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ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the influence of selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics on the alcohol consumption of students enrolled in a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States who were members of a social fraternity. The two main goals of this study were: 1) to determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States and 2) to determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

The target population for this study was defined as all students enrolled in colleges and universities who were members of social fraternities. The accessible population was defined as students currently enrolled in one research extensive university located in the southern portion of the United States who were members of social fraternities. The sample consisted of all students who were active members of six social fraternities selected through a stratified, cluster random sampling procedure.

The instrument utilized in this study consisted of three parts: 1) the Alcohol Use and Drinking Behavior Survey, a researcher designed instrument developed to
measure alcohol consumption patterns and perceptions of selected alcohol related
issues and effects using a combination of questions emerging from the current
literature and from the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (1994a); 2) the Leader
Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), used to measure specific aspects of the
leader behavior of presidents of social fraternities as perceived by the membership of
that fraternity; and 3) the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI), a researcher
developed scale, designed to measure perceived leader effectiveness.

One finding resulting from this study was that chapter presidents of social
fraternities consumed substantially less alcohol than other members of those same
social fraternities.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Alcohol abuse and problems associated with this abuse can arguably be considered the nation’s number one public health problem (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 1993), particularly in matters relating to youth (Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 1999). However, concerns also extend to America’s colleges and universities, where heavy episodic underage drinking, often referred to as binge drinking, has been attracting increased attention and response from campus administrators (Bachman, O’Malley & Johnston, 1984).

Alcohol and alcohol related problems have influenced policies at academic institutions around the world for more than 800 years (Cowley, 1934; Stewart, 1962), and understanding drinking patterns among America’s undergraduate students, particularly fraternity members, during the past 20 years has enabled researchers to recognize recurring themes as well as prompt greater concern among college and university administrators (Sherwood, 1987; Borsari & Carey, 1999). Increasingly, that concern has given way to fear as recent and current research data reveal a greater propensity for students, parents and other interested parties to seek judgements through the legal system. These actions are cause for alarm among those who work in the college and university setting in the area of Greek Life, specifically with fraternities (Reisberg, 1998).
Binge drinking among college students, especially fraternity members, has emerged as a national crisis with continuing consequences (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo & Lee, 2000). In a 1998 study (Cashin, Presley & Meilman), data indicated that members of Greek organizations, on average, consumed more drinks, drank more heavily, and experienced more difficulties than non-Greeks. While alcohol use on the American college campus is generally the rule and not the exception (Engs & Hanson, 1990; Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens, & Castillo, 1994), Greek organizations have for many years been identified as groups which consume excessive quantities of alcohol (Baer, Stacy & Larimer, 1991; Wechsler, 1995). In addition, members of fraternities and sororities experience greater negative consequences resulting from alcohol and other drug use at levels greater than those who comprise the general student population (Baer & Carney, 1993; Hendren, 1989; Lichtenfeld & Kayson, 1994).

Based on the findings from national studies, researchers seem convinced that binge drinking is prevalent on college campuses; however, most college students who might be considered binge drinkers do not consider themselves such (Carter & Kahnweiler, 2000; Wechsler et. al., 2000). The perceptions of college students who binge drink regarding their own drinking patterns, as well as the patterns of their peers, support their feelings that they do not have a drinking problem (Perkins, 1997). Many of them have been drinking since high school or before, and when they transition into college, they continue their heavy drinking experiences from high school and exhibit beliefs and attitudes which might encourage or support alcohol
abusing behaviors (Baer, Kivlahan & Marlatt, 1995; Wechsler, Kuo & Davenport, 1996; Borsari & Carey, 1999). These attitudes are due in part to “the expectation that the Greek system will support a heavy drinking pattern” (Werner & Greene, 1992, p. 491).

Many binge drinkers, however, fail to realize that because of their abusive drinking and subsequent behaviors, not only are they possibly endangering their own life and health, but they are also impacting the life and health of those who are directly or indirectly involved in their lives (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo & Lee, 2000). “Non-binging students who attend schools in which more than half of the students binge drink are more than twice as likely to report secondhand effects such as insults and arguments, vandalism, physical threats, or unwanted sexual advances than are students in schools with fewer binge drinkers” (Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 2000, p. 38). In addition, non-binging students sometimes experience difficulties in their academic performance because of loss of sleep or study time caused by bingers who are noisy residents or roommates (Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 2000).

The costs can, however, extend even to those not directly involved with binge drinkers resulting in such negative actions as vandalism. Many expenses related to actions taken by colleges and universities to combat alcohol related problems are directly linked to binge drinkers and problems resulting from their behaviors (Epstein & Finn, 1996). In addition, most, if not all states, have enacted tougher laws targeting those whose drinking behaviors warrant closer scrutiny and, when necessary, punishment (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996).
The problems and issues associated with binge drinking by undergraduates who are underage are also impacted in other ways by situations and circumstances which naturally exist or which are created by the society in which we live. As outlined in a 1996 study (Chaloupka & Wechsler), the federal government enacted the Federal Uniform Drinking Age Act of 1984, legislating a change in the minimum drinking age from 18 to 21. When this occurred, each state was required to raise its minimum legal drinking age for all alcoholic beverages to 21 years. If the states had not done so, they would likely have lost most of their federal highway funding. This action was directed at helping to solve some of the problems associated with those who were underage. While legislation such as this might be a positive decision, drinking patterns and cultural trends for all ages have been in existence for centuries, and in many cases have helped shape some of the behavior which is observed, particularly among college students (Engs, Diebold, & Hanson, 1996).

One of the major influences affecting policy changes within colleges and universities in recent years has been the degree to which society has become so litigious (Zirkel & Tsai, 1990). Court decisions apparently based on evidence of a lack of responsible behavior and action by fraternities, as well as colleges and universities, indicate fraternities and the institutions where they are located could face increasing civil liability for injuries, depending on whether alcohol is served to those who are underage. The threat of legal action has served notice to institutions of higher education that empty promises of action are not enough to satisfy the courts. There must also be evidence of a stronger institutional emphasis on increased educational
programs to heighten the awareness of underage drinkers and lead them to more responsible behavior in their drinking patterns (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo & Lee, 2000). Colleges and universities are responding, and they are realizing the complexity of the problem before them, particularly with regard to binge drinking within fraternities (Wechsler, Kelly & Weitzman, 2000).

The ways in which the colleges and universities are responding vary, but most include educational programs targeting fraternity members and their leadership (Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 1999). Binge drinking rates on campuses range from one to 80 percent of students (Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 2000) so there is no single solution or program that will be appropriate at all colleges or universities. Different circumstances will necessitate unique solutions. However, as reflected in Wechsler’s (2000) study, institutions are finding some common ground through instituting similar approaches and solutions. Included among these solutions are implementation of tougher policies governing alcohol use by student organizations both on and off their campuses. Other steps include segregating the heaviest drinkers, limiting the impact of low-cost alcohol and encouraging the concept of designated drivers and others who can help with the problems (Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 2000).

One other specific approach being used by some institutions as they work with their fraternities is to determine the role fraternity leaders can and do play in helping solve the problem. Cashin, Presley & Meilman (1998, p. 5-6), found that the heavy drinking habits among fraternity leaders “were significantly greater than among those
who merely attended functions (z = 6.53, p < .001), but were not statistically different from those who were actively involved (z = 0.61, NS).” Based on these findings, leaders are the problem drinkers and are the catalyst for the heavy drinking and the resulting behavioral problems. In response to these situations, educational efforts focused on prevention should be targeting fraternity leaders (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998). It would also be beneficial to focus particularly on the beliefs and norms of the leaders of the fraternities to determine why so many of them drink to excess (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998).

However, to this date, studies have not examined the specific role of leaders with respect to responsible drinking patterns and whether the undergraduate leaders might possibly be able to influence positive change with regard to binge drinking within their organizations. In addition, environmental issues dealing with drinking contexts have not been adequately addressed in the alcohol research literature (Clapp, Shillington & Segars, 2000). Much of the available research focusing on alcohol consumption by college students in general and fraternity members specifically, reflects a perception that leadership performance among fraternity men is impacted by their level of alcohol consumption, and the more prevalent the alcohol abuse, the less effective fraternity leaders tend to be (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998). However, based on the researcher’s 29 years of experience as a student affairs professional, many of those years spent working directly with leaders in fraternities, many, though not all, fraternity leaders who are more mature and exhibit strong, responsible drinking behaviors tend to lead more effectively and have a more positive impact on
the behavior of their organizations. They have a better understanding of responsibility and accountability and a greater awareness of social situations and how to respond to them. Also, in the researcher’s experience, several personal qualities, traits and characteristics, including alcohol consumption behavior, influence decision making in both membership selection as well as the election of those who serve in leadership positions within the fraternity. Maturity, strong values, courage and wisdom are equally important qualities needed by both members and leaders. Sound decision-making, a spirit of fairness and an open mind play a vital role in determining the best leader. Honesty, integrity and moral discipline are strong influences on member behavior and on the performance of elected or appointed leaders. A return to these and other core values of fraternities are helping many chapters in their efforts to counter increased declines in membership (Reisberg, 2000).

In addition, there are other properties which negatively impact alcohol consumption and might also impact perceived leadership performance of those in leadership roles. One of these properties is the campus culture (Schein, 1985). Other factors influence behavior and attitudes relative to drinking including traditional demographic variables such as family and socioeconomic background, level of parent’s education, health conditions, and religious values (Engs, Diebold, & Hanson, 1996). Some of these influences may have a greater influence than might otherwise be realized, because they began at birth. Many of the personal traits and qualities may have been passed on genetically, but others were learned, either from family members or friends. Therefore, environmental conditions also influence an
individual’s attitude toward drinking and play a key role in shaping their alcohol behavior patterns and possibly their leadership style (Walker & Avioli, 1991). Some influences, more external in nature, already exist in the form of university policies and procedures and national fraternity guidelines. Others, such as traditions and myths, result from the student’s membership in the fraternity (Arnold & Kuh, 1992).

In addition to these, other factors influence the alcohol behavior and attitudes of students, particularly fraternity men. Included among these factors are peer acceptance and poor or lack of self-concept (Chickering, 1969); the desire for popularity (Arnold & Kuh, 1992); fear of rejection (Hughes & Winston, 1987); lack of self-worth and confidence (Kraft, 1979a); and the need or desire to meet or exceed expectations, particularly of parents or special individuals (Chickering, 1969). All of these factors can positively or negatively impact behavior and attitudes depending upon circumstances (Borsari & Carey, 1999; Maryland University, College Park, 1995).

In the researcher’s opinion, therein lies both the challenge and the opportunity presented to those who join fraternities, and especially those who eventually move into leadership roles. They can experience the development of a greater appreciation for the stated values and ideals of the fraternity, and at the same time, they can be learning how to develop a mature perspective with regard to the social aspects of the fraternity, especially responsible alcohol consumption. The values and traditions espoused by the fraternity, through its history and ritual, offer to young college men the opportunity to become part of something that is stronger than themselves. The
fraternity establishes programs which, if effectively implemented and adhered to, will refine those skills present in the new member, as well as discover, model and shape other desirable qualities for the members. One of the more lasting legacies of the modern day fraternity is the ability to mold and enrich the lives of the young college men who join and positively influence the performance of those members in leadership roles.

Therefore, additional research that allows members to self-report on the relationship between perceived leader behavior and alcohol consumption within the fraternities could be beneficial to fraternity executives, University officials, alumni leaders and chapter members. The findings might enable them to accurately discern those members with strong leadership potential and develop strategies to effectively prepare them for future leadership roles so that the fraternities would function in a manner consistent with the educational philosophy of the institution where they are located (Kuh, 1990; Kuh & Lyons, 1990). While one might question the accuracy of self-reported drinking measures, recent research supports the validity of this approach for understanding drinking behavior (Polich, 1982; Rachal, Guess, Maisto, Cavanaugh, Waddell & Benrud, 1980).

**Purpose and Objectives**

The primary purpose of the study was to determine the influence of selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics on the alcohol consumption of students enrolled in a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States who were members of a social fraternity. The two main goals of this
study were: 1) to determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by scores on both the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States and 2) to determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in current levels of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States (as measured by scores on the Alcohol Use and Drinking Behavior Survey). The study focused on objectives which were descriptive, reflective of alcohol consumption patterns, and perceptions of attitudes and behavior of both the leaders and the members of the organizations and how they are related.

The following specific objectives were formulated to guide the researcher:

1. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the following selected demographic characteristics:
   a. Student classification status;
   b. Age;
   c. Ethnic origin;
   d. Marital status;
e. Current living arrangements;

f. Employment status;

g. Parent’s income level;

h. State or country of origin;

i. Religious preference;

j. Level of participation in organized worship services/meetings;

k. Level of volunteerism activity;

l. Leadership positions previously held in the organization;

m. Leadership positions currently held in the organization; and

n. Leadership positions to which members may aspire.

2. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their self-reported patterns and level of alcohol consumption.

3. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to their consumption of alcoholic beverages.

4. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life.
5. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding selected effects of alcohol consumption.

6. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their level of involvement in selected aspects of university campus life.

7. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to other students’ consumption of alcoholic beverages.

8. To describe at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States social fraternity leader behavior as reflected by the perceptions of the members of that fraternity as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument.

9. To determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by scores on the LBDQ) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

10. To compare the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States by whether or not the student held a leadership position within the organization.
11. To compare the effectiveness of the current leadership of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States as perceived by the members of the organization with the self perceived leadership effectiveness of students who served as the president of the organization.

12. To compare at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States the level of alcohol consumption of fraternity members in leadership positions with those members who were not in leadership positions.

13. To determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported frequency of attendance at organized worship services/meetings and the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

14. To determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the advent of college drinking clubs, problems resulting from the excessive consumption of alcohol have plagued academic institutions, including Oxford and Cambridge, dating to the 1200s. The consumption of alcohol was not viewed as the problem, but rather, it was the excessive or abusive consumption which led to situations resulting in less than desirable behavior, and in some cases injury or death, on the parts of those individuals involved (Cowley, 1934; Stewart, 1962).

Alcohol and its role in disorderly behavior is not a recent societal phenomenon, whether in or out of the academic arena. One of the most notable altercations dates from the battle of St. Scholastica’s Day, February 10, 1354. The riot originated during a tavern quarrel. When some customers disapproved of the wine which they had been served, the tavern master responded in a manner that offended the patrons, prompting them to hurl the wine and glasses at his head (Rait, 1912).

Such confrontations on or near the college campuses have continued to the present day, sometimes violent and sometimes only mildly disturbing. The difference today, however, is that society has become so litigious that colleges and universities increasingly find themselves involved in lawsuits, particularly because of the institution’s relationship with Greek organizations (Reisberg, 1998). Many of these
lawsuits have arisen because of the use or abuse of alcohol which may have caused or contributed to accidents, injuries or deaths to student members of Greek organizations or their guests (Zirkel & Tsai, 1990). The relationship of the University with student organizations in general, and fraternities in specific, as it is impacted by the use and abuse of alcohol, has prompted many institutions to become more directly involved in the day to day operations of fraternities and sororities (Sherwood, 1987). The current trend in legal decisions is causing great concern to colleges and universities because of the way in which the courts are interpreting the law with reference to questions of legal liability on the part of the institution. In a 1999 case in the state of Nebraska, Jeffery Knoll vs. The Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska, the state Supreme Court “reversed a lower court’s ruling that the University had no such duty to protect the plaintiff when a hazing incident occurred. The Supreme Court sent the case back to trial court to determine whether the University had failed in its obligations” (Reisberg, 1999, p. A54). This case, in which abuse of alcohol was also involved, is being viewed with great concern across the nation, because it has the potential to drastically change the way in which colleges and universities relate to Greek organizations as well as other student groups, particularly with regard to alcohol consumption. These and other legal questions reflect the ongoing concern regarding the possible limits of civil liability of the University for accidents and injuries occurring both on and off the campus resulting from incidents involving excessive alcohol consumption by members and their guests (Zirkel & Tsai, 1990; Reisberg, 1998).

Some 600 plus years after initial confrontations and disturbances on and near early university campuses, time and circumstances have impacted education in other
parts of the world, but the influence of alcohol and its related problems in higher education in America has not changed to any significant degree (Rabow & Duncan-Schill, 1995). The primary concern reflected in the various studies conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health (1997) has been alcohol abuse. The focus of alcohol abuse deals primarily with behavior and not so much with the quantity consumed. When behaviors exhibited by those who drink excessively include dangerous, offensive or obnoxious actions, and these actions cause difficulties for others, that is alcohol abuse (Harvard School of Public Health, 1997). Substance abuse (primarily alcohol) is the most significant challenge to the quality of campus life today (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990). Not only can it damage the individual’s life and limit their future career, but there is also potential for serious undesirable consequences for those who might be family members or friends (Harvard School of Public Health, 1997). Alcohol abuse is indeed a serious problem, but the concern surrounding it is not just a recent realization. College and university presidents have been aware of alcohol abuse for several years. In response to this alarming trend, many colleges and universities have taken steps during the past 20 to 30 years to address alcohol abuse and to seek ways to slow the gradual social decay which has plagued their campuses (Sherwood, 1987).

While the problems associated with alcohol abuse on college campuses have been widespread, the focus of these institutions has primarily been directed at fraternities, the present day organizations which evolved from the earlier drinking clubs. These Greek organizations trace their origin to Phi Beta Kappa, an academic
honors association, founded in 1776 (Baird’s Manual, 1991). While the heritage of the Greek societies can be linked to Phi Beta Kappa, many today believe that fraternities no longer share any significant identity with that academic organization. Phi Beta Kappa and other academic organizations bearing Greek names were all founded for reasons other than merely as drinking societies. However, observers inside and outside the academic arena see fraternities primarily as social clubs (Baird’s Manual, 1991). The other principles on which the fraternities were founded—leadership, scholarship, community service, moral and ethical values, brotherhood—have to some degree given way to greater emphasis on the social aspects of fraternities (Reisberg, 2000). The resulting behavior patterns in most of these Greek organizations reflect more apparent emphases on alcohol consumption than on academic performance, campus and community service, leadership, or brotherhood. Because of this increased emphasis on alcohol consumption, those involved in Greek life are focusing their efforts on ways to respond to this threat (Borsari & Carey, 1999).

