

**ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RACIAL ANTAGONISM AND PREVIOUS
FRATERNAL STATUS**

THESIS

**Presented to the Graduate Council of
Southwest Texas State University
In Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements**

For the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Keith Kerr, B.S.A.S..

**San Marcos, Texas
May, 2002**

COPYRIGHT ©

By Keith T. Kerr

2002

For My Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my grandparents as the guiding force that has compelled me to pursue a master's degree. The satisfaction and joy of continued education that I have found would not have been achieved without them.

Mawmaw and Pawpaw, thank you for the value of education that you instilled in me without even realizing you passed this on. Through intensive labor jobs, without even the backing of a high school or an equivalent degree, the two of you made certain your children had the benefits of a college education. Now, only two generations removed, your sacrifices are about to lead to not only five bachelor's, but a Master's of Arts as well. I hope you are proud. It was through your sacrifices to obtain better lives for your family, that I came to value education. I only wish the both of you could be here to see what you have accomplished.

I would also like to acknowledge my second set of grandparents, Bob and Lois Kerr. In a time when higher education was by far the exception to the rule, both of you had the foresight to strive beyond what was expected and earn graduate degrees. I took notice, and chose to follow in your footsteps. More than your educational accomplishments, however, was the love of knowledge that you have taught me. Through trips to the library as a child, to early morning discussions over coffee, the two of you taught me that religion and politics were not topics to avoid, but instead, topics to find great meaning within. For this, I am more grateful than you will ever know. Nanny and Bobba, it is a blessing to know that both of you are here to witness, what in a very large sense, is both of your accomplishments.

Thanks are due to Dr. Sally Caldwell. Few other professors would spend Easter Sunday helping a student make sense of statistical data. Thank you Dr. Audwin Anderson for your guidance and advice through the thesis process. Your hands-off approach allowed me to find the self-discipline that will be required of me at the Ph.D. level. I cannot think of a better professor or a better approach to completing a thesis that would have matched my personality. Also, thanks to Glynis Christine and Cynthia. Not only did you allow me to take over your house so I could begin the statistical analysis of my data, but more importantly, the both of you provided the patience, encouragement and advice that saw me through those late-thesis days when I thought I might never finish.

Finally, Mom and Dad, thank you. The next degree is for you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1
2	Review of Literature 5
	Hypotheses 24
3	METHODOLOGY 26
	Data Collection 26
	Instrument Construction 27
	Statistical Analysis 29
4	FINDINGS 31
	Characteristics of the Sample 31
	Test of Hypotheses 34
	Other Findings 35
5	CONCLUSIONS 37
	Methodological Problems 37
	Discussion of Findings 39
	Recommendations for Further Research 43
REFERENCES	45
TABLES	48

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racdif1	48
2	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racdif2	49
3	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racdif4	50
4	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racmost	51
5	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racseg	52
6	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racpres	53
7	Crosstabs of Variables Memgreek and Racmost	54

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The Problem

As evidenced by the overwhelming amount of literature investigating correlation between fraternal membership while in college and alcohol and sexual abuse, predominantly white social fraternities have been under increasing scrutiny in recent years regarding their treatment of women and alcohol. Because of increasing concerns of lawsuits and rising insurance premiums at fraternity houses, more stringent rules and regulations were activated by fraternities and universities in the 1990s to stem what was believed to be an unacceptable level of alcohol and sexual abuse from members of these groups (Hafner 2002: Personal Correspondence). One national consultant of a predominantly white social fraternity estimated that almost 20% of his work deals with alcohol and sexual abuse related issues (Hafner 2002: Personal Correspondence). What has gone largely unnoticed, however, by both fraternities and social scientists, is what appear to be high levels of racial intolerance existing within these groups. For the most part it has only been through the reporting of news organizations that actions of racial intolerance within fraternities have come to the public's attention.

In 2001 the *Associated Press* (AP) reported that the Kappa Alpha Order Fraternity (KA) at the University of North Texas, a fraternity claiming roots in the Old South and Robert E. Lee as its spiritual founder, was placed on five-year probation after members waived a Confederate battle flag and yelled racial slurs at a group of African American

football recruits passing in front of the KA house. Five years previously, the chapter had come under scrutiny after a notebook containing racial slurs was found inside the organization's shelter (No Author Given 2001: *Associated Press*).

In November of 2001, the *Auburn University News* reported the suspension of two predominantly white social fraternities at Auburn University after professional photographs were published on the internet depicting members dressed in Ku Klux Klan robes and blackface. One student dressed in blackface had a noose around his neck. According to the AP account, the photographs were taken during a Halloween party (Lowry 2001). The same month at the University of Mississippi two Alpha Tau Omega members were expelled from the organization after photos of the two members were published on the web showing one member dressed as a police officer holding a gun to the head of another man dressed as blackface. The man dressed as blackface was shown picking cotton (Finlay and Yoste 2001).

Despite the string of recent incidents involving fraternities, few studies have been conducted which have looked at racism in these organizations. Part of the reason behind this neglect may have to do with applicability to larger populations that the studies would encounter. Demographics of fraternities vary greatly from campus to campus. Different sizes, differing membership dues, group composition, different geographical locations and histories all work to make it difficult to translate any findings on one college campus to social fraternities on another college campus (Fox et al. 1987). While it is difficult to locate prior findings related to the work at hand, there has been a limited amount of research that has looked at issues concerning racial antagonism within predominantly white social fraternities. Recent studies have indicated members of white fraternal

organizations are more racist as compared to those not in fraternities (Muir 1991), undergraduates living in Greek Housing show greater acceptance of country clubs that exclude ethnic minorities, less interest in associating with those from different cultures and racial backgrounds, greater opposition to interracial marriages and less concern about racial prejudice and the rise of hate groups (Morris 1991). Further, recent studies have also found that perpetrators of ethnoviolent acts (violent acts directed at a person because of that person's perceived ethnicity) on college campuses are more likely to be male fraternity members (Ehrlich 1991).

While previous research seems to indicate correlation between current fraternal status and degrees of racial antagonism, the data available for this study, as well as the research design, afford the opportunity to examine what is believed to be a previously unexplored question. That is, is there any correlation between *previous* fraternal status and degrees of racial antagonism held later in life? Absent a longitudinal design, it is impossible to determine the true nature of any association that might be found between prior fraternal status and present day attitudes. Nonetheless, this study hopes to determine if there is a need for future in-depth investigations.

Although there have been some research efforts directed toward the question of fraternal status and racial attitudes, the studies are few in number and spread across a variety of disciplines (e.g., African American studies, education, and sociology). Moreover, existing studies on the general area of inquiry tend to focus on the link between fraternal status and racial attitudes on the part of *current* college or university students. No research has been identified that explores the question as to whether or not someone's prior status as a member of a fraternal organization might be linked to racial

attitudes held later in life. Despite the limitations, some studies do shed light on the possibility of such a link. At a minimum, they serve to underscore the need for the research at hand.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Past theoretical efforts and empirical studies relevant to the topic at hand can be divided into three themes. First, is theoretical literature that has attempted to document and explain perceived race/ethnicity differences. Second, is research that explores the correlation between current fraternal status and racial antagonism, and third is literature that has explored links between the influence of college experiences and attitudes/values later in life.

