A COMPARISON OF VALUE

ORIENTATIONS BETWEEN SORORITY

AND INDEPENDENT RESIDENCE HALL WOMEN

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate College

Wisconsin State University-La Crosse

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Rebecca Romenesko

August, 1971

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY-LA CROSSE

GRADUATE COLLEGE

Candidate: Rebecca Romenesko

We recommend acceptance of this thesis to the Graduate College in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree Master of Science   .

Norene A. Smith
Thesis Committee Member

August 5, 1971
Date

Robert M. Mullally
Thesis Committee Member

August 4, 1971
Date

Jean Foss
Thesis Committee Member

August 4 1971
Date

This thesis is approved for the Graduate College:

James H. McEachron
Dean, Graduate College

August 6, 1971
Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate value orientations
between sorority and dormitory women on the value scales of independence,
sociability, academic achievement, and intellectualism. The subjects
used in this study were the 1971 spring pledge class and the graduating
sorority seniors of the four sororities at Wisconsin State University-
La Crosse. These subjects were matched by academic major and year in
school to a randomly selected dormitory sample of underclassmen and
seniors. The revised form of the intellectualism scale, the sociability
scale which consisted of the social skills and status scale of the Scott
Value Scales were issued to the above subjects. The questionnaire was
intended to measure any differences which may exist between the two
major groups or the four subgroups.

A two by two factorial analysis of the variance was used to
determine any differences between Greek and dormitory students. Dunn's
multiple comparison procedure was utilized in determining differences
between the subgroups.

Results of the statistical analysis indicated no significant
relationship at alpha equal .05 on any of the value scales. Pledges
were significantly lower on the independence scale than dormitory
underclassmen at alpha equal .10. There was a significant difference
between underclassmen and upperclassmen on the independence scale at
alpha equal .10; the results rated the underclassmen higher on
independence. Greek students were significantly higher on the

sociability scale at alpha equal .25. There was no significant difference between Greeks and dormitory students on the academic achievement or intellectualism scale.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The social fraternity and sorority system on American college
campuses is an often misinterpreted organization by the general public.
It is often subject to critical review by newspaper and magazine
articles and viewed by many as an organization of only parties and
pranks. People fail to investigate the true objectives of the fraternal
group and explore the organizing effects for personality integration
provided the individual through membership in such groups. Very little
objective research has been attempted to determine the impact of the
fraternal organization on student development. This study dealt with
sororities only but the term "fraternity" may be used interchangeably on
occasion with the term "sorority". The relationship of membership in a
fraternal organization and the four values of independence, sociability,
academic achievement, and intellectualism as measured by the Scott Value
Scales (1965, p. 249) will be of major concern.

There has been lack of agreement by men of the twentieth century as
to what are valid reasons for belief in values. Three types of claims
have been identified for sanctions of values. These are: (1) divine
revelation, (2) tradition and custom, and (3) human intelligence. No
culture operates completely by one to the exclusion of the other.
Kluckhoim (1962) stated,

Values precisely are abstract standards that transcend the
impulse of the moment and ephemeral situation. Values do not

consist in 'desires' but rather in the desirable-that is,
what we want to feel is right and proper to want for
ourselves and others. (p. 289)

Kluckholm and Strodtbeck in a similar study (1961) stated that these

values exist on a continium in which elements are blended in the overall

picture that characterizes an individual or group. This blending is

referred to as a "value orientation" and is variable from culture to

culture but only in ranking patterns of component parts. Explicitly

Kluckholm stated,

Value orientations are complex but definitely patterned
(rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transitional
interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements
of the evaluative process-the cognitive, the affective,
and the directive elements-which give order and direction
to the everflowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these
relate to the solution of 'common human' problems. (p. 4)

There are a series of value orientation systems which are present

in all societies at all times but are differentially preferred. These

are as follows:

1. Human-nature Orientation

This orientation asks the question, "What is the character

of innate human nature?" and concerns itself with whether man

is good or bad. The Puritan ethic is still prevelant in

American culture which professes that man is basically evil but

has a perfectable human nature. Constant control and discipline

is required to achieve goodness, and the danger of regression

is ever present.

2. Man-nature (supernature) Orientation

"What is the relation of man to nature?" is the concern

here. Is man sugjugative-to-nature, in harmony with nature.

or master over nature? Mastery over nature is the dominant orientation of most Americans. Natural forces of all kinds can be overcome and put to the use of human beings; thus, there is an emphasis on technology.

3. Time Orientation

Time orientation concerns itself with the temporal focus of human life. It questions whether man should place his emphasis on the past, the present, or the future. Their future is anticipated to be "bigger and better." The past is not considered good, and few Americans are simply content with the present.

4. Activity Orientation

The activity orientation centers around man's mode of self-expression in the human personality. The focus is three-fold: being, being-in-becoming, and doing. The being orientation emphasizes spontaneous expression of what is conceived to be given in the human personality, it is a non-developmental conception of activity. The being-in-be-coming shares with the being orientation the concern for the human being rather that what he can accomplish, but the idea of development is paramount in this orientation; it emphasizes the kind of activity which has as its goal the development of all aspects of the self as an integrated whole. The doing orientation is very characteristically American. Its distinctive feature is a demand for the kind of activity which results in accomplishment measurable by standards external to

the acting individual; the nature of the activity is judged
by accomplishments achieved by acting upon persons, things, or
situations. "Let's do something about it" is a stock American
phrase.

5. Relational Orientation

What is man's relationship to other men? Is it lineal,
collateral, or individualistic? In the lineal orientation, the
group goals have primacy. The continuity of the group is
carried through time and ordered positional succession. In the
collateral group the individual is not a human being except as
he is part of a social order. Finally, the individualistic
orientation places its primary focus on the autonomy of the
individual. Individualism is typically American. (Kluckholm
and Strodtreck, 1961, p. 8)

In relating values to society and organizations, Parsons and Bales
(1955) stated,

A society as an ongoing system must develop subsystems which meet
functional requirements as a system. It is a hierarchy of more or
less inclusive subsystems or organizations which can be
progressively more highly differentiated in function in the total
society. (p. 161)

The attainment of specific goals is the defining character of an
organization which distinguishes it from other subsystems. Continuing
along these lines, Parsons (1964) stated,

The main point of reference for analyzing the structure of any
social system is its value pattern. This defines the basic
orientation of the system to the situation in which it operates;
hence, it guides the activities of participant individuals.
.... Since the organization is always defined as a subsystem of a
more comprehensive social system, it must be a subvalue system of
a higher order one. (p. 20)

In general, the values of the organization legitimize its existence as a system and its functional pattern of operation which are necessary to implement the goals. In classifying types of organizations according to their goals, there are basically four:

1. Organizations oriented to economic production as business firms.

2. Organizations oriented to political goals or allocation of power.

3. Integrative organizations which contribute to the efficiency and mechanisms of social control.

4. Pattern-maintenance organizations whose primary concern is cultural, educational and expressive functions. Examples are the churches and schools.

In this research, the activity orientation is the value of concern. The fraternal system has emerged as a specifically American institution. Bairds's Manual of American College Fraternities (1968) defines it as such:

> The American college fraternity is an American institution and the chapter in the form it ideally exists on the college campus is a miniature of the larger American democracy. Institutionally, the fraternity chapter is a dependency of the college. (p. 1)

Being a dependent of the college, the fraternity must profess the values of the college to be a subsystem of it. The American higher education seeks to educate the whole man. A section from the statement of purpose of Wisconsin State University-La Crosse reflects this aim.

> Wisconsin State University-La Crosse seeks to equip its students with a broader and deeper knowledge of themselves and the world in which they live.... Thus, the objective is to help students to learn how to live better with themselves and others, to serve well the communities in which they may earn their livings and to

participate fully in the rights and responsibilities of American and World Citizenship. (p. 33)

Over and above educating the whole man, the university seeks to perpetuate the society under which it was established. As Morris (1961) stated, "The school's first function is to sustain and perpetuate a cherished pattern of living and to guarantee more surely that the society of which they are instruments shall continue to prosper (p. 11)." The American college fraternity shares the ideals and values of the system of higher education and American society as a whole. For these reasons, it is also concerned with the various value orientations held by American society, the university, and the fraternity itself.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to investigate value orientations between sorority and independent women on the value scales of independence, sociability, academic achievement, and intellectualism as measured by the Scott Value Scales to determine if any significant differences existed between the two groups. A subproblem was to determine whether membership in a fraternal organization aids in positive growth of one's development and in personality integration.

IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

On many college campuses the college fraternity is losing the importance it once held. It would appear that they have not been able to meet the challenges of today nor to withstand the misunderstandings directed toward the fraternal system. They have also apparently been unable to convey their ideals and principles to the present college generations. The college fraternity system need not fade away; it has

performed a vital function for many college students. However, the

fraternal groups must be willing to meet the challenges confronting

them. Robson (1966) stated the issue well.

> Fraternities are now faced with two major challenges. One is that
> of interpreting the meaning of fraternity to non-fraternity people,
> the administration and the faculty, to rushees, to pledges, and
> sometimes even to active members. The other is that of bettering
> our fraternity system by accepting the challenge presented to us.
> What is this challenge? It seems to me that we should widen our
> concept of fraternalism to include the intellectual life, to
> include the worlds of campus, state, nation, and world, as well as
> the small world of individual fraternity. Fraternities need to
> broaden their horizons. Narrowness of outlook is a common fault
> on many campuses. (p. 84)

With the use of objective research, the fraternity system can begin to

better understand itself. Through understanding and knowledge of

functions, the fraternity can broaden concepts to assist individual

members in comprehending the organization to which they belong and

better meet goals. Also, it can better meet the challenge of

explaining fraternalism to non-members.

DELIMITATIONS

1. This study was conducted at Wisconsin State University-

La Crosse during the spring term of the 1970-71 academic school year.

The subjects used were college women who were members of one of four

sororities on campus or resided in one of the residence halls on campus.

LIMITATIONS

1. The sororities on the campus maintain suites rather than

established houses; these suites are used for meetings and social

functions only. Because sorority housing is not provided, members must

live in the dormitories or in off-campus apartments.

2. Some of the subjects in the dormitory sample might have been potential rushees in the future. No way was found to separate them.

3. The researcher has served as an intern advisor to the Panhellenic Council and as an advisor to one of the sororities on campus. She also served as a head resident in one of the dormitories. Care was taken to conceal the researcher's identity so as not to initiate elicit responses rather than the subjects' true feelings. However, some subjects did know the identity of the researcher. Their knowledge did not seem to affect the results.

4. The questionnaire requested the respondent to select one of three responses, "always admire", "always dislike", and "depends on the situation", which forced the subjects to think in terms of absolutes. Adding two responses, "admire" and "dislike" may have given a more accurate picture of the subject's value orientation. The above became apparent as the researcher worked with the results of the study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Social Sorority - A self-perpetuating mutually exclusive group established for the development of social competence, leadership qualities, scholastic performance, participation in extra-curricular activities and service to school and community. The term "fraternity" is used synonymously with sorority.

Active - A sorority member who has completed her period of pledge-ship and has been formally initiated into the organization.

Chapter - The local group of a National fraternal organization.

Greek - The name applied to all members of social sororities and fraternities identified by Greek letters.

Independent - The term used to designate non-Greeks.

Initiation - The ceremony through which a pledge becomes an active.

Pledge - A new member of a Greek group who has not yet become an initiated member.

Bid - A formal invitation to join a Greek organization.

Panhellenic Council - The governing body of sororities. Panhellenic means "all Greeks".

Rushee - A student seeking membership or being sought for membership in a Greek organization.

Rush - The period in which the rushee and active meet each other through a series of formal and informal gatherings designed to assist the rushee in selecting a group in which to affiliate and for the sorority members to determine if they wish them to be a member.