**Binge Drinking**

Perhaps one of the most significant threats facing society today is binge drinking. Binge drinking is generally defined as having five or more drinks in a single sitting (Presley, Meilman & Cashin, 1996). Wechsler was even more specific in saying that binge drinking is defined as “five or more drinks in a row, one or more times during a two-week period for men, and four or more drinks in a row one or more times during the same period for women”....and “a drink is defined as a 12 ounce can
or bottle of beer, a four ounce glass of wine, a 12 ounce bottle or can of wine cooler, or a shot of liquor taken straight or in a mixed drink” (Wechsler, 1996, p.23). His findings, particularly those focusing on binge drinking, were initially based on information drawn from the 1993 Harvard School of Public Health Study and confirmed by the 1995 study providing comprehensive conclusions pertaining to the use and abuse of alcohol by college students (Wechsler, 1996).

In another study, Chaloupka and Wechsler (1996) established levels or categories to more accurately reflect the patterns of behavior exhibited by college students, particularly as the patterns might be related to binge drinking. The four categories are as follows: “abstention or did not drink in the past year (abstainer); drank in the past year but did not engage in binge drinking in the past two weeks (drinker); binged once or twice in the past two weeks (binger); and binged three or more times in the past two weeks (frequent binger)” (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996, p. 112). These categories allow the researcher to present the data with greater clarity and perhaps with a degree of fairness for those who do drink responsibly. Those who consume alcohol are not all drinking at the same level nor reflecting the same behavior patterns. Therefore, the researcher is able to gather data and present it in an accurate and informative manner. However, regardless of the way in which the data are reported, the information received reflects a growth in binge drinking and the subject warrants significant research followed by the implementation of appropriate institutional policies designed to reach effective solutions (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996; Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 2000).
Binge drinking begins in high school, or before, and continues into the college years and beyond (Borsari & Carey, 1999). Many agencies and individuals, searching for solutions, have focused their efforts for these age groups on disseminating information and developing educational programs as ways of addressing the problem and studying possible solutions (Grant, Hartford, Chou, Pickering, Dawson, Stinson & Noble, 1991). What has been most alarming to researchers in recent years has been the large number of high school students and even those younger who binge. In the 1995 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study, the data revealed that 38% of high schoolers were bingers, and 80% of those continued their bingeing in college. For those high schoolers who were non-bingers (62%), almost 50% less binged in college. Therefore, there is a predictive relationship between bingers in high school and those in college (Harvard School of Public Health, 1995).

In the 1999 alcohol study by the Harvard School of Public Health (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo & Lee, 2000), research data support the idea that alcohol consumption and binge drinking by college students in general and fraternity members specifically continues to be high. This information supports findings revealed in a similar study conducted in 1995 (Wechsler, Dowdall, Maenner, Gledhill-Hoyt & Lee, 1998) indicating that binge drinking (that behavior generally defined as having five or more drinks at a single occasion) continues to be problematic and has become the greatest threat to good health for college students in the 1990s (Gordon, 1995) with almost one-half of all male college students bingeing during a given two-week period (Wechsler et al., 1998). These studies also found that fraternity members drink more
than the average non-Greek college student (Brennan, Walfish & AuBuchon, 1986). More specifically, fraternity college freshmen (pledges), often considered “high risk” individuals (Marlatt, Baer & Kivlahan, 1998), are deemed to be especially vulnerable to problems associated with the abuse of alcohol or with binge drinking (Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986; Kodman & Sturmak, 1984). They tend to drink more than other fraternity members and with greater irresponsibility, in part because they arrived at college with a drinking problem, and they found in the fraternity an environment which supported excessive or binge drinking (Wechsler & McFadden, 1979; Faulkner, Alcorn & Garvin, 1988). Few binge drinkers consider themselves to be heavy or problem drinkers primarily because they compare their behavior to those with whom they party, and feel that those around them are drinking more, so there must not be a real problem (Borsari & Carey, 1999; Wechsler et al., 2000).

**Factors Influencing Alcohol Consumption/Binge Drinking**

Several issues impact the problem of alcohol abuse and binge drinking as related to fraternity membership. Through the years, changes have occurred in society and in collegiate environments which have influenced the alcohol consumption patterns of college students in general and fraternity men specifically (Brennan, Walfish & AuBuchon, 1986; Carter & Kahnweiler, 2000). Until 1984, the minimum legal age at which an individual could consume alcohol was 18 in many states (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996). As public concern over alcohol-related problems, injuries and deaths rose, the federal government became more involved in establishing policies and legal constraints designed to curb alcohol abuses. The most significant
action came when Congress enacted the Federal Unified Drinking Age Act of 1984 which required each state to raise their minimum drinking age to 21 (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996). If the states had not complied, they would likely have lost most of their federal highway construction funding. One by one, in response to both the federal legislation as well as public concerns, states began enacting legislation raising the minimum drinking age to 21, but many states resisted the change as long as possible (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996).

Louisiana was the last state to legislate the 21 year old minimum age to drink legally. In the researcher’s opinion, Louisiana’s opposition to change was based primarily on cultural and emotional issues, one of which was that Louisiana was one of those geographic areas where cultural practices and environmental influences have for many years impacted attitudes and patterns of behavior related to alcohol consumption. With a strong Catholic influence, particularly in south Louisiana, many citizens, especially those younger than 21, had long enjoyed consuming alcohol on a regular basis. Much of the social life in Louisiana, as in many other states, centers around food, and many food events and festivals, as well as family meal times, included alcohol as part of the meal. Because of these cultural influences, there was significant opposition to the change.

These geographic and cultural influences, regardless of the culture represented, are critical to understanding the pre-existing expectancies or perceptions held by college students as they arrive on campus, because they often play a role in determining the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of college students (Darkes &
Goldman, 1993). The stronger the expectancies or perceptions regarding the effects of alcohol, the more reinforcing they are in relationship to heavier drinking patterns in both adolescents (Brown, Creamer & Stetson, 1987) and adults (Brown, Goldman & Christianson, 1985). Also, personal variables interacting with environmental variables represent perceptions which influence the behavior patterns of those fraternity members consuming alcohol (Borsari & Carey, 1999). Because of these perceptions, as well as negative fraternity traditions, chapter leaders and advisors experience greater difficulty trying to teach the incoming pledges new beliefs, values and habits, particularly as they relate to changes in university policies or national fraternity policies (Enos & Pittayathikhun, 1996). Such influences should in no way excuse irresponsible attitudes or actions by colleges and universities or by fraternities and their individual members. However, they do point out why academic institutions might have had difficulty winning the battle against alcohol abuse and binge drinking on campus, particularly in fraternities and most specifically as it relates to freshmen pledges (Maryland University, College Park, 1995; Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Walker & Avioli, 1991).

Closely linked to these influences is the reality that a significant percentage of current freshmen arrive on campus as binge drinkers, presenting yet another factor impacting binge drinking on college campuses, specifically in fraternities (Wechsler et al., 1998; Wechsler, 1996). The drinking patterns for many of these freshmen were formed before they turned 18 years of age, not only because of their cultural background, but also the ready availability of alcohol through family and friends. One
of the interesting national trends reflects the reality that many college students today probably began drinking earlier than in past years (Hersch, 1999). The most recent information and research indicates youth/adolescents are increasingly drinking at a younger age (Wechsler, Kuh & Davenport, 1996; Hersch, 1999). Of even more concern is the percentage increase in the number of binge drinkers, particularly in high school (Goodwin, 1992; Background, 1998), and these binge drinkers tend to continue their behavior into college (O’Connor, 1996) where they pledge fraternities and find that their binge drinking patterns, beliefs and attitudes are often encouraged (Werner & Greene, 1992).

There are several reasons the vast majority of these “bingers” are drawn directly to fraternities. Among those reasons are two of the greatest difficulties confronting students upon entering the University: peer pressure (Tyler & Kyes, 1992) and what they perceive as expected behavior for a freshman or a fraternity pledge (Borsari & Carey, 1999). Sherry and Stolberg (1987, p.353) found peer pressure to be not just an influence facing freshmen college students, but “the most consistent and potent predictor of the frequency and consumption of alcohol” for freshmen. In a separate but related study (1986), Brennan, Walfish and AuBuchon found that peer pressure is an even stronger influence than family when related to the hazardous use of alcohol.

There are, however, some institutional responses that provide opportunities in which its students, particularly freshmen, can experience some of “the positive benefits of peer influence and be less likely to exhibit negative or destructive behavior with regard to the consumption of alcohol” (Bruffee, 1999, p.3). These experiences
will only occur when the colleges and universities find creative opportunities through
the normal day to day activities, such as the classroom setting, to provide situations
where freshmen will experience “surprise, change, and intellectual stimulation” as
mechanisms for positive social interaction. Through such academic encounters,
freshmen will be exposed to influences by their peers who will be positive in nature
and supportive of mature, responsible attitudes and behavior in all aspects of their
social development, particularly alcohol consumption (Spitzberg, Jr. & Thorndike,
1992). Involvement in campus and community service activities as well as student
organizations will also enable students to more easily become part of the college or
university family and not just exist as one of the many hundreds or thousands who
attend class there (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbiel & MacKay,
1991). Such involvement, according to some researchers (Goodwin, 1989; Sherry &
Stolberg, 1987) suggests that those students will drink less than students who are not
involved. A similar study (Kuh et al., 1991), however, indicates that the extent to
which students will consume less alcohol is directly linked to whether or not the
activity in which they are involved is compatible with the goals and objectives of the
institution they are attending.

This is particularly true with regard to Greek social organizations, especially
fraternities. Although many higher education institutions strongly support these
organizations, conflicts often arise because of the questionable practices in which the
fraternity members are sometimes engaged. Activities such as hazing and alcohol
abuse are troublesome to the university, and when the actions of chapter members
involved in such practices lead to injuries or perhaps death, the university finds itself in an extremely difficult position (Reisberg, 1998). On many campuses, the Greek organizations enjoy an historic and mutually supportive relationship with the institution. Like the other chapters in their national organizations, they have been established in accordance with both institutional philosophy and the same ideals and ritualistic principles on which the fraternities were originally founded, including scholarship, leadership, community service, social activity, civic responsibility and serving as a positive role model to others (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). Both the fraternities and the institutions recognize the importance of working together to meet the persistent challenges which present themselves (Riordan & Dana, 1998).

At the same time, the administration cannot condone activities and behavior which stand in direct opposition to those values and principles on which the university was founded (Maryland University, College Park, 1995). Although adherence to the founding principles of the fraternities is more challenging for members today than ever before (Baird’s Manual, 1991; Reisberg, 2000), higher education institutions and fraternity national organizations have begun to realize that the continued existence and growth of the fraternity system on college and university campuses will be determined by the extent to which the local chapters and the institutions themselves can serve as catalysts for change and redirect the chapters to more diligently practice those principles upon which the fraternity was founded (Reisberg, 2000). Although the research data which exist are limited (Epstein & Finn, 1996; Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Clay, 1999), they indirectly support the idea espoused by some fraternity and
academic professionals who feel that working to enhance personal qualities, traits and values which also happen to be most similar to the founding principles of the fraternity might have a direct correlation to reducing some of the major problems regarding binge drinking and abusive alcohol consumption which continue to plague fraternities (Epstein & Finn, 1996; Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Clay, 1999).

One of these principles, a strong emphasis on religious beliefs, tends to receive little or no emphasis in the chapters once formal pledging and initiation are concluded. Some researchers have suggested that members who do not regularly engage in some type of religious activity or worship opportunity are more likely to experience a higher level of alcohol consumption which might lead to binge drinking (Perkins, 1985; Perkins, 1987; Svendson & Griffin, 1991). Stated differently, “students indicating that participation in campus religious activities and programs is important to them are significantly less likely to drink or to engage in binge drinking than students who do not regard these activities as important” (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996, p.113). Such a direct relationship between the importance of religion, as it relates to the ritual and founding principles of the fraternity and the frequent or heavy drinking behavior patterns of members, has led some researchers to conclude that members who espouse strong religious beliefs, and practice those beliefs on a somewhat regular basis, are less likely to be binge drinkers or even heavy drinkers (Reiskin & Wechsler, 1981).

In the researcher’s opinion, these strong belief systems have been supported and encouraged by those values and ideals reflected through the ritual of the fraternity and could play an important role in enabling those involved with the chapters to find ways to refocus their efforts to have the chapters return to those principles. Although
rituals vary in many ways, the most common thread woven through the fabric of all of them is confirmation of a religious belief system consistent with that espoused through the various proclamations in the ritual. Initiated members have each taken an oath and sworn to uphold those various principles and precepts set forth in the ritual. The absence of an emphasis on religion by the chapters and the lack of involvement in religious activities by individual members may actually result in a higher level of alcohol consumption by chapter members (Faulkner et al., 1988).

However, negative perceptions of some ideas thought to be part of the historic and traditional values of fraternities can have a damaging effect on how new freshmen view the fraternity experience (Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Borsari & Carey, 1999). The incoming pledges respond to what they have heard or continue to hear about fraternities and gauge their behavior accordingly. They tend to view alcohol consumption and binge drinking in a way that is consistent with their fellow members, yielding both to perceptions as well as peer pressure (Arnold & Kuh, 1992). In addition to peer pressure and perceptions of expected behavior as related to alcohol consumption, many students are also drawn to fraternities because of the freedom involved in the self-selection process as it relates to taking in new members (Borsari & Carey, 1999). The fraternities are often seen as groups whose attitudes about alcohol encourage the use or abuse of alcohol, prompting those who identify with these ideas to seek out the fraternity as a secure place to belong (Baer, Kivlahan & Murlatt, 1995).

The fraternity provides a place to belong in the philosophical and emotional sense, but it also offers a literal place to belong for those who reside in the fraternity house. One of the most obvious ways in which fraternities are impacted by the
members’ use or abuse of alcohol occurs as a result of those members who reside in the house (Fraternities and Sororities, NASPA, 1996). Fraternity house environments appear to tolerate the hazardous use of alcohol, particularly binge drinking, and as a result, house residents tend to drink more (Presley, Meilman & Lyerla, 1993) and are more likely than non-residents to abuse alcohol (Globetti, 1988). In addition, the fraternity house residents are more likely than non-Greek students to experience negative consequences associated with drinking (Wechsler, Kuh & Davenport, 1996). Chapter houses can offer great learning environments for the members, and a well managed house can provide a strong, positive influence on all those members who reside there (Strange & Miller, 1978).

In addition to these challenges, societal changes and legal and administrative guidelines outlined by the universities and the national offices also present challenges for some of the existing members as well as for some of the alumni who return (Harrington-Lueker, 1999). Change is difficult for both members and alumni, but it is essential if the chapter leadership and the more progressive members are to maintain the perspective necessary in today’s more restrictive and litigious atmosphere (Resiberg, 2000).

Even with greater regimentation, whether imposed by the university, the national organization or the courts, the social aspects of the fraternity experience, including consumption of large quantities of alcohol, continue to be one of the major reasons students join (Borsari & Carey, 1999). It is therefore easy to see why the fraternity experience can become distorted with the social aspects being over-
emphasized, resulting in members experiencing a number of negative consequences (Faulkner, Alcorn & Garvin, 1989), potentially leading to the downfall of many Greek chapters (Harrington-Lueker, 1999). Students involved in fraternities who use and abuse alcohol usually experience more negative consequences than students who are not fraternity members (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998). Some of these problems include performing poorly on a test, getting into an argument or fight, and missing class (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998).

However, as previously discussed, attempts to solve these problems might include encouraging students to move beyond the social aspects of the fraternity experience and become involved in other campus activities (Kuh et al., 1991). By doing so, they personally have a greater appreciation for the total collegiate experience, and the chapters, as well as individual members, often experience a corresponding reduction in the number of negative consequences resulting from the use and/or abuse of alcohol (Cherry, 1987). Some chapters have begun refocusing programmatic efforts on the traditional values and principles upon which they were founded, and they are experiencing a corresponding reduction in member problems and behaviors resulting from previously established behavior patterns related to alcohol use and binge drinking (Reisberg, 2000).

Though many students enter the university and the fraternity experience with previously established behavior patterns as related to alcohol consumption, others simply arrive and slip into a pattern of behavior which can become detrimental to the chapter and the individual (Walker & Avioli, 1991; Borsari & Carey, 1999). While
many institutions have guidelines which outline the expected behavior of students and organizations in general, and fraternities specifically, students often lack an understanding of the university’s parameters for drinking behavior. Most students, even though they usually will not admit it, want some sort of guideline or policy that establishes a standard of acceptable behavior. It is almost as if they want to be told what to do or what not to do (Wechsler, Nelson & Weitzman, 2000). In partial response to this notion, the national Greek organizations have taken steps to educate their pledges and members concerning many of the problems resulting from alcohol abuse (Kappa Sigma, 1999). While these programs have received praise from colleges and universities, as well as alumni and some undergraduate members of those organizations, some chapter members reflect the opinion that they really do not believe they have a problem, individually or as chapters (Borsari & Carey, 1999). This particular attitude is one of the reasons many student leaders within both the Greek system and the individual fraternity chapters have seen a lack of peer leadership and are taking steps to address these issues as peers. It is their opinion that potential students, new students and continuing students will more likely be positively influenced by peers rather than university administrators or national organization representatives (Clay, 1999).

There are other factors which impact or influence students’ drinking behavior, although they are not directly related to academia. Students often face uncertainties in their lives regarding decisions such as choosing a career (Baird, 1988) and struggle with a lack of self-esteem or self-confidence (Chickering, 1969). They are not sure if they “fit in,” but they do not feel comfortable or confident enough in their relationship with
other chapter members to raise the question or respond to it if asked of them (Goodwin, 1990). Quite often, those concerns which appear to be “non-issues,” with regard to how and if a student is adjusting to the college lifestyle, can become major problems if they are not recognized and addressed by the individuals or by their families and their fraternity brothers. Working through these issues will provide strength and encouragement to more than just the students involved (Engs, Diebold & Hanson, 1996).