Theory and Race

The first of the three themes to be discussed here will deal with the theoretical literature and its contribution to how perceived racial differences are explained. Of note in this body of literature is the rich and varied ideas and explanations that each theory has proposed to explain perceived racial differences. The section will begin with a brief introduction to the concept of social distance, as developed in the early part the 20th century by Parks and later Bogardus, will continue with an examination of theories

behind prejudices, then conclude with an examination of a more recent theoretical piece on race relations in the United States.

One of the methods employed in the current study of racial antagonism and fraternal status, drew heavily upon the concept of social distance. The concept was first introduced by Parks in 1924 who described the concept as, “the grades and the degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterizes personal and social relations generally,” (Ehrlich 1975). One year later, Bogardus operationalized the concept and later refined it in 1933 (Cover 1995, Bogardus 1933). Bogardus’ social distance scale was devised to gauge the subject’s willingness to associate with people of different racial, religious, and occupational backgrounds in five different social categories (family member, friend, neighbor, co-worker and member of same country) (Bogardus 1933). The idea being that levels of social distance would increase as one moved up through the list of social categories (Weinfurt and Moghaddam 2001). Bogardus believed that by testing a subject’s “feelings” toward interacting with people of different backgrounds in different situations, we could come to a better and a more predictive understanding of their attitudes. In a 1947 article titled “Measurements of Personal-Group Behavior,” Bogardus defended the validity of the test,

Feeling reactions reveal “likes” and “dislikes” better than any other approach. Social distance tests disclose these reactions in the simplest, crudest, and purest forms. They indicate how a person would express himself toward his fellows if he acted “without thinking,” “just the way he feels,” and without regard to politeness and social amenities, or his own status...He can “let loose” and express his innermost feelings (307).

The impact from the development of this scale has been vast if one considers the wide-use of the scale today, some 70 years after its development, and the fact that some researchers still feel a need to attack the validity of the scale (Weinfurt and Moghaddam 2001). Despite its wide use, there do appear to be major problems with its application. The most apparent of these is the question, what exactly is the scale measuring? As explicitly stated by Bogardus in his 1947 article in *Sociometry*, and as alluded to in the above quote from the same article, Bogardus felt that measures of social distance (i.e., attitudes and feelings toward certain groups) could best be used as predictors of behavior toward those groups in certain social circumstances. However, Bogardus also suggested later in the same article that the scale should also be given at regular intervals to subjects in order to measure changes in social distance attitudes (Bogardus 1947). Studies have consistently indicated prejudiced attitudes/feelings and racist behaviors can occur independent of one another (Ehrlich 1975). Thus, the scale appears to be best utilized not as a tool of predictive behavior, but instead, as a means to gauge longitudinal trends in attitude amongst a certain group or individual, or when comparing attitudes between groups. Hence the applicability of the scale to the current study.

Therefore, while it appears to be presumptuous to use the scale as a predictive tool of behavior, researchers do seem to agree that the scale can be employed to gauge at least attitudes towards certain groups in increasingly intimate social settings.

Arguably, Bogardus' measure of social distance allows researchers to measure degrees of prejudiced attitudes toward certain groups. Explaining the formation and maintenance of these prejudices, however, fall beyond the scope of the social distance measure and moves into the theoretical realm of social psychology. Within social psychology there is a vast and developed amount of work that attempts to explain the formation and maintenance of prejudice. The following section will attempt to give a brief outline of the substantive theories that have emerged out of the discipline.

Prejudice

The first task that must be accomplished before reviewing literature on prejudice, is to define what is meant by "prejudice." A simple definition of the term is hard to come by. Early uses of the word defined it simply as a "pre-judgement," or a decision before the facts could be examined (Levin 1975). Of note in this early definition is the value-free wording of it. That is, one could hold a positive prejudice just as easily as a negative prejudice. For the purpose of the current research and examination of theoretical literature that will explore prejudice, the term will be restricted to include only negative prejudices directed at ethnic groups and thus, can be defined as such:

Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group (Allport 1954: 9).

Speaking to the formation and maintenance of these prejudices in his book *The Social Animal*, social psychologist Elliot Aronson argues that prejudices are ultimately derived from a person's need for self-justification of their power and status position. Citing various studies to back-up his assertion, Aronson says that as individuals' social status begins to decline, we can expect to see an increase in prejudice, and conversely, as social status increases, there is a decrease in prejudice attitudes.

When looked at from the social-psychological viewpoint, Aronson contends that there are four causes for prejudices. First is economic and political competition, which arise as jobs or resources within a society are scarce. A second cause for prejudice is the "scapegoat" effect. In this phenomenon there is a psychological need to displace anger, and groups which are deemed the weakest (generally ethnic minorities), tend to feel the brunt of this displacement in the form of prejudice formation and maintenance toward them. Aronson goes on to argue that a third cause of prejudice is a predisposition of some personalities toward prejudice attitudes. Aronson states that people with "authoritarian personalities" are predisposed to be rigid in their beliefs, they have an intolerance for weakness in others, they tend to be punitive, value authority to extreme degrees and are overly suspicious. The fourth and final cause of prejudice that Aronson addresses is prejudice through conformity. Stated simply, this causation is the result of human needs to conform to social norms. If those norms include prejudiced attitudes

toward certain groups, then we can expect the formation and maintenance of prejudiced attitudes in order to conform to pre-existing and prevailing norms (Aronson 1992).

In his book, *The Function of Prejudice*, Levin makes many of the same points highlighted in Aronson's treatment of the subject (see above), with one major difference; Levin attempts to work these causes of prejudices into a larger social system and show how prejudice is maintained because of its functionality. Expounding on this point, Levin writes,

...prejudice persists in our society precisely because it continues to have adaptive benefits- latent and manifest, long term and short term, psychological and sociological- for elements of the majority group as well as the minority group. It follows that we then can only reduce prejudice and attendant majority-minority inequities to the extent that we actually come to grips with the important functions that prejudice serves (Levin 1975: 10).

Psychologically speaking, Levin contends that prejudice-forming actions, such as anger displacement and the predisposition of personalities toward prejudice, function as means to protect the self-esteem and the self-image of the individual, and function to reduce uncertainty. Speaking of prejudice's functionality at the societal level, Levin asserts that prejudice serves to maintain existing occupational status, helps to justify the performance of minimum and low-wage jobs, and also serves to protect power structures by helping to exert hostilities at minority groups rather than at the power structure itself (Levin 1975).

In short, then, it can be said that not only does prejudice serve as unique psychological coping mechanisms, but further, it serves as a function within the larger institutional structure of a given society.

Social structure and race

Not everyone, however, is convinced of the problem and pervasiveness of prejudice in contemporary American society. In fact, some would argue that in the study of racial differences, prejudice should not be the focus, but instead, those structural forces which have led to inequalities between racial and ethnic groups should serve as the main area of research.