Underclassmen - All the freshmen, sophomores and junior students surveyed in this study.

Upperclassmen - Students who have earned over 90 academic credits, which classifies them as seniors and were surveyed in this study.

Dormitory students - Students who reside in the college residence halls.

ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

The design rests on the following assumptions:

It appears as if many students pass through a stage of greater dependency on other individuals. As a student enters college, he becomes involved in the process of separation from home and defining his own self-concept. Relationships with other students can help ease this task. As the student becomes more sure of himself it may also

become easier for him to share in interpersonal relationships and to enjoy social activities which involve the company of others. The Greek affiliate appears to value social activities to a greater extent than non-Greeks, but as the non-Greeks live in a dormitory and participate in its activities, their degree of sociability increases to the extent that at graduation they may be ready and willing to join an organization such as a fraternal group. Finally, it would appear that as students achieve emancipation from home and reorganization of self, their dependency needs lessen and their relations with others become more interdependent.

The college fraternity has been placed in the heart of the collegiate sub-culture on the college campuses. The collegiate's commitment seems to be popularity, extra-curricular activities, and course work that demands little intellectual involvement. However, one of the basic goals of the college fraternity is scholastic achievement. This is an objective which coincided with those of the university, and researchers have found that many sorority chapters do maintain high scholastic standards.

The following hypotheses were tested based upon the assumptions listed above:

1. That sorority pledges would score lower on the independence scale of the Scott Value Scales than the independent underclassmen.

2. That underclassmen would score lower on the independence scale of the Scott Value Scales than the upperclassmen.

3. That dormitory students would score lower on the sociability scale of the Scott Value Scales than the sorority members.

4. That underclassmen residing in the dormitories would score lower on the sociability scale of the Scott Value Scales than the dormitory seniors.

5. That sorority members would score lower on the intellectualism scale of the Scott Value Scales than the dormitory students.

6. That dormitory students would score lower on the academic achievement scale of the Scott Value Scales than sorority members.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature relative to fraternal groups and
unaffiliated individuals, a substantial amount of information
concerning the social area and independence of fraternity members can
be found. Less ample in information are the areas of academic
achievement and intellectualism. Although there is considerable
overlap in discussing these variables, each will be dealt with
independently in this chapter.

Before focusing on the above principles, it might be helpful to
relate the dimensions of college student subcultures introduced by
Clark and Trow (1960; Newcomb and Wilson, 1966) since other studies
involving these concepts will be interposed in the consequent review
of the literature. In an attempt to categorize a student's orientation
towards a college education, Clark and Trow stated,

> These orientations are defining elements of student subcultures,
> in which they appear as shared notions of what constitutes right
> attitudes and actions toward the range of issues and experiences
> confronted in college. (p. 19)

An individual student is not necessarily confined to one subculture but
may participate in several subcultures available on his campus. Clark
and Trow established four subcultures: collegiate, vocational,
academic, and non-conformist culture. (p. 20)

Collegiate Culture

The collegiate subculture is the stereotype of football,

sororities and fraternities, dates, cars, drinking, and campus
fun. Teachers, courses, and grades are in the picture but in the
background. This subculture's values and activities are not
hostile to the college; in fact, they generate strong loyalties.
But it is resistant to the demands of the faculty for involvement
with ideas and issues over and above that required for a diploma.
This subculture generally consists of students from middle and
upper middle class homes and flourishes on resident campuses of
big state universities. At other institutions, part time work,
intense vocational interests, an urban location, commuter students,
all work against the full flowering of a collegiate subculture, as
do students' aspirations for graduate or professional interest on
the part of students and faculty. (p. 21)

Vocational Culture

The vocational culture primarily consists of lower middle
class students who often are married. College, for them, is
largely off the job training; it is an organization of courses and
credits leading to a diploma and a better job. These students
have little attachment to the school and resist intellectual
demands beyond what is required to pass the courses. If the
symbol of the collegiate culture is football and fraternity, then
the symbol of this culture is the college placement office.

Academic Culture

The characteristic of this subculture is its value
orientation and identification with the intellectual concerns of
the serious faculty members. The student of this culture works

hard, gets the best grades, and lets the world of ideas and knowledge envelope him. The symbol for these students is the library, laboratory, and seminar. These students are often strongly attached to the institution which supports intellectual values and opportunities for learning.

Non-conformist Culture

This subculture is deeply involved with ideas they encounter in their classroom and ideas current in the wider society of art, literature, and politics. To a much greater extent than the academic oriented, these students use off-campus groups and currents of thought as points of reference rather than the campus culture. These students have a critical detachment from the college and faculty, and a generalized hostility to the college administration. As the other groups look for fun, diploma, or knowledge, these students pursue an identity, not as a by-product but as the primary aim of their education.

Clark and Trow (1966) stated further that the forces which affect college and student cultures are the same values held by most people of this country regarding higher education. These values are shaped by the changing demands of an occupational structure which in turn reflects the changing character of society's major institutions. Three major social forces-the bureaucratizing of organizations, the professionalizing of occupations, and the democratizing of higher education are together influencing what students seek in college and how they use their college experience. (Newcomb, 1966, p. 28) With the above sobering effects, the collegiate subculture, with its stereotype

of big time sports and fraternity week-ends, dominant on campuses since

the end of the nineteenth century, now appears to be on the decline.

Although not in danger of extinction, the demands of large

organizations, international involvement, ecology, and technical

expertise are strengthening the academic and especially the vocational

cultures while detracting from the prestige and appeal of the

collegiate subculture. (p. 28)

INDEPENDENCE

Much sentiment has accompanied the distinction between a fraternal

affiliate and the independent. Terminology in this case implies that

the non-Greek values independence, and the affiliate has a greater need

for dependency. Scott (1965) found that pledges ranked lower on the

value of independence than non-pledges. In comparing pledges to

dormitory students, female pledges scored higher than non-pledges with

respect to the values of social skills, loyalty, academic achievement,

and status and lower on the values of kindness and independence.

(p. 140) In surveying actives who left a Greek organization before

graduating, Scott discovered that these actives scored lower on loyalty

and also tended toward higher scores on the independence values.

(p. 181) Dollar (1966) found that fraternity men were more dependent

in interpersonal situations. (p. 148)

Yet many underclassmen seem to have a period of dependency on

their peers as they weather the process of disengagement from parents

and development of self-direction and competence. Heath (1969),

discussing college students in general, stated that the first two years

are crucial ones in the transition from adolescence to adulthood.

While the early adolescent searches for the social sphere to direct

his self-expression, the late adolescent is close to mastering this

role. Both environmental and organic factors encourage change. The

change is ideally directed toward autonomy and away from control by

external forces. (p. 220) Katz (1969) stated,

> Sharing experiences and values with one or several friends
> influence the tempo of the separation process and provides
> experiences that the student utilizes in clarifying his self-
> concept and goals.....The peer pressures receive added force
> from the fact that they are usually derivation from and parallel
> to the views held in the student's own home situation. (p. 257)

At the same time, Chickering (1969) points out that the surer a person

is of himself, the more likely he is to enjoy the company of others.

He said, "The youth who is not sure of his identity shies away from

interpersonal intimacy, but the surer he becomes of himself, the more

he seeks it in the form of friendship, combat, leadership, love, and

inspiration. (p. 104)" Sherif and Sherif in Education and Identity

(1969) supported this concept by reporting that human beings are

promoted to form social ties for two major reasons: (1) secure social

ties provide a dependable basis for a consistent and stable self-

picture, a firm sense of identity, and (2) social ties provide both

instrumental and emotional support as the business of living is carried

out. Once an individual identifies himself with a particular group,

the group becomes both an anchor and reference point to the individual;

the individual then uses the group as a basis for his decisions about

behavior and modification of values and attitudes occur according to

the dictation of the group. The extent to which a particular group

envelopes an individual depends, first, upon how much the ties to

family, friends, and other social structures have been broken, and

second, upon how much the group enables him to fulfill his social and material needs, to realize his immediate purposes, and to move toward long range goals. (p. 226)

Alfred (1968) found that developmental stages seem to play a part in the choice of living situations at college. As students mature, the direction of change is away from living at home, and toward living independently. She found college residences as dormitories and fraternity houses provide a transition where rules reinstate parental supervisory functions, yet the student is free to experiment with new roles and definitions. Alfred found that dormitories and fraternities served as stepping stones towards autonomy in which these housing arrangements received an influx of students from homes as well as a loss of students who moved into off-campus apartments. (p. 92) Students, as they climb the ladder of college years, seem to shift away from dependence toward independence in interpersonal relations. Students begin to solidify their self-concept, thus becoming more flexible and less punitive allowing for more freedom and trust in interpersonal relationships; the student is less strict in his demands for dependency and his need for group activity decreases. Chickering (1969) felt that as interpersonal relationships become easier, the need to participate in group activities may well decline in favor of spending more time with a few good friends. The relatively greater importance of the group during early adolescence and early adulthood, declines as increased maturity of interpersonal relationships involves increased "introversion." This tendency is reflected by less need to be a "joiner" and by less need for association with more than a few close

friends. (p. 102) Scott (1965) found this true of senior fraternity

members. He stated,

> The fact that senior members were less attracted to their
> organization than the junior members may be cited as evidence
> for alienation. Seniors tended to value loyalty less and
> independence more than younger actives. In various ways,
> the older members may have become maladjusted to fraternity
> and sorority living. They tended to hold group maintaining
> values less strongly than their younger colleagues; they
> found membership in the organization less rewarding; they
> were not so highly regarded by the newest members. (p. 225)

Chickering (1969), in an analysis of students from eight institutions,

also found significant changes occurred in the direction of increased

independence on practically all items for both male and female. (p. 65)

Another study by Chickering, Mc Dowell, and Campagna (1969) found that

in spite of differences in students and colleges, student development

proceeds along very similar lines. The change was toward an increase

in the degree of autonomy, awareness of emotion, impulse expression,

aestheticism, and practical orientation. (p. 315)

SOCIABILITY

In a study conducted on the University of North Dakota campus by

Jackson and Winkerson (1964) to determine if differences did exist

between pledges and independents, the results showed that pledges

participated in more social activities in high school than independents.

It appears from this study that students who pledged fraternities are

those whose needs and behavior are socially oriented. They probably

perceived fraternity life as a means of facilitating the satisfaction

of these needs. (p. 381) Similarily, Levine and Sussman (1960) conducted

a study at an eastern technical school to ascertain who as freshmen

would rush and who would not. They found that pledges:

(1) dated and socialized in high school, (2) thought of "having fun generally" as important to his college career, (3) placed greater importance on making close friends while at college, (4) spent less time on studying and homework in high school, (5) placed a greater importance on achieving extra-curricular distinction, (6) planned to devote more hours to extra-curricular activities during college, than those freshmen who did not go through rush. (p. 397) In conclusion, the researchers felt that both family income and gregariousness affected the rates at which students at an eastern technical college apply and are accepted for membership into the Greek organizations. The wealthy youth, regardless of sociability and the poor youth if sociable in a defined way are more readily accepted than the both poor and socially inexperienced youth.