**Potential Solutions**

In considering these components of the problem of alcohol abuse and binge drinking within the fraternity system, responses regarding possible solutions have come from those various groups or entities which are directly involved in the lives of the young men who comprise the membership of the fraternity chapters on college and university campuses (Phi Delta Theta Fraternity, 1997; Kappa Sigma Fraternity, 1999; Clay, 1999). While there is a limit to who can speak for whom, some groups believe significant steps have already been taken by simply admitting that a problem exists within the fraternity culture. However, a need exists for all parties to realize how particularly acute the problem is within the fraternity system. It is one thing to recognize and acknowledge the existence of alcohol abuse. It is quite another matter to find ways in which to help others understand the degree of seriousness which can be attributed to the situation (Harrington-Lueker, 1999; Carter & Kahnweiler, 2000). All of the national organizations have developed programs designed to assist their chapters and their individual members with problems which might arise due to alcohol abuse or
related issues. These programs have been slow to evolve because many on the national and local levels did not want to admit there was a problem which needed fixing (Enos & Pittayathikhum, 1996). However, as the number of problems resulting from alcohol use and abuse continued to increase, the national leadership made decisions to take specific steps to eliminate or at least limit the impact this issue could have on the chapters (Reisberg, 2000). They have come to the realization of how critical the problem is and the decisions they must make to bring it under control. Understanding the severity of a problem is necessary if the national organizations and universities are to achieve a successful and meaningful response to the problem (Enos & Pittayathikhum, 1996; Reisberg, 2000).

One of the specific steps undertaken by a number of higher education institutions to better understand the problem includes support for and participation in numerous alcohol focus groups, studies and surveys which reflect reliable statistics based on responses from students attending those colleges and universities being surveyed (Berkowitz & Perkins, 1987a). The result is a specific, visible campus response represented by groups such as GAMMA (Greeks Advocating the Mature Management of Alcohol), BACCHUS (Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students) and TAAD (Talking About Alcohol and Drugs). If the groups are also supported by reliable data, they can likely be more successful in fulfilling their purpose of addressing the problem and seeking collaborative involvement from all parts of the campus community. This is one of the most effective responses to the problem because of the various groups and individuals involved. When they work cooperatively, they claim ownership of the idea and the potential for
solutions. When this happens, the level of enthusiasm is greater, and the desire for positive results is engendered in everyone (Riordan & Dana, 1998; Enos & Pittayathikhun, 1996).

Another positive response, which actually began several years ago, reflects concern and support from the Greek organizations’ national leadership. Their support indicates a willingness to address the problem, express concern and develop plans and approaches to respond to the problem of alcohol abuse and related issues (The End of Animal House? St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 2000). One such approach in recent years has been the decision by several national organizations to declare their houses alcohol-free (Meyers, 1998; Reisberg, 2000). While less than 10 fraternities have actually taken such positions, several others are strongly considering the move. Some national organizations acknowledge the decision would focus attention on the issue, but they are not convinced it would help achieve the desired goal of the responsible use of alcohol (Scheu, 1998).

These discussions at the national level have even influenced those in decision-making roles at the chapter level to take steps to develop programs and approaches to curb alcohol abuse on their campuses and in their chapters (Hylden, 1999). In addition, university administrators have called upon campus leaders, such as fraternity members and officers, to help reduce binge drinking. To some, this may seem ironic, because recent studies revealed that fraternity leaders have the highest rates of heavy drinking. “Nearly 74% of fraternity leaders reported having engaged in binge drinking as compared to 58% of those not in leadership roles” (Anderson, 1997, p.A20). These
numbers are disturbing to national fraternity organizations as well as college and university professionals. It would seem logical that those individuals who are chapter leaders would be the ones who are most sensitive regarding liability issues, particularly because of the positions of responsibility they occupy. But, as a result of their excessive alcohol consumption and binge drinking, they are becoming more the source of the problem rather than the solution (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998).

But, Cashin, Presley & Meilman (1998) found that not only were the heavy drinking levels of chapter leaders high, they were significantly higher than those members who simply attended functions and were not actively involved nor holding leadership positions. In the researcher’s opinion, if chapters are to experience improvements in the way in which they address issues of alcohol abuse and binge drinking by members, the chapter leaders must assume a more responsible role and exhibit those traits and qualities which are more reflective of fraternity ideals and are inherent in those leaders with a deep level of commitment to quality and excellence in the life of the chapter. Nevertheless, the leaders may still be having an impact. For example, many Greek systems have formed local groups which are affiliated with the national organization “Greeks Advocating the Mature Management of Alcohol (GAMMA)”. On other campuses, the Greek system has simply become part of a larger campus program designed to respond to the problem as one community. Regardless of the approach, authorities are encouraged that efforts are being made by fraternities to address the situation, and they are hopeful that these efforts will produce positive results (Enos & Pittayathikhun, 1996).
Limitations

As might be expected, there seem to always be impediments to making improvements which might help in achieving positive results. When it comes to efforts and programs designed to reduce or eliminate the problems associated with alcohol use or abuse, difficulties certainly arise. Because of the societal trends and the unique cultural practices in many geographic areas, conflicts arise from many different directions. Some feel the problem is simply too big to attack at the college or university level, and others choose to simply “turn their head” so that they will not see the things which actually occur. In either case, the failure to respond with some type of effort or program designed to correct the situation will ensure that the problem will continue to grow and cause greater difficulties in the future (Rodin, 1997).

Those who feel that the problem is no worse today than it was years ago have not availed themselves of the data and research which tell a different story (Harvard School of Public Health, 1995). At the institutional level, some would argue that the leaders speak out of both sides of their mouths. On one hand, they make decisions which seem to reveal an approach directly in conflict with stated concerns about alcohol consumption and abuse. Yet, they remain concerned that a problem with alcohol abuse exists, and they appear to be committed to helping find a solution to that problem (Campus Chronicles, 1998). These efforts are particularly evident in the development of policies related to the on-campus use and consumption of alcohol by student organizations and the role of the institution in supporting various councils or task forces organized to develop programmatic responses. Greek student leaders often express
feelings that the enforcement of the policy is more restrictive on them than on other student groups or those in university residence halls (Wechsler et al., 2000). Also, while many colleges and universities have taken steps to sever ties with alcohol or drug related companies or products by banning advertisements for alcohol or tobacco products in campus newspapers or the promotion of athletic events by alcohol and tobacco companies (Naughton, 1998), other college and universities have added luxury boxes to athletic complexes in an effort to attract large contributors to the athletic programs and other University programs. The attractiveness of such campaigns has been the guarantee that alcohol can be served in those areas, although it is not allowed or sold to fans in other parts of the stadium. When students and others see the policies and guidelines being applied differently in situations such as these, it has prompted many of them to view the other actions by the University as insincere in terms of wanting to be part of the solution rather than part of the problem (Maisel, 1988; Reisberg, 1998). These actions are seen as a continuation of the lack of institutional response when it comes to a clear, concise and consistent statement of expectations with regard to the use and consumption of alcohol on campus (Riordan & Dana, 1998).

Part of the problem moves beyond the campus itself. The alumni of both the Greek chapters and the institutions involved can also be an impediment to change. Alumni members of the Greek organizations often want to return to the campus and their houses to experience the same atmosphere that was present when they were undergraduates. When they realize the current policy does not allow the chapters to operate as they did in the past, without special permission, they can become disenchanted and withdraw their financial support (Phi Delta Theta, 1997). Fraternity
alumni can become an ally for the chapters and the institutions if they will become informed and become sensitive to the problems associated with alcohol abuse in the collegiate environment (Reikofski, 1998). If they become involved in the effort to address the problem, they will likely realize that the problem actually exists before the students ever arrive on the campus. This is an area where they can have a direct influence by helping develop programs and activities that will support those in middle and high schools who are struggling with the same difficulties. They can also influence the communities surrounding the university campuses to become part of the solution to the ongoing problem of alcohol abuse (Kraft, 1979a).

**Conclusion**

As can be seen from the information presented, the fraternity experience, whether as a member or as a leader, and the consumption of alcohol are, for most members, very closely linked to each other. Although the fraternity was founded as more than a social club, it has evolved into an organization that, by most, is viewed as an automatic invitation to party (Borsari & Carey, 1999; Arnold & Kuh, 1992). Those who know the system and are better informed, realize there are many other positive aspects to the fraternity system such as leadership development, encouragement for strong academic performance, a focus on campus and community service and, certainly not least, a better understanding of the term brotherhood (Arnold & Kuh, 1992).

Nevertheless, when it comes to a discussion of alcohol use and abuse and binge drinking on the college or university campus, most agree that the attention is focused on fraternities. The research reveals that alcohol abuse is a problem for the entire college
and university community, but the percentage of use and abuse and binge drinking is greater in fraternity membership, both actives and pledges. The message has certainly been delivered to those involved that their continued existence is at stake in terms of how they respond to this situation (Harrington-Lueker, 1999; Reisberg, 2000; Hylden, 1999). If they fail to respond quickly and effectively, chapters could find themselves disappearing from the system and from the university community because of their unwillingness to address the problem and work to find suitable solutions which meet both the letter and the spirit of the policies and guidelines presented by the leaders of both the colleges and universities and the national organizations (Whipple & Sullivan, 1998).
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this chapter is to define and present the procedures and methodology employed in the study. Included in these procedures are sampling, instrumentation, focus group methodology, the pilot study, data collection, and data analysis. Employing these procedures helped the researcher achieve the two main objectives of the study: 1) to determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by scores from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States and 2) to determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was defined as all students enrolled in colleges and universities who were members of social fraternities. The accessible population was defined as students currently enrolled in one research extensive university located in the southern portion of the United States who were members of
social fraternities. The sample consisted of all students who were members of six
social fraternities selected through a stratified, cluster random sampling procedure.
The minimum required sample size was determined to be 179 using Cochran’s (1977)
sample size determination formula for continuous data with the following computations:

\[
n_0 = \frac{t^2 \cdot s^2}{d^2} \\
= \frac{(1.96)^2 \cdot (.75)^2}{(.1)^2} \\
= \frac{3.84 \cdot .5625}{.01} \\
= 216
\]

\[
n = \frac{n_0}{1 + \frac{1}{n_0 - 1}} \\
= \frac{216}{1 + \frac{1}{216 - 1}} \\
= \frac{216}{1.21} \\
= 179
\]

Legend for Cochran’s sample size determination formula:

\[d^2 = \text{acceptable margin of error of } + 2\%\]

\[= (.02 \times 5 \text{ point Likert-type scale})\]
\( s^2 \) = the estimated variance (1)

\( t^2 \) = risk willing to take

( \( t \) at .05 for \( N \) = approximately 1,500 is 1.96)

\( N \) = population size

\( n_o \) = unadjusted sample size

\( n \) = adjusted sample size

Criteria used in these computations included an alpha level established a` priori at the .05 level (equivalent t value = 1.96); a conservative estimate of the variability in the population established as .75; and an acceptable margin of error of measurements established at 2% (\( d = .10 \)).

The sampling plan for the study included the following steps:

1. A complete frame of the social fraternities at the university included in the study was established. This frame consisted of 23 fraternities.

2. Each of the fraternities was classified into one of three groups (small - 12 to 49 members, medium - 50 to 99 members, and large - 100 or more members) based on the membership size of the organization.

3. Two fraternities were then randomly selected from each of the three strata.

4. This provided the researcher with two fraternities classified as having large membership, two classified as having medium membership, and two classified as having small membership.
**Instrumentation**

The instrument used to collect the data for this study consisted of three parts (Appendix A). The first part of the instrument was The Alcohol Use and Drinking Behavior Survey (AUDB), a researcher designed instrument developed to measure alcohol consumption patterns and perceptions of selected alcohol related issues and effects using a combination of questions emerging from the current literature and from the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (Presley, Harrold, Scouten, Lyerla & Meilman, 1994a). This instrument, the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (1994a), was not used in its totality, because it measured items not covered by this study. The newly designed instrument focused on members’ patterns of behavior regarding alcohol consumption and the relationship of these patterns of behavior to negative consequences experienced or perceived. It also reflected the degree to which these patterns of behavior were impacted and influenced by the actual level of involvement and/or leadership positions held in college and fraternity life, and by religious beliefs and/or attendance at organized worship services/meetings. The content validity of this instrument was established through a review by a panel of experts consisting of individuals with specific expertise in the area of alcohol use and abuse, individuals with expertise in the area of research design and methodology, university faculty and administrators who had experience in working with undergraduate students, and a group of current and/or former students who are/were members of social fraternities.

The second part of the instrument was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This instrument was used to measure specific aspects of the leader behavior
of presidents of social fraternities as perceived by the membership of that fraternity. The LBDQ was originally developed by Halpin and Winer (1957). Content validity of the instrument was established by the instrument developers and has been re-confirmed in a variety of studies in which it was employed since its development including behavioral studies (Stogdill, 1963), the Four Factor Theory (Bowers & Seashore, 1966) and Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Theory (1977). In addition, reliability figures (estimated by the Cronbach’s alpha) for the scales of the instrument have typically ranged from 0.83 to 0.92 for the initiation of structure scale, and from 0.82 to 0.76 for the consideration scale.

The third part of the instrument was a researcher designed instrument, the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI) which was used to measure perceived leader effectiveness. The instrument was comprised of 12 items focusing on the traits that have been shown in the literature (Miller, 1981) to be related to leader effectiveness. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their chapter president exhibited each of these traits. In addition, the researcher conducted a pilot test of the instrument by administering it to a group of students who were members of a social fraternity and who were not to be included in the scheduled data collection process. Following the pilot test results, adjustments and modifications were made prior to final data collection.

**The Pilot Study**

Prior to administering the surveys, the researcher conducted a pilot study with one of the fraternities not selected in the random sampling process. The researcher contacted the president of the chapter, secured his permission for the chapter to be involved in the pilot study, arranged a date and time to administer the pilot study and
conducted the pilot study. The researcher introduced the pilot study in the same manner used later in administering the surveys to the six chapters involved in the study. The instructions given to the pilot study group included the assurance of anonymity for both the individual members as well as the chapter, an explanation that they were not required to participate in the pilot study, a brief description of each part of the survey instrument and an offer to return to the chapter in the future, if invited, to share the overall findings of the study. While the participants in the pilot study had some questions about particular items, it was determined after the pilot study that no changes were required in the instrument.

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected using descriptive survey techniques. Specific steps in data collection included the following:

1. Presidents of each of the six randomly selected social fraternities were contacted, provided with a brief description of the purpose of the study and asked to cooperate with the collection of the data for the study.

2. After the president of the organization agreed to support the study, specific arrangements were made to schedule a time with the fraternity and conduct the survey.

3. On the arranged time for data collection, the researcher met with the fraternity and provided them with a brief explanation of the study, explained the procedures for completion of the survey, and distributed the instruments to all of the active members present at the meeting. Part of this procedural
explanation included a guarantee of anonymity for both the active members as individuals and for the fraternity as an organization of the university campus.

4. Other instructions given to the respondents included the fact that there were no individual identification numbers on the instrument and the fact that if they felt uncomfortable responding to any specific question(s) they had the option of leaving that question blank. They were also told they had the option of declining to participate in the study.

Focus Groups

Due to the self-reported nature of the quantitative data collected in this study, the researcher determined that the addition of focus group methodology as an additional component to the study would provide the opportunity to confirm or disconfirm some of the primary issues identified in the survey. This technique was selected for collecting the qualitative data in the study because of its advantage as identified by Denzin and Lincoln (1994). These advantages include, “inexpensive, rich data, flexible, stimulating to respondents, recall aiding, and cumulative and elaborative, over and above individual responses” (p. 365).

According to Morgan and Krueger (1993) focus groups provide a most useful method to be used in discovering the degree of consensus about a topic. In addition to aiding in the evaluation of specific programs, focus groups also provide a mechanism for feedback from those particular groups often viewed as less powerful. The discussion of values within and between groups can also be enhanced through focus groups. However, there are times when participants may change their opinions
as a result of the influence of the group involved in the focus group approach (Crabtree, Yanosik, Miller and O’Connor, 1993).

With regard to the administration of the focus group, Morgan and Krueger (1993) do not feel that is necessary to have a professional moderator leading the focus group. They indicated that they believe the moderator should be able to function effectively with both the participants as well as the research group in the study and should have worked with groups rather than as a leader of groups. They also suggest that the researcher might serve effectively as the moderator, since it is the researcher who is most familiar with the goals and objectives of the study.

The procedures used in this study included the following: the decision was made to conduct two focus groups with the break point being by leadership position of the member. In other words, one focus group was conducted with individuals who were serving as presidents of their fraternities, and one was conducted with individuals who were members but not in the position of president. The focus group discussions were based on questions appropriate to the study and are presented in Appendix B for the member focus group and Appendix C for the president focus group. Krueger (1994) describes five basic types of questions: opening questions, introductory questions, transition questions, key questions, and ending questions.

The guidelines for the focus groups included the following:

- There were two focus groups with the chapter presidents invited to participate in the president group and 12 members invited to participate in the member group.
• The focus groups were conducted away from the fraternity houses.
• The focus groups were conducted independently of each other.
• The member group had at least one member (and no more than two) from each of the six chapters which participated in the survey.
• The second focus group included the six presidents who were in office at the time of the survey.
• Efforts were made to include sophomores, juniors and seniors in the member group.
• The questions asked the member group are included in Appendix B.
• The questions asked the president group are included in Appendix C.
• The researcher audio tape recorded each focus group session.
• The time allotted for each focus group was approximately one and one-half hours.

Data Analysis

Data collected in this study was analyzed using the following procedures for each respective study objective.

Objective # 1

To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the following selected demographic characteristics:

a. Student classification status; (ordinal)

b. Age; (ordinal)
c. Ethnic origin; (nominal)
d. Marital status; (nominal)
e. Current living arrangements; (nominal)
f. Employment status; (nominal)
g. Parent’s income level; (ordinal)
h. State or country of origin; (nominal)
i. Religious preference; (nominal)
j. Level of participation in organized worship services/meetings; (interval)
k. Level of volunteerism activity; (interval)
l. Leadership positions previously held in the organization; (nominal)
m. Leadership positions currently held in the organization; (nominal) and
n. Leadership positions to which members may aspire. (nominal)

To accomplish this objective, each of the descriptive items was summarized using basic descriptive statistics. The most appropriate statistic was determined for each item based on the level of measurement of the variable. Variables that were measured on a categorical scale of measurement (either nominal or ordinal) were summarized using frequencies and percentages in categories. Variables that were measured on a continuous scale of measurement were summarized using means and standard deviations. Each of the variables listed in the first objective had the level of measurement of the variables as measured in this study noted in parentheses after the item.
Objective # 2

To describe students who are members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their patterns and level of alcohol consumption.

