and begin to implement changes. This study found that 15 percent or less of the institutions responding to this survey selected the partnership process to describe their conduct process with hazing, alcohol, and “other” violations. Institutions need to begin to incorporate other stakeholders into the conduct process, as it can be difficult to make changes in an organization or a community without their assistance. Stakeholders can include university administration, alumni of the organization, National organization, current chapter members, students, and other parties with invested interest. Another important aspect of the partnership process is that each of these stakeholders would walk away from the process with agreed upon outcomes by all parties involved. Since the chapter leadership and members would be apart of this process, the chapter and their leaders would agree with the outcomes of the process. Research has shown that offenders would be more likely to comply with an agreed upon outcome than with sentencing conditions found in a traditional hearing process and also less likely to reoffend (Ierely & Classen-Wilson, 2003). A negative aspect of using a traditional process (administrative hearing or a conduct board) is that this scenario often creates a win-lose outcome and encourages participants to justify their conduct (Taylor & Varner, 2009). Using a partnership process may allow all parties to discuss the conduct concerns honestly and allow a win-win situation to occur since stakeholders would agree upon the outcomes, to include chapter officers and/or members. The need for a traditional process

(administrative hearing or a conduct board) for certain disciplinary incidents will always exist and should be reserved for situations with the potential for the most significant consequences (Schrage & Thompson, 2009).

The results of this study also indicated that general student organizations and individual student conduct processes are the same as the processes used to address the same conduct violations with fraternities and sororities (see Tables 4.17 and 4.19). There is evidence that colleges and universities have given fraternities and sororities the same rights and responsibilities as individual students (AFA, 2010). This may have then transpired into universities using the same system to address the behavioral concerns with fraternities and sororities as individual students and general student organizations. University administrators need to consider the differences in each of these entities when coming up with a process that takes the differences into consideration. These differences would include the additional stakeholders (National organization, advisory boards, etc.) fraternities and sororities have that general student organizations may not have in place. Individual students would not have the same type of stakeholders in place, thus the process needs to be different taking this into consideration as well. The implications for practice and the recommendations from the researcher need to be seriously considered if university administrators want to make cultural change within fraternity and sorority communities.

Limitations

This research study allowed university administrators and other stakeholders to gain a better understanding of the current conduct processes being utilized to address hazing, alcohol, and “other” violations with fraternity and sorority communities. However, this research was not perfect and has several limitations. These limitations need to be considered and addressed when looking at future research on this topic. Based on the researcher’s journey with this study, he has included several of these limitations in hopes that it will assist future researchers on this topic.

The first limitation the researcher identified with this study was the survey design and collecting categorical data. Using categorical data limited the options the researcher had in being able to run statistical analysis on the data. This is the reason the researcher used the Chi-square test, since the information collected was categorical data. A different survey design that would allow the researcher to be able collect different types of data, besides categorical, would allow future researchers the ability to run different levels of analysis. This would allow the researcher to have additional options in what type of statistical analysis could be run with the data collected.

Another limitation with this study was the sample size and some of the responses having less than five total responses when the participants were selecting the type of conduct process utilized for their institution. This was the main reason the researcher was forced to collapse some of the data in order to strengthen the Chi-square test results. Future research either needs to have fewer categories to

choose from or to increase the sample size. Future research could collapse the “Governing Council Conduct Board” with “Peer Conduct Board”, as with both of these processes, students would be heard by their peers and could be considered an overarching category of a Peer Conduct Board. The researcher may also need to increase the number of institutions responding to the survey. For this study the researcher e-mailed all of the valid e-mail addresses received from ASCA, but only had 201 total valid responses that indicated they had Greek organizations recognized by their institution. The researcher decided to target the conduct administrators instead of the Greek life professionals at universities. Future research could target Greek life professionals in hopes of achieving a higher response rate and total number of respondents, as this would be a better way to ensure those that are being targeted do indeed recognize Greek organizations on their respective campuses. The Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors could be approached to assist in future research and access to members of the association for potential participants.

Another limitation for this study was that the data collected for this research does not lend itself to reliability as mentioned in chapter three. The researcher was unable to demonstrate how this research is free from random error. If this research and survey design is administered in the future, this will assist with the reliability concerns, as researchers will be able to look to see how the survey has been administered over time. The researcher was concerned with reliability when administering the study and creating the instrument. The researcher had to create

an instrument as no other known instruments were found to measure the fraternity and sorority conduct processes utilized by institutions.

The last limitation the researcher has identified with this study is that the overall research was quantitative and did not look at why certain processes are utilized, as mentioned previously in this chapter. The researcher focused on what types of processes are utilized as a starting point for the overall research regarding fraternity and sorority conduct processes. Additional research will need to be conducted using a qualitative approach in order to be able to look at why certain processes are utilized over others. Qualitative research on this topic could also allow for a deeper understanding of certain processes that are utilized with fraternities and sororities and their effects. The researcher has established a starting point for future research on this topic.

Reviewing the limitations with this research study will allow future researchers the opportunity to continue to improve future inquiry into the conduct processes utilized by institutions for fraternities and sororities. Even with the limitations that have been listed, the research believes this research was important and added valuable knowledge to the research topic. The research on this topic can continue to be improved and refined in order maximize the opportunity to make generalizable findings from the research that is free from error. Scholars may need to utilize multiple research methods in order to strengthen the overall inquiry with this topic.