A study conducted by Lozoff (1967) found fraternity men exhibited more self-confidence, scored lower on verbal and math aptitude tests, and showed more interest in dating. (p. 370) Of like finding, Hountas and Pederson (1971) discovered that the senior affiliates had a significantly higher self-concept, significantly greater self-acceptance and a significantly higher concept of the ideal self. (p. 18) Results of a study at Oklahoma State University by Dollar (1966) showed that fraternity men were more concerned with social recognition, more dominant but also more dependent in interpersonal relationships and less inclined toward altruistic motives. They were brighter, from larger high schools, from families with higher incomes, and had better educated fathers. (p. 148) Schmidt (1971) in a paper read at the Personnel and Guidance Convention in Las Vegas stated she found college

women as a whole tend to change significantly from casual dating as freshmen to being pinned or engaged as seniors, but sorority girls changed more significantly than the independents. (p. 208) Scott (1965) found that students who admire loyalty, social skills, academic achievement and status are more apt to find the fraternity and sorority membership more congenial than are students who value independence. (p. 173)

Thompson and Paplia (1964) studied the attitudes of independent men towards the social opportunities available to fraternity men. The results were as follows: (1) Independent men felt that equality of social opportunities did not exist between them and the fraternity men. (2) In the opinion of the independents, fraternity men had greater social opportunities. (3) The independent men indicated that an association with fraternal groups appear to connote greater social status on campus. (4) In an effort to determine the areas of fraternity life an independent would consider beneficial to an independent organization, social activities, taking part in college activities, and brotherhood were the three top choices. In the establishment of any independent organization, the social aspect of fraternity life seems to have the most appeal. (p. 89)

In reviewing the finding in a study conducted by Kaludis and Zatkin (1966), the following seems relevant to this inquiry. (1) The non-fraternity students were more dependent on their own means to finance their education. (2) A greater proportion of non-fraternity students held or were interested in finding part-time jobs. (3) Fraternity members came from homes with higher incomes. (4) The fraternity members

came from homes with higher social status. (p. 283) Eaton and Smart (1971) found that pledges can be differentiated from both rushees and independents by using the social spontaneity scales. Family income sharpened the discrimination between pledges and rushees but had no effect in distinguishing rushees from independents. (p. 206)

Frantz (1971) in a study on college students in general versus non-college students found that regardless of sex, college students scored significantly higher on the social scale than did non-college subjects. (p. 51) Frantz also found that regardless of college attendance young adults seem to change in the social area in the direction of becoming more gregarious, friendly, less shy, and lonely. The least changes took place in the degree of traditional values and beliefs. Finally, Ivan Maw (1971) did a study on student subcultures and the degree of activity participation. He found that the academic and vocational subcultures did not engage in many activities that they did not view as important to their future. At the same time, the non-conformist and collegiate subcultures engaged in more activities not perceived as important to their future indicating that they are less selective in activities that will contribute to their futures, and they sample more diversified segments of the university activity roster. (p. 65)

Various sources seem to point to the fact that the Greek affiliate has had a greater opportunity to participate in extra-curricular activities before entering college and thus was already versed in social activities while the non-Greek students were less sure of himself and less willing to join an organization. Katz (1969) explained,

> When the fraternity men first arrived on campus, the social
> education stood them in good stead in making new friends.
> Besides that they had experienced the advantage of being
> recognized leaders in their high school communities. Many of
> them also had known the satisfaction of having well-educated
> parents. (p. 265)

Hountas and Pederson found that fraternity pledges expected to lead a

more active social life and hold more positions of leadership than

non-pledges. (p. 18) At the same time, Katz (1969) in his fraternity

studies found the fraternity group to be social, athletic, and

interested in managerial professions. (p. 258) As a whole, fraternity

men appeared to have been interested in a model that would be

appropriate for potential leaders of men, persuaders of men and

decision-makers.

In contrast, Katz (1969) found dormitory students less assured of

themselves in social situations. He stated,

> The dormitory students, with their shyness and emotional
> investment in themselves as workers, appeared to desire minimal
> response from other men, individually or in a group. (p. 282)

The dormitory men came from families where the parents had been

relatively unsociable, and somewhat older than the parents of the

fraternity men. He discovered that these students upheld the

impression of their parents as being hard working, serious minded

people who desired little interaction with others. Many of the

dormitory men had limited social lives. Katz continued by stating,

> Their friends were generally few in number and their relationship
> with them was reserved. They dated infrequently or moved into
> early marriage with girls from their hometown. (p. 308)

Katz felt that these men were often in need of guidance and education

in social interaction and gaining respect for themselves as persons.

Realizing the need to help students gain composure in social

situations and to develop leadership potential, many college residence

halls have developed programming to enhance these competencies. They

have conceded to the fact that fraternity living may have functional

value for students as much of the residence hall programming has

paralleled the agenda of fraternity education. In fact, the origin of

college dormitories can be traced back to chapter houses built by

fraternities after World War II. The quarters available to independents

in college communities were unable to house all the students who needed

lodging; the university officials foresaw the chapter house as a

suitable model for overcoming this shortage. At many institutions the

typical programs for fraternity activities have also been copied by the

dormitories as an antidote for depersonalization within the institution.

(Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, 1968, p. 12) Students

through this residence hall programming often have been able to

develop competency in social activities to the point of enjoyment in

group participation. Katz (1969), sums this up well,

> By the end of their four years, they had gained an awareness of
> how their comments might have jarred others in a group situation.
> They had benefited from being at overseas campuses, or from
> forming close relationships, and had learned to show recognition
> of needs of others, to express their ideas and interests. If
> rushing had occurred in the senior year, these men might have been
> interested in joining a fraternity and benefiting from further
> knowledge of social skills. (p. 295)

Changes in these dormitory men had come about mainly from involvement

in student organizations. Some students, by their senior year, were

asked to hold offices and maintain responsibility in dormitories where

they had lived for four years. Katz finished with the following,

> Their new position involved working with other people toward
> common goals in a relatively narrow area, but for these constricted
> young men, it was an opportunity to venture out of their personal
> lives in a way that was not frightening or overwhelming. (p. 303)

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

To demonstrate the emphasis placed on academic achievement by the
Greek organizations, it may be helpful to present the statement of
purpose of the National Panhellenic Council. This statement serves as
a guide for the local Panhellenic Councils to follow. (Baird's Manual
of American College Fraternities, 1968, p. 829)

> To maintain on a high plane fraternity life and inter-fraternity
> relationship; to cooperate with college authorities in their
> effort to maintain high social and scholarship standards
> throughout the whole college, and to be a forum for the discussion
> of questions of interest to the college and fraternity world.

The pledge is introduced to the importance of academic achievement very
early in the pledge period. Without revealing the identity of the
sorority, it may aid understanding to present a few excerpts from a
pledge manual. One reason listed for pledging is scholarship. "To
find stimulation and direction for one's ambition to attain high
scholarship and to become a truly educated individual." Under
responsibilities of a pledge, scholarship is also mentioned.
"Scholarship. When a girl joins a sorority, her scholarship becomes a
matter of group importance. Her lack of application will lower the
grade average of the entire chapter." Several pages of the pledge
manual are also devoted to study hints, correct study procedures, and a
time budget. All in all scholarship has great emphasis placed upon it
from the very beginnings of membership.

The research relating to academic achievement finds some fraternal
groups higher, some lower, and some with no difference in grade point
average from independent students. Scott (1965) found grade point
average of fraternity and sorority members at many schools tend to be

higher than those of Independents. (p. 85) Citing again the Kaludis and

Zatkin study (1966), the groups did not differ in academic ability as

measured by the ACT or in first semester grade point average. According

to the results, fraternity pledging neither helped or hindered the first

semester performance. (p. 284) Worchester (1923) did a comparison of

fraternity versus non-fraternity groups on the basis of scholarship at

ten colleges and universities. His results were that some had better

grade point averages and others did not; there was no clear distinction.

(p. 148)

Collins and Whetstone (1965) did a study on sorority and

independent women based on retention, academic achievement and aptitudes.

The results were that: (1) Sorority pledges had significantly higher

scholastic aptitude scores than independent students. (2) Sorority

pledges dominated the mid-range of aptitude scores and represented a

more homogeneous population. (3) More sorority women, regardless of

aptitude, return for their sophomore year than independent women.

(4) No difference was found between independent women and Greeks on

scholastic probation. (p. 178) Bradshaw (1967) similarly attempted to

determine membership effects on academic performance. He found that

fraternity men declined from a statistically significant higher mean

grade point average the first semester to a statistically significant

lower grade point average the second semester of the freshmen year. He

found no significant differences between the grade point averages for

the sorority and non-sorority women for any semester. (p. 62)

INTELLECTUALISM

As reviewed earlier, the writings on college subcultures seem to

discourage ideas that the Greeks possess high qualities of intellectualism. Peterson (1968) placed the college fraternity members at the core of the collegiate sub-culture on the college campus. He stated the collegiate's commitment is to popularity, play, sex, and other proclivities which may be realized through formal and informal extra-curricular events. He continued by stating that the collegiate is anti-intellectual, and his course work tends to center in fields that make few intellectual demands. (p. 301) Franz (1969) supported the above by saying that Greeks rank lowest in grade point average and had the least propensity for attending graduate school. (p. 18) Kees and Mc Dougall (1971) felt that the collegiate places less emphasis on the cultivation of the intellect and the development of occupational competence. (p. 193) This article also supported the contention that land-grant-college campuses are dominated by the collegiate and vocational sub-cultures. Jackson and Winkler (1964) seemed to support the idea of the collegiates' lack of intellectualism. The results of their study suggested that female pledges are different from female independents in that they have fewer needs for introspection and empathy, for a complacent regard for another's wishes, and more need for heterosexual relationships. They have more preference for working with things than ideas and tend to be more interested in aesthetic values than independent women. (p. 380) In contrast, Scott (1965) found sorority pledges increased on the values of intellectualism and independence, and decreased their mean value of loyalty. (p. 222)

Brow (1968) made an attempt to investigate the differences between intellectual inquiry and academic achievement. He felt,

> Students pursuing academic interests concern themselves with
> questions aimed to increase their knowledge within a discipline,
> while those concerned with intellectual inquiry focus upon
> growing wisdom. (p. 439)

In his article he asked the question, "Are students with high grades

more intellectually oriented than students with lower grades, and do

they become involved in a range of intellectual activities?" The

pattern of the correlations from this study suggest that the

intellectual student was more likely to be reflected in reading

interests than in activities. This corresponds to the stereotype

image of the intellectual being more reflective than active. The

results further suggest that the more successful student was more

likely to be more rational than the less successful students but not

any more interested or active in other cultural or intellectual

pursuits. (p. 441)

In conclusion, the study of Williamson and Hoyt (1952) should be

cited. They felt fraternity and sorority members tended to be "just

students" in that there was relatively little difference between them

and other students; whereas, it is frequently implied that fraternity

members are outstandingly different from other types of students.

(p. 65) Williamson and Hoyt felt there was no significant differences

between the two groups of students.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate value orientations
between Greek women and women students living in college residence halls
to determine if differences exist between the two groups of students.
It was attempted to assess differences on the variables of independence,
sociability, academic achievement, and intellecutalism as measured by
the Scott Value Scales. This chapter will deal with the sample chosen
for the study, the instrument used to assess differences, and the
administration of the questionnaire.

Since this study is concerned with the relationship of Greek
students to the total campus environment, a brief explanation of the
total population may help place the chosen sample into proper
perspective. Wisconsin State University-La Crosse is one of nine
state universities in Wisconsin. It was established in 1909 as a
normal school whose purpose was primarily preparing teachers for the
public schools. In 1926, it became a teachers college with the
authorization to award the baccalaureate degree. By 1951, liberal arts
programs were established, and it became a "state college". With
expansion of both undergraduate and graduate programs, the name was
changed to "State University" in 1964. It still retains its historic
interest in teacher education but has also expanded into a multi-purpose
institution. The stated purpose of the institution is, "to help students
attain mastery of special fields of learning which may be used in

teaching, in other employment, and for personal improvement".

(Wisconsin State University Catalogue, 1970-71, p. 32) The University

is organized into four colleges: Letters and Science, Education,

Health-Recreation and Physical Education, and the Graduate College.

Since this study is interested only in the undergraduate population, the

graduate college will not be of concern here.