To accomplish this objective, the researcher used basic descriptive statistics to report the individual responses for each of the areas used in describing patterns and level of alcohol consumption. These variables included both categorical and continuous variables and each were summarized accordingly. In addition, the variables that were included in measuring components of this construct included responses to the following items in the AUDB:

• Have you ever consumed alcoholic beverages?
• Average number of drinks you consume a week.
• Have you ever consumed five or more drinks in one sitting?
  (A) Did you do this in high school?
  (B) Do you do this as a college student?
• Have you ever consumed alcohol in a manner that meets this definition of binge drinking?
• Within past two weeks, how many times have you had five or more drinks in one sitting?
• To what extent has your alcohol use changed within the last 12 months?

Objective # 3

To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected
negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to their consumption of alcoholic beverages.

To accomplish this objective the data collected were analyzed using the following procedures: respondents were asked to indicate on a numerical scale how often, during the last year (12 months), they had experienced 19 selected negative results due to drinking. The numerical scale offered six possible responses from 1 = never to 6 = 10 or more times. A mean value was determined based on the specific responses of the respondents with the values of the responses having the following values: 1 = never; 2 = once; 3 = twice; 4 = 3-5 times; 5 = 6-9 times; and 6 = 10 or more times. A mean score based on these responses is presented for each of the 19 items in the scale. In addition, these data were further summarized by using the factor analysis procedure to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale. This procedure enabled the researcher to determine if the response patterns indicated that these items could be combined into a single measure of negative consequences or if multiple constructs existed in this scale. These derived factors were then used to calculate factor scores that were used as independent variables in subsequent analyses.

Objective # 4

To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life.

To accomplish this objective, the researcher used basic descriptive statistics to report the individual responses for each of the areas used in describing respondents’
perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and behaviors and attitudes as related to selected aspects of college and fraternity life. The variables that were included in measuring components of this construct were combined into two scores: one linked to behaviors in which respondents engaged as related to alcohol consumption and one linked to attitudes concerning selected aspects of college and fraternity life. These scores were calculated as follows:

Alcohol consumption as related to behaviors was measured using the following item:

- During the past 30 days, to what extent have you engaged in each of the following behaviors?

Eight specific behaviors were presented for responses. This item was evaluated to derive a behavior score. The numerical scale offered six possible responses from 1 = never to 6 = 10 or more times. A mean value was determined based on the specific responses of the respondents with the values of the responses having the following values: 1 = never; 2 = once; 3 = twice; 4 = 3-5 times; 5 = 6-9 times; and 6 = 10 or more times. A mean score based on these responses was presented for each of the eight items in the scale. In addition, these data were further summarized using the factor analysis procedure to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale. This procedure enabled the researcher to determine if the response patterns indicated that these items could be combined into a single measure of behaviors or if multiple constructs existed in this scale. These derived factors were then used to calculate factor scores that were subsequently used as independent variables in additional analyses and were calculated as follows:
Alcohol consumption as related to attitudes concerning selected aspects of college and fraternity life were measured using the following item:

- Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each of the following items regarding alcohol consumption by circling one response for each item listed.

Twenty-four specific attitudinal statements were presented for responses. This item was evaluated as follows to derive an attitude score. The numerical scale offered six possible responses from 1 = never to 6 = 10 or more times. A mean value was determined based on the specific responses of the respondents with the values of the responses having the following values: 1 = never; 2 = once; 3 = twice; 4 = 3-5 times; 5 = 6-9 times; and 6 = 10 or more times. A mean score based on these responses was presented for each of the 18 items in the scale. In addition, these data were further summarized by using the factor analysis procedure to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale. This procedure enabled the researcher to determine if the response patterns indicated that these items could be combined into a single measure of attitudes or if multiple constructs existed in this scale. These derived factors were then used to calculate factor scores that were subsequently used as independent variables in additional analyses.

Objective # 5

To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding selected effects of alcohol consumption.
To accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized the section on the Alcohol Use and Drinking Behavior (AUDB) instrument which asked respondents to indicate whether or not they perceived that alcohol had each of 13 different effects. Each of the 13 response items was summarized by reporting the number and percentage of participants that indicated “Yes” and “No” to the item. In addition, these responses were used to calculate an alcohol effect score by scoring a value of 1 for each “Yes” response and a value of 0 for each “No” response. Therefore, the alcohol effect score had values ranging from a minimum possible score of 0 to a maximum possible score of 13.

Objective # 6

To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their level of involvement in selected aspects of university campus life.

To accomplish this objective, the data collected were analyzed using the following procedures: respondents were asked to indicate on a numerical scale their level of involvement in nine selected areas of university campus life. The numerical scale offered four possible responses from 1 = not involved to 4 = leadership position. A mean value was determined based on the specific responses of the respondents with the values of the responses having the following values: 1 = not involved; 2 = attended; 3 = active involvement (non-leader) and 4 = leadership position. A mean score based on these responses was presented for each of the nine items in the scale. In addition, an overall campus involvement score was computed as the sum of the responses to the nine items. Therefore, the campus involvement score had a possible range of values from a minimum of nine to a maximum of 36. The respondents were
then described on their overall campus involvement as measured by this score in addition to the individual items within the scale.

Objective # 7

To describe students who are members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion or the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to other students’ consumption of alcoholic beverages.

To accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized the section on the AUDB instrument which asked respondents to indicate whether or not the alcohol consumption of other students had that influence on their life in each of six specific areas. Each of the six response items was summarized by reporting the number and percentage of participants that indicated “Yes” and “No” to the item. In addition, these responses were used to calculate a score designed to measure the overall effect of the alcohol consumption of other students by scoring a value of 1 for each “Yes” response and a value of 0 for each “No” response. Therefore, this score had values ranging from a minimum possible score of 0 to a maximum possible score of 6.

Objective # 8

To describe at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States social fraternity leader behavior, as reflected by the perceptions of the members of that fraternity as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI).

To accomplish this objective, members’ perceptions were measured using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as designed by Halpin and Winer
(1957). The instrument is comprised of 40 questions related to administrative leadership, presented in two major dimensions: “Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration.” The score for each dimension was the sum of responses marked on each of the items in the dimension. From among the five available responses for each item: always, often, occasionally, seldom and never, the respondent was asked to indicate the most appropriate response for each item. The findings presented to accomplish this portion of the objective include descriptive information for each of the two primary dimensions measured by the LBDQ, “Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration.” Specific information presented includes the mean value, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum values for each of the two dimensions. Finally the data were summarized by classifying each individual response as either high or low on each dimension and then cross-tabulating the two dimensions to identify the overall classification of the perceived leader behavior as either High Initiation of Structure and High Consideration; High Initiation of Structure and Low Consideration; Low Initiation of Structure and High Consideration; or Low Initiation of Structure and Low Consideration.

In addition to assessing leader behavior using the LBDQ, the researcher also used the LEI to measure perceived leader effectiveness. The instrument was comprised of 12 items focusing on the traits related to leader effectiveness. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their chapter president exhibited each of the 12 traits. The LEI used five response categories: never, seldom, sometimes, usually and always. From among these five available responses, participants were asked to select the most appropriate answer for each item. The following response values were used: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = usually, and 5 = always.
Objective # 9

To determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by the LBDQ) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

To accomplish this objective the researcher employed the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient procedure. Correlations were computed between the alcohol consumption score (as measured by the number of drinks per week), each of the two LBDQ dimension scores, and the Leadership Effectiveness score to determine if the variables were related. In addition, correlations were computed between each of the two LBDQ dimension scores and the alcohol consumption score to determine if alcohol consumption had an influence on perceptions of leader behavior.

Objective # 10

To compare the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States by whether or not the student held a leadership position within the organization.

Analysis procedures used to accomplish this objective involved grouping the respondents into two groups: those who currently hold or previously held a leadership position within the organization, defined as president, vice president, pledge trainer, secretary, treasurer, house manager, rush chairman, social chairman, and alumni.
chairman and those who did not currently hold a leadership position within the organization. These two groups were then compared using the independent t-test procedure on their alcohol consumption score.

**Objective # 11**

To compare the effectiveness of the current leadership of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States as perceived by the members of the organization with the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of students who currently serve as the president of the organization.

This objective was accomplished by determining the difference between the self-perceived leadership as measured by the LBDQ dimension scores of the current president of each of the fraternities and the mean LBDQ dimension scores for the membership of the same fraternity. Since this involved comparing a single measurement with the mean of a group, statistical comparison tests were not employed as they required variance among the scores for computation. In addition, to protect the anonymity of the individuals currently in the position of president of the organization, the information presented was only the differences and the direction of the differences (higher or lower than the membership perceptions). Specific measurements of the self-ratings of the presidents of the six organizations were not presented.

**Objective # 12**

To compare at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States the level of alcohol consumption of fraternity members in leadership positions with those members who were not in leadership positions.
This objective was accomplished using a substantive comparison of the mean alcohol consumption levels of fraternity members in leadership positions and those members who do not hold leadership positions within the fraternity. The reason that no test of statistical significance was planned for this objective is that “fraternity members in leadership positions” was operationalized as the individuals currently in the position of president of the fraternity. Consequently, the number of individuals in the comparison group which consisted of the fraternity leaders had too few individuals to make meaningful statistical comparisons. Since the leader group consisted of only six individuals, the use of t-tests or other statistical comparison procedures to accomplish this objective would be tenuous at best. Therefore, to accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized a procedure to make a decision regarding the substantive significance between the mean scores of the non-leader group (defined as all study participants except the current presidents of the organizations) and the leader group. The procedure selected for this purpose was the construction of a confidence interval at each of four different levels of confidence around the mean of the non-leader group based on the number of drinks per week consumed by both the members and the presidents.

Objective # 13

To determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported frequency of attendance at organized worship services/meetings and the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

This objective was accomplished by calculation of a Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient between the self-reported frequency of attendance at organized
worship services/meetings by the respondents and the current alcohol consumption scores calculated from the data reported.

Objective # 14

To determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

This objective was accomplished using the multiple regression analysis procedure with current alcohol consumption as the outcome measure (dependent variable) and selected demographic, perceptual, and experiential factors used as antecedent measures (independent variables). The exact number of these measures was determined by the results of the factor analysis of the scales used in the AUDB instrument. In this analysis, step-wise entry of the variables was used due to the exploratory nature of the research being conducted. In addition, variables were added to the explanatory model which increased the total explained variance by 1% or more as long as the overall model remained significant.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Objective One

Objective one of this study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research university in the southern portion of the United States on selected demographic characteristics. Active members of six randomly selected national social fraternities provided the sample of 207 respondents for this study. Two chapters were randomly selected from each of three active membership levels: small, medium and large.

Student Classification Status of Respondents

Respondents were asked to report their current student classification status. Possible responses provided to participants ranged from freshman to graduate. As reflected in Table 1, the largest group of respondents (n = 81, 40.1%) indicated that they were sophomores. Only three respondents (1.5%) reported their classification as freshman.

Table 1
Student Classification of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
Age of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their age in years. The mean age for all respondents was 20.2 years (SD = 1.08), with the youngest being 18 years and the oldest being 23 years. The majority of the respondents in the study indicated that they were either 19 or 20 years of age (see Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Seven respondents did not indicate their age.

Note. The mean age of all respondents was 20.2 years (SD = 1.08).
Ethnicity of Respondents

When respondents were asked to indicate their ethnic origin, the majority reported that they were “White (non-Hispanic)” (n = 194, 96%). All other ethnic groups were reported by three or fewer respondents (See Table 3). One person (0.5%) indicated an “Other” ethnic group, but they did not indicate what that “Other” group was, and five study participants did not respond to this item.

Table 3

Ethnic Origin of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Five study participants did not respond to the question on ethnic origin.

*The individual who indicated “Other” did not specify the “Other” ethnic group.

Marital Status

Respondents were asked to indicate their marital status. Of the 200 respondents to this question, 199 (or 99.5%) indicated they were single, and 1 (or .5%) indicated that he was married. None of the respondents claimed to be separated,
divorced or widowed. Seven of the study participants did not respond to the survey item related to marital status.

**Living Arrangements**

Respondents were asked to report two aspects of their living arrangements by indicating “Where” they lived and “With Whom” they lived. Regarding “Where” they lived, the majority \( n = 115, 56.9\% \) reported that they lived in a “House/apartment/etc.” Living in the “Fraternity House” was the second most frequently reported response \( n = 84, 41.6\% \). Only one \( 0.5\% \) of the study participants indicated living in the “Residence Hall,” and two \( 1.0\% \) respondents reported that they had “Other” living arrangements. However, these respondents did not indicate what the “Other” arrangement was.

The second aspect of living arrangements requested by the researcher was “With Whom” the respondents lived. Study participants were provided with a list of individuals/groups with whom they might live, and they were asked to indicate for each of those listed whether or not they lived with that individual/group. The majority of respondents \( n = 117, 56.5\% \) indicated that they lived “With Roommate(s).” The second most frequently reported response \( n = 39, 18.8\% \) was “Alone.” Five participants \( 2.4\% \) indicated each of the responses “With Parents” and “Other” in response to the question regarding with whom they lived. However, those who indicated “Other” did not provide the additional information regarding the “Other” individuals/groups (See Table 4).
Table 4

Individuals/Groups Reported to be “Lived With” by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived With</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate(s)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Those who indicated “Other” did not specify a person or group.

Employment Status

Participants in the study responded to items concerning current employment status, location of the workplace, and the number of hours worked each week. Slightly more than 58% (n = 118) indicated they were currently employed, and 84 (41.6%) of the respondents indicated they were not currently employed. Of the 118 who were employed, 36 (32.1%) indicated that they were employed on campus, and 76 (67.9%) were employed off campus. Six of the respondents who said they were employed did not indicate whether on or off campus.

Respondents who reported that they were employed were also asked to indicate the approximate number of hours they worked each week. The mean number of hours
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worked by those who indicated they were employed was 16.8 (SD = 7.33). The fewest number of hours worked was two, and the most was 45 hours. Five of the 118 who were employed did not report a number of hours worked. More than one-half of the respondents (n = 62, 54.9%) who worked indicated that they worked between 11 and 20 hours each week. Eighteen (15.9%) worked between 21 and 30 hours per week, while 29 (25.7%) worked 10 or less hours per week. Table 5 provides a summary of the hours worked per week by respondents.

Table 5

Approximate Number of Hours Worked Per Week by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Eighteen respondents reported being employed, but they listed “0” hours worked. Note. The mean number of hours worked by those employed was 16.8 (SD = 7.33).

Parent’s Level of Income

Respondents were asked to indicate the level of income for their parents by marking the most appropriate category from those provided. Categories ranged from
less than $35,000 to greater than $150,000 (see Table 6). The largest group of respondents indicated the “Greater than $150,000” category (n = 45, 23.9%). The

**Table 6**

Parent’s Income Level Reported by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $35,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001-50,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-65,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,001-85,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,001-100,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001-130,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130,001-150,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $150,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total               | 188       | 100.0   |

Note. Nineteen respondents did not report a level of income for parents.

second largest response category was the “$85,001-100,000” category (n = 40, 21.3%). Only 3.7% (n = 7) reported their parents’ income level to be “Less than $35,000.”

**State or Country of Origin**

The majority of the respondents (n = 181, 86.6%) indicated that they were residents of the state of Louisiana. The residency of all respondents is presented in Table 7.
Table 7
State/National Origin of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Five respondents did not indicate a state or country.

The residency of the other 21 respondents not residing in Louisiana was reported as follows: Texas (9), Mississippi (5), Alabama (2), Indiana (1), West Virginia (1), Virginia (1), Arizona (1) and New Mexico (1). Two-hundred two respondents indicated they were citizens of the United States. Five respondents did not indicate a state or country.

Religious Preference

Respondents were asked to indicate their religious preference (see Table 8). Of the 199 respondents to this item, more than sixty-eight percent (n = 136) reported
Table 8

Religious Preference of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-denominational</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern (Buddhism, Hinduism, etc)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**\(^b\)     199  100.0

\(^a\)Other responses provided included Episcopal (\(n = 5\)), Church of Christ (\(n = 2\)), Agnostic (\(n = 1\)), Assembly of God (\(n = 1\)), Atheist (\(n = 1\)), and Lutheran (\(n = 1\)).

\(^b\)Eight respondents did not indicate a religious preference.

they were Catholic. There were 18 (9.0%) respondents who indicated they were Methodist, and Baptist was indicated by 13 (6.5%) of those reporting.

Level of Participation In Organized Worship/Meetings

Respondents were asked to indicate for a typical month (30 day period) how many organized worship services/meetings they attended. Participants were provided three available response options. The first of these was “Attend one or more services/meetings per month,” which was selected by 92 (50.85%) of the 181 participants who provided useable data for this item. Forty-six (25.4%) reported they attended less than one
service/meeting per month, and 44 (24.3%) indicated they attended on “Special Occasions” only. Ten (5.5%) reported not attending any services/meetings in a typical month. For those who indicated they attended one or more services or religious meetings per month, the individuals were also asked to indicate the number by writing in the specific number of services/meetings attended. The mean number of times attended in a typical month for these 92 respondents was 3.9 (SD = 2.56). Table 9 provides a summary of the number of services/meetings attended by the respondents in a typical month.

**Table 9**

**Number of Religious Services/Meetings Attended by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Services/Meetings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
The mean number of religious services/meetings attended by active members who attended one or more services/meetings per month was 3.9 (SD = 2.56).

