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ABSTRACT

REASONS FOR COLLABORATION AMONG EUROPEAN AND AFRICAN AMERICAN GREEK COUNCILS

AUGUST 2002

JAMES DAVID LOUK

B.A. AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY

M. ED. GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Directed by: Professor Dale Grant

The study examines the barriers that inhibit collaboration between traditionally European-American fraternities and sororities and historically African-American fraternities and sororities. In the study, 176 members of the fraternity/sorority community responded to the survey. The survey was developed by the researcher to address issues of collaboration between similar governing council's member organizations, reasons for collaboration with organizations in the different governing council, as well as to explore reasons collaboration had not occurred. Membership in a governing council was used as the defining variable to different responses. The results indicated that lack of knowledge of the cross racial council's member organizations and members of the organizations and racial prejudice were inhibitors to collaboration. Philanthropy and community service, as well as, events for the entire Greek system were reasons for collaboration.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Almost every student affairs theorist echoes the value of being involved on the college campus. From Nancy Schlossberg's theory of Marginality and Mattering to the Seven Vectors of Arthur Chickering, being involved while in college is considered to be a positive endeavor (Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito, 1998). The fraternity and sorority system is comprised of over 9,000,000 college students and alumni members with the vast majority located within the United States and Canada, while other individual organizations have chapters located outside the two countries (Alpha Kappa Alpha website; Alpha Phi Alpha website; Delta Sigma Theta website; Iota Phi Theta website; NIC website; NPC website).

Membership within a fraternity or sorority is one of many ways that students can become involved in campus life while at a college or university. Fraternity and sorority life has been an integral part of the collegiate environment since the founding of the first organization in 1776, which coincides with the founding of the United States of America (Anson and Marchesani, 1991). The fraternity and sorority Greek system at many universities is composed of an Interfraternity Council (IFC), a National Panhellenic Council (NPC), and a National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC). The Interfraternity Council's member organizations are traditionally European-American fraternities. The National Panhellenic Council is comprised of member organizations that are traditionally...
European-American sororities. The National Pan-Hellenic Council's member organizations are traditionally African-American fraternities and sororities. At some universities, the rising multicultural fraternities and sororities are finding a place within the National Pan-Hellenic Councils as member organizations or have created their own governing council. A positive Greek Life system can bring positive recognition to a university; as well, a poor system can generate unwanted and unfortunate press for the university and to the fraternity and sorority system.

The fraternity and sorority system has mirrored American society for many years in that it has struggled with issues that have been related to segregation based on race, creed, and gender (Johnson, 1972). The traditionally European-American and the historically African-American fraternities and sororities have co-existed since 1906. Society has changed since the early founding of almost all the organizations, as society has taken strides to address diversity issues, gender equity, and moved toward the acceptance of individuals. People of different races, creeds, and genders are represented in almost every community in the workplace, living environments, and in our daily living endeavors. "Projections show that between 1990 and 2030, the population of whites in the United States will increase about 25.0 percent, the black population about 68.0 percent, the Asian American, Pacific Island American, and the American Indian population about 79.0 percent, and the Hispanic population about 187.0 percent" (Whipple, 1998, p. 19). These changes will bring and have brought the beginning of a new student body. Student organizations such as fraternities and sororities will need to adapt to meet these changes.
Even though many of the historical barriers that existed to inhibit collaboration have been removed, nevertheless on numerous college and university campuses the organizations that represent the Greek community appear to struggle with collaborative efforts. However, there is little literature to address the issues of their collaborative efforts. This poses a problem for colleges and universities that face the challenge of creating diverse learning communities to better prepare their students to live and work within a diverse population (Whipple, 1998). For what reasons do organizations collaborate and what barriers presently exist to inhibit collaboration between the traditionally European-American and the historically African-American fraternities and sororities?

The purpose of this study was to discern the barriers to collaborative efforts between members of the Interfraternity Council and the National Panhellenic Council with members of the National Pan-Hellenic Council on a local level. In other words, what barriers exist between the traditionally European-American and the historically African-American fraternities and sororities?

Even though these organizations have a history that includes racial isolation and prejudice, these organizations also have much in common within their histories, of philanthropic endeavors, mission statements; commitment to enhancing the mind, and the pursuit of happiness. Thus far, on many college campuses it appears as though the history of isolation rather than common goals influence the decisions made by local chapters regarding collaborative efforts. Given the focus on diversity today on college and university campuses and within the workplace, some portion of the efforts of Greek
life should be to help college students in preparing them for the diverse world in which we live. "If Greek letter organizations are to survive and flourish within the modern college and university, it is imperative that they understand the importance of diversity" (Whipple, 1998, p. 19).
CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

There have been many studies on college fraternities and sororities. Topics for these studies range from binge drinking and spending habits to cognitive effects of the fraternal experience and involvement factors (Astin, 1993). However, there is little literature that addresses the collaborative efforts of the historically African-American fraternities/sororities and traditionally European-American fraternities/sororities. A review of histories, vision statements, creeds, and statements of purpose indicates these organizations within the fraternity/sorority system have parallel interests: scholarship, high ideals of brother and sisterhood, community service, leadership, and high ethical standards. However, these similarities have not led to many collaborative efforts between the two groups on numerous campuses throughout the United States. What are the hindrances to group collaboration among the organizations?

"Greek letter organizations constitute a powerful student subculture, with powerful implications for the members' learning" (Whipple, 1998, p. 10). Research from the National Interfraternity Conference and the National Panhellenic Conferences conducted in 1997 confirmed several key items. Members who join the Greek system are "more likely to volunteer and to be active in civic affairs during adulthood; members are more likely to contribute financially to charitable and nonprofit organizations and religious groups, and to do so in greater amounts; also members are more likely than
non-Greek students to be involved in college organizations; and alumni of Greek letter organizations are more satisfied than non-Greeks with their social development during college" (Whipple, 1998, p. 11).

Fraternity and sorority membership is valued for several reasons; it provides a good democratic social experience; gives value beyond college years; creates, through their ideals, an ever-widening circle of service beyond the membership to the local and global communities at large; develops the individual's potential through leadership opportunities and group effort; and it fills a need of belonging (NPC website). A fraternity or sorority is a life-long affiliation for its members.

From a historical perspective on college and university fraternal organizations, the first organization bearing Greek letters was Phi Beta Kappa (ΦBK). Phi Beta Kappa was founded at the College of William and Mary on December 5, 1776 in Williamsburg, Virginia; the organization was founded for scholarly and social purposes at the college (Bryan, 1983; Johnson, 1972; Whipple, 1998). During this time period at early American universities, there was very little discussion outside of rigid schoolwork. The American college fraternity arose in response to a need for close personal relationships among students, and the fraternity has provided an opportunity for supplemental education beyond the formal curriculum of the college (Mitchell, Wilson, Wickham, Schreiber, McKee, Bauman, Huebner, Mayr, Zeiss, O'Dwyer, Houpt, Bishop, Simithfield, and Christensen, 1992). The founding of Phi Beta Kappa signaled a "revolt against the authoritarianism of the college and the assertion by students of their right to assemble, to
choose those with whom they wished to associate in their [leisure], to be free to speak their minds, and to make decisions affecting their own welfare" (Johnson, 1972, p 4).

Phi Beta Kappa established a secret grip, mottos, ritual, distinctive badge, code of laws, and the use of Greek letters (Mitchell, 1992). Almost every current day fraternity and sorority utilizes most, if not all, of these items brought forth by Phi Beta Kappa. These secret ritualistic items of a grip, secret motto, badge, coat of arms, a ritual ceremony, and the secret meaning to the organization have been the backbone of almost every fraternity or sorority. There is a dichotomy within these "secret societies" in that there are two views of the society, one of public nature and the other private. The public view is where community service, parties, membership, and other activities are visible and this is where collaboration can be accomplished. The private side is one with ceremonies, initiations, and other ritualistic activities viewed only by members of the particular organization. The rituals are what make each individual organization unique and special. The rituals are what unite the individuals within the organizations in the bonds of brotherhood and sisterhood. Though Phi Beta Kappa started as a social fraternity, the fraternity has since become strictly an honor society for college and university students (Anson and Marchesani, 1991; Mitchell, 1992).

The fraternity that has been labeled as the "father" of all fraternities is the Kappa Alpha Society (KA), which is different from the Kappa Alpha Order, a social fraternity founded in 1865 at Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Virginia. The Kappa Alpha Society was founded at Union College in Schenectady, New York on May 26,
1825. The Kappa Alpha Society formed around literary and social interests (Horowitz, 1987). The organization of the Kappa Alpha Society inspired other fraternities to begin at Union College: Sigma Phi (ΣΦ) and Delta Phi (ΔΦ) both founded in 1827 (Sigma Phi website; Delta Phi website). These organizations set in motion the fraternity movement in America. The students at Union College founded three more fraternities for a total of six fraternities founded at Union, thus Union College is recognized as the "Mother of Fraternities" (Mitchell, 1992).