The University currently enrolls approximately 7,000 students. A

majority of these students come from small towns or farms with a majority

of parents' incomes between the $7,500 to $15,000 per year range. The

school is considered "conservative" among the other state universities

and seems to have less difficulty with campus unrest than some of the

other institutions. Students appear to "study hard" and to also "play

hard". The city and the campus provide many activities for students so

that more students tend to remain "on campus" on weekends than students

who go home.

About ten per cent of the student population belongs to a sorority

or fraternity. These groups have traditionally carried out the majority

of campus events and are relied upon by the University administration to

assist in campus promotions. Presently, there are four sororities on

campus which accommodate approximately sixty-five members each in the

fall semester and about eighty members during the spring semester.

Deferred rushing, in which freshmen cannot pledge until they have

established a grade point average, is the policy in use. Therefore, the

major rushing season is in the spring when any girl who has earned a 2.3

grade point average can sign up to rush; each sorority can take fifteen

pledges in the spring. After a six to nine week pledge period, the

pledges become active members. There are no sorority houses at

Wisconsin State University-La Crosse. Each sorority maintains a suite

located in a residence hall, and the members either live in the

dormitories, apartments, or at home. The majority, at present, reside

in apartments. The sororities are active in campus events and social

affairs but also are strong in the area of philanthropy and academic

achievement; the sorority members consistently rank higher than the

non-Greeks in grade point average. (Appendix C)

The University has six residence halls for housing female students.

During the 1970-71 school year, only freshmen were required to live in

university housing. Space was also available to sophomores and juniors

wishing to reside in the dormitories. One dorm had two floors open to

seniors who also wished to live in college housing. A few seniors could

be found in the other halls, but it was the exception rather than the

rule. Students not living in the residence halls either live at home or

in apartments throughout the city. Although much progress has been made,

resident hall programming within the dormitories is in its developmental

stages.

SAMPLE

The Panhellenic Council of Wisconsin State University-La Crosse

gave the researcher permission to issue a questionnaire to the spring

pledge class of 1971 and the sorority seniors of 1971. The spring

pledge class was selected because a larger number of freshmen and

underclassmen rush at this time; it is also the major rush period of the

academic year. The researcher obtained a list of all the pledges and

seniors from the four sororities which included fifty-six pledges and

seventy seniors. By using a student roster which lists students' name,

identification number, college, major, grade point average and year in

school, the researcher compiled a list of the pledges and seniors'

academic major and year in school. The subjects were listed according

to whether they were in health-recreation and physical education, in

letters and science, in secondary education, or in elementary education,

and whether they were a freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. Table 1

illustrates the breakdown between academic major and year in school.

Table 1

Sample by Academic Major and Year in School

	H-R-PE	L&S	SEC.	ELEM.
PLEDGES				
Freshmen	10	6	4	4
Sophomores	13	2	5	7
Juniors	4	4		
SENIORS	28	6	14	22

The sorority subjects were also matched by academic major and year

in school to a randomly selected sample of dormitory underclassmen and

seniors. Matching was made to prevent any skewing of results on the

academic achievement or intellectualism scale; the sample was assumed to

be hetrogeneous on all other variables. The computer center at

Wisconsin State University-La Crosse compiled a random sample of female

dormitory students for the researcher. The following is an explanation

of the random sample program developed by the computer center.

Given P, the population size, and N, the size of the
sample, the program generated N random numbers in the range
of 1 to P. These random numbers are stored, and no duplicate
entries are allowed. The card file representing the population
is then read and duplicate cards are punched for cards in
order position corresponding to the random numbers that were
generated. (For example, if the number 5 were generated, then
the fifth card in the population would be in the random sample.)

Since the numbers generated to form a random sample of
the number scale 1 to P (each number in the scale having
equal probability of being selected), then even though the
population card file may be ordered, each number still has
equal probability of being selected, thus the sample of
subjects must be random.

The random number generator is based on addition to
and mulitplication of a previous result by prime numbers,
with extraction of central result digits to arrive at the
random numbers. The starting position is based on time of
day in milliseconds. Repetitive sequences are detected and
corrected.

The researcher instructed the computer center to obtain a sample of

women dormitory students for both underclassmen and seniors. For the

underclassmen dormitory sample, the computer center selected a random

sample of one hundred and fifty female students living in the residence

halls and listed their academic major and year in school. From this

sample, the researcher chose the needed majors and year in school to

mirror the sorority sample. If the random sample had more individuals of

a certain major and/or year, the researcher took every other individual

or every third individual or the like depending on the numbers involved.

The senior sample was also matched in a similar manner. Since there

were only forty-six seniors living in dormitories, the senior dormitory

sample was proportioned to half that of the senior sorority members.

THE INSTRUMENT

The revised form of the intellectualism scale, the sociability

scale which consisted of the social skills and status scale, the
academic achievement scale, and the independence scale of the Scott
Value Scales were issued to the above subjects. The kindness, loyalty,
physical development, honesty, religiousness, self-control, and
creativity scales were omitted. These scales were developed to measure
specific values in a multiple of questions which invites the subjects to
accept or reject items but is intended to tap the same value. (Scott,
1965, p. 19) The scales appear in a closed questionnaire which consists
of three responses-always admire, always dislike, and depends on the
situation. The revised form of the scales contains items with reversed
scoring. The scales used in this study have been described as attempting
to measure the following (p. 24):

Independence. Being independent, outspoken, free thinking, and

    unhampered by the bonds of tradition or social restraint.

Sociability. This scale contains the social skills and status scale.

    Social skills. Being charming, popular, well mannered, and getting

    along with all kinds of people. Status. Having strong leadership

    qualities, being respected by others, and gaining recognition for

    one's achievements.

Academic Achievement. Studying a great deal and working hard to get good

    grades.

Intellectualism. Having strong intellectual and cultural interests,

    trying to learn a great deal about things, even though the

    knowledge may not be useful.

    Scott (1965) had developed a shorter form of all the items mentioned
above for use in his study. However, there were certain defects in these
original scales mainly: (1) that they were too short to yield reliable

measures and (2) that acquiescent response set may contribute heavily to their response, since nearly all of the items are stated in the positive direction. (p. 248) The original scales showed tentative evidence of their validity in detecting differences among groups, but Scott felt the revised scales would do a more thorough assessment. (p. 33) To obtain the revised scales, three hundred and twenty-five items were correlated with every other item in its intended scale and with every other item in outside scales that correlated highly (.50 or more) with the item's own scale. Any item in the trial scale that had a mean intra-scale correlation of less than .10, or which had a mean intra-scale correlation less than its mean correlation with the items in some other scale, was eliminated. This procedure was aimed at maximizing intra-scale homogeneities and minimizing inter-scale correlations. (p. 249) A chart of the homogeneities of the revised scale plus correlation with the original scales is located in Appendix C. A complete form of all items developed in the revised scales is also presented in Appendix B. Since the inter-correlations between the various scales was not significantly great, the researcher felt some scales could be utilized while others were eliminated. The inter-correlations of the revised scale can be found in Appendix C. The questionnaire issued to the subjects also appears in Appendix B; items of the four scales were presented in a random mixed-up order so as not to reveal the identity of the scale.

ADMINISTRATION

The questionnaires were first coded in the following fashion: P for pledges, D for dormitory underclassmen, A for sorority seniors (Actives), and S for dormitory seniors. The surveys were addressed to

each subject and given to the pledge trainer or president of each
sorority and to the various head residents in the dormitories. The
pledges were instructed to fill out the questionnaire some time during
the week and return it to their pledge trainer the following week; some
pledge trainers took time from their meeting to have their pledges
complete the questionnaires together. The sorority presidents handed out
the seniors' questionnaires at a meeting and requested they return them
the following week. These questionnaires were returned over a three
week period. The researcher kept in touch with the various pledge
trainers and presidents to keep encouraging the subjects to return their
surveys. The forms for the dormitory sample were placed in the subjects'
mail box with instructions to return the completed surveys to the
head resident. The head residents were given a list of subjects in their
dormitories. Some head residents were very faithful in encouraging
students to return their questionnaires while others were not as helpful.
Forty-four pledges, thirty-two dormitory underclassmen, thirty-two
sorority seniors, and twenty-nine dormitory seniors returned their
questionnaires. Table 2 illustrates the return according to academic
major and year in school.

Table 2

Return Sample by Academic Major and Year in School

	H-R-PE	L&S	SEC.	ELEM.	TOTAL
PLEDGES					
Freshmen	7	5	1	2	15
Sophomores	11	2	4	6	23
Juniors	4	1			5
				Total	43

One subject did not list major.

	H-R-PE	L&S	SEC.	ELEM.	TOTAL
DORMITORY UNDERCLASSMEN					
Freshmen	5	4	3	3	15
Sophomores	7	1	3	2	13
Juniors	3	1			4
				Total	32
SORORITY SENIORS	13	3	7	9	32
DORMITORY SENIORS	12	2	7	8	29

The questionnaires, upon return, were separated according to the coding, and the items were coded according to the scale to which they belong; two questionnaires were thrown out because they were not completed properly. The items were then scored and a total developed for each variable. Items that were marked "always admire" were given a score of three; those items marked "depends on the situation" were given a two; and those items checked "always dislike" were scored as one. Reverse-scored items were scored in the opposite direction; always dislike received a three, depends on the situation received a two, and always admire received a one. A total was then compiled for each variable. The independence, academic achievement, and intellectualism scale could receive a total score of sixty, and the sociability scale had a possible score of one hundred and twenty. A high score indicated greater dependency to possess a particular value. Individual totals are listed in Appendix A.

The questionnaire was intended to measure any differences which may exist between the two major groups-sorority versus dormitory students-and/or differences between the four subgroups. A two by two factorial analysis of the variance was used to determine any significant differences between the two major groups. Dunn's multiple comparison procedure was used to determine any interaction between the subgroups.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate value orientations between Greek and non-Greek women who live in college residence halls on the values of independence, sociability, academic achievement, and intellectualism to determine if any significant differences exist between the two groups. The revised form of the Scott Value Scales consisting of the independence, sociability which is the social skills and status scale, academic achievement, and intellectualism scale was issued to the senior and pledge members of the four sororities at Wisconsin State University-La Crosse and to a randomly selected sample of dormitory students matched by year in school and academic major. Sixty-three per cent return was experienced. Table 3 illustrates the percentage of return by student groups.

Table 3

Percentage of Return by Student Groups

Student Group	Number Issued	Number Returned	% of Return
Pledges	56	44	78.5
Dormitory Underclassmen	56	32	57.1
Sorority Seniors	70	32	45.7
Dormitory Seniors	35	29	82.8
Total	217	137	63.1

A two by two factorial analysis of the variance was applied to the results to determine any differences between the major groups of sorority versus the dormitory students. A variance simply indicates how much a sample varies from its mean. Groups of collected data have a grand mean or total mean. The deviation of a given score from the grand mean can be partitioned into two clearly distinct segments-the deviation of the score from the mean of its group and the deviation of that group mean from the grand mean. If the sample means vary around the grand mean more than the individual scores vary around the sample means, the samples are comparatively widely dispersed from each other; but if the sample means vary around the grand mean less than individual scores vary around their sample means, the sample are very much like each other in score values. The F ratio is computed to determine the differences.

between the means. To place in perspective the above, factorial analysis of the variance can be defined as, "the statistical method that analyzes the independent and interactive effects of two or more independent variable on a dependent variable." (Chase, 1967, p. 162) The independent variables of this study are sorority members-both pledges and seniors-and dormitory students-both underclassmen and seniors. The dependent variables are independence, sociability, academic achievement, and intellectualism.