In recent years, William Julius Wilson's, *The Declining Significance of Race*, has perhaps been the most influential of those arguing this point. In his groundbreaking book, Wilson contends that racial antagonism has historically been a product of the economy. However, Wilson also argues that it is from these past economic structural (dys)functions which forced black laborers into lower socio-economic brackets, that negative stereotypes of blacks are ultimately derived. Wilson speculated that once the SES status of this group rises, the stereotypes will ultimately dissipate (Wilson 1974). The point most pertinent to the thesis at hand, is Wilson's contention that despite the rise in SES of blacks in the second half of the 20th century, racism still exists. It has simply shifted to the sociopolitical arena (Wilson 1974). Further, while racist actions and

ideologies have an impact on African Americans, life-chances are ultimately derived from the economic sector and not the sociopolitical arena, leading Wilson to conclude that there is a declining significance to race (Wilson 1974). It can be reasoned that if blacks are making their way into the workforce and are making more money, then they will begin to want and demand access to areas that their newfound social mobility exposes them too (such as private clubs and fraternal organizations). Wilson hypothesized that it was in these places that racist conflicts would occur in modern society, hence the applicability of Wilson's study to the present research.

Not all theorists, however, have agreed with Wilson's assertion that there is a declining significance of race. In his book titled *Portraits of White Racism*, Wellman contends that class and race play equal roles in shaping attitudes and values towards different ethnic groups in the United States (Wellman 1994). In short, Wellman argues that peoples' lives are created through the push and pull that social class and race advantages (or disadvantages) have on the individual. Speaking of white middle class Americans, Wellman argues that much of the animosity this group may feel toward blacks comes from perceived pressures of black Americans moving into the traditional white middle class. In essence, these blacks are creating increased competition within the social class. In short, white middle class Americans feel trapped between the blacks moving up and the ceiling that the middle class economic structure imposes.

The upward and downward pushes pinch them between simultaneous threats. From above they are squeezed economically. From below they are pushed to make room for more competition over resources already squeezed from above. From both directions they are told they are better off because they are white, but they do not feel *better* off (Wellman, 215 1994)

Later it will be argued that fraternities and social clubs in general are private creations which uniquely serve to undercut the dual pressures of economic limitation and racial competition that Wellman sees pressuring white working and middle class Americans, and which he sees as ultimately the genesis of racial antagonism.

Fraternities and Racial Antagonism: Recent Findings

The following section will explore the literature that has examined the correlation between *current* fraternal status and racial antagonism, an area that Wilson predicts high levels of racial antagonism will be found. As previously stated, there has been no literature identified which has examined links between *previous* fraternal status and racial antagonism. Within the last decade there have been a number of incidents involving fraternities that have given reason for social scientists and educators to begin examining issues of race in the context of fraternities.

One such incident was documented in a 1991 *New York Times* article. According to the article, in the 160-year history of the University of Alabama, no African American had joined a predominantly white social fraternity on that campus, leading some to call for attempts at integration of the Greek system. In 1991 the school passed a new

accreditation policy for fraternities which mandated a certain level of academic and moral standards for members. In addition, the regulation called for “a commitment to the university’s stated ideal of an inclusive campus and good faith efforts to achieve and maintain a racially and culturally diverse chapter management”. The regulation resulted in the *New York Times* piece titled, “University of Alabama: Integration is at hand for the Fraternity System,” (No Author Given 1991: *New York Times*). It wasn’t until over a decade later that the first African American male entered into the predominantly white Greek social system (No Author Given November, 2001: *Associated Press*).

While this is just one of many recent examples of the intersection of race and fraternities, recent studies in the educational, African American studies, and sociological fields have consistently found a correlation between current fraternal status and racial antagonism.

Education’s examination of fraternities and race

Several studies published in education and higher education journals in the past decade have begun to lay the groundwork for the assertion that higher degrees of racial antagonism exist within predominantly white social fraternities as compared with those students not belonging to such groups. The National Study of Student Learning (NSSL), a federally funded program designed to measure effects of learning and attitudes in college students, found that affiliation with a Greek organization had negative effects on

students' openness to diversity. In the paper documenting some of these findings, "Influences of Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College," Pascella et al. cited previous research which indicated that higher rates of education was correlated to more open and tolerant views of other races and cultures. Attempting to replicate findings of previous research, 3,910 students at 18 different institutions were followed for three-years in the NSSL study. The findings mirrored previous research, indicating that the level of education was inversely proportionate to openness of diversity (Pascella et al. 1996). Pascella et al. concluded that, "Most of college impact is the 'cumulative result of a set of interrelated experiences sustained over an extended period of time' rather than the result of any single experience" (Pascella et al. 1996: 187-188). However, not all involvement had a positive impact. Holding other variables constant, membership in a fraternity had a negative impact on openness to diversity (Pascella et al. 1996). The authors hypothesized that,

...(fraternities) provide essentially homogenous and insulating environments that minimize the opportunities that white students have to interact with people of diverse backgrounds and philosophies. In this sense, Greek affiliation may provide a more proximal and influential psychosocial context than the level of openness to diversity and challenge characterizing the overall undergraduate student body of the institution as a whole (Pascella et al. 1996: 20)

A second study by Pascella, Whitt et al. (1996) analyzing data from the NSSL, found that Greek affiliation had a significantly negative impact on cognitive abilities, as

well, when compared with the non-Greek population and that these negative effects were discernable after only one year.

Pascella, Whitt et al. came to similar conclusions of Pike and Askew (1990) who had studied the issue at a single institution. The Pike and Askew study found small but significant negative effects of fraternity membership on the cognitive development of college seniors. In their study of 6,466 seniors at a single university, Pike and Askew found that while Greeks report higher levels of academic effort, white fraternity men have a significantly lower (.001 level of significance) GPA when compared with independent males (Pike and Askew 1990). Terenzini et al. documented concurrent findings in a 1999 article for the *Journal of College Student Development*. These corresponding findings raise the question; does fraternity membership's hindrance on cognitive ability also effect rates of racial antagonism in fraternity members? If past research is correct in that as education levels rise, racial antagonism decreases, one could predict that negative cognitive effects correlated with fraternity membership could help to account for a degree of the higher rates of racial antagonism found in this group.

A 1991 study examining race and fraternities by Morris, found results similar to other studies within the realm of education. Morris found those students living in Greek Housing were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to feel that racially segregated fraternities and sororities were OK. The sample included 270 undergraduates at a single university. Morris' study indicated those living in Greek housing were significantly less likely to

associate with people from other races or cultures ($p < .01$), and were also over twice as likely to find it morally and/or socially okay to join a country club that excluded racial minorities. It was also discovered that nearly a quarter of Greeks surveyed (24%) felt that interracial marriages were “clearly...wrong.” Only 12% of the non-Greeks responded in this manner, creating a statistically significant difference at the .02 level (Morris 1990).