The first secret society for females was the Adelphean Society, now known as Alpha Delta Pi (ΑΔΠ) Sorority, founded on May 15, 1851, at Wesleyan Female College in Macon, Georgia. Ironically, like Alpha Delta Pi being the first secret society for women, Wesleyan was the first institution of higher education for females, founded in 1836 (Mitchell, 1992; Wesleyan College website). The female organization, given credit for being the first national sorority, was I.C. Sorosis, now known as Pi Beta Phi (ΠΒΦ), founded on April 28, 1867, at Monmouth College in Monmouth, Illinois. Pi Beta Phi was the first women’s organization to model itself after the male fraternity (Johnson, 1972). The first women's group to use Greek letters for the founding of their organization was Kappa Alpha Theta Women's Fraternity (ΚΑΘ) founded on January 27, 1880, at Asbury College, now DePauw University in Greenville, Indiana (Whipple, 1998). The previous groups were using their original names: the Adelphean Society and I.C. Sorosis. At the time of Kappa Alpha Theta's founding, the term sorority had not been coined (Johnson 1972).
The first secret society for women, Alpha Delta Pi, formed around literary interests and the personal development of women. "This was a new world... She finds that many of her classmates think more of mischievous enjoyment than their lessons. And so, by and by, a sober thought enters her brain could she influence her friends to join an association for improvement" wrote Eugenia Tucker Fitzgerald, Founder, on her inspiration for the founding of the Adelphean Society (Ablard, 2001, p. 6). The founding of the first women's secret society started from the idea of one woman who saw that the "students at Wesleyan initiated each other into the fun and frivolous ways of the university life but she wanted something that would aid in personal development and improvement" (Ablard, 2001, p. 6).

Other women's organizations were founded to remedy problematic situations, as was true for some of the historically African-American organizations. When the founders of Kappa Alpha Theta entered school at Indiana Asbury University they were met with opposition and discontent. The female students were repressed and taunted for entering the school, thus making it a coeducational environment (Kappa Alpha Theta Website). Bettie Locke was invited to wear the Phi Gamma Delta's (ΦΓΔ) fraternity pin to be a champion of her brother's fraternity. Locke turned down the offer and asked to become a full member of Phi Gamma Delta. However, the members were reluctant to grant Locke full membership into their fraternity (Johnson, 1972). Locke's father, a member of Beta Theta Pi (ΒΘΠ), suggested she start her own fraternity. Thus, she along with three other women founded Kappa Alpha Theta (Johnson, 1972). The founders of Kappa Alpha
Theta joined together for support and friendship, and to endure the hardships faced by being a woman in a male dominated environment.

The historically African-American fraternities and sororities were founded during a time when African-Americans were denied the basic rights and services granted to others. The 1896 case *Plessy vs. Ferguson* legitimized the Jim Crow laws, making separate but "equal" public accommodations acceptable (Bryan and Mulledore, 1992). These laws acted as a large hindrance to the African-American community for numerous years. The African-American fraternities and sororities were not only organized for brotherly and sisterly congeniality, but also to serve the African-American community as a "conduit for collective action" (Anson, 1991).

The National Pan-Hellenic Council organizations or the African-American fraternal organizations had their beginnings with the founding of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity (ΑΦΑ) on December 4, 1906, at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. Alpha Phi Alpha's birth occurred on a predominantly European-American campus, where secret societies were very prevalent on the college campuses. Conditions at this time were very difficult for African-American students with the separate but "equal" status. The isolation of the African-American student included, but was not limited to, segregation from the student body and the pressures of university life that were difficult for these students. At this time, the retention rate of African-American students was very low at the predominantly white institution (Ross, 2000). The group formed for the purpose of academic and social support of its members at the university (Ross, 2000).
The first African-American sorority was Alpha Kappa Alpha (AKA) founded on January 15, 1908, at Howard University in Washington D.C. Alpha Kappa Alpha was the first fraternity or sorority founded at a historically black college or university (Ross, 2000). "Ethel Hedgeman Lyle viewed the sorority as an instrument for enriching the social and intellectual aspects of college life by providing mental stimulation through interaction" (Alpha Kappa Alpha website).

Most Greek organizations were founded for similar purposes of scholarship, congenial friendship, high ethical standards, and academic achievement. The following are items found within the various public mottos, statements of purpose, creeds, or founding elements of various traditionally European-American organizations within the Interfraternity Council fraternities and the National Panhellenic Council sororities, and the historically African-American organizations within the National Pan-Hellenic Council fraternities and sororities. "Bettering themselves morally, mentally, and socially" can be found within statements from Alpha Delta Pi's creed. "Promotes the principles of virtue, diligence, and brotherly love with emphasis on being a scholar, gentleman, and an athlete," are the principles of Sigma Phi Epsilon (ΣΦΕ) (Georgia Southern University Greek Life website). The men of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity (ΩΨΦ) state that "manhood, scholarship, perseverance, and uplift" are the fundamental principles of their organization (Omega Psi Phi website). The Jordan Standard states that a Sigma Chi (ΣΧ) is "a man of good character, ambitious purpose, good morals, and a deep sense of personal responsibility" (Sigma Chi website). The founders of Delta Sigma Theta (ΔΣΘ) set their main emphases when founding the organization as scholarship and
political activism (Ross, 2000). The object of the Kappa Delta (ΚΔ) sorority uses the words "encouragement of literature and education; furtherance of charitable and benevolent purposes; sisterly love" (Kappa Delta website). The mission statement of Alpha Omicron Pi (ΑΟΠ) emulates the words "friendship for a lifetime, academic excellence, developing leadership skills through service to the fraternity and community" (Alpha Omicron Pi website). The women of Zeta Phi Beta (ΖΦΒ) hold "Scholarship, Service, Sisterhood, and Finer Womanhood" as their motto for the organization and members (Ross, 2000).

Many of the same ideals can be found within the various organizations: scholarship, aspirations of man/womanhood, leadership, service to others, and serving the bond of the brotherhood or sisterhood within the organization. The common goals appear to be a powerful starting point for involvement with partnerships between organizations within the Greek system, where these collaborative efforts would unite the entire system into a unified group. If the chapters of all three councils worked together as a federated group of fraternity men and sorority women, there is a great deal that can be accomplished by these organizations.

The founding of the traditionally European-American sororities and the historically African-American fraternities and sororities was due to the oppression by the white male. However, over time there are some examples in history of specific local chapters of the national and international traditionally European-American fraternities supporting membership across gender, creed, religion, and racial lines. For example, there were some men's fraternities that did initiate females into their fraternal
organizations. Sigma Alpha Epsilon (ΣAE) initiated Lucy Pattie through their chapter at Kentucky Military Institute in Farmville, Kentucky. Pattie held their ritual and other secret items during the Civil War. Upon the end of the war, Sigma Alpha Epsilon was able to easily reorganize due to her assistance. Pattie was held in high honor and treated as a full member of the fraternity, until her death in 1922. Phi Delta Theta (ΦΔΘ) also initiated several women into a variety of their different chapters (Johnson, 1972).

Women's membership into an all-male dominated fraternity was not common and a variety of different items for Greek organizations needed to be addressed: dual membership, membership recruitment policies, and initiation requirements. There were no rules governing the fraternities and sororities outside of their individual organizational structure. In addition, there was little discussion outside of one's particular organization with a different fraternal organization. The necessity for structure set in motion the need for each fraternal system to have its own governing body. The governing bodies were founded in the following order: National Panhellenic Conference, National Interfraternity Conference, and the National Pan-Hellenic Council. These groups serve as a conduit for their member organizations to address standards of practice, create unity among fellow groups, and allow discussion pertinent to the particular student each governing body serves (Johnson, 1972).

The traditionally European-American women’s groups were the first to organize a national governing body. Kappa Kappa Gamma (ΚΚΓ) in 1891 called a meeting of all the sororities, of which there were seven, in Boston (Tessier, 2000). Moreover, in 1902 Alpha Phi (ΑΦ) called for a conference in Chicago to discuss standards. The outcome of
this meeting and several others created the Intersorority Conference, which is now known as the National Panhellenic Conference (Alpha Phi website; Tessier, 2000). "The purpose of NPC is to foster interfraternity relationships, to assist collegiate chapters in the NPC member groups, and to cooperate with colleges and universities in maintaining the highest scholastic and social standards" (Dunkel and Schuh, 1998, p. 23). There are currently 26 women's fraternities/sororities as members of the National Panhellenic Conference (see Appendix A) (Anson, 1991).

The purpose of the NIC was established as follows:

"To promote the well-being of its member fraternities by providing such services to them as the House of Delegates may determine. These services will include, but not be limited to, promotion of cooperative action in dealing with fraternity matters of mutual concern, research in areas of fraternity operations and procedure, fact-finding and data gathering, and the dissemination of such data to the member fraternities. Conference action shall not in any way abrogate the right of its member fraternities to self-determination" (Dunkel and Schuh, 1998, p. 22).

The National Interfraternity Conference (NIC) was formally organized in 1910. There are currently 66 member fraternities, with two historically African-American fraternities holding membership within the NIC as well as NPHC, Kappa Alpha Psi (KAΨ) and Iota Phi Theta (ΙΦΘ) (see Appendix B) (National Interfraternity Conference website).