Summary and Conclusion

Fraternities and sororities have been a part of the American higher education system since the early 1800s and currently have over 600,000 undergraduate members represented on more than 800 campuses nationwide (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2011). Since their origin, these organizations have been reflective of the highs and lows of collegiate behavior. Often times you will hear about the many positive benefits they bring to a collegiate environment, such as philanthropic and service efforts, brotherhood and sisterhood, leadership experiences, academic support, social and networking opportunities, and other positive benefits. However, the negative conduct issues that some members or organizations choose to participate in such as, hazing, alcohol abuse, sexual assault, and other negative or risky behaviors, overshadow the positive aspects. These negative behaviors conducted by members of the organizations have even led to a number of student deaths over the years, as at least one Greek student death has occurred every year since 1970 (Nuwer, 2010). It is for this reason that higher education professionals and stakeholders need to come together and determine what conduct processes are being utilized to address these behaviors and if the processes are initiating positive changes in Greek communities. This study is a catalyst to greater inquiry that needs to occur on this topic in hopes that positive changes can occur in Greek communities across the country.

The purpose of this study was to discover the types of conduct processes that are being utilized when fraternities and sororities violate university policies at four-year universities. This study had six research questions and the researcher

designed the survey instrument in order to answer these questions. This study revealed the processes that are currently being utilized for hazing, alcohol, and “other” violations. The process that is utilized the most when a hazing violation occurs is the “College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff and students”. Alcohol and the “other” categories utilized the “Administrative Conduct Hearing” process the most out of the other possible options. It was discovered that universities were not utilizing a partnership process to work with other stakeholders when issues arise as frequently as administrative hearings and College/University conduct boards. The study found that there were no significant differences between public and private universities and how they address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. No significant differences were found between general student organization and individual student conduct processes and the conduct processes that are utilized with fraternities and sororities at institutions. These findings concluded what was discovered when examining the six original research questions for this study. However, the research also included additional questions on the survey in order to give more insight into conduct processes being utilized at institutions and these were included in the additional findings section.

Some of the highlights from the additional findings from the research were found to be interesting to the researcher and had connections with the overall research. One of the additional findings was that it was discovered that 40 percent of the administrators surveyed indicated that a change was needed in their current conduct processes for fraternities and sororities. Of those that indicated a need for

a change, 65 percent indicated that it was either “likely” or “very likely” that changes could occur with their conduct process dealing with fraternities and sororities. It was also discovered that the way in which institutions address conduct issues regarding alcohol violations with fraternities and sororities, that the institutions geographic region and the number of chapters recognized by the institution had an effect on the type of process that is utilized. The type of fraternity and sorority housing indicated by the institution had an effect on all three violation categories (hazing, alcohol, and “other”) as there was a significant difference in which process was utilized based on the type of housing.

The study has indicated that this research is just the beginning of additional inquiry that is needed on the topic of fraternity and sorority conduct processes. Now that we know what type of conduct processes are being utilized, institutions need to analyze whether current processes are achieving desired outcomes and goals. It is suggested that a qualitative study needs to occur on this topic to determine why certain processes are being utilized. It is discussed that a case study design may assist in being able to investigate an institutions culture at a deep level to determine why certain processes are occurring and what are their results. This study has also suggested that future research needs to occur on why there were significant differences found when separating out some of the demographics for the institutions that participated. A question to consider is what are these connections and what do they mean for the overall research on this topic? Overall further inquiry needs to occur on whether these processes are working or if changes need to occur in hopes of making an impact in Greek communities across the country.

Based on this research study, the researcher has provided implications for practice and recommendations that are directed towards university administrators and stakeholders. The study indicated that stakeholders are not included in the conduct process for most institutions. The researcher believes this needs to be reevaluated and to include headquarters, local alumni, chapter leaders, and other stakeholders in the process. The stakeholders could even assist with crafting the agreed upon outcomes from the process. Traditional processes, such as an administrative hearing or conduct board, will still need to be maintained for the most serious offenses.

Research conducted from this study will give insight into the current conduct processes that are utilized with fraternities and sororities. The current processes are yielding few results as Greek communities all over the country continue to be plagued with conduct violations that have been around since the beginning of their existence. These practices may not ever be entirely eradicated, but significant strides can be made in order to attempt to reduce the number of conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. If university administrators and stakeholders believe changes need to occur and think they are possible, then why are we continuing to implement the same process in hopes of different results? This question needs to be seriously considered and further inquiry on this topic must continue.

REFERENCES

- Allan, E. J., & Madden, M. (2008). *Hazing in view: College students at risk*. www.hazingstudy.org.
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors. (2010). Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors: Student Conduct Resource Guide. Carmel, IN, United States of America.
- Astin, A. W. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Bickel, R. D. (2008). A commentary of the history of constitutional due process in the context of student discipline. *Journal of Student Conduct Administration*, 1 (1), 1-9.
- Binder, R. (2003). Historically White Men's fraternal organizations. In D. E. Gregory, *The administration of fraternal organizations on North American campuses: A pattern for the new millennium* (pp. 29-50). Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Bruce, S., & Keller, A. (2007). Applying social norms theory within affiliation groups: Promising interventions for high-risk drinking. *NASPA Journal*, 44(1), 101-122.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Colgan, S., & Opper, J. H. (1987). Using organization development techniques to enhance chapter functioning. In R. B. Winston, W. R. Nettles, & J. H. Opper, *Fraternities and sororities on the contemporary college campus* (Vol. Winter, pp. 87-103). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dannells, M. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education* (Vol. 25). Washington D.C.: George Washington University.
- Delta Upsilon Fraternity. (1971). *Our record: The manual of Delta Upsilon*. Indianapolis, IN: Delta Upsilon.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The tailored design method*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2D 150 (5th Circuit 1961).