Level of Volunteerism Activity

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of volunteer activity during a typical month. Of the 203 respondents, 42.9% (n = 87) reported that they did not volunteer at all or did so less than one hour per month, and 53.7% (n = 109) volunteered between 1 and 15 hours during a typical month. Seven (3.4%) respondents reported volunteering 16 or more hours during a typical month. Table 10 provides a summary of the number of hours of volunteer activity per month.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Volunteer, or Volunteer &lt;1 hour</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                | 203       | 100.0   |

Note. Four respondents did not report on this item.
Leadership Positions Previously Or Currently Held In The Organization

Participants were asked to indicate which of the listed leadership positions they had previously held or were currently holding. Table 11 presents a summary of the leadership positions previously and currently held. Only 11 (5.3%) of the 207 respondents indicated they had previously or were currently holding the position of president of their chapter. For the other leadership positions listed, the respondents reported the following information regarding previously or currently held positions: vice president-12 (5.8%); pledge trainer-7 (3.4%); secretary-14 (6.8%); treasurer-10 (4.8%); house manager-16 (7.7%); rush chairman-20 (9.7%); social chairman-20 (9.7%); alumni chairman-14 (6.8%); other-59 (28.5%). The most frequently reported position held was an “Other” leadership position.

Table 11

Leadership Positions Previously or Currently Held in the Organization by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Previously Held</th>
<th>Or</th>
<th>Currently Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes n %</td>
<td>No n %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>11 5.3</td>
<td>196 94.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>12 5.8</td>
<td>195 94.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge Trainer</td>
<td>7 3.4</td>
<td>200 96.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>14 6.8</td>
<td>193 93.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>10 4.8</td>
<td>197 95.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Manager</td>
<td>16 7.7</td>
<td>191 92.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
Leadership Positions To Which Members Aspire

Respondents were asked to respond to a question concerning those positions of leadership to which they aspire. Table 12 provides a summary of the data

Table 12
Leadership Positions to Which Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University Aspire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Yes n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge Trainer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Chairman</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were instructed to mark all that apply.
Those designated as “Other” by the respondents included Committee Chair (33), Interfraternity Athletic Council Representative (5), Interfraternity Council Representative (4), Sergeant-at-arms (4), Historian (3), Chaplain (1), Ritualist (1), Steward (1), and marked but not indicated (7).
Social Chairman 18 8.7 189 91.3
Alumni Chairman 14 6.8 193 93.2
Other\(^a\) 19 9.2 188 90.8

**Note.** Respondents were instructed to mark all that apply.
\(^a\)Those designated as “Other” by the respondents included Chairman (6), Sergeant-at-arms (2), Chaplain (1), Interfraternity Athletic Council Representative (1), Ritualist (1), and marked but not indicated (8).

regarding those leadership positions to which members reported that they aspired.

Thirty-seven (17.9\%) indicated they were interested in serving as president of the chapter. Thirty-six (17.4\%) expressed aspirations for vice president, and 45 (21.7\%) expressed interest in serving as pledge trainer.

**Objective Two**

Objective two of the study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their self-reported patterns and level of alcohol consumption. Information used to accomplish this objective is reflected by the responses to six questions contained in the survey.

The initial question asked respondents to indicate if they had ever consumed alcoholic beverages. Of the 205 total responses to the question focusing on whether the respondents had ever consumed alcohol, only five (2.4\%) indicated they had not consumed alcohol. Since binge drinking is considered a significant problem, particularly within the collegiate community (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, & Lee, 2000), this was measured in multiple ways. The second question on the survey sought information
regarding the number of times during the previous two weeks the respondents had consumed five or more drinks in a sitting. Responses were reported on a six-point anchored scale ranging from “None” to “10 or More.” Table 13 provides information regarding the number of times the respondents reported they had consumed five or more drinks in a sitting during the previous two weeks. A similar question asked respondents if they had ever consumed five or more drinks in one sitting, and a later question followed the presentation of a standard definition of binge drinking (“...consuming five or more drinks in one sitting”) and asked if they had ever consumed alcohol in a manner that met that definition. Binge drinking is generally defined as having five or more drinks in a single sitting (Presley, Meilman & Cashin, 1996). Wechsler was even more specific in saying that binge drinking is defined as “five or more drinks in a row, one or more times during a two-week period for men, and four or more drinks in a row one or more times during the same period for women”...and “a drink is defined as a 12 ounce can or bottle of beer, a four ounce glass of wine, a 12 ounce bottle or can of wine cooler, or a shot of liquor taken straight or in a mixed drink” (Wechsler, 1996, p. 23). Wechsler (1996) also reported that research with the Harvard study indicated that in determining the same risk factors involved in alcohol-related health and behavior problems, it takes four drinks for women and five drinks for men. It is at these levels of drinks consumed that signs of intoxication become noticeable. Respondents were also asked to report the average number of drinks they consumed in a week. Another question asked respondents to indicate the extent their alcohol use had changed within the last 12 months: increased, about the same, or decreased.
Number of Times Respondents Consumed Five or More Drinks in One Sitting

More than one-third of the respondents (n = 72, 36.0%) reported that they had consumed five or more drinks in one sitting between 3-5 times within the past two weeks. Another 50 (25%) of the respondents reported that they consumed five or more drinks in one sitting between 6-9 times during the past two weeks. Eighteen (9%) of the respondents indicated that they had not consumed five or more drinks in a sitting during the past two weeks.

Table 13

Number of Times That Five or More Drinks Had Been Consumed in a Sitting During the Past Two Weeks as Reported by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Seven respondents did not report on this item.

Number of Respondents Engaged In Binge Drinking Behavior

The survey contained two separate questions related to alcohol consumption focusing on “binge drinking.” They were strategically placed on the survey so that the
researcher could evaluate the responses in terms of consistency. The first question asked respondents “Have you ever consumed five or more drinks in one sitting?” Of the 198 respondents, 196 (99.0%) responded “Yes” and two (1%) responded “No.” Of those who said “Yes,” when asked “Did you do this in high school?”, 86.7% (n = 170) responded “Yes” and 13.3% (n = 26) responded “No.” When asked “Do you do this as a college student?”, 190 respondents (91.8%) indicated “Yes.” Seventeen respondents (8.2%) did not answer the question.

The second question followed a definition of “binge drinking” (“...consuming five or more drinks in a single sitting.”) and asked respondents “Have you ever consumed alcohol in a manner that meets this definition of binge drinking?” A total of 193 reported, with 180 (93.3%) indicating “Yes” that they had consumed drinks in a manner consistent with the stated definition. Thirteen (6.7%) responded “No.” Fourteen respondents did not report on this item. Of those who answered “Yes” to consuming alcohol in a manner that meets the definition of binge drinking, only 191 respondents answered the follow-up item on binge drinking in high school. When asked “Did you binge drink in high school?”, 156 (81.7%) indicated “Yes” and 35 (18.3%) indicated “No”. Sixteen respondents did not report on this item. Of the 188 respondents reporting on the question “Do you binge drink as a college student?”, 180 (95.7%) responded “Yes” and eight (4.3%) responded “No.” Nineteen respondents did not report on this item.

**Average Number of Drinks Per Week**

The average number of drinks per week reported ranged from 0 to 89 with a mean level of drinks per week of 21 (SD = 17.45). When asked to indicate the “Average # of
drinks* you consume a week:” (**A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.”), those reporting that they drank between 1 and 10 drinks per week comprised the largest group. Almost two-thirds (n = 126, 63.3%) of the respondents reported drinking between 1 and 20 drinks per week. More than one-third (n = 71, 35.9%) reported consuming more than 20 drinks per week. One (.5%) respondent reported consuming no drinks at all. Nine respondents did not report on this item. Table 14 provides a summary of the distribution of the average number of drinks per week.

### Table 14

**Average Drinks Per Week Distribution for Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Drinks per Week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Nine respondents did not report on this item.

*Note.* The mean number of drink per week was 21 (SD = 17.45).
Changes in Alcohol Consumption within the Last Twelve Months

The last question on alcohol consumption asked respondents to characterize changes in their alcohol consumption in the last 12 months. They were asked “To what extent has your alcohol use changed within the last 12 months?” The question received 197 responses with 42 (21.3%) indicating their level of consumption had increased, 96 (48.7%) indicating their level of consumption was about the same and 59 (29.9%) reporting their level of consumption had decreased. Ten participants did not respond on this item.

Objective Three

Objective three of this study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to their consumption of alcoholic beverages. Meeting this objective was accomplished by asking the respondents how often they had experienced the 19 listed items due to their drinking within the last year (12 months). The response scale used for each of the items included in this portion of the instrument was a six-point anchored scale ranging from “Never” to “10 or More Times”. Each response available to the participants had specific descriptors provided to serve as guidelines for their individual information. A response of “1” indicated the respondent had “Never” experienced the specific negative result during the past 12 months; “2” was the appropriate response if the respondent had experienced the negative result “Once.” If the respondent experienced the negative result “Twice,” the response was “3”. A response of “4” was indicative of the experience having occurred “3-5 Times”. A
response of “5” meant the experience had occurred “6-9 Times.” A response of “6” indicated the experience had occurred “10 or More Times” in the past 12 months.

While it is true that these data were most appropriately classified as ordinal data, this instrument was primarily utilized to develop summary measures that could be used to report the overall incidence of these 19 experiences as influenced by the respondent’s drinking. Using the data strictly as ordinal data would have limited the ability of the researcher to summarize the collected information. Therefore, these data were summarized by computing a mean score for each of the individual items. Using these responses to calculate mean scores would be somewhat analogous to the calculation of grade point averages from letter grades assigned to students in higher education. The estimated reliability of this scale in the current study as measured by the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined to be $\alpha = .88$.

The negative experience, due to drinking, reported most frequently by the respondents was “Had a hangover” which had a mean of 4.9 (SD = 1.43). “Missed a class” (M = 4.3, SD = 1.76) and “Driven a car while under the influence” (M = 3.9, SD = 1.85) were the next most frequently reported negative experiences. Other negative experiences reported by the respondents included “Done something I later regretted” (M = 3.5, SD = 1.85), “Got nauseated or vomited” (M = 3.4, SD = 1.63), “Had a memory loss” (M = 3.3, SD = 1.87) and “Been criticized by someone I know” (M = 3.2, SD = 1.80). The negative experiences reported least frequently were “Been arrested for DWI/DUI” (M = 1.1, SD = 0.52) and “Seriousy tried to commit suicide” (M = 1.1, SD = 0.42). Table 15 provides a summary of the responses reported on the six-point scale ranging from “Never” to “10 or More Times.” To aid in the interpretation of these
Table 15

Frequency of Selected Negative Experiences in the Last Twelve Months Due to Drinking Reported by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Never n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Once n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Twice n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>3-5 times n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>6-9 times n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>10 or more times n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a hangover</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6-9 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed a class</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3-5 times</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven a car while under the influence</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3-5 times</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done something I later regretted</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3-5 times</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got nauseated or vomited</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a memory loss</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been criticized by someone I know</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got into a fight or argument</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed poorly on a test or an important project</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been hurt or injured</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged property, pulled fire alarm, etc.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been in trouble with police, residence hall or other college authorities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought I might have a drinking problem</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have been taken advantage of sexually</td>
<td>1.6/1.19</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have taken advantage of another sexually</td>
<td>1.4/1.08</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried unsuccessfully to stop drinking</td>
<td>1.3/0.91</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously thought about suicide</td>
<td>1.2/0.66</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested for DWI/DUI</td>
<td>1.1/0.52</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously tried to commit suicide</td>
<td>1.1/0.42</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Mean value based on response scale 1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = twice, 4 = 3-5 times, 5 = 6-9 times, 6 = 10 or more times.
b 1.49 or less = never, 1.50-2.49 = once, 2.50-3.49 = twice, 3.50-4.49 = 3-5 times, 4.50-5.49 = 6-9 times, 5.50-6.0 = 10 or more times.

responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = never, 1.50-2.49 = once, 2.50-3.49 = twice, 3.50-4.49 = 3-5 times, 4.50-5.49 = 6-9 times, and 5.50-6.0 = 10 or more times. Using the interpretive scale, one item was classified in the “6-9 times” category, three items were in the “3-5 times” category, five items were in the “twice” category, five in the “once” category, and 5 were in the “never” category.

To further summarize the data regarding the negative experiences of active chapter members due to drinking, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the data. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method. Principal component analysis was chosen for this study due to two common problems associated with the use of common factor analysis: 1) Factor indeterminacy in common factor analysis, meaning that “for any
individual respondent, several different factor scores can be calculated from the factor
model results. There is no single unique solution” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black,
1998, p. 102); and 2) the fact that the shared variance is not always estimable and may
cause the variable to be deleted from the analysis (Hair, et al., 1998).

The first step in conducting factor analysis was to determine the most appropriate
number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root
criterion and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined
to be three. These techniques were used to determine the number of factors for the
following reasons: “the rationale for the latent root criterion is that any individual factor
should account for the variance of at least a single variable if it is to be retained for
interpretation” (Hair, et al., 1998, p. 103); “the scree test is used to identify the optimum
number of factors that can be extracted before the amount of unique variance begins to
dominate the common variance structure” (Hair, et al., 1998, p. 104). The results of the
factor analysis including the factor, its label as determined by the content of the items
included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor
loadings for each item in each of the factors is presented in Table 16. The researcher
labeled the three sub-scales as “Minor Problems,” “Power Play,” and “Cry For Help.”

Table 16

Factor Analysis of Negative Experiences Due to Drinking by Active Social Fraternity
Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Lack of Self Control</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 3 Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Done something I later regretted</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31.3% of variance explained)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missed a class</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven a car while under the influence</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed poorly on a test or project</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a hangover</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been criticized by someone I know</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a memory loss</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got nauseated or vomited</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got into an argument or fight</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been hurt or injured</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been in trouble with police/other authorities</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10.3% of variance explained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have taken advantage of another sexually</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been taken advantage of sexually</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged property, pulled fire alarms, etc.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried unsuccessfully to stop drinking</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7.2% of variance explained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seriously tried to commit suicide</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested for DWI/DUI</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
The first factor identified in the scale related to negative experiences due to drinking is designated “Lack of Self Control.” Experiences which were grouped in this factor included items such as “Done something I later regretted,” “Performed poorly on a test or a project,” and “Been hurt or injured.” The factor loadings ranged from a high of .79 to a low of .42 and explained 31.3% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor, identified by the researcher as “Physical Control” explained 10.3% of the overall scale variance and included experiences such as “Have taken advantage of another sexually” and “Tried unsuccessfully to stop drinking.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from .75 to .54. The third factor identified by the researcher as “Cry For Help” included items such as “Seriously tried to commit suicide’ and “Thought I might have a drinking problem.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from a high of .80 to a low of .46 and explained 7.2% of the overall variance in the scale.

After the three sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the three identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. For the first scale labeled “Lack of Self Control”, the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 1.0 to a high of 5.7 with an overall mean of 3.3 (SD = 1.11). Using the interpretative scale, this scale received an overall rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seriously thought about suicide</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought I might have a drinking problem</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classified in the “twice” category. The second scale was “Physical Control” and had individual subject means ranging from 1.0 to 5.5. The mean score for the group was 1.6 (SD = .80), which placed it in the “once” category. Finally, the third scale “Cry For Help” had an overall mean rating of 1.3 (SD = .53), placing it in the “never” category with individual subject scores ranging from 1.0 to 4.7. When these sub-scale scores were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the “Lack of Self Control” sub-scale (M = 3.3, SD = 1.11) (see Table 17).

**Table 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Self Control</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cry For Help</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Response scale: 1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = twice, 4 = 3-5 times, 5 = 6-9 times, 6 = 10 or more times.
b 1.49 or less = never, 1.50-2.49 = once, 2.50-3.49 = twice, 3.50-4.49 = 3-5 times, 4.50-5.49 = 6-9 times, 5.50-6.0 = 10 or more times.

**Objective Four**

Objective four was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life. To accomplish this objective, the
researcher used basic descriptive statistics to report the individual responses for each of the areas used in describing respondents’ perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and behaviors and attitudes as related to selected aspects of college and fraternity life. The variables included in measuring components of this construct were measured using two different scales: one linked to behaviors in which respondents engaged as related to alcohol consumption and one linked to attitudes concerning selected aspects of college and fraternity life.

These scores were calculated as follows: Alcohol consumption as related to behaviors was measured using the question “During the past 30 days, to what extent have you engaged in each of the following behaviors?” Eight specific behaviors were presented for responses, and they were evaluated as follows to derive a behavior score: The response scale used for each of the items included in this portion of the instrument was a six-point anchored scale ranging from 1 = Zero Times to 6 = 10 or More Times. The mean value was determined based on the specific responses of the respondents with the values of the responses having the following values: 1 = never; 2 = once; 3 = twice; 4 = 3-5 times; 5 = 6-9 times; and 6 = 10 or more times. A mean score based on these responses is presented for each of the eight items in the scale. The estimated reliability of this scale in the current study as measured by the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined to be \( \alpha = .65 \).

The behavior exhibited related to alcohol consumption reported most frequently by the respondents was “Heard someone else brag about his/her alcohol use” which had a mean of 3.9 (SD = 1.63). “Refused an offer of alcohol” (M = 2.8,
SD = 1.45), “Experienced peer pressure to drink” (M = 2.1, SD = 1.38), and “Bragged about your alcohol use” (M = 2.0, SD = 1.35) were the next most frequently reported behaviors. The behaviors exhibited related to alcohol consumption reported least frequently by the respondents included “Thought a sexual partner who was drunk was not attractive” (M = 1.7, SD = 1.18), “Carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, etc.” (M = 1.3, SD = .99), and “Told a sexual partner who was drunk that they were not attractive” (M = 1.2, SD = .68). To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = zero times, 1.50-2.49 = one time, 2.50-3.49 = two times, 3.50-4.49 = 3-5 times, 4.50-5.49 = 6-9 times, and 5.50-6.0 = 10 or more times. Using the interpretive scale, two items were classified in the “zero times” category, three were classified in the “one time” category, one in the “two times” category, and one in the “3-5 times” category. Table 18 provides a summary of the responses reported on the six-point scale ranging from “Zero Times” to “10 or More Times.”

Table 18

Behaviors Related to Alcohol Consumption Exhibited in the Last 30 Days as Reported by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>M / SD</th>
<th>Zero Times</th>
<th>One Time</th>
<th>Two Times</th>
<th>3-5 Times</th>
<th>6-9 Times</th>
<th>10 or More Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard someone brag</td>
<td>3.9/1.63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused an offer</td>
<td>2.8/1.45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Experienced peer pressure       | 2.1/1.38 | 102 | 52.8 | 31 | 16.1 | 26 | 13.5 | 22 | 11.4 | 6 | 3.1 | 6 | 3.1 | (table con’d.)
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To further summarize the data regarding the behavior exhibited in the last 30 days, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the data. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method.