The realization for a need for an umbrella organization for the historically African-American fraternal organizations came in May of 1930 at Howard University in
Washington, D.C. The primary founding groups included: Kappa Alpha Psi and Omega Psi Phi Fraternities, and Alpha Kappa Alpha, Delta Sigma Theta, and Zeta Phi Beta Sororities. The mission in 1930 of the National Pan-Hellenic Council was "unanimity of thought and action as far as possible in the conduct of Greek letter collegiate fraternities and sororities, and to consider problems of mutual interest to its member organizations" (National Pan-Hellenic website). The present mission of NPHC remains similar to that of its stated mission in 1930. The umbrella organization is now known as the National Pan-Hellenic Council with nine member organizations (see Appendix C).

Although five of the nine member fraternities and sororities of the National Pan-Hellenic fraternities and sororities had their birth at historically black colleges or universities, "black fraternities saw their fastest and widest expansion taking place on the white college campuses where black students had not had housing and were facing extreme discrimination and isolation" (Graham, 1999, p. 86).

The separation of the groups at that time is understandable; the white males dominated the culture of the campus, which was a reflection of society. Women, as well as African-American students, were in need of friendship and a support system for each other. It would only make sense for each to found a group to meet its needs. Similarly, Jewish students faced similar reactions during the 1800s and 1900s. The oppression of Jewish men led to the founding of Zeta Beta Tau (ZBT) on December 29, 1898, in New York (Horowitz, 1987). "Zeta Beta Tau was the first fraternity founded for students who couldn't get into other fraternities because of prevailing bigotry" (Zeta Beta Tau website).
Many fraternities began membership restriction policies banning the induction of members due to their race and/or religion. The groups began to collectively segregate the African-American and Jewish students upon their entrance onto the college/university campus. Phi Delta Theta (ΦΔΘ) at its 1912 convention sanctioned a "white only" rule for its chapters. The fraternity had been in existence for sixty-four years without such a "requirement" for membership and the rule lasted until 1952 (Johnson, 1972).

In the mid-1920s, the National Interfraternity Conference conducted a survey of the fifty-four men's general fraternities, of those fifty-one responded. The questions centered around the constitution and ritual of the fraternity. One question on the survey asked, "Does it [the fraternity] limit its membership by race, creed, or color?" Twelve fraternities of the fifty-one respondents stated that chapters were limited to electing men who were white, Caucasian or Aryan, eleven to those who were both white and Christian, and six to those who were Jewish. Over half of the NIC fraternities were limiting their membership due to racial and or religious reasons, if not both reasons.

The racial and religious "requirements" for fraternities and sororities caused the needs of several students to either not be met or instigated the need to create their own organizations.

"On some campuses, the administration discouraged the creation of Jewish and [African-American] fraternities; on others, they refused them official recognition, leaving [Jewish students] and [African-American students] completely outside the system of power" (Horowitz, 1987, p.146). These pressures led to even more dissention between
the African-American students and the European-American students on campuses. A study at Syracuse University in 1926 found:

"Greek-letter societies were far less willing than independents (non-fraternity or sorority affiliated undergraduate students) to admit [Jewish students] and [African-American students]: 19 percent versus 37.7 percent for Jews; 4.3 versus 12.5 percent for [African-Americans]. Those fraternity members identified as institutionally minded had the lowest proportion of acceptance of all: 13.9 percent for Jews; 3.5 percent for [African-Americans]. The fraternity turned out to be an all too effective school of prejudice," (Horowitz, 1987, p. 146).

In spite of their issues and policies, in 1948 Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst decided to pledge an African-American male to their chapter. The Amherst chapter alumni were supportive of the decision to pledge the man; however, the national organization threatened to remove the chapter from the national fraternity. That year the chapter became an independent club with the name of Phi Alpha Psi and initiated its first [African-American] member.

Similar incidents across the nation occurred. In 1950 Phi Epsilon Pi fraternity, a predominately Jewish fraternity at the University of Connecticut, exerted the same racism that was shown to the Jewish students across the nation. The national organization of Phi Epsilon Pi did not accept the idea of pledging an African-American to the fraternity. The University of Connecticut chapter led a campaign to accept Al Rogers, the African-American student into their chapter. The chapter enlisted the aid of eight other chapters to their side to help them in their struggle against the national organization. University of
Connecticut Chapter President of Phi Epsilon Pi, Irving R. Channels said, “We take our men on the basis of character, and no one is going to tell us we cannot use that basis.” The national organization relented, allowed Rogers to join and reinstated the University of Connecticut chapter after three-months (Smith, 2000, p. 115).

Women's organizations were not immune to exerting the same type of racial selection found within the male fraternities. At Cornell University in 1956 a chapter of the Sigma Kappa Sorority, a traditionally white sorority, extended a bid for membership to a young African-American female, Barbara Collier Delany. Delany recalls, "the girls in the sorority were nice to me, but the officials at the national headquarters were furious, and they told the students that they had better reject me or headquarters would shut down the sorority's chapter at Cornell," (Graham, 1999, p.87). The chapter chose not to reject Delany membership into their chapter and the national organization shut down the chapter at Cornell (Graham, 1999).

In 1949, the National Interfraternity Conference voted to recommend, “that member fraternities that do have selective membership provisions consider this question in the light of prevailing conditions and take such steps as they may elect to eliminate such selectivity provisions” (Johnson, 1972, p. 209). The National Interfraternity Conference maintained that member fraternities should have individual rights to select membership qualifications without the interference or restriction of a board or by non-members. To do so would hinder the democratic principles of free association and self-governance (Johnson, 1972).
The national organizations gradually dropped their discriminatory clauses against Jewish and African-American students, however, the problem just went underground (Johnson, 1972). Some organizations accepted a “token” member of each group; however the prevailing majority of fraternity and sorority members were still Caucasian and Christian (Johnson, 1972).

The national and international organizations were exclaiming they had lifted their ban on selection of membership on the basis of race, creed, or color. Membership selection was left to the individual chapter, who had the opportunity to base selection on these criteria. The Panhellenic system at the University of Texas in 1984 chose to move off campus rather than sign a non-discrimination agreement (Horowitz, 1987). Among the men in the Interfraternity Council at the University of Texas, only one African-American was a member of one of the fraternities. He had transferred his membership from his previous institution where he was initiated as a member. The members of Kappa Alpha Order during their annual Old South Week in 1985 had its house adorned with the Confederate flag (Horowitz, 1987). Members of the African-American community would definitely notice these blatant demonstrations of racism (Horowitz, 1987).

Astin conducted a study on the membership of the traditionally European-American fraternities and sororities to view membership characteristics. The variables positively associated with joining a social fraternity or sorority were listed as follows: having a Protestant religious affiliation, being white, being politically conservative, coming from an affluent family and scoring high on leadership, status striving, and
hedonism. The negative predictors of joining a fraternity or sorority included a strong commitment to promoting racial understanding, and working at an outside job (Astin, 1993).

Astin's study found that the involvement measures that had negative associations with liberalism include being a member of a social fraternity or sorority, number of math or numerical courses taken, and hours per week spent partying (Astin, 1993). Liberalism is associated with activism and diversity: participating in campus demonstrations, discussing racial or ethnic issues, attending racial or cultural awareness workshops, enrolling in ethnic studies courses, and enrolling in women's studies courses (Astin, 1993). If liberalism were a negative association to being a member of a fraternity or sorority, then issues of diversity would equate to being low within these organizations as well.

The promotion of racial understanding is positively correlated with institutional diversity emphasis, socioeconomic status of peer group, going away from home to attend college, and the humanities orientation of the college environment. This would suggest that if the institution has a commitment to diversity and racial understanding, then the students would be better served in regards to the understanding of a different race (Astin, 1993). If the institution values diversity, then these values will be transmitted to the student body, including fraternity and sorority members. The institution must first believe the issue of diversity is important.

Conversely, alcohol consumption was an involvement variable that was negatively associated with the promotion of racial understanding. In conjunction, being a
member of a fraternity or sorority was linked positively to the consumption of alcohol. This would connect being a member of a fraternity or sorority through consumption of alcohol with having a negative correlation with racial understanding (Astin, 1993).

Astin stated, "the existence of the pervasive racial conflict on the campus tends to balkanize the student body, such that students seek out social organizations whose membership is partly racially based" (Astin, 1993, p.129). He also found that students' perceptions of campus diversity orientation are positively associated with socializing with persons from different racial or ethnic groups and discussing racial or ethnic issues.

The study of racial identity development for a variety of under-represented groups and whites in America is extensive. There are several black identity development models, however, there are two that are said to be fully developed, that of Cross and Jackson (Sue and Sue, 1999; Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito 1998). Both models of identity development of African-Americans are centered around a person's experiences of racism and oppression (Sue and Sue, 1999). Cross's five stages are preencounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, internalization, and integrative awareness. Jackson's four stages are: passive-acceptance, active-resistance, redirection, and internalization.

Following are the five stages of identity development according to Cross, whose identity development theory is considered to be the more prevalent (Sue and Sue, 1999). The first stage in each is characterized by fitting into white culture and a devaluing of their own blackness. The second stage is where a significant racial crisis happens to challenge their thoughts of society and their views. In the third stage the individual draws away from the dominant culture, White culture, and begins to delve into their
African-American culture. The fourth stage is one where the constraints of having anguish and anger toward the White society have lessened and the movements toward a multicultural view of society have taken place. The fifth stage is one where the multicultural society are appreciated and valued (Sue and Sue, 1999; Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito 1998).