While previous research in the educational field has established what appears to be a relatively strong correlation between current fraternal status and higher degrees of racial antagonism, a 1986 study by Wilder et al. added an interesting dimension to the breadth of knowledge regarding fraternal status and racial antagonism within the educational field. Utilizing a longitudinal study of 2,178 students at a single university from subject's freshman to senior year, Wilder et al. found that Greek members initially scored lower on measures of liberalism, cultural sophistication and social conscience. While gains from freshman to senior year between Greeks and independents were consistent in three of the four areas, Wilder et al. found that Greeks showed smaller gains in cultural sophistication (1986).

Sociology's examination of fraternities and race

Most of the limited research on fraternities and race come from the education field. Sociology, however, has also contributed to our understanding of fraternities and

race. Muir's results from his 1991 seem to support previous research in the educational field. Using data from 1,710 anonymous questionnaires distributed at the University of Alabama, Muir's study found significant differences in fraternity members and independents in regards to race/ethnicity issues. The study looked at social distance scores between Greeks and non-Greeks and found that on the 14 measures used, members of white Greek social fraternities were significantly less accepting of blacks than non-Greeks in every area investigated. In order to determine if differences in rates of social distance between Greeks and non-Greeks could be contributed to in-house culture or if it was caused by the recruitment of already racist individuals, Muir partialated the data by class year. His findings indicated that relatively racist students receive bids from fraternities and sororities. However, Muir found that Greek seniors were more accepting of blacks than freshman Greeks in 12 of the 14 areas of comparison. He concluded this indicates some loosening of racist beliefs occurs within the Greek system over time. However, when Greek seniors were compared with non-Greek seniors, results indicated non-Greek's were more accepting in 13 of 14 areas. Thus, Muir concluded, "...the Greek system, recruiting from the most prejudiced of first-year students, maintains relative, but lessening, prejudice throughout the college years," (Muir 1991: 97).

Other significant findings indicated that nearly 88% of Fraternity men would have objections to dating a black, 12.5% of Fraternity men felt that there should be legal

restrictions against blacks running for public office, and nearly 1 out of 10 Greek men felt that blacks should not receive equal treatment by police and courts (Muir 1991).

A second study within sociology found significant differences between Greek's and non-Greek's adherence to black stereotypes. A 1994 study, conducted by Wood and Chesser, employed a non-random, voluntary survey questionnaire completed by 918 students at a single university. While the sample was not random, data provided by the target university's Public Relation Office indicated that the sample was proportionately representative of the student population when broken down by race, gender, fraternal affiliation, political orientation and GPA (Wood and Chesser 1994).

Wood and Chesser found a correlation between Greek affiliation and adherence to stereotypes of African Americans. At the .05 level of significance, Greeks were more likely to adhere to negative stereotypes of blacks than were non-Greeks. Interestingly, Greeks were also significantly more likely to adhere to positive stereotypes of blacks than were non-Greeks (.001 level) (Wood and Chesser 1994). It must be noted here, however, that the study failed to partialate these numbers by gender or race. Therefore, any conclusions from the data regarding white male fraternity members would only be speculative.

What is not speculative is the evidence pointing to white, male, fraternity members as the most likely perpetrators of campus ethnoviolence. While anti-intellectualism, elitism and sexism within fraternities has been previously documented

(Yancey and Hummer 1989; Moffatt 1995), a 1992 report by Ehrlich also indicated that perpetrators of on-campus violence against minorities were more likely to be white male students, and that fraternity members are over represented in this group (1992). According to Ehrlich, his findings were consistent with a 1991 study by the Campus Violence Prevention Center which found that perpetrators of campus crimes (rape, assault, vandalism, robbery, theft) were more likely to be athletes or fraternity members, males and have lower GPAs (Ehrlich 1992).

The final study within sociology to be discussed here attempted to look at the limiting effects of Greek membership and gender on the correlation between education and racial prejudice. Floyd et al. used data from a representative sample of 398 undergraduate students at an undisclosed southern university with an evangelical Protestant history. All respondents were white (Floyd et al.: Unpublished Manuscript).

Floyd et al. examined willingness to establish relations with Blacks, Hispanics and Asians in regards to residential neighborhoods, church, friendships and dating. Findings indicated significant inclusiveness in the first three contexts, but significant exclusion in the context of non-white dating partners. As would be expected, those with the most education (seniors) were the most willing to outdate (63.4% willing to date Hispanics, 54.3% willing to date Asians, 35.1% willing to date blacks). When controlled for Greek membership, data indicated that non-Greeks were more open to racial outdating than were their Greek counterparts. While the study found an increase in

willingness of outdating among Greeks as educational levels rose, by far the most prejudicial group was freshman Greek members of which only 5.1% were willing to date blacks (Floyd et al: Unpublished Manuscript).

In comparing influences of Greek affiliation and sex in correlation with education and prejudicial attitudes towards racial outdating, both measures lowered the influence of education. Floyd, et al concluded, “The Greek membership seems to have the greater impact of the two (on willingness to racially outdate)” (Floyd et al.: Unpublished Manuscript).

African American Studies' examination of fraternities and race

The literature on African American fraternities focus the bulk of its attention on predominantly black fraternal organizations and the attitudes and actions of members of this organization. However, a 1987 study by Fox et al., published in the *Journal of Negro Education*, sought to compare attitudes held by black and white fraternity members. The study was conducted on a 6,000-student college campus and utilized the *College Student Questionnaire* to gauge subjects Family Independence, Peer Independence, Liberalism, Social Conscience, Cultural Sophistication and Satisfaction with Educational Experience. The results indicated that at statistical significant levels, white fraternity members were less involved with social issues, scored lower on the liberalism scale, and had lower

scores on social-conscience measures. In addition, white fraternity members were found to be less involved with other formal associations on campus as compared with their black counterparts. Fox et al. went on to conclude that the experience of black fraternity members is Therefore different in both attraction and retention of members as compared with white fraternities. The data showed a link between membership in a black fraternity and greater overall integration into the university as a whole. For whites, however, membership within a Greek organization correlated with higher levels of segregation- an opposite effect when compared to their black counterparts (Fox et al. 1987).

Attitude Formation in College

The literature exploring current fraternal status and attitudes toward minorities seems to support assertions of higher levels of racial antagonism amongst white fraternity members. It is important, however, to pair these studies with other findings that have examined long-term affects of value formation in college.

Until the 1950s, it was widely accepted that attending college effected changes in the personality, attitudes and values of students. By the 1960s there was significant evidence to back up these assumptions. Beach (1966), Chickering and McCormick (1973), Feldman and Newcomb (1969) and various others all found data in their research that indicated on average, college students moved in the direction of greater liberalism in

the political, social and religious views. What was not clear at the time, however, was how lasting these changes were. In a 1976 study of the issue, Kuh concluded that impressions made during the college years were very important in regards to certain aspects of a student's lives after college. 492 entering freshmen were given the Omnibus Personality Inventory and the Alumni Questionnaire in their first semester of school. Four years later, these same students were asked to complete the test again, and then two years following graduation, were asked to complete the tests a final time. After analyzing the data, Kuh concluded that the freshman-to-senior changes in attitudes and values were consistent with the findings of other studies (see above). In the four years between the first administration of the test and the second, the students exhibited significant increases in their general intellectual orientation, appreciation for the aesthetics and religious liberalism. In addition, subjects also saw a decrease in the measure of importance of material possessions (Kuh 1976).