- Draft, R. L., & Marcic, D. (2009). *Understanding management*. Mason, OH: South-Western College.
- Early, C. (1998). Influencing ethical development in Greek letter organizations. *New Directions for Student Services* 81, 39-47.
- English, E. M., Shutt, M. D., & Oswalt, M. D. (2009). Decreasing use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs on a college campus: Exploring potential factors related to change. *NASPA Journal*, 46 (2), 163-182.
- English, E. M., Shutt, M. D., & Oswalt, M. D. (2009). Decreasing use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs on a college campus: Exploring potential factors related to change. *NASPA Journal*, 46 (2), 163-182.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student Development In College: Theory, Research, and Practice* (Second ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finkel, M. A. (2002). Taumatic Injuries Caused By Hazing Practices. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 20 (3), 228-233.
- Gehring, D. D. (2000). Understanding the legal implications of student affairs practice. In M. J. Barr, & M. K. Desler, *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* (pp. 347-376). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(6) 746-762.
- Goldblum, A. (2009). Restorative Justice From Theory To Practice. In J. M. Schrage, & N. G. Giacomini (Eds.), *Reframing Campus Conflict: Student Conduct Practice Through a Social Justice Lens* (pp. 140-154). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2008). *Essentials of Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (Sixth ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Hauptman, A. M. (1997). Financing American Higher Education in the 1990's. *New Directions for Institutional Research* (93), 19-35.
- HazingPrevention.org. (2012). *Hazing Definitions*. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from HazingPrevention.Org: www.hazingprevention.org

- Hennessy, N. J., & Huson, L. M. (1998). Legal Issues and Greek Letter Organizations. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New Challenges for Greek Letter Organizations: Transforming Fraternities and Sororities into Learning Communities* (pp. 61-77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (Fifth ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Holmes, R. C., Edwards, K., & DeBowes, M. M. (2009). *Why objectivity is not enough: The critical role of social justice in campus conduct and conflict work*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Hoover, E. (2012, Feb 12). As deaths mount, a question is raised: Are students hard-wired for hazing? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1-8.
- Hoover, E. (2011, August 21). U. of South Carolina suspends fraternity rush. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 1-3.
- Ierley, A., & Classen-Wilson, D. (2003). Making things right: Restorative justice for school communities. In T. Jones, & R. Compton (Eds.), *Kids working it out* (pp. 199-219). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (2007). *The Law of Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (2003). *Black Greek 101: The culture, customs, and challenges of Black fraternities and sororities*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Kuh, G. B., Douglas, K. B., Lund, J. P., & Ramin-Gyurnek, J. (1994). *Student Learning Outside the Classroom: Transcending Artificial Boundaries*. Washington D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. Washington, D.C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1.
- Kuh, G. D., Pascarella, E. T., & Wechsler, H. (1996, April 19). The questionable value of fraternities. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A68.
- Kurfiss, J. G. (1988). *Critical thinking, theory, research, practice and possibilities* (Vols. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no. 2). Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