White identity has two major theorists, Hardiman and Helms. "Hardiman studied the autobiographies of individuals who obtained a high level of racial consciousness" (Sue and Sue, 1999). Helms' model is considered to be the most influential identity model for Whites. Helms' model utilizes status versus stages used by other theorists and the stages are equally divided into two phases. The first phase is Abandonment of Racism, which encompasses the first three statuses: contact, disintegration, and reintegration. Phase two is Defining a Nonracist White Identity containing the last three statuses: pseudo-independence, immersion/emersion and autonomy (Sue and Sue, 1999).

Contact is the first status. In this status a person does not see racism, has a view that everyone is equal and "may profess to be color blind" (Sue and Sue, 1999). The second status is disintegration, where feelings of guilt, anger toward one's race, or defensiveness can be common. In this status one may not acknowledge that prejudice and oppression exist in current society, where one may even witness an event or be a contributor himself or herself. The final status in phase one is reintegration where a regression occurs and the person goes back to the beliefs that White society is right and minority groups are the ones to blame for the problem (Sue and Sue, 1999).
Phase two begins with the pseudo-independence status that begins to hone and clarify a non-racist White identity. The fifth status is immersion/emersion where one begins to truly confront one's own biases and search for what it means to be White and understand the associations made with the White identity. The final status of Helms' White Identity Model is autonomy. The status is where one accepts their Whiteness and has developed a non-racist identity where one is able to explore racial issues without feeling defensive (Sue and Sue, 1999).

Institutional racism from the university or the larger structure of the fraternity or sorority has been widespread. The groups have exerted racist attitudes since they have the power of being the majority. The use of concepts from Bailey Jackson and Rita Hardiman have allowed for the process for an institution to transform itself into one that is an anti-racist multicultural institution. The idea is based on a continuum in which there is movement forward and backward, however a step cannot be skipped. The first stage is one of exclusion where racism is the "status quo". Passive is the second stage, where White power is maintained but there is a limit to minority of racial and ethnic people. Symbolic Change is where proclamations of "commitments to diversity" or "racial equality" exist, however, the ignorance of the White privilege and its practices is still prevalent. However, there is an attempt to recruit minorities, as long as they "do not cause too many problems". Analytic Change begins the desires to dismantle discrimination and White privilege. Programs emerge to assist minority groups. The practices are developed and implemented from the dominant group's frame of reference, thus racism still exists. Structural Change is where commitment to the change of the
barriers and racism and the altering of the structure of the organization begins to take place. The understanding of the anti-racial multiculturalism is the stimulation for the structure transformation. Inclusive is where the institution is entirely committed to being anti-racist multicultural in all aspects. The inclusion of minority groups to have the ability to make change and have an impact upon the institution is viewed as an asset. The dedication to battling racism within the institution and community is an important factor of the foundation of the institution (Rea and Warkentin, 1999).

There is a lack of literature to discuss cross racial efforts among fraternity and sorority chapters. In an effort to increase information, this study attempts to help fill the void. The effort is to increase the information on collaborative involvement efforts between IFC/NPC and NPHC fraternities and sororities, and to discover reasons for and reasons that hinder collaboration between the organizations.

Therefore, this study addressed the relationship between the Interfraternity Council, National Panhellenic Council and National Pan-Hellenic Council members and their perception of the barriers to collaborative efforts between the three governing councils' member fraternities and sororities in a mid-sized university located in the southeast region of the United States.

The researcher designed six specific questions designed to answer the basic question of identifying the barriers to collaborative efforts between the three governing bodies' member fraternities and sororities. The research questions addressed were:

1. Does lack of knowledge of the other councils or member fraternities/sororities of said councils inhibit collaboration?
2. Does the number of events held by an organization inhibit collaboration?

3. For what reasons does collaboration occur within same race councils?

4. Does lack of invitation inhibit collaboration?

5. If collaboration does occur, what are the reasons for the collaboration?

6. If collaboration does not occur, what are the reasons for this lack of collaboration?
CHAPTER III

Method

Sample

The process of selection of participants involved members of the university and volunteer advisors of each fraternity and sorority. Permission was first obtained and granted from the Institutional Review Board at the institution for the study to be conducted (see Appendix D). The university's Greek Life Advisor was contacted to identify all current active fraternity and sorority chapters on campus and their advisors. In addition, permission to survey the fraternities and sororities was solicited and granted from the university advisor as well. Approval was then sought from the volunteer alumni advisor from each active fraternity and sorority. There are twenty-one active fraternities and sororities on the campus who are members of the National Panhellenic Council, the National Pan-Hellenic Council or the Interfraternity Council. Information about the study as well as questions for participation of the fraternity/sorority members was mailed to the advisor (see Appendix E). Of those twenty-one chapter advisors, nine gave approval for the survey to be distributed to their chapters. All four National Pan-Hellenic Council organization's advisors represented on the campus provided consent to survey the chapter members. Two National Panhellenic Council and three Interfraternity Council organizations agreed to participate in the study, but only two IFC fraternities returned the
surveys. The researcher contacted the third chapter president on numerous occasions after surveys were distributed; however, no return contact was ever received from the third chapter president.

Chapters were advised that the study would not identify a particular organization or member who completed the survey. This was to ensure confidentiality of the participants and member organizations. For this reason, the names of the specific chapters that participated in the study are not listed.

The participants were from the fraternity/sorority community of a mid-sized public university located in the southeastern region of the United States with an undergraduate enrollment of 12,809. The fraternity/sorority community was comprised of 1,323 students, of which 603 were male and 720 were female (Fraternity/Sorority Academic Standings Report Fall Semester 2001). The total number of respondents to the survey was 176 or 13.3 percent of the total Fraternity/Sorority population at the university. The largest number of respondents came from the Interfraternity Council (IFC) and National Panhellenic Council (NPC) member fraternities and sororities groups with 139 respondents, or 79 percent of the survey participants. While the number of National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) respondents was 37, it is 64 percent of the NPHC population.

The classification breakdown of the respondents is as follows: freshman 22.7 percent, sophomore 21 percent, junior 30.7 percent, and senior 25.6 percent.
Research Design

The research was a descriptive study using survey methodology to determine the fraternity and sorority member's perceptions of barriers to collaboration between IFC/NPC member organizations and NPHC member organizations.

Instrumentation

The researcher designed two surveys: one for IFC/NPC fraternity and sorority chapters (see Appendix F) and one for NPHC fraternity and sorority chapters (see Appendix G). The items found in the various sections were derived from the literature review and personal observation of the IFC and NPC member fraternities and sororities working with or alongside NPHC member fraternities and sororities on campuses. The items were designed to measure the reasons for collaborative efforts between the IFC and NPC groups and between NPHC groups as well as the reasons for no collaboration.

The surveys consisted of fifteen questions, with directions to circle the most appropriate corresponding answer, and with space labeled "other" for a write in response on questions eleven, fourteen and fifteen if a respondent did not find an answer provided to his or her liking. The choices provided for said questions were consistent with information gathered in the literature review.

The first part of the survey dealt with respondent descriptive information: classification, governing council, and if he or she held an officer position within his or her chapter. The next two questions asked about the student's knowledge of the cross racial councils. The remainder of the survey is comprised of the chapter's activities with their own racial group and with other racial organizations.
The membership council for the chapter determined which survey the participants would receive. The surveys were almost identical and dealt with collaborative participation of chapters. The exception was on questions five, six, nine, ten, twelve, and thirteen. On said questions, the governing councils were switched to the other corresponding governing council. For example, on question five for an IFC/NPC chapter it would read: "Do you know a member of an NPHC fraternity or sorority?" While on an NPHC survey the "NPHC" would be replaced with "IFC/NPC." This was the only difference in the instrument for participating chapters. The survey was designed so that no specific fraternity or sorority or their members would be identifiable.

Procedure

Upon receipt of the approval from IRB, university fraternity and sorority advisor, and the chapter advisor, the chapter's current president was then contacted by phone to discuss distribution of the surveys at an upcoming chapter meeting. Distribution of the survey with attached consent letter (see Appendix H) was completed through either the president or the researcher. If a fraternity or sorority was having a secret ritual meeting, the president distributed and collected the surveys. In the instances when the chapter was not having a ritual meeting, the researcher distributed the survey. The chapter president or the researcher collected the data upon completion of the survey. When necessary, the survey information was returned to the researcher by the chapter president upon completion of the meeting. If the president collected the data, arrangements were made to pick up the surveys. All information was collected in the spring academic semester during the month of April of 2002.
The participants received a consent letter stapled with the survey. The participants were asked to complete the survey during a regularly scheduled meeting by their local chapter president or by the researcher. Students under the age of 18 were asked not to complete the survey.

Data Analysis

The data was entered and analyzed using the computer program Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The computer program SPSS was used to calculate the responses to compare the differences between NPHC members and IFC/NPC members on the survey questions. The items not answered on the survey by the participants were entered as "missing data." Where data are shown with the division of IFC/NPC and NPHC organizations, the percentage is reflective of the number of participants associated with the Interfraternity Council, National Panhellenic Council, and the National Pan-Hellenic Council that responded to the question.
CHAPTER IV

Results

The research question, what are the barriers to collaborative efforts between the traditionally European-American fraternities and sororities and the historically African-American fraternities and sororities, were addressed by a series of sub questions.