The first step in conducting factor analysis was to determine the most appropriate number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be two. The results of the factor analysis including the factor, its label as determined by the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each item in each of the factors is presented in Table 19. To complete this step, the researcher

**Table 19**

Factor Analysis of Behaviors Exhibited Related to Alcohol Consumption by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Maturity Issues</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bragged about alcohol use</td>
<td>2.0/1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk partner unattractive</td>
<td>1.7/1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a weapon</td>
<td>1.3 / .98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told partner unattractive</td>
<td>1.2 / .68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30.5% of variance explained)

Told drunk sexual partner they were not attractive  

.81  

-0.07  

(table con’d.)
Carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, etc.  .77  .03
Thought drunk sexual partner was not attractive .65  .14
Held a drink to have people stop bothering you .52  .15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Decision-Making Issues</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced peer pressure to drink</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard someone else brag about alcohol use</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragged about your alcohol use</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused an offer of alcohol</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19.9% of variance explained)

labeled the two sub-scales as “Maturity Issues” and “Decision-Making Issues.”

The first factor identified in the scale related to behavior exhibited related to alcohol consumption is designated “Maturity Issues.” Behaviors which were grouped in this factor included items such as “Told sexual partner who was drunk that they were not attractive,” and “Carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, etc..” The factor loadings ranged from a high of .81 to a low of .52 and explained 30.5% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor, identified by the researcher as “Decision-Making Issues” explained 19.9% of the overall scale variance and included experiences such as “Experienced peer pressure” and “Bragged about your use of alcohol.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from a high of .77 to a low of .52.

After the two sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the two identified sub-scales. These
sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = zero times, 1.50-2.49 = one time, 2.50-3.49 = two times, 3.50-4.49 = 3-5 times, 4.50-5.49 = 6-9 times, and 5.50-6.0 = 10 or more times. Using the interpretive scale, one item was classified in the “zero times” category and one was classified in the “two times” category.

For the first scale labeled “Maturity Issues” the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 1.0 to a high of 5.0 with an overall mean of 1.4 (SD = .62). Using the interpretative scale, this scale received an overall rating classified in the “Zero Times” category. The second scale was “Decision-Making Issues” and had individual subject means ranging from a low of 1.0 to a high of 6.0. The mean score for the group was 2.7 (SD = 1.01), which placed it in the “Two Times” category. When these two sub-scales were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the “Decision-Making Issues” sub-scale (M = 2.7, SD = 1.01) (See Table 20).

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Two Times</td>
<td>1.0 - 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>Zero Times</td>
<td>1.0 - 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aResponse scale: 1 = zero times, 2 = one time, 3 = two times, 4 = 3-5 times, 5 = 6-9 times, and 6 = 10 or more times.

b1.49 or less = zero times, 1.50-2.49 = one time, 2.50-3.49 = two times, 3.50-4.49 - 3-5 times, 4.50-5.49 = 6-9 times, and 5.50-6.0 = 10 or more times.
Alcohol consumption as related to attitudes concerning selected aspects of college and fraternity life was measured by scoring the responses to a question designed to measure their degree of agreement/disagreement with each of 24 perception statements regarding alcohol consumption. The five-point Likert-type scale used the following response categories: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. To facilitate reporting of these findings, a scale was established by the researcher to guide the interpretation of the responses to the individual items. This scale was developed to coincide with the response categories provided to the respondents and included the following categories: < 1.50 = strongly disagree; 1.50 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.50 to 3.50 = undecided; 3.51 to 4.50 = agree; and > 4.50 = strongly agree.

The item respondents most agreed with was “Being a fraternity member helps me meet people,” which had a mean of 4.3 and SD of .97. This perception was followed closely by “A person can enjoy being in this fraternity without drinking alcohol” (M = 4.2, SD = 1.2) and “College is more meaningful as part of a fraternity” (M = 4.2, SD = 1.02). The estimated reliability of this scale in the current study as measured by the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined to be α = .81.

Those items with which the respondents most strongly disagreed included: “No one can be a member of a fraternity unless they drink alcohol” (M = 1.3, SD = .61), “Binge drinking is an expected part of being a fraternity leader” (M = 1.5, SD = .76), and “I drink because of the peer pressure from my fraternity brothers” (M = 1.5, SD = .72). Overall, four items were classified in the “Agree” response category, six were
classified in the “Uncertain” category, thirteen in the “Disagree” category, and one in the “Strongly disagree” category. Table 21 presents the mean level of agreement/disagreement with the items concerning the relationships of alcohol consumption and various aspects of college and fraternity life.

**Table 21**

**Attitudes Relative to the Relationships between Alcohol Consumption and Selected Aspects of College and Fraternity Life of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Response Category b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being a fraternity member helps me meet people</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College is more meaningful as part of a fraternity</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person can enjoy being in this fraternity without drinking alcohol</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more fun when I drink alcohol</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternities are known to have liberal attitudes toward drinking alcohol</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders in my fraternity exhibit alcohol consumption patterns that are more responsible than those of our general membership</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking is an important part of the college experience</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking helps me meet people</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I drink alcohol to have positive social experiences</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attitudes of my fraternity brothers influence my drinking patterns</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined a fraternity because I wanted to be part of a group that shared my attitudes toward drinking</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My drinking patterns in high school influenced my decision to join a fraternity</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My fraternity brothers influence the amount of alcohol I drink</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drinking is an expected part of belonging to a fraternity</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fraternity ideals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity ideals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who live in the fraternity house are expected to drink alcohol more than those who live out of the house.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fraternity brothers pressure me to participate in binge drinking</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person has to drink to fit in with this fraternity</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I drink because of the peer pressure from my fraternity brothers</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drinking is an expected part of being a fraternity leader</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one can be a member of a fraternity unless they drink alcohol</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Mean value based on the response scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

*b* Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: strongly disagree = <1.50, disagree = 1.5-2.49, uncertain = 2.5-3.5, agree = 3.51-4.50, and strongly agree = >4.50.

To further summarize the data regarding the perceptions of active chapter members of social fraternities regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life at a research extensive university, the
researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the data.

The researcher first determined the appropriate number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be four. The results of the factor analysis, including the factor, its label as determined by the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each item in each of the factors is presented in Table 22. The researcher labeled the four sub-scales as “Alcohol Consumption As Influenced By Peer Pressure Of Fraternity Members,” “Alcohol Consumption As An Integral Part Of The Fraternity Social Experience,” “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals,” and “Alcohol Consumption As An Important Part Of Being A Fraternity Member And Leader.”

Table 22
Factor Analysis of Levels of Agreement/Disagreement Regarding the Relationships between Alcohol Consumption and Selected Aspects of College and Fraternity Life as Reported by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item - Alcohol Consumption As Influenced By Peer Pressure Of Fraternity Members</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 3 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 4 Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I drink because of the peer pressure from my fraternity brothers</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fraternity brothers pressure me to participate in binge drinking</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fraternity brothers influence the amount of alcohol I drink</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25.2% of variance explained)
Members who live in the fraternity house are expected to drink alcohol more than those who live out of the house

A person has to drink to fit in with this fraternity

The attitudes of my fraternity brothers influence my drinking patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Alcohol Consumption As An Integral Part of the Fraternity Social Experience</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11.9% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more fun when I drink alcohol</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking is an important part of the college experience</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking helps me meet people</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I drink alcohol to have positive social experience</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College is more meaningful as part of a fraternity</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternities are known to have liberal attitudes toward drinking alcohol</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I joined a fraternity because I wanted to be part of a group that shared my attitudes toward drinking</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My drinking patterns in high school influenced my decision to join a fraternity</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8.9% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
My fraternity ideals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members  

My fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members  

Fraternity ideals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alcohol Consumption As An Important Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th><strong>Factor 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of Being A Fraternity Member And Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5.9% of variance explained)

Binge drinking is an expected part of being a fraternity leader  

Binge drinking is an expected part of belonging to a fraternity  

No one can be a member of a fraternity unless they drink alcohol  

Being a fraternity member helps me meet people  

Leaders in my fraternity exhibit alcohol consumption patterns that are more responsible than those of our general membership  

A person can enjoy being in this fraternity without drinking alcohol  

The first factor identified in the scale related to the participant’s perceptions relative to the level of agreement/disagreement with the relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life “As Influenced By Peer Pressure Of Fraternity Members.” Items in this factor included “I drink because of the
peer pressure from my fraternity brothers,” “My fraternity brothers pressure me to participate in binge drinking,” and “My fraternity brothers influence the amount of alcohol I drink.” The factor loadings ranged from a high of .76 to a low of .56 and explained 25.2% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor identified by the researcher as “Alcohol Consumption As An Integral Part Of The Fraternity Social Experience” explained 11.9% of the overall scale variance and included experiences such as “I have more fun when I drink alcohol”, “Drinking is an important part of the college experience,” and “Drinking helps me meet people.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from a high of .69 to a low of .41. The third factor identified by the researcher as “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals” included “Fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members” and “My fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from a high of .87 to a low of .62 and explained 8.9% of the overall variance in the scale. The fourth factor identified in the scale was “Alcohol Consumption As An Important Part Of Being A Fraternity Member And Leader.” Experiences grouped in this factor included items such as “Binge drinking is an expected part of being a fraternity leader,” “Binge drinking is an expected part of belonging to a fraternity,” “No one can be a member of a fraternity unless they drink alcohol,” and “Leaders in my fraternity exhibit alcohol consumption patterns that are more responsible than those of our general membership.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from a high of .66 to a low of .43 and explained 5.9% of the overall variance in the scale.
After the four sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the four identified sub-scales. These sub-scales scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. Since some of the items were designed as reverse scale items (for example, on some items strongly disagree represented the more positive attitude while on other items strongly agree represented the more positive attitude), the items were recoded so that for all items, the lower value represented a more positive attitude toward the role of alcohol in college and fraternity life. After the items were recoded, an overall mean attitude score was computed for each sub-scale identified by the factor analysis. It should be noted that these scores no longer reflect simply agreement/disagreement due to the recoded items. The sub-scale scores should now be interpreted as positive or negative attitudes toward the role of alcohol in college and fraternity life (See Table 23).

Table 23

Level of Agreement/Disagreement with the Relationships between Alcohol Consumption and Selected Aspects of College and Fraternity Life Sub-scale Scores After Recoding of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption As:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An integral part of the fraternity social experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.5 - 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced by peer pressure of fraternity members</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1 - 4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
An important part of being a fraternity member and leader 6 1.8 .53 1 - 3.67

A reflection of fraternity rituals and ideals 4 1.7 .80 1 - 5.0

Note. All items were recoded so that lower response values reflect more positive relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life.

a Response scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

For the first scale labeled “Alcohol Consumption As Influenced By Peer Pressure Of Fraternity Members,” the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 1.0 to a high of 4.2 with an overall mean of 1.8 (SD = .65). The second scale was “Alcohol Consumption As An Integral Part Of The Fraternity Social Experience” and had individual subject means ranging from 1.5 to 4.5. The mean score for the group was 2.8 (SD = .63). The third scale, “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals,” had an overall mean rating of 1.7 (SD = .80) with individual subject scores ranging from 1.0 to 5.0. Finally, the fourth scale, “Alcohol Consumption As An Important Part Of Being A Fraternity Member And Leader,” had an overall mean rating of 1.8 (SD = .53). The individual subject scores ranged from 1.0 to 3.7. When these sub-scales scores were examined, the factor which received the most positive response score was the sub-scale “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals” sub-scale (M = 1.7, SD = .80).

Objective Five

Objective five of this study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding selected effects of alcohol consumption. To
accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized the question on the instrument which asked respondents to indicate whether or not they perceived that alcohol had each of 13 different effects listed.

Respondents were provided with 13 items which identified possible outcomes of alcohol consumption. They were asked to respond “Yes” or “No” regarding whether or not they felt that each of these outcomes resulted from alcohol consumption. The effect with which the largest proportion of the respondents indicated “Yes” was “Breaks the ice” \((n = 188, 94.5\%)\). In addition, 88.4\% \((n = 176)\) responded “Yes” that alcohol “Enhances social activity.” The effect with which the smallest proportion of respondents indicated “Yes” was “Makes food taste better” \((n = 69, 34.8\%)\). Overall, 11 of the 13 items received a “Yes” response from the majority of the study participants, and two of the items received a “No” response from the majority of the participants (See Table 24).

**Table 24**

Affirmative/Negative Responses to Statements Regarding the Effects of Alcohol as Reported by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks the ice</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances social activity</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates male bonding</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows people to have more fun</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives people something to do</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
Facilitates sexual opportunities    158  79.4  41   20.6   199  100.0
Gives people something to talk about 157  78.9  42   21.1   199  100.0
Makes women sexier      147  73.9  52   26.1   199  100.0
Facilitates a connection with peers 145  72.9  54   27.1   199  100.0
Facilitates female bonding       138  69.3  61   30.7   199  100.0
Makes it easier to deal with stress 122  61.3  77   38.7   199  100.0
Makes me sexier               78   39.2 121   60.8   199  100.0
Makes food taste better       69   34.8 129   65.2   198  100.0

To further summarize these data, the researcher calculated an alcohol effects score which was defined as the combined responses to the 13 items in the scale. This score was computed using the following procedure. Each of the items was coded such that a response of “Yes” had a value of “1” and a response of “No” had a value of “0.” The responses to the 13 items were then summed to yield a score with a possible range of scores from 0 to 13. This score was defined as the alcohol effects score. The actual range of scores was from a low of 1 to a high of 13 with a mean for the group of 9.4 (SD = 2.87).

**Objective Six**

Objective six of the study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their level of involvement in selected aspects of university campus life. Meeting this objective was accomplished by asking respondents to indicate to what extent, within the last year, they had participated in any of the activities listed in the question. The response scale used for each item included in this portion of the
instrument was a four-point anchored scale ranging from “not involved” to “Leadership Position.” Specific descriptors served as guidelines for the specific information provided by each response from the participants. “Not involved” in any of the listed activities was given a value of “1,” while responses of “attended” any of the listed activities within the last year were given the value of “2.” If the respondent was actively involved, but as a non-leader, in any of the listed activities, a value of “3” was assigned, and a “4” indicated the respondent had participated in a leadership position in the listed activity during the past 12 months. Summary measures were developed to be used in reporting the overall incidence of these 13 experiences as influenced by the respondent’s level of participation. The data were summarized by computing a mean score for each of the individual items. The estimated reliability of this scale in the current study as measured by the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined to be $\alpha = .77$.

The level of participation indicated for items was varied, but the activity in which the highest level of participation was reported was “Social fraternity” which had a mean of 3.3 (SD = .61). “Attended regular chapter meetings” ($M = 3.1, SD = .67$) and “Attended chapter social functions” ($M = 3.0, SD = .69$) were the next most frequently reported activities in which respondents participated. The activities in which respondents reported the lowest level of active participation were “Minority and ethnic organizations” ($M = 1.1, SD = .34$), “International and language groups” ($M = 1.1, SD = .39$) and “Student newspaper, radio, TV, magazine, etc” ($M = 1.2, SD = .55$). Table 25 provides a summary of the responses reported on the four-point scale ranging from
“not involved” to “leadership position.” To facilitate the interpretation of these responses, the research established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = not involved, 1.50 - 2.49 = attended, 2.50 - 3.49 = active involvement (non-leader) and 3.50 - 4.00 = leadership position. Using the interpretive scale, five items were classified in the “active involvement” category, three items were in the “attended” category, and five items were classified in the “not involved” category.

**Table 25**

**Level of Participation in Campus Activities and University Life in the Last Twelve Months by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>M* / SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Not Involved</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Active Involvement (non-leader)</th>
<th>Leadership Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social fraternity</td>
<td>3.3/.61</td>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>0 0 17 9.2</td>
<td>103 56.0</td>
<td>64 34.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended regular chapter meetings</td>
<td>3.1/.67</td>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>1 .5 29 14.6</td>
<td>110 55.6</td>
<td>58 29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended chapter social functions</td>
<td>3.0/.70</td>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>3 1.6 34 17.8</td>
<td>109 57.1</td>
<td>45 23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community chapter service projects</td>
<td>2.7/.89</td>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>24 12.2 45 22.8</td>
<td>96 48.7</td>
<td>32 16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural or club sports</td>
<td>2.5/.96</td>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>39 19.8 42 21.3</td>
<td>89 45.2</td>
<td>27 13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in fraternity academic programs</td>
<td>2.3/1.02</td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>57 29.4 52 26.8</td>
<td>60 30.9</td>
<td>25 12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>1.8/.82</td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>85 43.4 78 39.8</td>
<td>25 12.8</td>
<td>8  4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious and interfaith groups</td>
<td>1.7/.83</td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>97 49.2 60 30.5</td>
<td>36 18.3</td>
<td>4  2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and other performing groups</td>
<td>1.4/.68</td>
<td>Not Involved</td>
<td>134 67.3 50 25.1</td>
<td>12  6.0</td>
<td>3  1.5 (table con’d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political and social action groups 1.3/.61 Not Involved 154 77.8 36 18.2 4 2.0 4 2.0

Student newspaper, radio, TV, magazine, etc. 1.2/.55 Not Involved 167 83.9 23 1.6 7 3.5 2 1.0

International and language groups 1.1/.39 Not Involved 184 93.4 7 3.6 6 3.0 0 0

Minority and ethnic organizations 1.1/.34 Not Involved 184 92.5 12 6.0 3 1.5 0 0

\(^a\) Mean value based on the response scale 1 = not involved, 2 = attended, 3 = active involvement (non-leader), and 4 = leadership position.
\(^b\) Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: 1.49 or less = not involved, 1.5-2.49 = attended, 2.5-3.49 = active involvement (non-leader), and 3.50-4.00 = leadership position.

To further summarize the data regarding levels of participation in campus activities and university life by active chapter members of social fraternities, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the data. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method.

In order to conduct a factor analysis, the first step was to determine the most appropriate number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be three. The results of the factor analysis, its label as determined by the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each item in each of the factors is presented in Table 26. The researcher labeled the three sub-scales as “Fraternity,” “Other Campus Groups,” and “Athletics.”