- Lake, P. (2009). *Beyond discipline: Managing the modern higher education environment*. Bradenton, FL: Hierophant Enterprises, Inc.
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42 (4), 43-53.
- Lipka, S. (2011, August 28). As they try to rein in fraternities, colleges stir debate. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 1-3.
- McEwen, M. K. (2003). The nature and use of theory. In S. R. Komives, & D. B. Woodard Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (Fourth Edition., pp. 153-178). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983, Sept./Oct.). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of Extension*, 45-50.
- Mosier, C. L. A critical examination of the concepts of face validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 7, 191-206.
- Myers, J. L. (1966). *Fundamentals of experimental design*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nevo, B. (1985). Face validity revisited. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 22 (4), 287-293.
- North-American Interfraternity Conference. (2011). *2011 Hill Visit Packet*. Retrieved Oct. 9, 2012, from North-American Interfraternity Conference: www.nicindy.org/press/resources
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (Third Edition ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, & D. B. Woodard Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (Fourth Edition., pp. 65-178). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nuwer, H. (2010). *Hazing-(Jail) Time for a Change?* Retrieved Oct 9, 2012, from StopHazing.org: www.stophazing.org/nuwer/chico.htm
- Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities and sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Owen, K. C. (1991). Reflections on the college fraternity and its changing nature. In J. L. Anson, & R. F. Marchesani (Eds.), *Baird's manual of American college fraternities* (20th Edition ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Baird's Manual Foundation.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the spss program*. New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Paul, R. W. (1990). *Critical thinking: What every person needs to survive in a rapidly changing world*. (A. A. Binker, Ed.) Rohnert Park, CA: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University.
- Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.
- Pike, G. (2000). The influence of fraternity or sorority membership on students' college experiences and cognitive development. *Research In Higher Education*, 40(1), 117-139.
- Procedures for requesting permission to study ASCA membership*. (n.d.). Retrieved January 23, 2011, from Association of Student Conduct Administration: <http://www.theasca.org/procedures-for-research/>
- Randall, K., & Grady, D. L. (1998). The Greek experience and critical-thinking skills. In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: Transforming fraternities and sororities into learning communities* (Vol. no. 81, pp. 29-37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rest, J. R. (1986). Moral Development in Young Adults. In R. A. Mines, & K. S. Kitchener, *Adult Cognitive Development: Methods and Models* (pp. 92-111). New York, NY: Praeger.
- Schrage, J. M., & Giacomini, N. G. (2009). *Reframing campus conflict: Student conduct practice through a social justice lens*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Schrage, J. M., & Thompson, M. C. (2009). Providing a spectrum of resolution options. In J. M. Schrage, & J. M. Giacomini (Eds.), *Reframing campus conflict: Student conduct practice through a social justice lens* (pp. 65-84). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Scott, W. (1965). *Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Sigma Kappa Headquarters. (n.d.). *Our purpose and values*. Retrieved July 24, 2011, from Sigma Kappa Headquarters:
<http://sigmakappa.org/default.aspx.40?id=40>
- Singh, K. (2007). *Quantitative social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stoner II, E. N., & Lowery, J. W. (2004). Navigating past the "spirit of insubordination": A twenty-first century model. *Journal of College and University Law*, 31(1), 1-78.
- Straw, J. (1996). Documenting the American college fraternity system. *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society* 23(1), 19-24.
- Syrett, N. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of White college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Taylor, S. H., & Varner, D. T. (2009). When student learning and law merge to create educational student conflict resolution and effective conduct management programs. In J. M. Schrage, & N. G. Giacomini (Eds.), *Reframing campus conflict: Student conduct practice through a social justice lens* (pp. 22-49). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of american higher education*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Development sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63 (6), pp. 384-399.
- Tuckman, B. W., & Jensen, M. A. (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Group and Organization Management*, 2(1), 419-427.
- Weaver, R. G., & Farrell, J. D. (1997). *Managers as Facilitators*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Whipple, E. G., & Murphy, R. K. (1996). Student Activities. In F. J. MacKinnon, & Associates, *Rentz's Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education* (Third Edition ed., pp. 298-335). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Whipple, E., & Sullivan, E. (1998). Greek letter organizations: Communities of learners? In E. G. Whipple (Ed.), *New challenges for Greek letter organizations: transforming fraternities and sororities into learning communities* (pp. 7-18). San Francisco: Joesey-Bass.

Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching Internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*.

APPENDIX A
IRB EXEMPTION APPLICATION

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/ projects using living humans as subjects, or samples, or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

– Applicant, Please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-E, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please submit two copies of the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at <http://research.lsu.edu/CompliancePoliciesProcedures/InstitutionalReviewBoard%28IRB%29/item24737.html>

– A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:

- (A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of part B thru E.
- (B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1&2)
- (C) Copies of all instruments to be used.
*If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
- (D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)
- (E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (<http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>)
- (F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: (<http://research.lsu.edu/files/item26774.pdf>)



Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
131 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.6792
irb@lsu.edu
lsu.edu/irb

1) Principal Investigator: Jonathan Sanders Rank: Student
Dept: Greek Life Ph: 225-578-2171 E-mail: Jsanders@lsu.edu

2) Co Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each
*If student, please identify and name supervising professor in this space

Dr. Brian Bourke: Assistant Professor, College of Education 225-578-4759 bbourke@lsu.edu

IRB#	<u>E5994</u> LSU Proposal #
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Complete Application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Human Subjects Training

3) Project Title: Conduct Issues with Fraternities and Sororities: University Processes Evaluated at Four-Year Universities

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb

4) Proposal? (yes or no) ☐ No If Yes, LSU Proposal Number

Also, if YES, either

- ☐ This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant
OR
☐ More IRB Applications will be filed later

5) Subject pool (e.g. Psychology students) Conduct officers at four-year universities

*Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired; pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

6) PI Signature *Jonathan Sanders* Date 5/22/12 (no per signatures)

** I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changes, I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for three years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Screening Committee Action:	Exempted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Exempted <input type="checkbox"/>	Category/Paragraph <u>2</u>
Reviewer	<u>Mathews</u>	Signature <u><i>Robert Mathews</i></u> Date <u>5/24/12</u>

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 5/23/2015

Survey of Greek Conduct Processes

The purpose of this research study is to examine the conduct process that is used by institutions to address conduct violations by fraternities and sororities. Your participation in this study will help us determine what types of conduct process are utilized with fraternities and sororities when different violations occur at your institution. You received this survey as you have been identified as member of the Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) and have been randomly selected from other possible members at your institution. Please answer the following questions based on your knowledge of the conduct process at your institution working with fraternities and sororities. If you do not have direct knowledge of the conduct process that is utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution, please forward this survey to someone at your institution that would have that knowledge. The individuals or institutions participating in this survey will not be identified based on their individual responses.

Completion of this survey will serve as voluntary consent to participate in this study. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. This study is being conducted by Jonathan Sanders, fellow ASCA member, from Louisiana State University as part of his Ph.D. doctoral research. Please contact Jonathan at Greekconductsurvey@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding the survey. This study was approved (Exxxx) by the LSU IRB office and if you have any questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, you may contact Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair, Institutional Review Board, 131 David Boyd Hall, 225-578-8692.

Hazing Section

Please answer the following questions in this section based on how your institution defines hazing. If hazing is not listed in your code, you can use the following definition for reference: "Hazing is any action taken or situation created intentionally: that causes embarrassment, harassment or ridicule, risks emotional and/or physical harm to members of a group or team, whether new or not, regardless of the person's willingness to participate" (Definition taken from Hazingprevention.org).