The first three items on the survey provided demographic information of participants which was as follows: 20.5% were members of IFC fraternities, 58.5% were members of NPC women's fraternities or sororities representing traditionally European-American organizations, and 21% were representatives of NPHC historically African-American fraternities and sororities. The classification of members was as follows: 22.7% were freshman, 21% were sophomores, 30.7% were juniors, and 25.6% were seniors. Participants responding that they held an officer position were 40.3%, while 59.7% did not hold an officer position.

The results that correspond with question number four on the survey were that 55.7% of the participants indicate that their chapter had at least one member who was of a different ethnic background than the prevailing majority of their chapter. The participants who responded that they did not have such a member within their chapter was 35.2% and 8.5% were not sure.

Question five addressed participants' knowledge of the members of the different fraternities and sororities represented by the cross-racial council(s) organizations. This
was to see if lack of knowledge and/or lack of personal contact would be a deterrent to collaboration with the various councils' member organizations. IFC and NPC member fraternities and sororities were asked if they knew a member of an NPHC fraternity or sorority, and NPHC members were asked if they knew an IFC/NPC member. The NPHC participants stated that 81.6% of them knew a member of an IFC or NPC organization, and 18.4% stated they did not know a member. Slightly over half, 52.2% of the IFC/NPC participants, knew a member of the NPHC member organizations, and 47.8% stated they did not know a member of the NPHC member organizations. The NPHC responses were much higher than that of IFC/NPC members, while IFC/NPC participants were about equal with those knowing a member and those who did not.

Question six asked participants to respond to knowledge of the cross racial council's fraternities and sororities. Knowledge of the various councils differed slightly from knowledge of membership. Both councils were similar in stating they had "little" knowledge of the fraternities and sororities within the other councils: IFC/NPC 61.5% and NPHC 63.2%. Participants with a response of "none" represented 30.4% of IFC/NPC and 23.7% of NPHC responses. A small portion of the IFC/NPC stated "extensive," 1.5%, whereas the remaining 3.6% for IFC/NPC and 13.1% for NPHC was represented by the response of "a lot". IFC/NPC and NPHC groups did not differ vastly on their knowledge of the opposite governing councils or member organizations. It is also noticeable the amount of participants who utilized the option of "none" within this particular item on the survey, 54.1% of the total participants indicated no knowledge of the cross racial councils.
The following two items on the survey, seven and eight were designed to determine if groups were sponsoring collaborative activities on campus. The total participant's response to item seven on whether or not they had hosted an event with another fraternity or sorority in the current year was as follows: 94.3% Yes, 5.1% No and .6% did not respond to the question. There was little difference between the two groups when separated by councils: IFC/NPC organizations 96.4% and 89.2% for NPHC organizations. Therefore, responses to item seven on the survey indicate that chapters are co-sponsoring events. The follow up question centered on the amount of activities hosted.

The number of joint events was similar as well. In response to item eight IFC/NPC organizations reported that 44.9% and NPHC organizations at 63.6% had one to two collaborative activities within the past year. The numbers varied at the three to five events mark with IFC/NPC organizations responding with an increase to 47.1% and a decrease to 21.2% for NPHC organizations. The percentage reporting zero joint activities was 1.5% for IFC/NPC organizations and 9.1% for NPHC organizations. The remainder of the responses was found in the six to eight and nine or more categories.

The focus of next two survey items, nine and ten, was on whether or not any efforts to collaborate occurred among European-American chapters and among African-American chapters. Table 1 addresses the number of times the organization initiated (asked) collaboration with another organization and Table 2 addresses the number of times they had been asked for collaborative efforts.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 9: Initiation of collaboration within IFC/NPC or NPHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10: Number times a similar council(s) had been asked for collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Table 1 regarding the initiation of collaborative efforts, the majority of participants regardless of council membership were unsure as to who initiated the efforts for their chapter to collaborate with another chapter within similar council(s); 35.5% for IFC/NPC and 27% for NPHC. The second most frequent response for both IFC/NPC, 29.9% and NPHC, 24.3% members was the three to five times for asking others.

From Table 2 regarding the request to collaborative efforts, the most frequent response for IFC/NPC, 33.6% and NPHC, 35.1% was that they were "unsure" as to how
many times they had been asked for collaboration. The second frequent was three to five times for IFC/NPC, 29.9% and NPHC 27%.

Therefore, responses to 9 and 10 indicate that there is a collaborative effort between similar councils. However, participants were unsure as to who initiated the collaboration and the number of times a group has been asked for a collaborative effort.

Item eleven centered on the reasons for the collaboration of the chapters within the same council, again IFC/NPC with IFC/NPC and NPHC with NPHC member organizations. The results are shown in Table 3. Participants were allowed to circle one or more reasons for this item on the survey.

| Table 3 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Item 11: Reasons for collaboration between similar racial councils** | **IFC/NPC** | **NPHC** |
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **Opportunity to Meet People** | 77.8% | 22.2% | 48.1% | 51.9% |
| **Financial Resources** | 28.7% | 71.3% | 25.9% | 74.1% |
| **Popular Group** | 30.6% | 69.4% | 18.5% | 81.5% |
| **Personal Contact** | 31.5% | 68.5% | 22.2% | 77.8% |
| **Large Membership** | 16.7% | 83.3% | 11.1% | 88.9% |
| **Close Proximity** | 16.7% | 83.3% | 11.1% | 88.9% |
| **Other** | 11.7% | 88.3% | 22.9% | 77.1% |

The most frequent reason for collaboration within similar racial councils, IFC/NPC with IFC/NPC and NPHC with NPHC, was the opportunity to meet people, for both IFC/NPC (77.8%) and NPHC (48.1%) participants. IFC/NPC participants cited personal contact (31.5%), working with a popular organization (30.6%) and financial resources (28%) as their reasons for collaboration with the other European-American
fraternities and sororities. NPHC participants cited financial resources (25.9%), other (22.9%) and personal contact (22.2%) as their top reasons for collaboration with the other African-American fraternities and sororities. Large membership and close proximity were not strong reasons for both IFC/NPC and NPHC members at 16.7% for both items for IFC/NPC and 11.1% for NPHC members.

The following were responses participants chose to write in on item eleven and indicate other reasons for collaboration on the survey, 11.7% from IFC/NPC participants and 22.9% from NPHC participants had write in responses: "Philanthropy/community service" (seven responses), "attempt to get a closer bond" (two responses), "to have fun" (one response), "be involved" (one response), "keep active" (one response), "interact with a different organization" (one response), "unity" (one response), and "gain leadership skills" (one response). There were seven write in responses who indicated they were unsure/didn't know.

Where items nine and ten focused on how many times activity occurred within similar racial councils, items twelve and thirteen were concerned with cross racial governing council collaboration. These items were designed to determine how often an IFC or NPC chapter had asked or had been asked for collaboration by an NPHC chapter and likewise for NPHC chapters.

In response to item twelve, "how many times an organization initiated an activity with a cross racial council's organization" 40% percent of NPHC and 30.6% of IFC/NPC participants responded to one to two times. Participants who were unsure comprised 29.9% of the IFC/NPC and 31.4% of the NPHC responses. The selection of zero as a
response was calculated as 37.3% of IFC/NPC and 22.9% of NPHC responses in the survey. The remainder 2.2% for IFC/NPC and 5.7% for NPHC was comprised of three to five and nine or more.

Response to "how many times one group had been asked by the other cross racial governing council's organization" or item thirteen, were varied. Participants who were unsure comprised 31.1% of the IFC/NPC responses and 40% of the NPHC responses. One to two times was ranked by IFC/NPC with the highest percentage with 38.6%; NPHC had response of 22.9%. The three to five times were comparable between the councils with IFC/NPC 30.3% and NPHC 31.4%. NPHC organizations indicated a 5.7% in the six to eight ranges. There is indication of activity while participants were unsure as to who initiated the activity for the possible collaboration.

Question fourteen asked the reasons for the collaborative efforts between cross-racial council organizations. The responses are found in Table 4. Outside of "other", the items, which received higher percentages of "yes" responses included-- the opportunity to meet people and for financial resources. Participants were allowed to circle one or more reasons for this item on the survey.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14: Reasons for collaboration between cross racial councils</th>
<th>IFC/NPC</th>
<th>NPHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to Meet People</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Contact</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Group</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Membership</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Proximity</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While financial resources were the most frequent choice for IFC/NPC organizations, at 35% it ranked second for NPHC at 19%, although slightly less than half the number found in IFC/NPC responses. The most frequent for NPHC members was the opportunity to meet people at 28.6%, which was second on the responses from IFC/NPC members at 20%.