Kuh went on to conclude that the social and emotional maturation that occurred between the freshmen and senior years continued during the adult years. Further, subjects became more self-assured and more comfortable with the needs of others (Kuh 1976). Notably, the study failed to measure any sort of racial antagonism, the main concern with the present paper. However, what is pertinent to the paper at hand, is the link that the author makes between attitude and value formation from college on into adulthood. While one cannot say with certainty that degrees of racial antagonism will

fall in line with the attitudes and values investigated in the Kuh study, it appears that enough evidence is currently available to at least hypothesize about the persistence of racial antagonism once out of college.

Hypotheses

As demonstrated in the above research, the findings investigating the correlation between current fraternal status and levels of racial antagonism, seem to be consistent and span across several disciplines. Based upon the existing empirical research, as well as the theoretical notions outlined above, one could reasonably assume the possibility of some link between prior fraternal status and present day expressions of racial antagonism. Thus, based on the previous empirical and theoretical literature, the current study investigates the correlation between *prior* fraternal status and degrees of racial antagonism held after graduation from a college or university. Breaking the term “racial antagonism” into its smaller elements, the current study hypothesizes that individuals with prior fraternal affiliation exhibit higher degrees of social distance after graduation from a college or a university, than those with no prior fraternal affiliation. Further, the study hypothesizes that those with prior fraternal affiliation exhibit higher degrees of prejudiced attitudes after graduation from a college or a university, than those with no prior fraternal affiliation. Therefore, the following formal hypotheses are advanced:

Individuals with a prior Greek fraternal affiliation exhibit higher degrees of social distance than those without a prior Greek fraternal affiliation; and

Individuals with a prior Greek fraternal affiliation exhibit higher degrees of prejudiced attitudes than those without a prior Greek fraternal affiliation

Conversely, the study will utilize the inverse of the above hypotheses in order to perform tests on the statements. The testable null hypotheses will be as follows:

There is no difference in degree of social distance between individuals with a prior Greek fraternal affiliation and those without a prior Greek fraternal affiliation; and

There is no difference in degree of prejudiced attitudes between individuals with a prior Greek fraternal affiliation and those without a prior Greek fraternal affiliation

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The present research utilized a pre-existing data set in the form of the General Social Survey (GSS). The GSS is an almost annual national survey of American households carried out by the National Opinion Research Consortium, with funding provided from both public and private grants. The survey first began in 1972 and has been conducted every year with the exceptions of 1979 and 1981 when lack of funds temporarily halted the survey. The data collected in the survey is free and open to the public (ICPSR Website).

The design of the survey consists of approximately 600 questions covering a wide range of social topics and issues. The design, however, stresses repetition. Many of the question are repeated each year in order to measure social change (and stability). Outside of the replicated questions, “topical modules” are added each year in to order to measure timely, but sometimes fleeting topics. In addition to the replicated questions and topical modules, at times the GSS employs experimental questions to test a variant in working or order in standard GSS questions. This process helps to ensure the validity of GSS questions (Davis and Smith 1992).

The survey is administered in the form of field interviews conducted by some 800-900 trained interviewers from across the country. The GSS probability sample is a stratified, multi-stage area probability sample of clusters of households in the United States. The survey population covers people 18 and over living in households. Excluded from the sample are those adults living in institutions and group quarters. As of 1990, the survey included 97.3% of the resident adult population in the United States (Davis and Smith 1992).

Instrument Construction

For the purpose of this study, it was necessary to exclude females from analysis in the GSS data set since the population comprised of fraternity members restricts access to their organizations to this segment of the general population. Any difference in rates of racial antagonism that may exist between sexes could have served to undermine the validity of the study at hand, since these differences would be incorporated into conclusions of one population (non fraternity-affiliated individuals), but not the population it was measured against (individuals with fraternal affiliation). For the same reason, the sample was also limited to those males who identified themselves as “white” and who had attended college for 1-8 years.

Likewise, all data obtained from the GSS was limited to the years of 1988-1991. It must be noted that the design of the data collection prevented any sort of longitudinal

data between these years, but instead grouped all data together. 1988-1991 was selected as the years to be measured because of the convergence of several variables measuring racial antagonism along with a variable measuring fraternal affiliation while in school.

Therefore, filters were used on the GSS site to include in the data set only white males with at least some college experience who had been surveyed between the years 1988 and 1991.

For purpose of this study, racial antagonism will refer to combined levels of social distance and prejudiced attitudes. Fraternal status will refer to a subject's prior association with a fraternal organization (i.e., member or non-member of a Greek fraternal organization while in college or university).

In order to measure social distance between groups, four questions were taken from the GSS which measured subjects' opinion on laws against interracial marriages, subject's opinions on white's right to maintain racially segregated neighborhoods, likelihood of voting for a black president, and willingness to send children to a school where most of the students were black. Subjects were asked a second group of questions which measured beliefs as to why blacks appear to have "worse jobs, income, and housing than white people," in three different areas.

Statistical Analysis

For purposes of statistical analysis, the population under study was defined as white males with at least some college experience who were asked as to their previous fraternal status and were surveyed in the years spanning 1988-1991. The GSS initially located 769 subjects who met the criteria. Of the 769, 78 indicated prior fraternal status and 691 indicated no prior fraternal experience. However, due to the construction of the GSS, while all subjects were asked about previous fraternal status, not all were surveyed regarding the seven dependant variables under investigation.

In order to overcome this problem, it was necessary to take a sub-sample of the original sample for each dependent variable to be tested. For example, while 769 subjects were asked about prior fraternal status, only approximately half were surveyed over their opinion on property owner's rights to segregated neighborhoods. Therefore, subjects who were not asked this question were eliminated.

Additionally, those indicating no prior fraternal status and who were questioned over their opinions on property owner's rights to segregated neighborhoods, outnumbered subjects with previous fraternal status by almost 10 to 1. A sub-sample was taken to obtain roughly equal numbers of subjects in each group. The process was repeated for each variable.

This was accomplished by creating seven separate files for each dependent variable. Included in each of the files were the dependent variable to be tested, the independent variable (fraternity membership) and the control variables. Each file was handled separately. Initially, those subjects who were not measured on the dependent variable isolated in the file were deleted. SPSS was then utilized to locate all subjects who indicated prior fraternal status. Once identified, SPSS was employed to select a random number of subjects, equal to the number of subjects who had indicated prior fraternal status, who had indicated no previous fraternal affiliation. Once done, each of the seven dependent variables had an equal number of fraternity and non-fraternity affiliated males from which statistical tests could be run.

Next, frequency distributions were run on the original sample as well as the seven sub-samples. In order to test both hypothesis one and two, Chi-square analysis's were run to test for significance in the four dependent variables measuring social distance and three dependent variables measuring prejudice.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Characteristics of the Sample

As indicated in the previous chapter, the sample was limited to only those subjects who had classified themselves as caucasian, male and who had at least some college experience. Since seven sub-samples were taken for each of the seven dependent variables to be tested, the demographics for the sub-samples will be treated individually.