Dunn's multiple comparison procedure was used to determine any interaction between the subgroups. This statistical test can be used to make all planned comparisons among means. The procedure consists of splitting up the level of significance (alpha) among a set of planned comparisons.

RESULTS

Table 4 illustrates the computed means of the four variables
Independence, sociability, academic achievement, and intellectualism.

Table 4

Means of Dependent Variables

	Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
Pledges	41.45	102.98	49.16	53.66
Dormitory Underclassmen	44.58	101.98	49.03	52.19
Sorority Seniors	41.42	103.65	49.00	54.52
Dormitory Seniors	40.17	99.83	48.17	53.69

The results of the student groups measured by the independence
scale was not statistically significant at alpha equal .05 level of
significance (Table 5). However, the results became significant
somewhere between alpha equal .10 and alpha equal .05 when comparing
underclassmen to seniors and when sorority seniors and dormitory
underclassmen are compared with dormitory seniors and the pledges.
Using Dunn's multiple comparison procedure (Table 6) to determine
differences in independence between pledges and dormitory underclassmen,
the results become significant at alpha equal to .10. Pledges scored
lower on the independence scale than dormitory underclassmen.

The results on the measure of sociability did not prove significant at alpha equal .05 (Table 7). The results approached significance between alpha equal .25 and alpha equal .10 when comparing Greeks to dormitory students. The Greeks were higher on the sociability scale. When the dormitory underclassmen were compared with the dormitory seniors by the Dunn's multiple comparison procedure on the sociability scale (Table 8), the results did not prove significant.

No significant difference was found on the academic achievement scale or the intellectualism scale (Tables 9 and 10) between the Greeks and dormitory students. The results on the academic achievement scale, although not significant, emerged in the right direction as hypothesized. The results from the intellectualism scale were opposite that hypothesized.

DISCUSSION

The results seem to suggest the possibility of difference between Greeks and non-Greeks on the value orientations of independence and sociability. However, since the results did not prove significant at alpha equal .05, the possibility of error is much greater. In those areas that prove significant at alpha equal .10, the researcher can only be sure that the results will be as derived ninety per cent of the time; there is a ten per cent chance of error. Those areas which proved significant at alpha equal .25 leave a twenty-five per cent chance of error; the researcher can only be seventy-five per cent assured that the obtained results were an accurate account of the measured variables.

Table 5

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure for Independence Scale

	S	A	P	D
Senior dorm (S) 40.17	–	1.25	1.28	4.47
Sorority senior (A) 41.42	–	–	.03	3.16
Pledge (P) 41.45	–	–	–	3.13
Dorm underclassmen (D) 44.58	–	–	–	–

alpha .10   d=3.12769   alpha .05   d=3.29056

Table 6

Analysis of Variance for Independence Scale

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Between sorority/ dorm	1	34.01	34.01	.865482
Between upperclassmen/ underclassmen	1	124.16	124.16	3.159
Interaction A x B	1	141.55	141.55	3.602
Within Groups	131	5147.81	39.296	
Total	134	5473		

alpha .25=1.34   alpha .10=2.75   alpha .04=3.92

Independence

The first hyposthesis was supported at alpha equal .10. There is a ninety percent probability that these results did not happen by chance alone. The first hypothesis is as follows:

Sorority pledges would score lower on the independence scale of the Scott Value Scales than the independent underclassmen.

The housing authorities at Wisconsin State University-La Crosse require all freshmen to live in university housing. Assuming heterogenity, the dorms have a chance of possessing more students at extremes which could possibly boost the independence scores of the sample while the sororities may filter off the freshmen who are more group minded. Since sophomore and juniors are not required to live in the residence halls, it is very possible that the dormitories attract more independently oriented students while the sororities appeal to students who are inclined to value group welfare.

The second hypothesis was stated in the following manner:

The underclassmen would score lower on the independence scale of the Scott Value Scales than the upperclassmen.

The results were significant between alpha equal .10 and alpha equal .05, but the findings were in the opposite direction of those hypothesized. The upperclassmen scored lower on the independence scale than underclassmen. The dorm seniors scored lower in independence than the sorority members. Since the residence halls house few seniors, it is very likely that the more independent, free thinking students have moved into apartments. This would tend to support the findings of Elizabeth Alfred's study (1968) that as students grow older, they want to be more independent of rules and supervision, so they move into

apartment situations. Those students who still depend on supervision remain in residence halls or sorority houses. The outcome of the dormitory seniors possibly suggests they still desire supervision. The findings for the sorority seniors hint at the possibility that seniors in sororities on this campus stay the same or increase slightly on group orientation. Possibly they do not become alienated as Scott suggested.

In focusing on the value of independence, the researcher wishes to pose a question. "Is dependence bad?" In discussing dependence versus independence, dependence seems to bear the brunt of negativism. Persons want to be more independent as opposed to dependent. Individualism is typically American. This relational orientation places its primary focus on the autonomy of the individual. The American student probably is exposed to the individualistic orientation rather than those orientations which have a more dependent orientation. But who is to say the individualistic orientation is better than a dependent orientation? Chickering (1969) seems to feel the surer a person is of his identity the more interest he has in other individuals. "The youth who is not sure of his identity shies away from interpersonal intimacy, but the surer he becomes of himself, the more he seeks it in the form of friendship, combat, leadership, love, and inspiration." (p. 104) At casual observation, a social isolate would seem to possess greater difficulties than an individual who constantly seeks the company of others.

Sociability

The hypotheses dealing with sociability are as follows:

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Sociability Scale

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Between sorority/ dorm	1	231.8	231.8	2.049749
Between upperclassmen/ underclassmen	1	8.6	8.6	.076
Interaction A × B	1	20.1	20.1	.177739
Within Groups	131	14814.4	113.087	
Total	134	15089.2		

alpha .25=1.34   alpha .10=2.75   alpha .05=3.92

Table 8

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure for Sociability Scale

	S	D	P	A
Senior Dorm (S) 99.83	–	1.52	3.15	3.82
Dorm underclassmen (D) 101.35	–	–	1.63	2.30
Pledge (P) 102.98	–	–	–	.67
Sorority Senior (A) 103.65	–	–	–	–

alpha .05 d=6.14   alpha .10 d=7.81

The dormitory students would score lower on the sociability scale of the Scott Value Scales than the sorority members.

The underclassmen in the dormitories will score lower on the sociability scale of the Scott Value Scales than the dormitory seniors.

The results concerning the dormitory students as opposed to sorority students on the sociability scale emanate in the direction hypothesized, but the level of significance leaves a twenty-five per cent margin for chance happenings. The mean for the pledges is higher than dormitory students, and the mean for sorority seniors is higher than the pledges. This hints at the possibility that pledges are more socially oriented and that sorority membership has helped accent that value orientation within its members. A longitudinal study which would test the pledges of this study when they are seniors would help substantiate the above findings.

The relationship between dormitory seniors and dormitory underclassmen on the sociability scale did not prove significantly different and developed in the opposite direction than that hypothesized. Since there are so few seniors residing in the university housing facilities, the possibility that the more socially minded students do not remain in the halls is again possible. The residence halls at Wisconsin State University-La Crosse have been slow in developing programming in the dormitories. Until recently, the halls have often had an impersonal air. Students who were interested in social events and closer relationships may have exited to apartments where they could have their parties and become closer to the few people with whom they live. As students group up to live together, it is quite possible that those who are less socially oriented would be left behind. Observers of these

Table 9

Analysis of Variance for Academic Achievement Scale

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Between sorority/ dorm	1	7.57	7.57	.0017
Between upperclassmen/ underclassmen	1	8.56	8.56	.001966
Interaction A x B	1	2.07	2.07	.000475
Within Groups	131	570140.99	4352.00	
Total	134	570160.11		

alpha .25=1.34   alpha .10=2.75   alpha .05=3.92

Table 10

Analysis of Variance for Intellectualism Scale

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Between sorority/ dorm	1	40.08	40.08	.590976
Between upperclassmen/ underclassmen	1	37.68	37.68	.555588
Interaction A x B	1	3.35	3.35	.049395
Within Groups	131	8884.02	67.82	
Total	134	8971.00		

alpha .25=1.34   alpha .10=2.75   alpha .05=3.92

seniors seem to feel these women shy away from personal relationships and participate very little in the social affairs of their hall. If the seniors who live in the senior dorm could be separated from seniors living in the other halls in general, the results may prove to be revealing.

Academic Achievement and Intellectualism

The following hypotheses are concerned with academic achievement and intellectualism:

The dormitory students would score lower on the academic achievement scale of the Scott Value Scales than the sorority members.

The sorority members would score lower on the intellectualism scale than the dormitory students.

Although the academic achievement variable was in the direction hypothesized and the intellectualism variable was in the opposite direction, there was no significant difference between the two groups on these two variables. The four subgroups were broken into the four academic fields of health-recreation-physical education, letters and science, secondary education, and elementary education to determine if there was any difference among the various areas. Dunn's multiple comparison procedure was used. The researcher felt one major could be scoring high while another was scoring low thus cancelling out the effects of the difference. (Tables 11,12,13,14,15,16,17, and 18) No significant difference was found between the various means. No particular academic field was consistently high or low between the two groups.

It is quite possible that this study measured those students who

Table 11

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Pledges on the

Intellectualism Scale by Academic Major

		Sec.	H-R-PE	L&S	Elem.
Sec.	52.60	–	.72	.90	3.78
H-R-PE	53.32	–	–	.18	3.06
L&S	53.50	–	–	–	2.88
Elem.	56.38	–	–	–	–

alpha .05   d=7.30

Table 12

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Pledges on the

Academic Achievement Scale by Academic Major

		Sec.	H-R-PE	Elem.	L&S
Sec.	47.40	–	1.8	2.73	3.35
H-R-PE	49.20	–	–	.93	1.55
Elem.	50.13	–	–	–	.02
L&S	50.75	–	–	–	–

alpha .05   d=7.89

Table 13

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Sorority Seniors on the

Intellectualism Scale by Academic Major

		Sec.	H-R-PE	Elem.	L&S
Sec.	52.86	-	.45	2.01	2.14
H-R-PE	53.31	-	-	1.56	1.69
Elem.	54.87	-	-	-	.13
L&S	55.00	-	-	-	-

alpha .05 d=8.45

Table 14

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Sorority Seniors on the

Academic Achievement Scale by Academic Major

		L&S	Sec.	Elem.	H-R-PE
L&S	46.33	-	2.10	2.30	3.59
Sec.	48.43	-	-	.19	1.49
Elem.	48.62	-	-	-	1.30
H-R-PE	49.92	-	-	-	-

alpha .05 d=9.80

valued academic achievement; thus, there would be no difference in their value orientations. Statistics on grade point averages comparing Greek women and non-Greek women at Wisconsin State University-La Crosse show that the Greek women average higher in grade point average than non-Greek women. Greek women also have higher grade point average than the all university average. (Appendix C) A study conducted by Dr. Norene Smith in the spring of 1971 comparing grade point averages between dormitory students and those who live off-campus revealed that students who live in dormitories, regardless of year in school, maintain higher grade point averages. (Appendix C) Therefore, it is quite feasible that students who value high grades were surveyed in this study which would account for little differences in their value orientations. If students who live off-campus, both Greek and independent women, were issued the Scott Value Scales, a statistical difference may have been found in this value orientation.