The following were responses participants chose to write in on item fourteen on the survey, 48.5% from IFC/NPC participants and 30.3% from NPHC participants. These were the highest totals for both councils: "Philanthropy" (twelve responses), "none" (six responses), "Greek Week/for all Greeks" (two responses), "fundraiser" (two responses), "Greek Life" (one response), "had to" (one response), "schedule conflicts" (one response), and "they suck" (one response) (written by a member of the IFC/NPC subsection). There were eight write in responses whose only information to the item indicated they were unsure/don't know.
The final question of the survey addressed the reason for not having collaborated with the cross council's member fraternities and sororities. Table 9 addresses their responses. Participants were allowed to circle one or more reasons for this item on the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15: Reasons for no collaborative efforts</th>
<th>IFC/NPC</th>
<th>NPHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Communication</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Invitation</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of racist attitudes</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No personal contact</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been done</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Resistance</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Membership</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Influence</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Proximity</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational purpose</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other #15</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate a lack of communication at 48.9% for IFC/NPC and 55.9% for NPHC participants as the reason for the lack of collaborative efforts between the councils and council member fraternities and sororities. In addition, the second highest was a lack of invitation at 41.5% for IFC/NPC and 50% for NPHC. The remaining items received a considerable high response of "no", indicating that they were not barriers to
collaboration between cross councils. NPHC members found that perception of racist attitudes to be more significant at 29.4%, which was almost tripled that of IFC/NPC members at 11.7%. While IFC/NPC members found the lack of personal contact to be more of an inhibitor at 30.9%, the NPHC members responded at 17.6%. Alumni influence 1.1% for IFC/NPC and 2.9% for NPHC, geographic proximity 1.1% for IFC/NPC and 5.9% for NPHC, and organizational purpose 0% for IFC/NPC and 2.9% for NPHC were found to be the least common reasons for both groups.

The following were responses participants chose to write in on item fifteen on the survey, 35.4% from IFC/NPC participants and 13.9% from NPHC participants: "Clash in schedules" (eighteen responses), "none" (two responses), "time conflicts" (one response), "busy" (one response), "communication issues" (one response), (the following were written by NPC/IFC respondents) "they don't like whites" (one response), "cultural differences" (one response), "[The community] is a racist ignorant town who does not like stuff like that" (one response), and "they suck" (one response). There were five write in responses whose only response to the item indicated they were unsure/don't know.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The first research question "does lack of knowledge of the other councils or
member fraternities/sororities of said councils inhibit collaboration" brought several
items to the forefront of the survey. Almost half, 47.8%, of the IFC/NPC fraternity's and
sororities' participants did not know a member of an NPHC member fraternity or sorority.
As well, 89.2% of the total participants of the survey indicated having no or little
knowledge of the cross racial councils' member organizations: this is for both IFC/NPC
and NPHC. Reasons for collaboration show it is for the opportunity to meet people: this
was the most frequent response for both IFC/NPC and NPHC councils as well.

It is interesting to note that the IFC and NPC organizations stated the
collaboration of their activities was to get to meet other people. As stated, almost half of
the IFC and NPC members did not know a member of an NPHC fraternity or sorority.
This would indicate the opportunity to meet new people is extensive within the NPHC
council's fraternities and sororities. Additionally, knowledge of the various governing
councils and their member organizations is low. It would suggest that education about
the councils and organizations represented by the councils is essential to bridging the gap
for collaboration. If the true response is for the opportunity to meet new people within
those organizations, what impedes the collaboration? Is it that people only have a desire

to know someone similar to them?

The second question was concerned with the number of collaborative events and

its potential to inhibit collaborative efforts between cross racial councils. The

overwhelming majority 94.3% of total participants indicated having held a joint activity

with another fraternity or sorority in the past year. The most frequent responses for both

IFC/NPC and NPHC organizations fell into one to two, IFC/NPC 44.9% and NPHC 63.6%

and the three to five responses IFC/NPC 47.1% and NPHC 21.2%, at 86.9% combined together for both cross racial councils. This would indicate the possibility of

potential collaborative efforts is positive due to the amount of joint activity being

conducted by the participants. Therefore, the amount of collaborative activity does not

appear to be a hindrance to collaborative efforts.

Question three was concerned with the reasons for collaboration within similar

racial council(s). The majority of both IFC/NPC and NPHC participants felt the

opportunity to meet people was the most frequent response, 77.8% for IFC/NPC and

48.1% for NPHC. Personal contact at 31.5% for IFC/NPC and 22.2% for NPHC was

another possible reason for collaborative activity. Also, financial resources were another

item that received slightly more frequent responses. Write in items for the item included

being involved, closer bond, and unity as being items to bring the fraternity and sorority

system closer as a cohesive group.

The fourth question as to whether lack of invitation inhibits collaboration yielded

interesting data. Regardless of similar racial council organization or cross racial council
organization, a large portion of both the IFC/NPC and NPHC participants were unsure as to who initiated collaboration. Within similar racial council(s) the second most frequent response was the three to five times that a chapter had initiated or had been asked for a collaborative effort.

The participants who were unsure or selected zero for who initiated the cross racial collaborative activity totaled 67.7% for IFC/NPC and 54.3% for NPHC. The one to two times for one's chapter initiating cross racial collaborative activity had a response rate of 30.6% for IFC/NPC and 40% for NPHC. Again participants were unsure as to having been asked for cross racial collaborative activity with IFC/NPC at 31.1% and NPHC at 40%. The second most frequent response was the three to five mark at 30.3% for IFC/NPC and 31.4% for NPHC. Although it appears there is an invitation for collaboration for joint activities, both IFC/NPC and NPHC participants selected lack of invitation as the second most frequent inhibitor to collaborative efforts.

Question five as to reasons for collaboration if they did occur indicated for philanthropic reasons. This was found within the other section as a write in response. Financial resources, 35% for IFC/NPC and 19% for NPHC and the opportunity to meet people at 20% for IFC/NPC and 28.6% for NPHC were found to be the most frequent responses. Other write in responses, although not as numerous as the others, wrote the collaboration was due to the "Greek Life Office" and "events for all the fraternities and sororities". Philanthropy is consistent with the literature, since it was found to be among many of the central purposes of almost every fraternity and sorority.
The sixth research question was concerned with the reasons collaboration did not occur between cross racial council organizations. Lack of communication and lack of invitation were the two most frequent responses for the reasons for inhibiting collaboration by both IFC/NPC and NPHC respondents. Many indicated having asked or been asked by the cross council's organization for joint activities. Systems should be in place to assist the flow of communication between the councils. Involvement in major events, such as Greek Week and other activities, should be shared equally between the three councils. Another possibility is for representatives from each of the three different councils to have a representative to the other councils. Are the respondents trying to displace the blame of invitation to the opposite group?

NPHC fraternities and sororities indicated the perception of racist attitudes was a reason for not participating with the IFC and NPC groups. This would be consistent with the literature with numerous cases of racist actions found within the confines of the IFC and NPC member organizations across campuses. It is also interesting to note that written in remarks in the "other" section for items eleven, fourteen, and fifteen received racial remarks from the IFC/NPC participants. In response to why collaboration had not occurred, responses of "they don't like whites", "they suck", and "[the community] is a racist ignorant town that does not like things like that" were supportive of some of the perceptions of racist attitudes perceived by the NPHC members in their response to why collaboration had not occurred. The flying of the Confederate flag by IFC member organizations is a racist action perceived by many people. The Confederate battle flag became a problem for one IFC member organization. They had to adopt a by-law on the
national level in August of 2001 at their 69th convention in Savannah, Georgia. The by-law is as follows:

"Regarding the battle flag, the following bylaw was adopted after much discussion and debate: 9-264. Display of the Confederate Battle Flag. The display of the Confederate Battle Flag shall be prohibited from any chapter house, lodge, or meeting place: a "display" shall mean a visible presence from the exterior of said property and from the common areas within. The Confederate Battle Flag shall not be displayed at any fraternity function or gathering, on or off property associated with Kappa Alpha Order. The Confederate Battle Flag shall not be associated with Kappa Alpha Order by any medium including, but not limited to, fabric pattern, printed material, painted or stenciled surfaces, or computer Web sites. The Confederate Battle Flag shall not be incorporated into the design of clothing or any other items bearing symbolism of Kappa Alpha Order," (Kappa Alpha Order Website).

These items support the reluctance of NPHC organization to participate with IFC and NPC groups. The lack of collaboration is a hindrance for the fraternity and sorority community at large. The membership and the organizations miss out on the opportunity to experience others and their culture, save money on cost of items for a party or activity, miss extra money to be earned for philanthropy, or extra assistance with manual labor at a community service event.

However, not all groups are guilty of such activities. Some fraternities and sororities may have on the international or national level at one point been less accepting
of African-American members with the restrictions on membership. There have been movements within the system to change these items. One would be hard pressed to find an international or national fraternity or sorority that has a written restriction on membership selection. The individual chapters have the responsibility of membership selection. While there may not be a written rule, it is unfortunate that there are some chapters who are unable see past the issue of skin color.

Although a member may not have racist attitudes at the beginning of his or her experience in the fraternity or sorority, socialization into the organization has the possibility of changing his or her structure of belief.

"When a student spends a great deal of time in a living group of his [or her] own choice, and is dependent on its members for much of his [or her] scrutiny and satisfaction, he [or she] should be vulnerable to potential influence from this group. His [or her] values may be affected, first because the group's members provide cues concerning what notions are "universally shared"; second, because they induce the person to engage in behaviors that he [or she] may subsequently be called upon to justify to himself [or herself] or to others; third, because the group members are in a position to punish serious deviation from their norms by withdrawing support from the offender" (Scott, 1965, p. 201).