Social Distance Sub-Samples

Sub-Sample 1 Demographics: Opinions on laws against interracial marriages

Sub-sample 1 contained 74 respondents with a mean age of 42.92. Over 67% of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 24.7% lower class. Almost three quarters reported either currently being married or had previously been married; 44.6% reported having no children and over 80% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Sub-Sample 2 Demographics: Opinions on rights to segregated neighborhoods

Sub-sample 2 contained 76 respondents with a mean age of 41. Over 73% of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 19.7% in the lower class.

Almost 66% reported either currently being married or had previously been married; While 41.1% reported having no children and over 70% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Sub-Sample 3 Demographics: Likelihood to vote for a black president

Sub-sample 3 contained 80 respondents with a mean age of 39.29. Almost 68% of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 21.3% in the lower class. Almost 64% reported either currently being married or had previously been married; 51.2% reported having no children and over 72% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Sub-Sample 4 Demographics: Willingness to send kids to a predominantly black school

Sub-sample 4 contained 74 respondents with a mean age of 39.32. About 56% of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 33.8% lower class. Almost 72% reported either currently being married or had previously been married; 54.1% reported having no children and over 69% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Prejudice Sub-Samples

Sub-Sample 5 Demographics: Belief that blacks are worse-off due to discrimination

Sub-sample 4 contained 86 respondents with a mean age of 42.36. Over 67% of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 23.3% lower class.

Almost 68% reported either currently being married or had previously been married; 50% reported having no children and 70% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Sub-sample 6 Demographics: Belief that blacks are worse off due to less in-born ability

Sub-sample 4 contained 86 respondents with a mean age of 40.1. Fifty-seven percent of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 30.2% lower class. Over 66% reported either currently being married or had previously been married; 52.3% reported having no children and 71% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Sub-sample 7 Demographics: Belief that blacks were worse off due to lack of motivation

Sub-sample 4 contained 90 respondents with a mean age of 42.9. Sixty percent of respondents reported themselves as members of the middle class and 30% in the lower class. 71.1% reported either currently being married or had previously been married; 56.7% reported having no children and 61.4% of respondents reported they lived “close to African Americans.”

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 stated that individuals with a prior Greek fraternal affiliation exhibit higher degrees of social distance than those without a prior Greek fraternal affiliation. In the measurements of the four social distance variables that comprised hypothesis 1, no significant differences between those with a previous fraternal status and those with no

prior fraternal status was found within any of the four variables. Therefore, rejection of hypothesis 1 is warranted. Further, when controlled for age, marital status, self-reported social class, number of children and racial make-up of those living near respondent, no significant differences between fraternal status and social distance materialized.

Hypothesis 2 stated that individuals with a prior Greek fraternal affiliation exhibit higher degrees of prejudiced attitudes than those without a prior Greek fraternal affiliation. In the measurements of the three variables gauging prejudice, comprising hypothesis 2, again no significant differences between fraternal status and three measures of prejudice was found. Likewise, hypothesis 2 is rejected. When controlled for age, marital status, self-reported social class, number of children and racial make-up of those living near the respondent, no significant differences between fraternal status and prejudice was found.

Possible reasons for lack of correlation will be discussed in detail later, but for now, it suffice to say that there are several factors that could have caused a lack of correlation. Foremost of these is possibly the similar social environment that the measured subjects now live in. By social environment, it is meant a similar economic sector, class environment and other factors such as shared norms for how working adults are to behave themselves.

Other Findings

Ultimately, there appears to be no correlation between prior fraternal status and rates of rational antagonism later in life. This is not to say that racial antagonism does

not exist among the sampled population. On the contrary, measurements of several variables hinted at heightened levels of social distance and prejudiced attitudes. One out of 10 respondents would not vote for a black president nominated by their political party. Almost forty-two percent of respondents had objections to sending their children to a school where most of the students were black. Over 63% of subjects felt that blacks were worse off than whites for reasons other than discrimination and 59.4% said this reason was due to lack of motivation or will power. Further, while data from the current research seems to indicate the presence of varying levels of social distance and prejudiced attitudes, other measures seem to hint at lack of racial antagonism. While over 2 out of 5 would object to sending their children to a school that was mostly black, almost 95% of subjects felt that property owners did not have the right to keep blacks from moving into a neighborhood.

Again, while not at significant levels, there are several instances where directional trends indicate higher levels of prejudice attitudes opposite of direction predicted by the hypotheses. Measuring opinions as to why blacks are “worse off” than whites, 62.8% of non-Greeks indicated it was due to lack of motivation, while only 55.8% of Greeks answered in this manner. Additionally, 8% of non-Greeks felt that there should be laws against whites and blacks marrying. No Greek-affiliated subjects felt the same.

In short, the hypotheses predicting correlation between fraternal status and rates of racial antagonism held later in life, must both be rejected. Additional findings show that in at least two of the seven measures, while not at significant levels, predicted directional trends move opposite of this prediction. That is to say that non-Greeks

answered in such a way that it appears they hold more prejudiced attitudes on the two measures, than Greeks.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Methodological Problems

First and foremost, it must be noted that previous research cited in this study focused primarily on predominantly white social fraternities. Likewise, the current study set about to study racial antagonism amongst those who were previously affiliated or not affiliated with these groups. Due to the GSS's construction of the question measuring prior fraternal status, any conclusions on racial antagonism held later in life on the part of previous members of predominantly white social fraternities can only be speculative in nature. The question measuring prior fraternal status did not distinguish between social fraternities and service fraternities. Further, the question did not ascertain the racial composition of the fraternity subjects indicated they belonged to. Therefore, it is possible that white subjects who indicated previous fraternal status could have belonged to a historically black fraternity or to a service fraternity.

Further, as indicated in Chapter 2, data collected for the current study spanned from 1988-1991. The subsequent decade that has passed since the collection of the data may mean that data collected today would yield different results. Therefore, any conclusions from the study are time bound. That is they are limited to the time span in

which they were collected and cannot be used to come to any conclusions regarding those today with prior fraternal status.

Next, the limited number of subjects with prior fraternal status ($n=78$) surveyed by the GSS is somewhat low for a comprehensive national sample. Compounding the problem, not all respondents indicating previous fraternal status were asked the seven variables which the present study utilized in measuring racial antagonism. This worked to further lower the number of subjects included in the sub-sample of any one variable. Perhaps with a larger sample, results may have differed. Additionally, with such a small number of subjects for a national sample, conclusions regarding this sample must be tentative

Finally, it must also be realized that the current study was not longitudinal in nature. Because of the research design of the GSS, comparison of results from the current study cannot be compared with research reviewed measuring levels of racial antagonism amongst those with a *current* fraternal affiliation. Under the present research design, it is impossible to determine the degrees of racial antagonism of the subjects while they attended college. Therefore, it is just as possible under the current research design, that surveyed subjects have maintained degrees of racial antagonism once out of college. The current research then, only speaks to correlation (or lack of correlation) and not causation.

Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this research was to investigate possible correlation between prior fraternal status and racial antagonism later in life. Previously reviewed literature (see Chapter 1) indicating heightened rates of racial antagonism existing within school fraternity groups, paired with research showing lasting effects of attitude/value formation in college, along with Wilson's contention that racial antagonism would be found in the sociopolitical arena, led this author to hypothesize that correlation between prior fraternal status and racial antagonism would be found later in life. No correlation materialized.

When reviewing prior research on racial antagonism and fraternal status, past data shows higher rates of racial antagonism correlated with fraternal status. The study at hand, however, found no such correlation existing after members left college. As previously stated, while the current study cannot speak to its subjects' rates of racial antagonism while they were in college, the study does raise some interesting questions as to the long-term impact of fraternal status. The reviewed research, coupled with the current study, seems to indicate that at the least, there is the possibility of lessening rates of racial antagonism once fraternity members leave college. However, directional change could just as easily be plotted in the opposite direction. That is, it is also possible that it are those with no fraternal status who show an *increase* in prejudiced attitudes and not former fraternity members who show a decrease. The only certainty the data speaks to, is that no correlation exists between fraternal status and degrees of racial antagonism held

later in life. The question which must be probed then, is what is causing this possible vanishing of correlation between fraternal status and racial antagonism once out of college?

A second review of the literature yields some possible explanatory clues to account for the lack of correlation in the present research. In Muir's 1991 longitudinal study of racial antagonism within predominantly white social fraternities, Muir discovered a lessening of racial prejudices and social distance from freshman to senior year. The current study is unable to measure if this lessening of racial antagonism continues after graduation, but such a change in attitudes and actions, if continued once out of college, could help to account for the lack of correlation found in the current study.

Further, Wilson argues in the *Declining Significance of Race*, that structural based racism in economic institutions has dissipated in the latter part of the 20th century. Therefore, it is possible that as fraternity members leave the racist in-house cultures of their groups, documented by earlier cited research, and enter into a more diverse, less racist job force, the result is a lessening of racial antagonism formed while in college. This lessening could be due to more opportunities to interact and socialize with people of different ethnic and racial backgrounds.

Yet another explanation for the lack of correlation found in the study can be found in Aronson's and Levin's treatment of prejudice formation. Both identify conforming to social norms as a fundamental cause for the rise and maintenance of prejudice attitudes.

Reviewed research examining racial antagonism within fraternities seems to indicate that expression of this racial antagonism is supported by the in-house or in-group culture of the fraternity. It is possible that expressions of racial intolerance even serve as latent and manifest functions of building group loyalty and support, and functions as a means to build group self-esteem within the fraternity. Once a member leaves the group upon graduation, however, and enters into the job force, such expressions of racial antagonism are no longer the expected norm. In fact, if Wilson is correct in his assertion that the economic sector is becoming increasingly integrated, expressions of racial antagonism in this area could be seen as a violation of norms. Therefore, it is possible that those with a prior fraternal status maintain degrees of racial antagonism formed while in college, but due to norms existing in the world outside of the in-group where their racial antagonism was formed, fraternity members feel less comfortable expressing these opinions. .

While the above assertions are only speculative, what can be stated with a bit more certainty, is the role that environment plays in shaping a population's degree of racial antagonism, especially the college environment. Fraternities appear to hold a unique place on the college campus. Unlike most other student-run organizations on college campuses, fraternities are the only few remaining unsupervised clubs. In the latter part of the 20th century, college newspapers, college radio, intersts clubs, etc. began to fall under University supervision. Fraternities have resisted college administrations attempts at controls. The result for fraternity members has been an environment that has

remained sheltered from administrations' pushes for diversity and multicultural understandings. There appears to be something about a college campus that decreases levels of racial antagonism for most of the students, and something about membership in a fraternity which works to buffer this liberalizing effect on racial antagonism for members of the group. The result is a difference between levels of racial antagonism between fraternity and non-fraternity men while in college. Therefore to account for the lack of correlation once out of college, one of two things is happening. First, it is possible that the inability to isolate one's self with like minded and self-selected friends once out of the college fraternity, works to lessen fraternity member's prejudices when they are exposed to people of different backgrounds and cultures. As addressed above, norms of life outside of college differ from the life provided by the closed-world of the fraternity. Therefore, fraternity members who once expressed racial antagonism may feel that prevailing cultural norms prevent them from expressing any such antagonism once they have left the safe confines of the fraternity. Some fraternity members may choose to conform to the more culturally diverse norms of life outside of fraternity memberships, or they may be choosing to not openly express their views for fear of negative consequences.

A second and just as viable explanation to account for the lack of correlation found in the present study, is the possibility that non-fraternity related subjects see an increase in racial antagonism once they leave college. For this group, many of the same

explanations which help to account for fraternity in-group racism could be applied.

Much as current fraternity members may feel more comfortable expressing opinions of racial antagonism because it is an existing and exceptable norm within their group, those not in fraternities may feel just as *uncomfortable* expressing opinions of racial antagonism while in college, because prevailing norms on a “liberal” campus forbid such expression. The effect is the same. The student holds a belief that is in contrast to expected norms. Therefore, the student either does not express the belief because of fear of negative consequences, or two, conforms to prevailing norms. Once, out of college, however, the norms provided by the college culture are lifted, and the student may feel more comfortable to express their true beliefs in regards to racial antagonism, thus causing a rise in reported racial antagonism for non-fraternity affiliated males. Such an effect would help account for the lack of correlation between fraternal status and racial antagonism held later in life.

Recommendations for Further Research

While the current study seems to indicate no correlation between prior fraternal status and degrees of racial antagonism held later in life, the study was only exploratory in nature and Therefore further research into the matter may be warranted. It is recommended that future studies employ longitudinal designs to measure degrees of racial antagonism while in a fraternity and any direction of change amongst the same

subjects once out of college. It would also be advised that future studies be designed in such a way that members of predominantly white social fraternities are the only subjects included in the fraternity sample. Such a study would give us a better understanding of any lasting effects of fraternal membership on racial antagonism. Further, a longitudinal study would help to demonstrate if fraternnity members see a decline in rates of racial antagonism once out of college, if non-fraternity affiliated subjects see an increase in racial antagonism once out of college, or if both groups move in these directions respectively.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Boston, Massachusetts: The Beacon Press.
- Aronson, Elliot. 1992. *The Social Animal*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Author Unknown. 2001, "Racial Controversies at Frats and Sororities." *The Associated Press*. August 30.
- Author Unknown. 2001, "Black Man Breaks Color Barrier in Alabama Fraternity." *The Associated Press*. November 7.
- Author Unknown. 1991, "Campus Life: Integration Is at Hand For Fraternity System." *The New York Times*. August 25, sec1, p47.
- Beach, Leslie. 1966. "Personality Change in the Church-Related Liberal Arts College." *Psychological Reports* 19: 1257-1258.
- Bogardus, Emory. 1947. "Measurement of Personal-Group Behavior." *Sociometry* 10: 306-311.
- 1933. "A Social Distance Scale." *Sociology and Social Research* 17: 265-271.
- Chickering, A.W. and J. McCormick. 1973. "Personality and the College Experience." *Research in Higher Education* 1: 43-70.
- Cover, Daniel. 1995. "The Effects of Social Contact on Prejudice." *Journal of Social Psychology* 135: 403-404.
- Davis, James and Tom W. Smith. 1992. *The NORC General Social Survey: A User's Guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ehrlich, Howard. 1991. *Campus Ethnoviolence: A research review*. Baltimore, Maryland: National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence.
- 1975. *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