Wisconsin State University-La Crosse, although expanding into a multi-purpose institution, still retains its emphasis on teacher education. This may place the institution more in the sphere of the vocational sub-culture. In looking over the subjects in the sample, it can be seen that the majority of students fall into the category of secondary education, elementary education, or health-recreation-physical education which all involve students whose aspirations are in the teaching field. Very few individuals in the sample were enrolled in the college of letters and science. When looking at the means of the various academic fields, one can see the letters and science area ranks the highest or second highest on the intellectualism measure in all four

Table 15

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Dormitory Underclassmen

on the Intellectualism Scale by Academic Major

		Elem.	Sec.	L&S	H-R-PE
Elem.	52.00	-	1	2.33	2.79
Sec.	53.00	-	-	1.33	1.79
L&S	54.33	-	-	-	.46
H-R-PE	54.79	-	-	-	-

alpha .05   d=9.84

Table 16

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Dormitory Underclassmen

on the Academic Achievement Scale by Academic Major

		L&S	Sec.	H-R-PE	Elem.
L&S	48.5	-	-	.21	2.70
Sec.	48.5	-	-	.21	2.70
H-R-PE	48.7	-	-	-	2.49
Elem.	51.2	-	-	-	-

alpha .05   d=11.2

Table 17

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Dorm Seniors on the

Intellectualism Scale by Academic Major

		Elem.	Sec.	H-R-PE	L&S
Elem.	53.25	-	.04	1.25	3.25
Sec.	53.29	-	-	1.21	3.21
H-R-PE	54.50	-	-	-	2.00
L&S	56.50	-	-	-	-

alpha .05   d=9.18

Table 18

Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure of Dorm Seniors on the

Academic Achievement Scale by Academic Major

		L&S	Elem.	H-R-PE	Sec.
L&S	43.00	-	5.13	5.33	6.43
Elem.	48.13	-	-	.20	1.30
H-R-PE	48.33	-	-	-	1.10
Sec.	49.43	-	-	-	-

alpha .05   d=9.99

subgroups. Possibly if this institution had more individuals enrolled in letters and science, the intellectual climate could register a significant difference between academic disciplines. Clark and Trow (1966) place the collegiate sub-culture near the same plane on intellectual endeavors. If Wisconsin State University-La Crosse is a more vocationally oriented school, then it becomes feasible that the Greek women who would be members of the collegiate sub-culture and the independent women could rank very closely on the intellectualism scale. A study which could establish in what proportion student subcultures exist on this campus and how well students meet the category requirements to fit into a particular subculture, would help place the above inquiry into proper proportion.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore value orientations
between Greek and dormitory students on the value scales of
independence, sociability, academic achievement, and intellectualism
to determine if any significant differences exist between the two groups.
The Panhellenic Council of Wisconsin State University-La Crosse gave the
researcher permission to issue a questionnaire to the spring pledge
class of 1971 and to the sorority seniors of 1971. The revised form of
the intellectualism scale, the sociability scale which consisted of the
social skills and status scales, the academic achievement scale, and
the intellectualism scale of the Scott Value Scales were issued to the
above subjects. The kindness, religiousness, self-control, and
creativity scales were omitted. These subjects were also matched by
academic major and year in school to a randomly selected dormitory
sample of underclassmen and seniors. These subjects were also issued
the Scott Values Scales. The questionnaire was intended to measure any
differences which may exist between the two major groups or the four
subgroups.

A two by two factorial analysis of the variance was used to
determine any differences between Greek and dormitory students. Dunn's
multiple comparison procedure was utilized in determining the
differences between subgroups. The results are as follows:

1. Pledges were significantly lower on the independence scale than dormitory students at alpha equal .10.

2. There was a significant difference between upperclassmen and underclassmen on the independence scale; the results became significant between alpha equal .10 and .05. The results were in the opposite direction of those hypothesized.

3. Greek students were significantly higher on the sociability scale than the dormitory students at alpha equal .25.

4. There was no significant difference between dormitory underclassmen and dormitory seniors on the sociability scale.

5. There was no significant difference between Greeks and dormitory students on the academic scale.

6. There was no significant difference between Greeks and dormitory students on the intellectualism scale.

CONCLUSIONS

In answering the question, "Can a Greek organization add positive growth to its member's development and personality integration?", the answer from the results of this study is a conservative "yes". The results seem to suggest as a student participates in a group, she becomes more group oriented and has greater interest in social activities. Therefore, a Greek organization may help a student make gains in the area of social competence. Results from the academic achievement area hints that possibly both sorority membership and residence hall living aids in positive value orientation towards higher grade point averages. The outcome of the intellectualism scores seem to suggest that there is little differences between Greek and non-Greek students on this campus

regarding intellectualism; this could help dispell the negative connotation that fraternal affiliation hinders intellectual endeavors.

Although the results are moderate, the researcher feels Greek organizations can help students in their development of social skills and formation of identity. It is interesting to note that the dormitory seniors scored lowest on all variables except intellectualism. Possibly if these students had been afforded the opportunities of Greek activities or programming comparable with it, these students may have placed greater value on independence, sociability, academic achievement or intellectualism.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A dormitory or living arrangement for seniors who do not wish to live off-campus could become a positive asset. If a natural filtering process does take place, it could give the University another opportunity to work with seniors who are less sure of themselves in identity and social skills through residence hall programming. It may give these students another chance to build competence before leaving school.

2. A study involving off-campus students in relation to the results of this survey may help place these effects in better perspective.

3. A longitudinal study which measured the value orientations of these pledges when they are seniors could supply more supportive answers to the value of Greek organizations.

4. A questionnaire with five responses as "always admire", "admire", "depends on the situation", "dislike", and "always

dislike" may give a more accurate picture of value orientations
than the three response categories used in this study.

5. A sorority seems to have positive effects on the members'
growth. Possibly the residence hall programming can parallel that
of fraternal organizations to enhance positive growth within the
residents of the hall.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alfred, E. Developmental stages and choice of residence in college. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 90-93.

2. Bradshaw, H. L. Differential effects of fraternity and sorority membership upon academically promising students. The Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 41, 62-64.

3. Brow, R. D. Investigation of the relationship between the intellectual and the academic aspects of college life. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 439-441.

4. Chase, C. L. Elementary Statistics, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

5. Kaludis, G. and Zatkin, G. Anatomy of a pledge class. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 282-284.

6. Chickering, A. W., McDowell, J. and Campagna, D. Institutional differences and student development. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 315-326.

7. Chickering, A. W. Education and Identity, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

8. Collins, W. P. and Whetstone, R. D. A comparison of sorority and independent women based on retention, academic achievement and scholastic aptitude. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1965, 28, 177-178.

9. Dollar, R. J. Student characteristics and choice of housing. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 147-150.

10. Elton, C. F. and Smart, J. C. Many are rushed but who will pledge? Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 204-207.

11. Frantz, T. T. Student and non-student change. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 49-53.

12. Frantz, T. T. Student subcultures. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1969, 10, 16-20.

13. Heath, R. Higher education and the development of persons. National Association Student Personnel Administrators, 1969, 6, 215-222.

14. Horentras, P. T. and Pederson, L. M. Self-concept of fraternity members and independence. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 46-49.

15. Jackson, R. and Winkler, R. C. A comparison of pledges and independents. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43, 379-382.

16. Katz, J. No time for youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

17. Kees, D. J. and McDougoll, W. P. A valadation study of the Clark-Trow college student subculture typology. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 193-198.

18. Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

19. Kirk, R. E. Experimental design: procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1968.

20. Kluckholm, C. Culture and behavior. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1962.

21. Kluckholm, F. and Strodtbeck, F. Variations in value orientations. Evanston, Illinois: Row and Peterson, 1961.

22. Levine, G. N. and Sussman, L. A. Social class and sociability in fraternity pledging. American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 65, 391-399.

23. Lozoff, M. H. Personality differences and residental choice. (Institute for the study of Human problems, Stanford University), 1967, 294-372.

24. Maw, I. E. L. Student subcultures and activity involvement. Journal of College Personnel, 1971, 12, 62-66.

25. Morris, V. C. Philosophy and the American school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

26. Newcomb, T. and Wilson, E. K. College peer groups. Chicago: Adline, 1966.

27. Parsons, T. and Bales, R. Family: socializations and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

28. Parsons, T. Structure and process in modern societies. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1964.

29. Peterson, R. E. The student left in American higher education. Daedalus, 1968, Winter, 293-317.

30. Robson, J. (ed.) Baird's manual of American college fraternities. Menesha, Wisconsin: George Banta, 1968.

31. Robson, J. The college fraternity and its modern role. Menesha, Wisconsin: George Banta, 1966.

32. Schmidt, M. Relationship between sorority membership and changes in selected personality variables, goals, and attitudes. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 208-213.

33. Scott, W. A. Values and organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

34. Thompson, E. A. and Paplia, A. S. Attitudes of independent men toward social opportunities at a fraternity oriented college. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1964, 6, 88-89.

35. Williamson, E. G. and Hoyt, D. Measured personality characteristics of student leaders. Education and Psychology Measurement, 1952, 12, 65-78.

36. Worchester, D. A. Fraternities and Scholarship. School and Society, 1923, 26, 147-148.

APPENDIX A

SCORES FOR SCOTT VALUE SCALES

Scores for the Pledges on the Acott Value Scales

Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
37	109	46	60
39	108	48	58
45	101	51	56
39	105	57	59
40	103	49	57
38	108	55	58
42	111	45	55
37	95	42	45
40	100	47	55
42	101	48	54
47	103	53	53
39	108	47	56
50	106	49	58
40	107	51	51
41	115	53	51
43	104	54	56
42	101	44	55
45	95	53	54
36	95	48	50
39	100	54	53
38	108	49	58
49	95	51	52
44	103	50	57
46	98	57	57
42	107	49	58
41	105	48	59
44	103	39	49
34	110	54	48
38	85	41	44
46	96	50	58
40	91	46	47
39	107	49	52
40	110	56	56
42	106	42	52
37	104	53	49
43	103	50	59
41	106	52	57
51	92	48	54
40	102	48	55
40	112	56	48
42	103	47	54
42	112	49	53
39	88	41	43

ΣX	1824	4531	2163	2361
$(\Sigma X)^2$	3326976	20529961	4678569	5574321
Mean	41.46	102.98	49.16	53.66

Scores for Dormitory Underclassmen on the Scott Value Scales

Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
43	105	54	58
43	112	53	47
42	93	50	53
49	101	49	54
46	106	50	48
54	105	45	56
55	101	44	56
48	93	40	50
45	101	52	50
47	102	48	54
44	102	53	52
49	99	49	59
43	96	46	54
47	90	52	50
42	94	52	54
43	110	54	59
46	85	38	50
39	101	52	58
49	105	50	58
41	115	53	60
37	101	49	51
40	98	40	51
40	95	38	42
41	107	50	60
53	110	54	57
38	99	42	56
40	104	50	58
45	99	49	49
47	102	49	53
45	104	52	56
50	103	54	58

	Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
ΣX	1382	3142	1520	1618
$(\Sigma X)^2$	1909924	9872164	2310400	2617924
Mean	44.58	101.35	49.03	52.19

Scores for Sorority Seniors on the Scott Value Scales

Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
42	107	50	47
47	102	49	60
43	106	56	60
47	97	49	56
39	89	44	50
47	112	43	53
39	106	54	59
37	100	44	54
37	115	55	59
38	103	49	57
47	108	49	49
39	103	45	52
46	97	45	49
48	100	47	56
41	100	49	48
42	108	56	58
43	99	45	55
42	100	38	52
39	108	50	58
40	100	50	56
40	96	53	50
40	103	46	53
45	104	49	51
40	117	55	58
41	94	45	54
37	109	46	56
38	102	49	56
43	101	48	51
41	110	47	58
42	116	58	60
40	101	56	55

	Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
ΣX	1284	3213	1519	1690
$(\Sigma X)^2$	1648656	10323369	2307361	2856100
Mean	41.42	103.65	49	54.52

Scores for Dormitory Seniors on the Scott Value Scales

Independence	Sociability	Academic Achievement	Intellectualism
42	104	49	57
43	100	49	56
48	100	44	53
38	82	43	49
37	105	51	51
38	85	46	47
39	112	53	58
42	102	50	55
42	89	43	51
43	95	51	46
45	101	54	53
41	103	48	59
37	111	49	54
42	106	54	54
42	92	47	56
50	102	48	57
48	85	38	56
38	97	44	50
37	94	52	52
41	97	43	58
41	108	55	58
37	102	53	52
37	103	42	53
44	105	48	49
40	95	49	54
46	103	49	57
42	100	46	49
40	111	48	57
46	106	51	56

ΣX	1165	2895	1397	1557
$(\Sigma X)^2$	1357225	8381025	650670	2424249
Mean	40.17	99.83	48.17	53.69

APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

COMPLETE REVISED FORM OF THE SCOTT VALUE SCALES

INTELLECTUALISM

Direct-scored items

Having a keen interest in international, national, and local affairs.
Having a strong intellectual curiosity.
Developing an appreciation of the fine arts—music, drama, literature, and ballet.
Having an active interest in all things scholarly.
Having cultural interests.
Striving to gain new knowledge about the world.
Enjoying books, music, art, philosophy, and sciences.
Keeping abreast of current events.
Knowing what's going on in the world of politics.
Keeping up with world news through regular reading or by watching informative programs.