The socialization process into an organization does not necessarily just involve racist attitudes. The process could be as simple as not liking a particular fraternity or sorority. The new member may have no clue as to why this is in place, but the evolution of the member through the organization can soon create distaste for the organization for
the reason that no one else likes the organization. Conversely socialization could work to help students become more tolerant of people who are different from him or her. If an individual encounters an atmosphere where the opportunity to interact and learn about someone who is different is valued, then this could diminish their biases against someone who is "perceived" to be different than he or she.

Though the margin is small on positive responses to membership resistance as an inhibitor of collaboration between the councils, the IFC/NPC response is double that of the NPHC response. This would indicate that the possible resistance to collaboration could be from the IFC/NPC fraternities and sororities, more so than from the NPHC fraternities and sororities. If the prevailing majority is unwilling to collaborate with the minority groups, then the problem continues to be a struggle. Information about education of the value of collaboration and diversity may need to focus on the IFC/NPC organizations.

Members in their identity development could be at stages where the members of the IFC and NPC organizations could view "race as not a factor" or hold to the beliefs that "whites are better than other groups." Potentially, members of the NPHC organizations have moved passed the second stage of Cross's Black Identity model, the encounter stage of the development model (Sue, 1999).

Limitations

If the study were to be duplicated, the following list of limitations found by the researcher should be taken into account. The study was limited by a few cumbersome factors. Selection of participants was largely on advisor approval. Although it was made
clear no individual group or any particular member could be identified, advisor approval was low. Also, the constructed survey had a flaw. Question fourteen; "What were the reasons for collaboration?" should have been a conditional response based on the response if there had been collaboration between the IFC/NPC and NPHC organizations. This resulted in a low response rate on the question and made it difficult to discern a particular answer. Item fourteen posed an additional problem in research. The question is designed to ask if there were collaborative efforts between the IFC/NPC and NPHC and vice versa. However, it did not read, "do not fill out unless there was collaborative efforts" on the survey. This should lead a person to believe if there had been "no collaboration" to leave the question blank. This is how the researcher interpreted the question and the data.

The surveys were distributed at a chapter meeting with members of their fraternity or sorority seated closely around them. It is possible not to have received an honest answer to a question if a sister or brother could view a member marking racist items about their organization.

**Implications for Further Research**

The results and limitations of this research suggest the opportunity for further research. A study with every governing council organization participating in the survey would be beneficial for future research. In addition, having those surveyed complete the item in private without the possibility of peers to see the responses would be beneficial.

Other further research ideas stemming from the research would be to examine the level of cultural identity awareness of IFC, NPC, and NPHC members. Evaluate to see if
the stages of cultural identity developments are inhibitors to collaboration. Furthermore, research on identity development as part of membership selection into a fraternity or sorority could be conducted.

**Implications for Practice**

Advisors are the primary contact with the undergraduate leaders. The fraternity and sorority advisors employed by the college or university and the volunteer alumni working with the particular chapters are the ones who are in a position to encourage and influence collaborative efforts (Whipple, 1998). "The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs specified as one of the six goals for the fraternity and sorority advising program: promoting an appreciation for different lifestyles and cultural heritages" (Rentz, 1996, p. 152). The respondents stated in the "Other" section on the survey that the Greek Life Office mandated some of the activities. These will help members to know one another to establish a relationship for future unstructured efforts.

These activities may be the encouragement members need to become familiar with the members in the other organizations. This would provide the personal contact some of them need to participate with the other council groups. Furthermore, the governing councils, the Interfraternity Council, National Panhellenic Council and the National Pan-Hellenic Councils programming together as a large council with allow the leaders of the councils to know members. They, in turn, pass along the ability to know about each other to members of their own chapters.
Host an All Greek retreat to address some of the issues everyone is facing for the education on diversity and its role within the university and in society. Have representatives from every chapter on campus attend the retreat. Set up goals and prepare for the accomplishment of the goals and evaluation of the efforts. It is important that the leaders have stake in the system because these are the people that will convey the message to their chapter.

As stated in the research, one continued criticism of the fraternity and sorority system is the lack of tolerance for minority groups by race, religion and gender. This continues to be a major problem with the system. Whipple stated programs should be encouraged which promote diversity in membership and a realization of the importance of valuing differences. "Some Greek governing boards have established human relations committees that work to promote, through programming, more sensitive and tolerant committees. Student affairs staff should continually look for educational opportunities to create sensitivity and understanding among all students" (Arentz, 1996, p. 151).

As stated before, the institution must value diversity to cultivate the support of diversity within the student body. The institution must be moving along the continuum in order to increase the support and the value of diversity with students and employees. The students learn from administrators, faculty, and student affairs personnel; if they are conveying these principles outwardly, students will take their cue as to its value within the university and within society.

Students and both volunteer and university advisors need to be educated about the changing student characteristics (Whipple, 1998). Education of the fraternity and sorority
system and knowledge of each of the organizations are possibly the key factors, which will assist the members in moving past some of the barriers to collaborative efforts among Interfraternity Council/National Panhellenic Council and National Pan-Hellenic Council fraternities and sororities. "Students need to understand that the acceptance of others can lead to the strengthening of their own group" (Arentz, 1996, p. 156). One cannot just stop providing the education; the next step is to move forward with education to create action. The encouragement by advisors, key officers, and influential members will move the chapters in a direction of understanding and collaboration.
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APPENDIX A

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE NATIONAL PANHELLENIC CONFERENCE

Alpha Chi Omega
Alpha Delta Pi
Alpha Epsilon Phi
Alpha Gamma Delta
Alpha Omicron Pi
Alpha Phi
Alpha Sigma Alpha
Alpha Sigma Tau
Alpha Xi Delta
Chi Omega
Delta Delta Delta
Delta Gamma
Delta Phi Epsilon
Delta Zeta
Gamma Phi Beta
Kappa Alpha Theta
Kappa Delta
Kappa Kappa Gamma
Phi Mu
Phi Sigma Sigma
Pi Beta Phi
Sigma Delta Tau
Sigma Kappa
Sigma Sigma Sigma
Theta Phi Alpha
Zeta Tau Alpha
APPENDIX B

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE NORTH-AMERICAN INTERFRATERNITY CONFERENCE

Acacia
  Alpha Chi Rho
Alpha Delta Gamma
  Alpha Delta Phi
  Alpha Epsilon Pi
Alpha Gamma Rho
Alpha Gamma Sigma
Alpha Kappa Lambda
Alpha Phi Delta
Alpha Sigma Phi
Alpha Tau Omega
Beta Sigma Psi
Beta Theta Pi
  Chi Phi
  Chi Psi
  Delta Chi
  Delta Psi
Delta Sigma Phi
Delta Tau Delta
Delta Upsilon
  FarmHouse
  Iota Phi Theta
Kappa Alpha Order
Kappa Alpha Psi
Kappa Alpha Society
  Kappa Delta Phi
Kappa Delta Rho
Kappa Sigma
Lambda Chi Alpha
Lambda Phi Epsilon
Lambda Sigma Upsilon
Lambda Theta Phi
  Phi Delta Theta
  Phi Eta Psi
  Phi Gamma Delta
Phi Iota Alpha
Phi Kappa Psi
Phi Kappa Sigma
Phi Kappa Tau
Phi Kappa Theta
Phi Lambda Chi
Phi Mu Delta
Phi Sigma Kappa
Phi Sigma Phi
Pi Kappa Alpha
Pi Kappa Phi
Pi Lambda Phi
Psi Upsilon
Sigma Alpha Epsilon
Sigma Alpha Mu
Sigma Chi
Sigma Lambda Beta
Sigma Nu
Sigma Phi Epsilon
Sigma Phi Society
Sigma Pi
Sigma Tau Gamma
Tau Delta Phi
Tau Epsilon Phi
Tau Kappa Epsilon
Theta Chi
Theta Delta Chi
Theta Xi
Triangle
Zeta Beta Tau
Zeta Psi
APPENDIX C

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE NATIONAL PAN-HELLENIC COUNCIL

Alpha Kappa Alpha
Alpha Phi Alpha
Delta Sigma Theta
Iota Phi Theta
Kappa Alpha Psi
Omega Psi Phi
Phi Beta Sigma
Sigma Gamma Rho
Zeta Phi Beta
To: James D. Louk  
Leadership, Technology and Human Development  

Cc: Dale Grant, Faculty Advisor  
Leadership, Technology and Human Development  

From: Mr. Neil Garretson, Coordinator  
Research Oversight Committees (AACUC/IBC/IRB)  

Date: April 15, 2002  

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research  

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I am writing to inform you that we have completed the review of your Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in your proposed research, “What are the barriers between traditionally Caucasian fraternities and sororities and historically African-American fraternities and sororities?” It is the determination of the Chair, on behalf of the Institutional Review Board, that your proposed research adequately protects the rights of human subjects. Your research is approved in accordance with the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR §46.101(b)(2)), which states:

(2) Research involving the use of...survey procedures, interview procedures (as long as)

(i) information obtained (either) is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects’ responses outside the research could (not) reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects’ financial standing, employability, or reputation.