- Feldman, K., and T. Newcomb. 1969. *The Impact of College on Students*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Finley, Julie and Elizabeth Yoste. 2001, "Fraternity Party Under Investigation." *DM Student Newspaper*. November 8.
- Floyd, Hugh, T. Smith and K. Dunlap. 2000. "Factors Limiting the Effects of Education On Racial Prejudice." Working Paper. Southern Sociological Society.
- Fox, Elaine, C. Hodge and W. Ward. 1987. "A Comparison of Attitudes Held by Black and White Fraternity Members." *Journal of Negro Education* 56: 521-534.
- Hafner, Andy. January, 2002. Personal Correspondence.
- ICPSR Website. 2002. <http://www.icspr.org/GSS/about/gss.about.htm>
- Kuh, George. 1976. "Persistence of the Impact of College on Attitudes and Values." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 17: 116-122/
- Levin, Jack. 1975. *The Functions of Prejudice*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Moffatt, Michael. 1995. *Coming of Age in New Jersey: College and American culture*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Morris, J.R.. 1991. "Racial Attitudes of Undergraduates in Greek Housing." *College Student Journal* 25,1: 501-505.
- Muir, Donald. 1991. "'White' Fraternity and Sorority Attitudes Toward 'Blacks' on a Deep-South Campus." *Sociological Spectrum* 11,1: 93-103.
- Pascarella, Ernest, M. Edison, A. Nora, L. Hagedorn, and P. Terenzi. 1996. "Influences on Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College." *Journal of Higher Education* 67,2: 174-195.
- Pascarella, Ernest, E. Whitt, A Nora, M. Edison, L. Hagedom, and P. Terezini. 1996. "What Have We Learned from the First Year of the National Study of Student Learning?" *Journal of College Student Development* 37,2: 182-192.

- Pike, Gary and Jerry Askew. 1990. "The Impact of Fraternity or Sorority Membership on Academic Involvement and Learning Outcomes." *NASPA Journal* 28,1.
- Terenzini, Patrick, E. Pascarella and G. Blimling. 1999. "Student's Out-of-Class Experiences and Their Influence on Learning and Cognitive Development: literature review." *Journal of College Student Development* 40,5: 610-623.
- Wellman, David. 1993. *Portraits of White Racism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weinfurt, Kevin and F. Moghaddam. 2001. "Culture and Social Distance: A case study of methodological causation." *Journal of Social Psychology* 141,1: 101-109.
- Wilder, David, A. Hoyt, B. Surbeck, J. Wilder and P. Carney. 1986. "Greek Affiliation and Attitude Change in College Students." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 27,6: 510-519.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1974. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wood, Peter and M. Chesser. 1994. "Black Stereotyping in a University Population." *Sociological Spectrum* 27,1: 17-34.
- Yancey, Patricia and Robert Hummer. 1989. "Fraternities and Rape on Campus." *Gender and Society* 3,4: 457-473.

Table 1: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racdif1
Chi-Square

Count

		RACDIF1		Total
		1	2	
MEMGREEK	1	17	28	45
	2	16	29	45
Total		33	57	90

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.048 ^b	1	.827	1.000	.500
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.048	1	.827		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	.047	1	.828		
N of Valid Cases	90				

Table 2: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racdif2
Chi-Square

Count		RACDIF2		Total
		1	2	
MEMGREEK	1	5	38	43
	2	1	42	43
Total		6	80	86

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.867 ^b	1	.090		
Continuity Correction ^a	1.613	1	.204		
Likelihood Ratio	3.111	1	.078		
Fisher's Exact Test				.202	.101
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.833	1	.092		
N of Valid Cases	86				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.00.

Table 3: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racdif4
Chi-Square

Count

		RACDIF4		Total
		1	2	
MEMGREEK	1	24	19	43
	2	27	16	43
Total		51	35	86

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.434 ^b	1	.510		
Continuity Correction ^a	.193	1	.661		
Likelihood Ratio	.434	1	.510		
Fisher's Exact Test				.661	.330
Linear-by-Linear Association	.429	1	.513		
N of Valid Cases	86				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.50

Table 4: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racmost
Chi-Square

		RACMOST		Total
		1	2	
MEMGREEK	1			
	Count	17	20	37
	% within MEMGREEK	45.9%	54.1%	100.0%
	% of Total	23.0%	27.0%	50.0%
	2			
	Count	14	23	37
	% within MEMGREEK	37.8%	62.2%	100.0%
	% of Total	18.9%	31.1%	50.0%
Total				
Count		31	43	74
% within MEMGREEK		41.9%	58.1%	100.0%
% of Total		41.9%	58.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.500 ^b	1	.480		
Continuity Correction ^a	.222	1	.637		
Likelihood Ratio	.500	1	.479		
Fisher's Exact Test				.638	.319
Linear-by-Linear Association	.493	1	.483		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.50

Table 5: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racseg
Chi-Square

Count

	RACSEG		Total
	1	2	
MEMGREEK 1	2	35	37
2	2	36	38
Total	4	71	75

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.001 ^b	1	.978		
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.001	1	.978		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.682
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.978		
N of Valid Cases	75				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.97.

Table 6: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racpres
Chi-Square

Count

	RACPRES		Total
	1	2	
MEMGREEK 1	36	4	40
2	36	4	40
Total	72	8	80

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.000 ^b	1	1.000		
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	1.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.644
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000		
N of Valid Cases	80				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.00.

Table 7: Crosstabulation of Variables Memgreek and Racmost
Chi-Square

Count		RACMOST		Total
		1	2	
MEMGREEK	1	17	20	37
	2	14	23	37
Total		31	43	74

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.500 ^b	1	.480		
Continuity Correction ^a	.222	1	.637		
Likelihood Ratio	.500	1	.479		
Fisher's Exact Test				.638	319
Linear-by-Linear Association	.493	1	.483		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.50

VITA

Keith Kerr was born in Clear Lake, Texas, on September 25th, 1977, to Tommy and Debbie Kerr. After graduation from Brazoswood High School in 1996, Mr. Kerr attended Southwest Texas State University (SWT) in San Marcos, Texas where he obtained a Bachelor of Science in Applied Sociology in May of 2000. The same year he began work at SWT on a Masters of Arts in sociology. In the spring of 2000, Mr. Kerr interned in the Department of Sociology at SWT, where he was later employed as a Graduate Assistant from September of 2000 thru May of 2002. At the time of this printing, Mr. Kerr had been accepted into the Ph.D. program in sociology at Bowling Green State University in Ohio.

Permanent Address: 218 Sleepy Hollow, Dr.
Lake Jackson, Texas 77566

The thesis was typed by Keith Kerr.