Which of these responses best describe the process that is typically used when a fraternity or sorority violates the **hazing** policy?

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

APPENDIX B
SURVEY OF GREEK CONDUCT PROCESSES

Survey of Greek Conduct Processes

The purpose of this research study is to examine the conduct process that is used by institutions to address conduct violations by fraternities and sororities. Your participation in this study will help us determine what types of conduct process are utilized with fraternities and sororities when different violations occur at your institution. You received this survey as you have been identified as member of the Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) and have been randomly selected from other possible members at your institution. Please answer the following questions based on your knowledge of the conduct process at your institution working with fraternities and sororities. If you do not have direct knowledge of the conduct process that is utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution, please forward this survey to someone at your institution that would have that knowledge. The individuals or institutions participating in this survey will not be identified based on their individual responses.

Completion of this survey will serve as voluntary consent to participate in this study. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. This study is being conducted by Jonathan Sanders, fellow ASCA member, from Louisiana State University as part of his Ph.D. doctoral research. Please contact Jonathan at Greekconductsurvey@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding the survey. This study was approved (Exxxx) by the LSU IRB office and if you have any questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, you may contact Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair, Institutional Review Board, 131 David Boyd Hall, 225-578-8692.

Hazing Section

Please answer the following questions in this section based on how your institution defines hazing. If hazing is not listed in your code, you can use the following definition for reference: "Hazing is any action taken or situation created intentionally: that causes embarrassment, harassment or ridicule, risks emotional and/or physical harm to members of a group or team, whether new or not, regardless of the person's willingness to participate" (Definition taken from Hazingprevention.org).

Which of these responses best describe the process that is typically used when a fraternity or sorority violates the **hazing** policy?

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

An “elective system” is a process where the same disciplinary process can be addressed either through a conduct board, administrative hearing, or a partnership process. Does your institution utilize an “elective system” when adjudicating **hazing** violations with fraternities or sororities?

- A) No
- B) Yes, the fraternity or sorority may choose which adjudication process is utilized.
- C) Yes, administrator(s) and/or faculty choose which adjudication process is utilized.

Please estimate what percentage of fraternity or sorority disciplinary cases that violated the **hazing** policy and were resolved by a process that included students since fall 2009.

- A) None
- B) Between 1-25%
- C) Between 26-50%
- D) Between 51-75%
- E) Between 76-99%
- F) All (100%)

Do non-Greek organizations found in violation of the **hazing** policy follow the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at your institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No
- C) N/A

If you selected no, please select the process that is used for **hazing** violations for non-Greek organizations.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

Does an individual student that was found in violation of the **hazing** policy follow the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at your institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No
- C) N/A

If you selected no, please select the process that is used for **hazing** violations for individual students.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.

- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

Alcohol Section

Which of these responses best describe the process that is typically used when a fraternity or sorority violates the **alcohol** policy?

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

An “elective system” is a process where the same disciplinary process can be addressed either through a conduct board, administrative hearing, or a partnership process. Does your institution utilize an “elective system” when adjudicating **alcohol** violations with fraternities or sororities?

- A) No
- B) Yes, the fraternity or sorority may choose which adjudication process is utilized.
- C) Yes, administrator(s) and/or faculty choose which adjudication process is utilized.

Please estimate what percentage of fraternity or sorority disciplinary cases that violated the **alcohol** policy and were resolved by a process that included students since fall 2009.

- A) None
- B) Between 1-25%
- C) Between 26-50%
- D) Between 51-75%
- E) Between 76-99%
- F) All (100%)

Do non-Greek organizations found in violation of the **alcohol** policy follow the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at your institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No
- C) N/A

If you selected no, please select the process that is used for **alcohol** violations for non-Greek organizations.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

Does an individual student that was found in violation of the **alcohol** policy follow the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at your institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No
- C) N/A

If you selected no, please select the process that is used for **alcohol** violations for individual students.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

“Other” university violations section

Which of these responses best describe the process that is typically used when a fraternity or sorority violates **“other”** university code of conduct violations? “Other” includes items reported in the Clery Act, but not including hazing and alcohol.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)

- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

An “elective system” is a process where the same disciplinary process can be addressed either through a conduct board, administrative hearing, or a partnership process. Does your institution utilize an “elective system” when adjudicating “**other**” violations with fraternities or sororities?

- A) No
- B) Yes, the fraternity or sorority may choose which adjudication process is utilized.
- C) Yes, administrator(s) and/or faculty choose which adjudication process is utilized.

Please estimate what percentage of fraternity or sorority disciplinary cases that violated the “**other**” policies and were resolved by a process that included students since fall 2009.

- A) None
- B) Between 1-25%
- C) Between 26-50%
- D) Between 51-75%
- E) Between 76-99%
- F) All (100%)

Do non-Greek organizations found in violation of the “**other**” policies follow the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at your institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No
- C) N/A

If you selected no, please select the process that is used for “**other**” violations for non-Greek organizations.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

Does an individual student that was found in violation of “**other**” policies follow the same conduct process as fraternities and sororities at your institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No
- C) N/A

If you selected no, please select the process that is used for “other” violations for individual students.