Reverse-scored items

Having restricted and narrow interests.
Having no knowledge of current events.
Being interested only in one's work.
Having no opinions about the world situation.
Knowing only one's specialty.
Having little interest in arts, theater, music, and other cultural activities.
Being uninterested in national and world affairs.
Showing little interest in the finer things of life.
Ignoring what goes on in the world around one.
Reading only things that don't pose any intellectual challenge.

KINDNESS

Direct-scored items

Being kind to people, even if they do things contrary to one's beliefs.
Helping another person feel more secure, even if one doesn't like him.
Helping another achieve his own goals, even if it might interfere with your own.
Turning the other cheek, and forgiving others when they harm you.
Being considerate of others' feelings.
Finding ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
Being utterly selfless in all one's actions.

Having a deep love of all people, whoever they are.
Going out of one's way to help someone new feel at home.
Being concerned about the happiness of other people.

Reverse-scored Items

Looking out for one's own interests first.
Ridiculing other people.
Being selfish.
Ignoring the needs of other people.
Revenging wrongs that other people have done to one.
Being unable to empathize with other people.
Hurting other people's feelings.
Making jokes at the expense of other people.
Letting each person go it alone, without offering help.
Refusing any aid to people who don't deserve it.

SOCIAL SKILLS

Direct-scored items

Being well mannered and behaving properly in social situations.
Dressing and acting in a way that is appropriate to the occasion.
Being able to get people to cooperate with one.
Being poised, gracious, and charming under all circumstances.
Always doing the right thing at the right time.
Being informed in proper etiquette.
Being able to plan social functions smoothly.
Being popular with everyone.
Always behaving properly in public.
Being concerned about what kind of impression one makes on others.

Reverse-scored items

Being a social isolate.
Dressing sloppily.
Displaying unpleasant personal habits in public.
Interrupting others while they are talking.
Constantly making social blunders.
Talking constantly and attracting attention to oneself.
Having bad manners.
Being discourteous.
Being unable to act in a way that will please others.
Being ignorant of the rules of proper behavior.

LOYALTY

Direct-scored items

Defending the honor of one's group whenever it is unfairly criticized.
Working hard to improve the prestige and status of one's groups.
Helping organize group activities.
Attending all meetings of one's groups.
Upholding the honor of one's groups.
Supporting all activities of one's organizations.
Doing more than one's share of the group task.
Performing unpleasant tasks, if these are required by one's group.
Remembering one's group loyalties at all times.
Taking an active part in all group affairs.

Reverse-scored items

Betraying one's group to outsiders.
Letting other people do all the work for the group, and not getting
 involved oneself.
Letting people get away with unfair criticism of one's group.
Being unconcerned with what other people think about one's group.
Being uncooperative.
Failing to support group functions.
Paying little attention to what the members of one's group think.
Criticizing one's own group in public.
Getting by with as little involvement in organizations as possible.
Not taking one's group memberships seriously.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (GRADES)

Direct-scored items

Studying hard to get good grades in school.
Working hard to achieve academic honors.
Trying hard to understand difficult lectures and textbooks.
Striving to get the top grade-point average in the group.
Studying constantly in order to become a well educated person.
Being studious.
Getting the top grade on a test.
Treating one's studies as the most important thing in college life.
Doing well in school.
Priding oneself on good grades.

Reverse-scored items

Being content with a "gentlemanly C" grade.
Making fun of academic grinds.
Being satisfied with poor grades.
Priding oneself on being able to get by in school with little work.

Not doing well in one's coursework.
Not letting studies interfere with one's college life.
Doing one's best to avoid working hard in a course.
Being proud of poor grades.
Paying no attention to lectures and textbooks that are difficult.
Taking snap courses that don't require any work.

PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

    Direct-scored items

Being graceful and well coordinated in physical movements.
Taking good care of one's physical self, so that one is always healthy.
Being good in some form of sport.
Developing physical strength and agility.
Developing an attractive body that others will admire.
Having a good figure or physique.
Having good muscular coordination.
Being a well developed outdoors type who enjoys physical activity.
Keeping in good physical shape.
Exercising regularly.

    Reverse-scored items

Being physically weak and puny.
Being an indoor type, and avoiding outdoor activities.
Being poorly proportioned physically.
Being uninterested in sports.
Being listless and uninterested in strenuous activity.
Being awkward in bearing and walk.
Being unable to do anything that requires physical effort.
Being unskilled in any form of athletics.
Ignoring one's own physical condition.
Avoiding any form of exercise.

STATUS

    Direct-scored items

Being respected by people who are themselves worthwhile.
Gaining recognition for one's achievements.
Being in a position to direct and mold others' lives.
Making sure that one is respected.
Doing what one is told.
Being in a position to command respect from others.
Having all the respect that one is entitled to.
Being dignified in bearing and manner.
Being looked up to by others.
Enjoying great prestige in the community.

Reverse-scored Items

Acting beneath one's dignity.
Not being able to do anything better than other people.
Not being recognized for one's true worth.
Being in a subordinate position.
Having little effect on other people's actions.
Being unable to exert any influence on things around one.
Failing to develop contacts that could improve one's position.
Being content with an inferior position all one's life.
Associating with worthless people.
Not taking pride in one's achievements.

HONESTY

Direct-scored items

Never cheating or having anything to do with cheating situations,
 even for a friend.
Always telling the truth, even though it may hurt oneself or others.
Never telling a lie, even though to do so would make the situation
 more comfortable.
Sticking up for the truth under all circumstances.
Always representing one's own true thoughts and feelings honestly.
Speaking one's mind truthfully, without regard for the consequences.
Testifying against friends, if need be, in order that the truth be known.
Presenting oneself completely and honestly, even if it is unnecessary to
 do so.
Going out of one's way to bring dishonest people to justice.
Volunteering information concerning wrongdoing, even if friends are
 involved.

Reverse-scored items

Helping a close friend get by a tight situation, even though one may have
 to stretch the truth a bit to do it.
Taking things that don't belong to one.
Telling white lies.
Deceiving others.
Using others' property without asking permission.
Telling falsehoods in order to help other people.
Helping a friend through an examination.
Using a false ID card to get into restricted places.
Stealing when necessary.
Being dishonest in harmless ways.

RELIGIOUSNESS

Direct-scored items

Being devout in one's religious faith.
Always living one's religion in his daily life.
Always attending religious services regularly and faithfully.
Avoiding the physical pleasures that are prohibited in the Bible.
Encouraging others to attend services and lead religious lives.
Saying one's prayers regularly.
Seeking comfort in the Bible in time of need.
Adhering to the doctrines of one's religion.
Having an inner communication with the Supreme Being.
Having faith in a Being greater than man.

Reverse-scored items

Being an atheist.
Denying the existence of God.
Paying little attention to religious matters.
Treating man, rather than God, as the measure of all things.
Abstaining from trivial religious rituals.
Not falling for religious mythology.
Taking a skeptical attitude toward religious teachings.
Seeking scientific explanations of religious miracles.
Treating the Bible only as an historical or literary work.
Regarding religions as crutches for the primitive peoples of the world.

SELF-CONTROL

Direct-scored items

Practicing self-control.
Replying to anger with gentleness.
Never losing one's temper, no matter what the reason.
Not expressing anger, even when one has a reason for doing so.
Suppressing hostility.
Keeping one's feelings hidden from others.
Suppressing the urge to speak hastily in anger.
Hiding one's feelings of frustration from other people.
Keeping one's hostile feelings to himself.
Not getting upset when things go wrong.

Reverse-scored items

Losing one's temper easily.
Showing one's feelings readily.
Telling people off when they offend one.
Expressing one's anger openly and directly when provoked.
Getting upset when things don't go well.
Letting others see how one really feels.

Letting off steam when one is frustrated.
Swearing when one is angry.
Becoming so angry that other people know about it.
Letting people know when one is annoyed with them.

CREATIVITY (ORIGINALITY)

Direct-scored items

Being able to create beautiful and artistic objects.
Developing new and different ways of doing things.
Constantly developing new ways of approaching life.
Inventing gadgets for the fun of it.
Trying out new ideas.
Being original in one's thoughts and ways of looking at things.
Always looking for new roads to travel.
Doing unusual things.
Creating unusual works of art.
Being an innovator.

Reverse-scored items

Doing routine things all the time.
Not having any new ideas.
Always doing things in the same way.
Enjoying a routine, patterned life.
Doing things the same way that other people do them.
Abiding by traditional ways of doing things.
Repeating the ideas of others, without any innovation.
Working according to a set schedule that doesn't vary from day to day.
Painting or composing or writing in a traditional style.
Keeping one's life from changing very much.

INDEPENDENCE

Direct-scored items

Being a freethinking person, who doesn't care what others think of his opinions.
Being outspoken and frank in expressing one's likes and dislikes.
Being independent.
Standing up for what one thinks right, regardless of what others think.
Going one's own way as he pleases.
Being a non-conformist.
Being different from other people.
Encouraging other people to act as they please.
Thinking and acting freely, without social restraints.
Living one's own life, independent of others.

Reverse-scored items

Conforming to the requirements of any situation and doing what is expected of one.

Going along with the crowd.

Acting in such a way as to gain the approval of others.

Keeping one's opinions to himself when they differ from the group's.

Being careful not to express an idea that might be contrary to what other people believe.

Always basing one's behavior on the recognition that he is dependent on other people.

Acting so as to fit in with other people's way of doing things.

Always checking on whether or not one's intended actions would be acceptable to other people.

Never acting so as to violate social conventions.

Suppressing one's desire to be unique and different.

INSTRUCTIONS

The following research is being conducted as a partial requirement for a Master of Science Degree in Student Personnel Services. Your prompt attention and honest responses would be most appreciated. Instructions as to how to complete the questionnaire should be self-explanitory. When you have completed your results, please return them to the head resident of your dormitory (House Mother), sorority president, or pledge trainer.

Thank you!

Please turn in your questionnaire by April 26, 1971.

Please read over the following statements, and for each one indicate
(by a check in the appropriate space) whether it is something you always
admire in other people, or something you always dislike, or something
that depends on the situation whether you admire it or not.