However, this approval is conditional upon the following revisions and/or additions being completed prior to the collection of any data:

1. Please ensure that the subsequent letters of approval/support are forwarded to the IRB for inclusion in your file.
2. In addition, we are still awaiting a letter from Mrs. Jane Campagne, Coordinator of Greek Life, that you mentioned.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns about these conditions of approval, please do not hesitate to contact the IRB Coordinator. Please send a copy of all revised and/or additional materials to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs (PO Box 8005).

This IRB approval is in effect for one year from the date of this letter. If at the end of that time, there have been no changes to the exempted research protocol, you may request an extension of the approval period for an additional year. If the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, whether or not it is believed to be related to the study, within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator prior to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, please notify the IRB Coordinator so that your file may be closed.
To: James D. Louie  
Leadership, Technology and Human Development

Cc: Dale Grant, Faculty Advisor  
Leadership, Technology and Human Development

From: Mr. Neil Garrison, Coordinator  
Research Oversight Committee (IRB/ACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: April 17, 2002

Subject: Status of Conditional IRB Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Committee has received your revised and/or additional application materials for the approved research titled, "What are the barriers between traditionally Caucasian fraternities and sororities and historically African-American fraternities and sororities?" You have satisfactorily met the conditions of your Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval as detailed in the April 15, 2002 approval letter.

Please remember that this approval is in effect for one year (4/15/02 - 4/15/03) and if at the end of that time there have been no substantive changes to the approved methodology, you may request a one year extension of the approval period.

Good luck with your research efforts, and if you have any questions, comments, or concerns about the status of your approval, please do not hesitate to contact me.
APPENDIX E

LETTERS SENT TO FRATERNITY AND SORORITY ADVISORS

February 20, 2002

Dear Georgia Southern Fraternity/Sorority Advisor:

My name is James David Louk. I am a graduate student, pursuing my Master's Degree in Higher Education Student Services Program at Georgia Southern University. I am working on my thesis and I am very interested in obtaining information from Georgia Southern University Greek Chapters for input on my research. My topic deals with Fraternity and Sorority Life. I myself am a member of an international social fraternity. Your chapter's participation is crucial.

I am asking the chapter take 5 minutes or less to complete the attached questionnaire, which the chapter will receive at a March meeting. I have provided you with a copy of the survey. Jane Campagne, Director of Greek Life has reviewed the survey and also serves on my thesis committee. If a member is under the age of 18, I ask they please do not complete the survey. All the information they provide will be held in confidence and used solely for the purpose of this research.

A chapter member may refuse to answer any of the questions. This information will only be used for group analysis and will not be singled out individually. In addition, no chapter will be able to be identified in the results. Once the data has been analyzed for my thesis, it will be destroyed. Completion of this survey will be considered permission to use their data in this study. An honest response to each item in the survey is very important to the study. Upon completion of the survey I will gladly pick up the completed items that evening from the chapter's meeting location.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, please contact me at 688-2430, or by electronic mail at james_d_louk@gasou.edu. If at any time you have concerns about the chapter members' rights as research participants in the study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board Coordinator at the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (912) 681-5565.

Thank you for your commitment to research. I really appreciate all of your contributions to information pertaining to Fraternity/Sorority Life. With this information, Georgia Southern University will be able to better serve its students. If you would like to know the results of this study, my thesis will be available in the Georgia Southern University Henderson Library by fall of 2002.

Sincerely,

James David Louk
Dear:

My name is James David Louk; I recently mailed a survey and letter for your review. The survey is part of my thesis for completion of my Masters Degree in Higher Education Student Services at Georgia Southern University.

The Institutional Review Board has indicated that I need approval in order to distribute the surveys to each fraternity/sorority. Enclosed please find a copy of the original letter, the survey, a consent letter for your signature, and a return envelope with postage.

The survey has one change to provide clarity, which is highlighted. Again, confidentiality of member and chapter is maintained.

Please fax the signed consent letter to me at 912-871-1148 by April 3rd as well as mailing it. My anticipated graduation date is May 4th, the reason for the urgency.

Thank you for your work with your Greek letter organization and your assistance in the completion of my thesis.

Thank you,

James David Louk
Advisor Consent Letter

I am aware of James David Louk's research on Greek Letter organizations. I am providing him the ability to survey the ______________ chapter at Georgia Southern University.

________________________
Fraternity/Sorority Advisor
APPENDIX F

IFC/NPC SURVEY

Survey for IFC/NPC Chapters

1) What is your classification?
   Freshman   Sophomore   Junior   Senior

2) Which governing body does your chapter belong to?
   Inter-Fraternity Council (IFC)   Panhellenic (PHA)
   National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC)

3) Do you hold an officer position within your chapter?
   Yes   No

4) Does your chapter have a member of a different ethnic background than the prevailing majority in your chapter?
   Yes   No   Not Sure

5) Do you know a member of an NPHC fraternity or sorority?
   Yes   No

6) How much do you know about NPHC fraternities or sororities?
   None   A little   A lot   Extensive

7) Has your chapter hosted an event with any fraternity or sorority this year?
   Yes   No

8) If Yes, how many joint activities has your chapter had with the other chapters within the past year?
   0   1-2   3-5   6-8   9+
9) How many times has your chapter **asked** an IFC/NPC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

10) How many times has your chapter **been asked** by an IFC/NPC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

11) What were the reasons for the collaboration? (circle all that apply)

- financial resources
- popular group opportunity to meet people
- large membership
- close proximity
- personal contact
- Other

12) How many times has your chapter **asked** an NPHC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

13) How many times has your chapter **been asked** by an NPHC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

14) What were the reasons for the collaboration? (circle all that apply)

- financial resources
- popular group opportunity to meet people
- large membership
- close proximity
- personal contact
- Other
15) For what reason would you have not participated with NPHC? (circle all that apply)

- low membership
- lack of communication
- never been done
- member resistance
- lack of invitation
- no personal contact
- financial resources
- alumni influence
- perception of racist attitudes
- organizational structure
- geographic proximity
- organizational purpose

Other: ________________________________
APPENDIX G

NPHC SURVEY

Survey for NPHC Chapters

1) What is your classification?
   Freshman    Sophomore    Junior    Senior

2) Which governing body does your chapter belong to?
   Inter-Fraternity Council (IFC)    Panhellenic (PHA)
   National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC)

3) Do you hold an officer position within your chapter?
   Yes         No

4) Does your chapter have a member of a different ethnic background than the prevailing majority in your chapter?
   Yes          No          Not Sure

5) Do you know a member of an NPHC fraternity or sorority?
   Yes          No

6) How much do you know about NPHC fraternities or sororities?
   None          A little     A lot         Extensive

7) Has your chapter hosted an event with any fraternity or sorority this year?
   Yes          No

8) If Yes, how many joint activities has your chapter had with the other chapters within the past year?
   0            1-2        3-5        6-8        9+
9) How many times has your chapter asked an IFC/NPC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

10) How many times has your chapter been asked by an IFC/NPC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

11) What were the reasons for the collaboration? (circle all that apply)

- financial resources
- popular group
- opportunity to meet people
- large membership
- close proximity
- personal contact

Other

12) How many times has your chapter asked an NPHC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

13) How many times has your chapter been asked by an NPHC fraternity or sorority to participate in an activity with your chapter in the past year?

Not sure 0 1-2 3-5 6-8 9+

14) What were the reasons for the collaboration? (circle all that apply)

- financial resources
- popular group
- opportunity to meet people
- large membership
- close proximity
- personal contact

Other
15) For what reason would you have not participated with NPHC? (circle all that apply)

- low membership
- lack of communication
- never been done
- member resistance
- lack of invitation
- no personal contact
- financial resources
- alumni influence
- perception of racist attitudes
- organizational structure
- geographic proximity
- organizational purpose

Other: 

______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX H

SURVEY CONSENT LETTER

February 20, 2002

Dear Fraternity/Sorority Member:

My name is James David Louk. I am a graduate student and pursuing my Master's Degree in Higher Education Student Services Program at Georgia Southern University. I am working on my thesis and I am very interested in obtaining your input for my research. My topic deals with Fraternity and Sorority Life. I would like to get your feedback on your participation in your chapter. I myself am a member of an international social fraternity. Your participation is crucial.

I am asking you to take 5 minutes or less to complete the attached questionnaire. If you are under the age of 18, please do not complete the survey. All the information you provide will be held in confidence and used solely for the purpose of this research.

Also, you have the right to refuse to answer any item, or to withdraw your participation at any time, without penalty. This information will only be used for group analysis and will not be singled out individually. Once the data has been analyzed for my thesis, it will be destroyed. Completion of this survey will be considered permission to use your data in this study. Your honest response to each item in the survey is very important to the study.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, please contact me at 688-2430, or by electronic mail at James_D_Louk@gasou.edu. If at any time you have concerns about your rights as a research participant in the study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board Coordinator at the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (912) 681-5565.

Thank you for your commitment to research. I really appreciate all of your contributions to information pertaining to Fraternity/Sorority Life. With this information, Georgia Southern University will be able to better serve its students. If you would like to know the results of this study, my thesis will be available in the Georgia Southern Henderson Library by fall of 2002.

I will pick up the completed surveys following your chapter meeting.

Sincerely,

James David Louk