- A) Governing Council Conduct Board (IFC, Panhellenic, National Pan-Hellenic, or other council)
- B) Peer Conduct Board, but not a governing council.
- C) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty, staff, and students.
- D) College/University Conduct Board involving faculty and staff, but not including student members.
- E) Administrative Conduct Hearing (single administrator involved)
- F) Process involving partnership between University Administration, Alumni, National Organization, and/or chapter members with agreed upon outcome (partnership process).
- G) None of the above

Overall Conduct Process Section

Do you perceive a need for a change in the current process used to address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities at your Institution?

- A) Yes
- B) No

If you answered yes, what is your assessment of how likely change is to occur?

- A) Very likely
- B) Likely
- C) Neither likely or unlikely
- D) Unlikely
- E) Very Unlikely

Demographic Section

Institutional Type

- A) Private
- B) Public

Enrollment Level

- A) Less than 2,000
- B) Between 2,000 and 5,000
- C) Between 5,001 and 10,000
- D) Between 10,001 and 20,000
- E) More than 20,000

Select Institution’s Geographic Region: (note this is the same as the ASCA Regions)

- A) East Region
Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts,
New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island,
Vermont, West Virginia

B) Midwest Region

Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

C) South Region

Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Virgin Islands

D) West Region

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

Total number of fraternities and sororities recognized by the Institution

- A) No fraternities or sororities
- B) 1-10 chapters
- C) 11-20 chapters
- D) 21- 30 chapters
- E) 31-40 chapters
- F) 41 or more

Number "National or International" fraternities and sororities recognized by the Institution

- A) No National or International fraternities or sororities
- B) 1-10 chapters
- C) 11-20 chapters
- D) 21- 30 chapters
- E) 31-40 chapters
- F) 41 or more

Number of "local" fraternities and sororities, not affiliated with National or International organizations that are recognized by the Institution

- A) No local fraternities or sororities
- B) 1-10 chapters
- C) 11-20 chapters
- D) 21- 30 chapters
- E) 31-40 chapters
- F) 41 or more

Overall percentage of the Greek population compared to undergraduate enrollment

- A) 0%- 7%
- B) 8%-15%
- C) 16%- 23%
- D) 24%-31 %
- E) 32% - 39%
- F) 40% or more

APPENDIX C
REQUEST TO STUDY ASCA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION



Request to Study ASCA Membership Application

Dated: April 13, 2010

Study Title: Conduct Issues with Fraternities and Sororities: University Processes Evaluated at Four-Year Universities

Lead Researcher: Jonathan Sanders

Institutional Affiliation of Lead Researcher: Louisiana State University

E-Mail Address of Lead Researcher: Jsanders@lsu.edu

Phone Number of Lead Researcher: 225-578-2171

Mailing Address of Lead Researcher: 10600 Lakes Blvd #1206 Baton Rouge, LA 70810

Additional Researchers & Institutional Affiliation: N/A

Instructions

This application and all requested supporting documents should be combined into a single PDF document. The completed application packet in PDF form should be e-mailed to the chair of the ASCA Research Committee, Dr. Kristen Kawczynski, at kkawczyn@tulane.edu. While information about the application process is contained on the ASCA Website, www.theasca.org all questions should be directed to the ASCA Research Committee Chair.

Application Questions (please check the appropriate box below)

1. Nature of Study: ☒ Quantitative ☐ Qualitative ☐ Mixed-Methods
2. Basis for study: ☒ Doctoral Dissertation ☐ Master's Thesis ☐ Independent Research
3. How do you plan to initiate the study: ☒ By e-mail invitation ☐ By postal mail invitation
4. What portion of ASCA membership do you plan to study (specific information requested later):
 - ☐ All ASCA membership
 - ☐ Random sample of ASCA membership
 - ☐ Selected sample of ASCA membership (i.e., just four year or two year institutions)
 - ☒ Random sample of selected ASCA membership (i.e., one member from two year schools)
 - ☐ Other
5. Are all researchers members of ASCA? ☐ No ☒ Yes - membership number(s): 61446
6. Do you plan to submit your study requests in manuscript form the ASCA Journal? ☐ No ☒ Yes
7. Do you plan to present a program at the ASCA Annual Conference about this study? ☐ No ☒ Yes

Information to be Included in the Application (responses may be typed into a separate document)

ASCA Application Questions for Jonathan Sanders

1. Study abstract [350 word limit]

Fraternities and Sororities epitomize the highs and lows of collegiate behavior: from service to friendship, to alcohol and hazing. Many negative issues have been associated with Greek letter organizations and have become a national concern, such as hazing, alcohol consumption, and other types of risky behavior. Universities have been working with fraternities and sororities in conduct matters since their inception. Some universities have even questioned their relevance on today's college campus. Research shows that even though campus administrators have invested time, energy and resources toward reducing these problems, these efforts are yielding few results (English, Shutt, & Oswalt, Decreasing use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs on a college campus: Exploring poential factors related to change, 2009).

Conduct issues with fraternities and sororities must be evaluated in order to determine if current practices are initiating change into Greek communities on college campuses. In order to do this, we must first take the time to analyze how universities are addressing conduct issues and what conduct process is being used with fraternities and sororities. Currently there is limited research that studies the procedures universities are using in the conduct process with fraternities and sororities and we need this information in order to begin a broader inquiry into whether these processes are yielding results.