The first factor identified in the scale related to the level of participation in campus activities and university life by active chapter members was designated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Fraternity</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 3 Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended regular chapter meetings</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended chapter social functions</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fraternity</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter community service projects</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity academic programs</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28.6% of variance explained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Other Campus Groups</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority and ethnic organizations</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and social action groups</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and language groups</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/ performing arts groups</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student media groups</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious and interfaith groups</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(17.1% of variance explained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Athletics</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(9.1% of variance explained)
“Fraternity.” Activities which were grouped in this factor included items such as “Social fraternity,” “Attended regular chapter meetings,” and “Attended chapter social functions.” The factor loadings ranged from a high of .91 to a low of .48 and explained 28.6% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor, identified by the researcher as “Other Campus Groups” explained 17.1% of the overall scale variance and included activities such as “Religious and interfaith groups,” “Minority and ethnic organizations,” and “Political and social action groups.” This factor yielded loadings ranging from a high of .80 to a low of .53. The third factor identified by the researcher as “Athletics” included “Intercollegiate athletics” and “Intramural and club sports.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from a high of .70 to a low of .56 and explained 9.1% of the overall variance in the scale.

After the three sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the three identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. For the first scale labeled “Fraternity,” the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 1.4 to a high of 4.0 with an overall mean of 2.8 (SD = .61). Using the interpretive scale, this sub-scale received an overall rating classified in the “Active Involvement” category. The second scale was “Other Campus Groups”
and had individual subject means ranging from 1.0 to 3.0 with an overall mean of 1.3
(SD = .38), placing it in the “not involved” category. Finally, the third scale
“Athletics” had an overall mean rating of 2.2 (SD = .73), placing it in the “Attended”
category with individual subject scores ranging from 1.0 to 4.0. When these sub-scale
scores were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the
“Fraternity” sub-scale (M = 2.8, SD = .61) (See Table 27).

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>1.4 - 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>1.0 - 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>1.0 - 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Response scale: 1 = not involved, 2 = attended, 3 = active involvement (non-leader),
4 = leadership position.
b 1.49 or less = not involved, 1.50 - 2.49 = attended, 2.50 - 3.49 = active involvement,
3.50 - 4.00 = leadership position.

Objective Seven

Objective seven of this study was to describe students who were members of
social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the
United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that
they would attribute to other students’ consumption of alcoholic beverages. To
accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized the section of the instrument which
asked respondents to indicate whether or not the alcohol consumption of other
students had influenced their lives. Respondents were provided with six items which
identified possible negative consequences they might have experienced. They were
asked to respond “Yes” or “No” regarding whether or not they felt they had
experienced each of these negative consequences as a result of other students’
consumption of alcoholic beverages. The effect with which the largest proportion of
the respondents indicated “Yes” was “Messes up your physical living space
(cleanliness, neatness, organization, etc.)” (n = 102, 51.5%). In addition, 44.4% (n =
88) responded “Yes” that alcohol consumption by other students “Interrupts your
studying.” The negative consequence with which the smallest proportion of
respondents indicated “Yes” was “Interferes in other way(s)” (n = 13, 7.2%). Overall,
only one of the six items received a “Yes” from the majority of the study participants,
and the other five items received a “No” response from the majority of the participants
(See Table 28).

Table 28

Whether or Not Selected Negative Consequences Were Experienced Due to the Alcohol
Consumption of Other Students by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research
Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messes up physical living space</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupts your studying</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversely affects group/team</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes you feel unsafe</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents you from enjoying events</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes in other ways</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nine participants did not respond on five parts of this question.
* Eighteen participants who responded to this question did not answer the “Other” component of the item.

To further summarize this data, the researcher calculated an alcohol effects score which was defined as the combined responses to the six items in the scale. This score was computed using the following procedure. Each of the items was coded such that a response of “Yes” had a value of “1” and a response of “No” had a value of “0.” The responses to the six items was then summed to yield a score with a possible range of from 0 to 6. This score was defined as the alcohol effects score. The actual range of scores was from a low of 1 to a high 6 with a mean for the group of 1.5 (SD = 1.34).

**Objective Eight**

Objective eight of this study was to describe at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States social fraternity leader behavior as reflected by the perceptions of the members of that fraternity as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI).

To accomplish this objective, members’ perceptions were measured in two ways. First, the leader behavior was measured using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as designed by Halpin and Winer (1957). The instrument is comprised of 40 questions related to administrative leadership, presented in two major dimensions: initiation of structure and consideration. The LBDQ has five response categories: Always, Often, Occasionally, Seldom and Never. From among these five
available responses, participants were asked to select the most appropriate answer for each item. In using the LBDQ, only 30 of the 40 items were scored, 15 for each dimension. The 10 unscored items were retained to maintain the consistency of the conditions of administration like those used in standardizing the questionnaire. Scoring of the responses to the LBDQ involved computing the sum of the 15 items included in each of the two dimensions being measured. The numerical codes assigned to each of the item responses ranged from 1 (assigned for a response of “Never”) to 5 (assigned for a response of “Always”). Therefore, the possible range of scores for each of the dimensions was from 15 to 75. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients for the LBDQ scales in this study were $\alpha = 0.75$ for the “Consideration” dimension and $\alpha = 0.88$ for the “Initiation of Structure” dimension.

Scores on the “Initiation of Structure” dimension ranged from a low of 26 to a high of 75 (the maximum possible score) with a mean for the 202 study participants that completed all parts of the instrument of 56.5 ($SD = 8.67$). On the “Consideration” dimension, the scores ranged from a low of 30 to a high of 73 with a mean consideration score of 53.2 ($SD = 6.85$). Summated scores are used in reporting results of administration of the LBDQ to compare the respondents on their orientation toward the two dimensions. The correlated t-test procedure was used to compare the mean scores on the two dimensions with the results indicating that presidents of social fraternities were perceived to have a significantly higher orientation to the “Initiation of Structure” dimension than they had to the “Consideration” dimension ($t_{201} = 9.45, p < .001$).
Scoring recommendations for use of the LBDQ indicate that the researcher should “...calculate a mean and standard deviation if you intend to use the results for research over a sample or population.” (Halpin & Winer, 1957, p. 36). Procedures specified for calculation of this mean indicated that the calculated raw score for each dimension should be divided by the number of items in each score (15) to produce this mean. This procedure was used in the current research since the researcher’s intention was to generalize the results to the population of social fraternity members at the study institution.

To facilitate reporting of these findings, a scale was established by the researcher to guide the interpretation of the dimension mean scores. This scale was developed to coincide with the response categories provided to the participants and included the following categories: ≥ 4.50 = always; 3.50 to 4.49 = often; 2.51 to 3.49 = occasionally; 1.51 to 2.50 = seldom; and ≤ 1.5 = never. When the scores were examined for the “Initiation of Structure” dimension, the majority of subjects (n = 126, 62.4%) were found to be in the “often” response category (See Table 29).

**Table 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Category</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Frequency a</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4.50</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 to 4.49</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 to 3.49</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.2 (table con’d.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.51 to 2.50  Seldom  5  2.5
≤ 1.50  Never  0  0

Response scale: 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = occasionally, 2 = seldom, and 1 = never.

a Five respondents did not have complete data on this measurement.

When the scores were examined for the “Consideration” dimension, the majority of subjects (n = 118, 58.4%) were also found to be in the “often” response category (See Table 30).

**Table 30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Category</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Frequency a</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4.50</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 to 4.49</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 to 3.49</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 to 2.50</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 1.50</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response scale: 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = occasionally, 2 = seldom, and 1 = never.

a Five respondents did not report on this question.

In order to explain overall styles of leader behavior for chapter presidents, respondents were categorized as high or low on each dimension of perceived leader behavior. These categories were defined by scores on each dimension for the group. Leader behavior scores above the mean on each dimension were defined as high, and those below the mean were defined as low (Halpin, 1966). According to Halpin (1966),
while the measurements of the two dimensions are separate and distinct, four quadrants of leader behavior can be defined by cross-partitioning on the mean score values of each dimension. Therefore, using both the dimensions of “Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration,” respondents were classified as low initiation of structure – low consideration, low initiation of structure – high consideration, high initiation of structure – low consideration, or high initiation of structure – high consideration.

Table 31 presents a summary of the categories relative to dimensions of leader behavior of chapter presidents as perceived by chapter members. The largest group (n = 90, 44.6%) included those who perceived their chapter presidents were high on both dimensions of leader behavior. Low initiation of structure – low consideration was the next largest group (n = 73, 36.1%). Low initiation of structure – high consideration was the smallest group (n = 15, 7.4%).

### Table 31

**Classification of Chapter Presidents at a Research Extensive University on Dimensions of Leader Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INS – CONS</th>
<th>Frequency a</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low – Low</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low – High</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High – Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High – High</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* INS – Initiation of Structure; CONS – Consideration.

*a* Five respondents did not have complete data on this measurement.
In addition to assessing leader behavior using the LBDQ, a second instrument designed by the researcher, the “Leadership Effectiveness Instrument” (LEI), was used to measure perceived leader effectiveness. The instrument was comprised of 12 items focusing on the traits that have been shown in the literature to be related to leader effectiveness. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their chapter president exhibited each of these traits. The LEI uses five response categories: never, seldom, sometimes, usually and always. From among these five available responses, participants were asked to select the most appropriate answer for each item. The five-point anchored scale used the following response values: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = usually, and 5 = always. To facilitate reporting of these findings, a scale was established by the researcher to guide the interpretation of the responses to the individual items. This scale was developed to coincide with the response categories provided to the respondents and included the following categories: <1.50 = never; 1.50 to 2.49 = seldom; 2.50 to 3.49 = sometimes; 3.50 to 4.49 = usually; and ≥4.50 = always. The estimated reliability of this scale in the current study as measured by the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined to be α = .96.

The item respondents felt most frequently described their chapter president was “I feel that my fraternity president is confident,” which had a mean of 4.8 (SD = .74). This response was classified in the “always” category. The items that received the second and third highest ratings were “I feel that my fraternity president is responsible and dependable” (M = 4.3, SD = .98) and “I feel that my fraternity president is an effective leader for our organization” (M = 4.2, SD = 1.01).
Those items which the respondents felt least frequently described their chapter president included “I feel that my fraternity president is a good motivator,” which had a mean of 3.9 (SD = .98), “I feel that my fraternity president is a good encourager” (M = 4.0, SD = .95), and “I feel that my fraternity president is a good listener” (M = 4.0, SD = .96). Table 32 presents the mean rating on each of the items examined in the LEI.

To further summarize the data regarding the perceptions of active chapter members of social fraternities regarding leadership effectiveness of their chapter president, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the data.

Table 32

Perceptions of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University Regarding the Leadership Effectiveness of the Chapter Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Response Category b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my fraternity president is.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible and dependable</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader for our organization</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest and sincere with others</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall a strong leader</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective communicator</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(table con’d.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A good listener    4.0  .96  Usually
Organized          4.0  1.11 Usually
A good encourager   4.0  .95  Usually
A good motivator   3.9  .98  Usually

\(^a\)Mean value based on the response scale 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = usually, and 5 = always.
\(^b\)Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: never = <1.50, seldom = 1.50-2.49, sometimes = 2.50-3.49, usually = 3.50-4.49, and always = <4.50.

The researcher first determined the appropriate number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be one. The results of the factor analysis, including the factor, its label as determined by the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by that factor, and factor loadings for each item in the factor are presented in Table 33. The researcher

\textbf{Table 33}

\textbf{Factor Analysis of the Perceptions of Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University Regarding Leadership Effectiveness of Chapter Presidents}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Perceived Leadership Effectiveness</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(85.3% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my fraternity president is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader of our organization</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall a strong leader</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
Responsible and dependable  .85
A good encourager  .85
A good motivator  .83
Honest and sincere with others  .82
An effective communicator  .82
A good listener  .81
Organized  .76
Decisive  .73
Confident  .72

labeled the sub-scale as “Perceived Leadership Effectiveness.” All 12 of the items factored into one sub-scale. The factor loadings ranged from a high of .91 to a low of .72 and explained 85.3% of the variance in the scale.

After the sub-scale and the items included in it were identified, the researcher computed a scale score for the sub-scale. The sub-scale score was identified as the mean of the items included in the factor. For the scale labeled “Perceived Leadership Effectiveness,” the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 3.9 to a high of 4.8 with an overall mean of 4.1 (SD = .77). Using the interpretive scale, this sub-scale received an overall rating classified in the “usually” category.

**Objective Nine**

Objective nine of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by the LBDQ and the LEI) among students who
were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States. To accomplish this objective the researcher employed the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient procedure. Correlations were computed between the alcohol consumption score (as measured by the number of drinks per week) and each of the two LBDQ dimension scores (“Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration”) and the Leadership Effectiveness score (as measured by the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument) to determine if the variables were related.

When these correlations were examined, a significant relationship was found between each of the LBDQ measures of leader behavior (“Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration” dimensions) and the number of drinks the respondents reported that they consumed per week. The calculated coefficient between the number of drinks per week and the “Initiation of Structure” dimension was $r = .19$ ($p = .008$). The calculated coefficient between the number of drinks per week and the “Consideration” dimension was $r = .18$ ($p = .01$). The nature of both of these associations was such that members who had higher perceptions of leader behavior of their chapter president tended to consume more drinks of alcohol per week. However, no significant relationship was found between the Leader Effectiveness score (as measured by the LEI) and the number of drinks per week ($r = .10$, $p = .16$).

**Objective Ten**

Objective ten of this study was to compare the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States by whether or not the student held a leadership position within the organization. The analysis procedure used to
accomplish this objective involved grouping the respondents into two groups: those who currently hold or previously held a leadership position within the organization, defined as president, vice president, pledge trainer, secretary, treasurer, house manager, rush chairman, social chairman, and alumni chairman and those who did not currently hold or had not previously held a leadership position within the organization. These two groups were compared using the independent t-test procedure on their alcohol consumption score.

When these groups were compared on alcohol consumption, a significant difference was found ($t_{196} = 2.71$, $p = .007$). The mean number of drinks consumed by those who held leadership positions was 17.8 ($SD = 16.51$) and the number of drinks consumed by those who had not held leadership positions was 24.4 ($SD = 17.86$). Therefore, those who held leadership positions reported consuming significantly fewer drinks per week than those who had not held leadership positions.

**Objective Eleven**

Objective eleven of this study was to compare the effectiveness of the current leadership of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States as perceived by the members of the organization with the self perceived leadership effectiveness of students who currently serve as the president of the organization.

This objective was accomplished by determining the difference between the self perceived leadership as measured by the LBDQ dimension scores of the current president of the fraternities and the mean LBDQ dimension scores for the membership
of the fraternities. In addition, the mean LEI scores were used to measure the member’s perception of the overall leader effectiveness of the chapter presidents.

Since the leader group consisted of only six individuals, the use of t-tests or other statistical comparison procedures to accomplish this objective would be tenuous at best. Therefore, to accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized a procedure to make a decision regarding the substantive significance between the mean scores of the non-leader group (defined as all study participants except the current presidents of the organizations) and the leader group. The procedure selected for this purpose was the construction of a confidence interval at each of four different levels of confidence around the mean of the non-leader group on each of the two measures of leader behavior (“Consideration” and “Initiation of Structure”).

The mean “Consideration” score for the non-leader group was 3.5 (SD = .46). Each of the specified confidence intervals for this mean is presented in Table 34. As can be observed by examination of the values in the table, the mean “Consideration” score for the leader group (M = 3.7, SD = .27) was not captured within the computed confidence interval at any of the specified levels of confidence. Therefore, the finding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>Non-Leader Group Mean</th>
<th>t(SEm)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Leader Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
is that the self-perceived “Consideration” scores of the leaders of the fraternities are
different from the perceptions of the non-leader group. Additionally, since the leader
group scores were higher than the non-leader group scores, and the 99.9% confidence
interval did not capture the leader group mean, the interpretation is that a high degree of
difference existed in the perceptions of the groups.

The mean “Initiation of Structure” score for the non-leader group was 3.8 (SD = .58). Each of the specified confidence intervals for this mean is presented in Table 35.

As can be observed by examination of the values in the table, the mean “Initiation of Structure” score for the leader group (M = 4.1, SD = .50) was not captured within the
computed confidence interval at any of the specified levels of confidence. Therefore,
the finding is that the self-perceived “Initiation of Structure” scores of the leaders of the

Table 35

Comparison of Perceptions of Initiation of Structure Dimension of Leader Behavior of
Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University by Whether or
Not the Participant is Currently in the Role of Organizational President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Non-Leader Group Mean</th>
<th>t(SE_m)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Leader Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
fraternities are different from the perceptions of the non-leader group. Additionally, since the leader group scores were higher than the non-leader group scores, and the 99.9% confidence interval did not capture the leader group mean, the interpretation is that a high degree of difference existed in the perceptions of the groups.

The mean LEI score for the non-leader group was 4.1 (SD = .78). Each of the specified confidence intervals for this mean is presented in Table 36. As can be observed by examination of the values in the table, the mean LEI score for the leader group (M = 4.3, SD = .61) was not captured within the computed confidence interval at any of the specified levels of confidence. Therefore, the finding is that the LEI scores of the leaders of the fraternities are different from the perceptions of the non-leader group. Additionally, since the leader group scores were higher than the non-leader group scores, and the 99.9% confidence interval did not capture the leader group mean, the interpretation is that a high degree of difference existed in the perceptions of the groups.

Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Non-Leader Group Mean</th>
<th>t(SE_m)</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>Leader Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 %</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
Objective Twelve

Objective twelve of the study was to compare at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States the level of alcohol consumption of fraternity members in leadership positions with those members who were not in leadership positions. This objective was accomplished using a substantive comparison of the mean alcohol consumption levels of fraternity members in leadership positions and those members who do not hold leadership positions within the fraternity. The reason that no test of statistical significance was planned for this objective is that “fraternity members in leadership positions” was operationalized as the individuals currently in the position of president of the fraternity. Consequently, the number of individuals in the comparison group which consists of the fraternity leaders would have too few individuals to make meaningful statistical comparisons.