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislike	
1.	_____	_____	_____	Having a keen interest in international, national, and local affairs.
2.	_____	_____	_____	Being a social isolate.
3.	_____	_____	_____	Studying hard to get good grades.
4.	_____	_____	_____	Acting beneath one's dignity.
5.	_____	_____	_____	Being a free thinking person, who doesn't care what others think of his opinions.
6.	_____	_____	_____	Enjoying great prestige in the community.
7.	_____	_____	_____	Taking snap courses that don't require work.
8.	_____	_____	_____	Being concerned about what kind of impression one makes on others.
9.	_____	_____	_____	Having a strong intellectual curiosity.
10.	_____	_____	_____	Being well mannered and behaving properly in social situations.
11.	_____	_____	_____	Working hard to achieve academic honors.
12.	_____	_____	_____	Not being able to do anything better than other people.
13.	_____	_____	_____	Suppressing one's desire to be unique and different.
14.	_____	_____	_____	Reading only things that don't pose any intellectual challenge.
15.	_____	_____	_____	Dressing and acting in a way that is appropriate to the occasion.
16.	_____	_____	_____	Being content with a "gentlemanly C" grade.

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislike	
17.	_____	_____	_____	Being respected by people who are themselves worthwhile.
18.	_____	_____	_____	Being outspoken and frank in expressing one's likes and dislikes.
19.	_____	_____	_____	Not taking pride in one's achievements.
20.	_____	_____	_____	Treating one's studies as the most important thing in college life.
21.	_____	_____	_____	Being unable to act in a way that will please others.
22.	_____	_____	_____	Having restricted and narrow interests.
23.	_____	_____	_____	Going along with the crowd.
24.	_____	_____	_____	Having an active interest in all things scholarly.
25.	_____	_____	_____	Being able to get people to cooperate with one.
26.	_____	_____	_____	Making fun of academic grinds.
27.	_____	_____	_____	Doing what one is told.
28.	_____	_____	_____	Ignoring what goes on in the world around one.
29.	_____	_____	_____	Being independent.
30.	_____	_____	_____	Developing an appreciation of the fine arts-music, drama, literature, and ballet.
31.	_____	_____	_____	Being poised, gracious, and charming under all circumstances.
32.	_____	_____	_____	Trying hard to understand difficult lectures and textbooks.
33.	_____	_____	_____	Gaining recognition for one's achievements.

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislike	
34.	_____	_____	_____	Conforming to the requirements of any situation and doing what is expected of one.
35.	_____	_____	_____	Not being recognized for one's true worth.
36.	_____	_____	_____	Standing up for what one thinks right, regardless of what others think.
37.	_____	_____	_____	Paying no attention to lectures and textbooks that are difficult.
38.	_____	_____	_____	Having no knowledge of current events.
39.	_____	_____	_____	Dressing sloppily.
40.	_____	_____	_____	Striving to get the top grade point average in the group.
41.	_____	_____	_____	Being in a subordinate position.
42.	_____	_____	_____	Going one's own way as he pleases.
43.	_____	_____	_____	Being in a position to direct and mold others' lives.
44.	_____	_____	_____	Being satisfied with poor grades.
45.	_____	_____	_____	Displaying unpleasant personal habits in public.
46.	_____	_____	_____	Having cultural interests.
47.	_____	_____	_____	Always doing the right thing at the right time.
48.	_____	_____	_____	Studying constantly in order to become a well educated person.
49.	_____	_____	_____	Having little effect on other people's actions.
50.	_____	_____	_____	Acting in such a way as to gain the approval of others.
51.	_____	_____	_____	Making sure one is respected.

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislike	
52.	___	___	___	Priding oneself on being able to get by in school with little work.
53.	___	___	___	Being informed in proper etiquette.
54.	___	___	___	Being interested only in one's work.
55.	___	___	___	Interrupting others while they are talking.
56.	___	___	___	Being studious.
57.	___	___	___	Being in a position to command respect from others.
58.	___	___	___	Never acting so as to violate social conventions.
59.	___	___	___	Having all the respect that one is entitled to.
60.	___	___	___	Not doing well in one's coursework.
61.	___	___	___	Being able to plan social functions smoothly.
62.	___	___	___	Striving to gain new knowledge about the world.
63.	___	___	___	Constantly making social blunders.
64.	___	___	___	Getting the top grade on a test.
65.	___	___	___	Being unable to exert any influence on things around one.
66.	___	___	___	Being a non-conformist.
67.	___	___	___	Being dignified in bearing and manner.
68.	___	___	___	Not letting studies interfere with college life.
69.	___	___	___	Being popular with everyone.
70.	___	___	___	Having no opinions about the world situation.
71.	___	___	___	Being discourteous.

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislike	
72.	_____	_____	_____	Doing well in school.
73.	_____	_____	_____	Failing to develop contacts that could improve one's position.
74.	_____	_____	_____	Being different from other people.
75.	_____	_____	_____	Acting so as to fit in with other people's way of doing things.
76.	_____	_____	_____	Being looked up to by others.
77.	_____	_____	_____	Being proud of poor grades.
78.	_____	_____	_____	Enjoys books, music, art, philosophy, and sciences.
79.	_____	_____	_____	Always basing one's behavior on the recognition that he is dependent on other people.
80.	_____	_____	_____	Being content with an inferior position all one's life.
81.	_____	_____	_____	Knowing only one's specialty.
82.	_____	_____	_____	Living one's own life, independent of others.
83.	_____	_____	_____	Keeping abreast of current events.
84.	_____	_____	_____	Talking constantly and attracting attention to oneself.
85.	_____	_____	_____	Always checking on whether or not one's intended actions would be acceptable to other people.
86.	_____	_____	_____	Having little interest in arts, theater, music, and other cultural activities.
87.	_____	_____	_____	Always behaving properly in public.
88.	_____	_____	_____	Keeping up with world news through regular reading or by watching informative programs.

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislikes	
89.	_____	_____	_____	Being careful not to express an idea that might be contrary to what other people believe.
90.	_____	_____	_____	Associating with worthless people.
91.	_____	_____	_____	Priding oneself on good grades.
92.	_____	_____	_____	Being uninterested in national and world affairs.
93.	_____	_____	_____	Encouraging other people to act as they please.
94.	_____	_____	_____	Being ignorant of the rules of proper behavior.
95.	_____	_____	_____	Doing one's best to avoid working hard in a course.
96.	_____	_____	_____	Showing little interest in the finer things in life.
97.	_____	_____	_____	Thinking and acting freely without social restraint.
98.	_____	_____	_____	Knowing what's going on in the world of politics.
99.	_____	_____	_____	Having bad manners.

Age_____

Year in school---Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior (Circle)

Major------Health, Recreation, or Physical Education   Letters & Science

Elementary Education   Secondary Education   (Circle)

APPENDIX C

RELATED STUDIES AND DATA

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG REVISED VALUE SCALES

(n=254)

	Indep.	Intell.	Creat.	Acad.	Hon.	Relig.	Self-cont.	Kind.	Loy.	Soc.sk.	Status	Phys.
Independence	(.82)											
Intellectualism	.18	(.82)										
Creativity	.54	.48	(.84)									
Academic achievement	.01	.47	.26	(.82)								
Honesty	-.04	.25	.10	.52	(.80)							
Religiousness	-.19	.21	.03	.35	.39	(.88)						
Self-control	-.08	.29	.14	.33	.32	.29	(.85)					
Kindness	-.12	.40	.18	.43	.47	.41	.42	(.85)				
Loyalty	-.10	.36	.19	.51	.45	.41	.38	.48	(.89)			
Social skills	-.30	.41	.10	.49	.40	.36	.42	.40	.65	(.87)		
Status	.19	.46	.46	.39	.22	.24	.25	.12	.42	.54	(.83)	
Physical development	-.05	.32	.27	.42	.21	.25	.29	.16	.42	.59	.50	(.89)

HOMOGENEITIES OF REVISED VALUE SCALES AND

CORRELATIONS WITH ORIGINAL SCALES

Value	Homogeneity H.R.[a]	r_{tt}[b]	Correlation with Original Scale
Intellectualism	.20	.82	.66
Kindness	.22	.85	.76
Social skills	.25	.87	.76
Loyalty	.28	.89	.79
Academic achievement	.19	.82	.75
Physical development	.29	.89	.81
Status	.20	.83	.67
Honesty	.17	.80	.75
Religiousness	.29	.88	.81
Self-control	.24	.85	.78
Creativity	.22	.84	.62
Independence	.19	.82	.74

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY-LA CROSSE

Sorority Grade Averages
Fall Semester 1970-1971

SORORITY	NUMBER PLEDGED	PLEDGE AVE.	NO. OF ACTIVES	ACTIVE AVE.	TOTAL MEMBERS	COMBINED AVE.	RANK	SPRING SEM. AVE.	INC. OR DEC. OVER SPRING SEMESTER
Sorority I	16	2.433	46	3.045	62	2.890	1	2.885	+ .005
Sorority II	8	2.529	61	2.906	69	2.861	2	2.726	+ .135
									All Sorority Average
Sorority III	10	2.399	52	2.941	62	2.853	3	2.878	- .025
Sorority IV	17	2.710	46	2.856	63	2.814	4	2.752	- .062
									All Women's Average
TOTAL	51		205		256			(7.5% of undergrad women)	
AVERAGES		2.536		2.937		2.855		2.814	+ .041
			ALL WOMEN'S AVERAGE			2.643		2.665	- .022
			ALL UNIVERSITY AVERAGE			2.485		2.507	- .022

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY-LA CROSSE

SORORITY GRADE STATISTICS

Sororities	1967-68		1968-69				1969-70				1970-71	
	Spring	Rk	Fall	Rk	Spring	Rk	Fall	Rk	Spring	Rk	Fall	Rk
Sorority I												
Pledge Ave.	2.51		2.46		2.29		2.626		2.384		2.529	
Active Ave.	2.80		2.63		2.75		2.712		2.806		2.906	
Comb. Ave.	2.74	4	2.58	4	2.65	4	2.687	4	2.726	4	2.861	2
Number			52		56		61		67		69	
Sorority II												
Pledge Ave.	2.71		2.55		2.55		2.783		2.810		2.433	
Active Ave.	2.98		2.93		2.94		2.845		2.907		3.045	
Comb. Ave.	2.92	2	2.82	3	2.85	2	2.831	2	2.885	1	2.890	1
Number			49		58		54		64		62	
Sorority III												
Pledge Ave.	2.45		2.26		2.56		2.609		2.357		2.710	
Active Ave.	2.96		3.02		2.91		2.848		2.893		2.856	
Comb. Ave.	2.85	3	2.90	2	2.82	3	2.802	3	2.752	3	2.814	4
Number			49		58		47		54		63	
Sorority IV												
Pledge Ave.	2.79		2.77		2.64		2.488		2.612		2.399	
Active Ave.	3.08		3.10		2.99		2.976		2.947		2.941	
Comb. Ave.	2.98	1	3.04	1	2.91	1	2.860	1	2.878	2	2.853	3
Number			48		62		58		72		62	
Sorority Ave.	2.85		2.83		2.81		2.794		2.814		2.855	
Number			198		234		220		257		256	
All Women's Ave.	2.61		2.62		2.63		2.586		2.665		2.643	

REPORT OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES BY CLASS

FOR THOSE LIVING ON AND OFF CAMPUS

By Semester GPA (Sem. 1, 1970-71)

	On Campus		Off Campus		All	
	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA
Freshmen	1679	2.1648	936	2.0334	2615	2.1178
Sophomores	555	2.5634	1027	2.4041	1582	2.4600
Juniors	153	2.7881	959	2.6708	1112	2.6870
Seniors	62	3.0918	1020	2.9277	1082	2.9371

By Cumulative GPA (Sem. 1, 1970-71)

	On Campus		Off Campus		All	
	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA
Freshmen	1679	2.1713	936	2.0674	2615	2.1341
Sophomores	555	2.5553	1027	2.4174	1582	2.4658
Juniors	153	2.7245	959	2.5961	1112	2.6138
Seniors	62	2.8589	468	2.7021	513	2.7111