I would like to begin to look at the conduct processes that are used with fraternities and sororities by studying the ASCA membership and their institutions. I would like to accomplish this by sending out a survey to a random sample of the membership who works for four-year universities. Once I have received the data, I would like to look to see if there are differences based on the type of violation (alcohol, hazing, other) and what type of process is utilized. I would also like to see if there is a difference based on different demographics of the institutions (private v. public, regional differences, percentage of Greek students, etc.) It is my hope that the results of this research will open the door for broader inquiry into how we can implement changes into the Greek system on campuses across the country.

2. Describe the specific portion(s) of the ASCA membership database that you wish to study (i.e., all membership, random sample, just four year institutions, etc.) [150 word limit]

I would like to send the survey to one random member of each of the four-year institutions. It is my hope that this would be a random person selected to complete the survey from each four-year institution that is represented through the ASCA membership. I will ask in the script of the survey if the participant is unaware of the conduct process for fraternities and sororities, to please forward the survey to someone at his or her institution that is familiar with that process.

3. Describe the plan and timeline for your study invitations. This narrative should include the nature of contacts with ASCA members as well as the number of contacts and the specific dates that you wish these contacts to occur. Please note that the ASCA Research Committee may need to work with you to set the specific dates for contact if your request is granted. [350 word limit]

I would like to send the initial e-mail with the survey link out on Monday, June 4th with a reminder email sent to those that have not responded up to three more additional times, depending of the response rate, within the next three weeks after the initial e-mail. I would hope to have closed the survey and completed data collection by Friday, June 29th. I believe that sending the survey the first part of June will help with the survey response rate, as most conduct officers would have hopefully wrapped up most of their cases from the spring semester by this time.

Proposed dates of contact are as follow: initial e-mail sent on Monday, June 6th, second e-mail to non-respondents on Wednesday, June 13th, third e-mail sent to non-respondents on Wednesday, June 20th, possible final e-mail sent to non-respondents on Monday, June 25th, and the survey will close on Friday, June 29th.

4. Describe your study's benefit to the ASCA membership and contribution to literature in the field of conduct administration. [200 word limit]

Research on the type of processes being used by universities is needed in order to analyze current practices. The results will also open up future inquiry into whether there needs to be a change in current processes being utilized by universities and whether the type of violation perhaps warrants a different approach. Conduct administrators will benefit from this research, as they will be able to compare their current process that is being utilized to address conduct issues within their fraternity and sorority communities with that of other institutions. This research is imperative in order to advance our fraternities and sororities and to ensure they are living up to their stated values and are positively contributing to the university experience.

5. Describe your protocol to insure the confidentiality of ASCA membership during your study as well as to insure that the ethics of ASCA members are not compromised during your study. Please note that all quantitative studies are required to insure that participation is both voluntary and anonymous. [250 word limit]

This study is a quantitative study that is not using individual subjects to respond based on their own experiences, but that of the respective processes for their institution when dealing with conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. I will be applying for an exemption from institutional oversight since the information is non-identifying and would not harm participants if they choose to participate. The study is voluntary for potential respondents and based on the information that is received, the individuals or institutions will not be identified based on the information that is collected. The ethics of ASCA members will not be compromised by this study and the results will be utilized to advance the Association and its members when working with fraternities and sororities. I have provided a copy of the Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight that I plan to submit to LSU IRB, attached to the application.

6. Please attach a copy of the invitation letter(s) you wish distributed to ASCA membership. It is recommended that different language be used in each contact letter, so please include a copy of each individual invitation letter you wish to use. Please note that the ASCA Research Committee may recommend alterations to your invitation letters if deemed appropriate.

Proposed letters have been attached to the application.

7. Please attach a copy of your proposed study instrument (at this stage, the instrument may still be in draft form).

Proposed instrument is attached.

8. Please attach a completed copy of your institution's IRB protocol that you plan to submit for this study. It is noted that you will not have previously submitted this document to the IRB (as permission to study ASCA membership has yet to be granted), but this information is vital to the ASCA Research Committee's decision-making. If you will not be seeking IRB approval, please describe why in detail.

The Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight for LSU is attached.

9. Describe any additional information that you wish to share with the ASCA Research Committee.

I have had the fortunate opportunity to work with the staff at Louisiana State University in developing a new process utilized when working with conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. It is for this reason I have been intrigued into how that process relates to how other universities address similar conduct issues. In February of 2010, Katie McGee Barras and myself presented on the new process adopted by LSU at the ASCA annual meeting. We received outstanding feedback from the participants of the presentation and many colleagues visited with us afterwards to continue the dialogue and discussions on how we can advance our Greek communities. Katie and I, along with additional staff members from LSU, also presented the new process at the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) conference in December of 2010 and yielded the same positive results with those constituents. The AFA presentation was not only comprised of university administrators in the audience, but also International Headquarter representatives, chapter advisors, volunteers, and other constituents that work with fraternities and sororities, and we all had similar concerns and interest in how to improve the conduct process when working with those groups.

When looking at possible dissertation topics for my Ph.D., I looked at the current research dealing with fraternity and sorority conduct and noticed a serious gap in the research on how universities can address conduct concerns with those communities. It is for this reason that I have chosen this topic for my doctoral research and I believe the results will allow not only ASCA members, but also AFA and other constituents to be able to pull resources together to continue to look to see how we can improve our fraternity and sorority communities. I believe this research will not only benefit ASCA in looking at fraternity and sorority conduct processes, but also contribute to the greater higher education community examining organizational conduct and behavior.

References

English, E. M., Shutt, M. D., & Oswalt, M. D. (2009). Decreasing use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs on a college campus: Exploring potential factors related to change. *NASPA Journal* , 46 (2), 163-182.

APPENDIX D
INITIAL EMAIL SENT TO ASCA MEMBERS

Initial E-mail (June 6th)

Dear ASCA Member:

You have been chosen to participate in a national study that will examine how universities address conduct issues with fraternities and sororities. Your participation in the following survey will not only support a fellow member's doctoral dissertation, but will also benefit our association in examining fraternity and sorority conduct processes and open up further inquiry into how we can improve these processes. This research has been endorsed by the ASCA Research Committee due to its potential to fill a serious gap in research in how conduct officers work with fraternity and sorority communities.

You are the only member at your institution that has been chosen to participate in this study, and as such, your response is requested to ensure that your institution type is accurately represented in the study. Please answer the following questions based on your knowledge of the conduct process at your institution working with fraternities and sororities. If you do not have direct knowledge of the conduct process that is utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution, please forward this survey to someone at your institution that would have that knowledge.

To participate, please click the link below for the online survey.

Insert Survey Link Here...

Completion of this survey will serve as voluntary consent to participate in this study. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. The individuals or institutions participating in this survey will not be identified based on their individual responses. This study is being conducted by Jonathan Sanders, fellow ASCA member, from Louisiana State University as part of his Ph.D. doctoral research. Please contact Jonathan at Greekconductsurvey@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding the survey. This study was approved (E5994) by the LSU IRB office and if you have any questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, you may contact Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair, Institutional Review Board, 131 David Boyd Hall, 225-578-8692.

We would like to thank you in advance for your participation in this national study as we hope this research will not only benefit ASCA members, but also contribute to the greater higher education community in strengthening conduct processes to improve our fraternity and sorority communities.

APPENDIX E
FIRST REMINDER EMAIL SENT TO ASCA MEMBERS

First Reminder E-mail (June 13th)

Dear ASCA Member,

You were contacted previously about participating in a national study examining conduct processes utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution. We would like to send this friendly reminder that you still have an opportunity to participate in the study and your completion of the survey will be crucial in being able to accurately compare institutions and the varying ways in which we work with fraternities and sororities in conduct matters.

Please answer the survey questions based on your knowledge of the conduct process at your institution working with fraternities and sororities. If you do not have direct knowledge of the conduct process that is utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution, please forward this survey to someone at your institution that would have that knowledge.

To participate, please click the link below for the online survey.

Insert Survey Link Here...

Completion of this survey will serve as voluntary consent to participate in this study. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. The individuals or institutions participating in this survey will not be identified based on their individual responses. This study is being conducted by Jonathan Sanders, fellow ASCA member, from Louisiana State University as part of his Ph.D. doctoral research. Please contact Jonathan at Greekconductsurvey@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding the survey. This study was approved (E5994) by the LSU IRB office and if you have any questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, you may contact Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair, Institutional Review Board, 131 David Boyd Hall, 225-578-8692.

We would like to thank you in advance for your participation in this national study as we hope this research will not only benefit ASCA members, but also contribute to the greater higher education community in strengthening conduct processes to improve our fraternity and sorority communities.

APPENDIX F
FINAL REMINDER EMAIL SENT TO ASCA MEMBERS

Final Reminder E-mail (July, 10th)

Dear ASCA Member,

You were contacted a couple of weeks ago about participating in a national study examining conduct processes utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution. **This is a final reminder that you still have a chance to participate in the study, as the survey will close Friday, July 20th.** Your response to the survey is imperative for the research, as we want to be able to accurately compare institutions and their respective conduct processes with fraternities and sororities. **This is a reminder that you still have an opportunity to participate in the study and your completion of the survey will be greatly appreciated.**

Please answer the survey questions based on your knowledge of the conduct process at your institution working with fraternities and sororities. If you do not have direct knowledge of the conduct process that is utilized with fraternities and sororities at your institution, please forward this survey to someone at your institution that would have that knowledge.

To participate, please click the link at the bottom of the page for the online survey.

Completion of this survey will serve as voluntary consent to participate in this study. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. The individuals or institutions participating in this survey will not be identified based on their individual responses. This study is being conducted by Jonathan Sanders, fellow ASCA member, from Louisiana State University as part of his Ph.D. doctoral research. Please contact Jonathan at Greekconductsurvey@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding the survey. This study was approved (E5994) by the LSU IRB office and if you have any questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, you may contact Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair, Institutional Review Board, 131 David Boyd Hall, 225-578-8692.

We would like to thank you in advance for your participation in this national study as we hope this research will not only benefit ASCA members, but also contribute to the greater higher education community in strengthening conduct processes to improve our fraternity and sorority communities.

VITA

Jonathan Burnard Sanders, son of Steve Avery Sanders and Judy Carol Sanders, was born in March 1980 in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. He graduated from Riverdale High School in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. Jonathan holds a Bachelor of Business Administration (2003) from Middle Tennessee State University and a (2006) Master of Business Administration from Middle Tennessee State University.

Jonathan began his career in higher education employed as a graduate assistant in the Student Organizations and Community Service office at Middle Tennessee State University in Murfreesboro, Tennessee (2005-2006) while simultaneously working on his Masters of Business Administration Degree. After completing his Master of Business Administration Degree, Jonathan was hired as the Assistant Director of Greek Life at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana (2006-2008). In 2008, Jonathan was promoted to the Associate Director of Greek Life at Louisiana State University and currently serves in this position.