Since the leader group consisted of only six individuals, the use of t-tests or other statistical comparison procedures to accomplish this objective would be tenuous at best. Therefore, to accomplish this objective, the researcher utilized a procedure to make a decision regarding the substantive significance between the mean scores of the non-leader group (defined as all study participants except the current presidents of the organizations) and the leader group. The procedure selected for this purpose was the construction of a confidence interval at each of four different levels of confidence.
around the mean of the non-leader group based on the number of drinks per week consumed by both the members and the presidents.

The mean score for the non-leader group was 21.3 (SD = 17.51). Each of the specified confidence intervals for this mean is presented in Table 37. As can be observed by examination of the values in the table, the mean score for the leader group (M = 10.7, SD = 12.37) was not captured within the computed confidence interval at any of the specified levels of confidence. Therefore, the finding is that the alcohol consumption of the leaders of the fraternities is different from the alcohol consumption of the non-leader group. Additionally, since the leader group scores were lower than the non-leader group scores, and the 99.9% confidence interval did not capture the leader group mean, the interpretation is that a high degree of difference existed in the alcohol consumption of the groups.

Table 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Non-Leader Group Mean</th>
<th>t(SE_m)</th>
<th>90% Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>99% Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>99.9% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective Thirteen**

Objective thirteen in this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported frequency of attendance at organized worship services/meetings and the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

Study participants were asked to indicate their attendance at organized worship services/meetings by marking the most appropriate of three available options: “Number of services/meetings per month,” “Attend less than one per month,” and “Attend on Special Occasions Only.” Those who indicated the option that indicated “Number of services/meetings attended per month” were also asked to write in the number of meetings attended. However, since the majority of respondents marked one of the latter two options, and the researcher judged that using the maximum amount of available information would be preferable to using only a portion of the data, the procedure chosen for accomplishing this objective was to compare the response groups (on organized worship services/meetings attended) on the reported number of alcoholic drinks consumed per week. This comparison was made using the one-way Analysis of Variance procedure. The group that indicated they attended one or more organized worship services/meetings per month reported a mean number of drinks consumed per week of 19.9 (SD = 16.93). The groups that reported attending less than one service/meeting per month and on special occasions only reported 21.3 (SD = 17.25) and 25.6 (SD = 20.16) drinks per week respectively. When the analysis of
variance test was calculated to compare these means, no significant differences were found between the groups ($F_{2,171} = 1.49, p = .23$).

**Objective Fourteen**

Objective fourteen of this study was to determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

This objective was accomplished using multiple regression analysis with alcohol consumption as the outcome measure (dependent variable) and selected demographic, perceptual, and experiential factors used as antecedent measures (independent variables). The exact number of these measures was determined by the results of the factor analysis of the scales used in the AUDB instrument. In this analysis, step-wise entry of the variables was used due to the exploratory nature of the research being conducted. In addition, variables were added to the explanatory model that increased the total explained variance by 1% or more as long as the overall model remained significant.

In analyzing the data, four variables were constructed from the data collected. For the variable, worship services/meetings, “dummy coding” was used to construct three variables. Variables created were whether or not respondents attended services/meetings one or more times in a typical month (30 day period), whether or not respondents attended less than one service/meeting in a typical month, and
whether or not respondents attended on “Special Occasions” only. In each case, yes was coded as “1” and no was coded as “0”. The variable religious preference was also dummy coded, with three “Yes” or “No” variables being constructed. The variables constructed were whether or not the respondents were catholic, whether or not the respondents were protestant, and whether or not the respondents had some other religious preference. Only 14 respondents reported a religious preference other than these three, so all other categories of religion were excluded from the analysis.

Dummy coding was also used for the variable, “classification”, with three “Yes” or “No” variables being constructed. The variables created were whether or not the respondents were classified as sophomore, whether or not the respondents were classified as junior, and whether or not the respondents were classified as senior. The freshman classification was not used as a variable since only one respondent indicated this classification. This response was excluded from the analysis for this variable.

The fourth variable constructed, “living arrangements”, had two dimensions, with the first dimension using dummy coding to construct three “Yes” or “No” variables. The variables created were whether or not the respondents lived in a house/apartment, whether or not the respondents lived in the fraternity house, and whether or not the respondents lived in a residence hall. Only two respondents indicated a living arrangement of “other,” but there was no indication of what the “other” was. Therefore, this response was not used as a separate variable in this analysis. The second dimension was “with whom” they lived. Since these responses were already established as dichotomies, it was not necessary to dummy code them.
The three responses used in the analysis were “with roommate(s),” “alone” and “with parents”.

Table 38 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis. Only those variables contributing 1% or more to the explained variance were included in the model. The variable which entered the regression model first was the sub-scale labeled “Lack of Self Control” of the AUDB instrument scale reflecting active member’s negative experiences associated with drinking. Considered alone, this variable explained 23.7% of the variance in the level of alcohol consumption. Ten other variables explained an additional 21.9% of the variance in the level of alcohol consumption.

Table 38

Multiple Regression Analysis of Level of Alcohol Consumption by Active Social Fraternity Members at a Research Extensive University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2486.371</td>
<td>14.844</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>167.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>R² Cumulative</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>p Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative experiences--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Self Control</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>63.630</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Exhibited--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity Issues</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>18.710</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sign t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Issues</td>
<td>- .060</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol effects score</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not employed</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ income level</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and college life—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important part of being fraternity</td>
<td>- .590</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member or leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and college life—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important part of fraternity</td>
<td>- .070</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and college life—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced by peer pressure</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation in activities—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation in activities—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>- .725</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative consequences—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol consumption by others</td>
<td>- .033</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ—consideration</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offices</td>
<td>- .027</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship - once or more per month</td>
<td>- .949</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship - less than once per month</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables not in the Equation

(table con’d.)
Focus Groups

Themes from the Member Focus Group and the President Focus Group

As an additional attempt to verify the accuracy of the information derived from the survey, the researcher conducted two focus group interviews with selected members of the study respondents. The guidelines for the focus groups were as follows:

There were two focus groups.

• The focus groups were conducted away from the fraternity houses.

• The focus groups were conducted independently of each other.

• The “member” group had 11 participants, at least one member (and no more than two) from each of the six chapters which participated in the survey.

• The second focus group included five of the six presidents who were in office at the time of the survey. One was unable to attend.

• Efforts were made to include sophomores, juniors and seniors in the member group.

• The questions used to guide the member focus group are included in Appendix B.

• The questions used to guide the president focus group are included in Appendix C.
• Each focus group was audio taped to ensure accuracy in summarizing the results.

• Approximately one and one-half hours were provided for each group.

Although the questions are included in complete detail in the Appendix B and Appendix C, a brief description is presented here. Questions used to initiate the group discussions were the same for both groups except for slight differences in the questions dealing with leadership. The first questions included introductory information from each participant, leading into descriptions of their time and experiences as a fraternity member. They were then asked to share particular points regarding their alcohol consumption and related effects resulting from their alcohol consumption. For the last two questions focusing on leader behavior, the members were asked to state their opinion of the leader behavior exhibited by their chapter president and to indicate how his behavior influenced their alcohol consumption. The presidents’ last two questions asked that they share their opinion of the leader behavior exhibited by them during their term as president and how their alcohol consumption was influenced by their being president.

Themes from the Member Focus Group

The members, in describing their time and experiences in their fraternity, felt that their personal development was enhanced through and because of their fraternity experience. The fraternity provided them an opportunity to better learn how to work with others, particularly those who might think or feel differently. The member group also spoke directly to the importance of the president being respected by the chapter if
he was to be effective. As Participant Eight indicated, “He must be respected even before he is elected president.”

The member group also expressed other observations regarding leadership positions. These ideas included: Participant Four shared “Sometimes the leaders who are the agents of change are not the ones who hold the offices. Also, the core officers can sometimes become so insulated from the rest of the chapter that leading is made more difficult and effective communication is impeded.”

Peer pressure was cited by multiple participants in the member focus group as the main reason that members consume alcohol as they do. Participant Two shared “Even though I will admit I drink less now than when I was a freshman, I think I must also admit that the expectations of those around me influenced me to often over indulge.” Some admitted finding themselves at times even asking why they drink at all, but especially why they have different drinking patterns in different contexts. They also indicated that freshmen and sophomore members who live in the fraternity house, tend to consume more alcohol than upperclassmen who reside in the house. They suggested that the reason for this is the susceptibility of freshmen and sophomores to peer pressure. As offered by Participant One, “When I moved into the house, I was drinking more than I should have. But, while I lived there, I began to drink less.”

The member group itself viewed most of the effects resulting from alcohol consumption in a negative way, citing incidents such as getting into fights, being thrown out of bars, damaging their personal reputation, and inhibiting friendships. As
Participant Four stated, “Alcohol is the lubricant of conversation, and it seems to enhance the bond which develops among the members.” However, that same member expressed concern that it is unfortunate that for some of the members, drinking may be their only bond.

As the member group expressed their opinions regarding leader behavior exhibited by the presidents, Participant Five voiced his concern this way: “It is difficult (for presidents) to get things done.....to change people.” When several participants indicated that they did not believe it was the president’s job to change people, the participant rephrased his comments, stating he was thinking more in terms of influencing members than changing them.

Participant Eight in the member group expressed his feelings that, “If the pledge program was well organized and emphasized those ideals upon which the fraternity was initially founded, the president and the other chapter leaders would have a less difficult time leading.” He also stated “The pledge program helps shape the thinking and the level of commitment of these future members. If they are taught those values and principles upon which the fraternity was founded, they will more likely be stronger members.” As the discussion progressed, the members concluded it was the president’s responsibility to ensure that the pledge program was appropriately organized and implemented.

In terms of how the presidents’ leader behavior influences alcohol consumption, the member group felt that the officers did not influence the alcohol consumption of the members. They tended to see the president more as a peer and
less as a role model attempting to influence their drinking habits. However, they did feel that the president was probably viewed more as a leader during chapter meetings and official chapter functions than at other times.

In summary, the member group recognized the importance of the president’s position and those leadership qualities which the presidents should possess, especially respect. According to their discussion, if the president is not respected, he will most likely be ineffective in his role. Most participants in the group indicated that while their level of alcohol consumption had decreased since their freshman year, they continue to enjoy drinking. However, like the presidents, they recognize that they cannot drink excessively and also maintain their personal level of responsibility.

Themes from the President Focus Group

The presidents, in describing their fraternity experiences, discussed enhanced social relationships, not in the partying sense, but more in terms of how members communicated and interacted with others. Several expressed the idea that the fraternity was like a personal haven for them while at the university. Participant Three stated, “The fraternity has been like a family to me. It’s just really personal.” The presidents also saw their primary role as that of “baby sitter,” although they did feel they were afforded a great opportunity to learn how to function more effectively in a broad range of situations with several different types of individuals. They also indicated that they believed the fraternity provided a strong emphasis on academics, both in terms of encouragement as well as options to improve academic performance. When discussing why many members lacked any interest in chapter leadership roles,
Participant Two commented, “They (members) do not want to have to deal with people like themselves.”

The presidents’ reflections centered more on changes occurring around them that necessitated adjustments in their personal patterns of behavior with regard to alcohol consumption. The deaths, nationally, of various fraternity members due to what was referred to as alcohol poisoning resulting from binge drinking forced those in leadership roles to re-evaluate how they consume alcohol, the quantity they consume, and when they feel they can drink at all. There have been policy changes, new laws passed, more rigid enforcement and greater realization of cultural and societal influences on patterns of behavior related to alcohol consumption. As a result, the presidents indicated that because of their responsibility as president, their behavior is different than before. As Participant One expressed it, “At fraternity social events, I do not drink at all, or rarely drink. I have to keep my eye on everybody else.”

The presidents’ comments concerning alcohol consumption tended to be more positive, revisiting the idea that, because of their previous experiences as well as their leader responsibilities, they were consuming less. They also felt that they personally experienced few problems related to academics in terms of missed classes or missed examinations.

However, the presidents saw themselves as the role models or catalysts within the fraternity. They felt it was their responsibility to counter the normative behavior of their non-leader members, and all of them felt that they had succeeded, if only
marginally, in improving their chapter. But, they did agree, as stated by **Participant Two**, “It’s not likely that the number one party guy is going to be elected president. However, sometimes, it seems that every four years or so, a fraternity puts the wrong person in office.” When that happens, they all agreed that the president either realizes the expectations surrounding the position and seeks to meet them, or the chapter suffers with a lack of leadership for that year. In these situations, the presidents conceded that leadership, or the lack of it, might be part of the problem as related to alcohol consumption. However, one of the presidents, **Participant Three**, stated “The catalyst for problems regarding drinking within the fraternities is the system itself. It’s the culture. Most of them (members) drank in high school, many of them drink with their parents, they joined a fraternity, and they attend a university that has rightly or wrongly been identified as a party school. It was the leadership of my fraternity that gave me positive advice regarding drinking, and I believe we are attempting to do the same thing today.”

In summary, the presidents acknowledged the difficulty of their leadership position and indicated that it was more demanding than they might have thought at the beginning of their term. They came to appreciate the aspects of “friendship” and “brotherhood” realized through their membership in the fraternity. To them, the fraternity became increasingly more like a family. The presidents also recognized the problems caused by excessive alcohol consumption among the members, but they were quick to indicate that the real “catalyst” with regard to problems associated with drinking within their chapters had more to do with the system, the culture and society.
itself. They see themselves as positive role models, offering positive advice and demonstrating responsible behavior.

Common Themes from Both Focus Groups

Both the member group and the president group shared some thoughts and ideas in common relative to their experiences as fraternity members. Included among those was “friendship,” “brotherhood,” and “leadership development.” Members in each group expressed strong feelings about the deep bonds of friendship which were formed through the fraternity and how valuable these friendships had been in their personal growth and development during their time as a member. The idea of “brotherhood” was also seen as an important part of their fraternity experience because of the way in which it incorporated the ritual as well as those ideals upon which their fraternity was founded. Leadership development was one of the experiences both groups felt was extremely beneficial, in the formal sense, through workshops and retreats, as well as informally through day to day experiences.

In terms of how they viewed fraternity leadership positions, both groups acknowledged that leadership positions were tough jobs, especially the position of president. Members and presidents alike observed that members not in a leadership position tend to be lazy and not as concerned about those issues with which most leaders are concerned. Both groups stated that a sense of commitment and responsibility along with character, honesty and integrity were essential traits for effective chapter leaders.

When the participants in the two focus groups discussed their personal alcohol consumption, one primary common theme emerged from their comments. Most
participants indicated that their level of alcohol consumption had decreased since they were in high school and also since they were freshmen. A theme expressed by participants in both focus groups was that chapter presidents could not drink (to excess) and be able to effectively fulfill their responsibilities.

When discussing some of the good and bad effects resulting from their alcohol consumption, both the members and the presidents felt that their reduction in alcohol consumption was directly linked to their previous excessive levels of alcohol consumption. They reduced their alcohol consumption because of the manner in which they previously consumed alcohol, particularly as related to the quantity. Some of the changes reflected by them were attributed to personal maturity and a greater realization of their responsibilities as leaders, especially as associated with striving to be more positive role models.

The last questions on leader behavior were somewhat different for the two groups, although there were some opinions the groups shared in common. One of the primary shared feelings was that chapter leaders had very difficult jobs. They were faced with a most challenging task and given very little, if any, praise for helping lead a group that often did not want to be led.

When discussing whether alcohol consumption is influenced by leader behavior or being in a leadership position, both the member group and the president group agreed that the primary problem with alcohol consumption within the chapter is not caused by the officers. Rather, it is caused by those who are not the elected leaders but are more likely the informal leaders.
Unique Themes from Both Focus Groups

While there were several themes common to both focus groups, there were also themes unique to each focus group. Much of the discussion within the member focus group centered around the negative effects of excessive levels of alcohol consumption by chapter members. Most of these were instances in which the problems experienced were the result of behavioral problems by the individuals themselves. However, those same drinking behaviors were given credit for possibly contributing to what was described as a “bonding” experience among some of the members. The concern expressed was that it was sad to think that for some of the members, this type of “bonding” might be the only bonding experience they would enjoy during their fraternity experience. Another major theme within the member focus group centered on the relationship of the president (and to a lesser degree the other officers) with the rest of the chapter. The ability to communicate effectively was seen as one of the important qualities or characteristics of an effective president. Some within the member group stated that they felt that the president and the other officers were sometime so insulated from the rest of the chapter that it was difficult for the chapter to know what was going on. In addition, they stressed the importance of the chapter’s respect for the individual who served as president. According to the member group, the health and welfare of the entire chapter rested on this issue of respect for the president.

The themes most unique to the president focus group grew out of expectations...those that the presidents had for themselves and those expectations of them held by
the fraternity system itself, the University, and society as a whole. Most times, as the presidents expressed, they felt as if they were nothing more than “baby sitters.” However, they recognized that they willingly offered themselves for election to the position they held, and, to a significant degree, they matured into the presidency. As they matured in their understanding of their overall responsibilities, they also developed a greater awareness and appreciation of the necessity for them to personally exercise better judgement with regard to their drinking behavior. They acknowledged a growing sense of responsibility regarding their role in the fraternity and the fraternity’s relationship with the various publics with whom they must be involved. This was the area in which they discussed the expectations which they felt from the fraternity system itself, the University, and society. As they saw the situation, much of their effort was spent in a balancing act....trying to maintain harmony within the fraternity and at the same time trying to appease those who were looking in with an even higher level of expectation. They often felt that their effectiveness was limited because of the circumstances which made their jobs more difficult. However, because of their level of commitment, they maintained a strong desire to accomplish as many of their goals as possible. **Participant Three** stated, “I often felt like a hamster....running a lot but not getting very far.” In spite of their frustrations, the presidents saw themselves as good role models and felt that they had been instrumental in achieving positive changes for their chapters.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the influence of selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics on the alcohol consumption of students enrolled in a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States who were members of a social fraternity. The two main goals of this study were: 1) to determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States and 2) to determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

The following specific objectives were formulated to guide the researcher:

1. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the following selected demographic characteristics:
a. Student classification status;
b. Age;
c. Ethnic origin;
d. Marital status;
e. Current living arrangements;
f. Employment status;
g. Parent’s income level;
h. State or country of origin;
i. Religious preference;
j. Level of participation in organized worship services/meetings;
k. Level of volunteerism activity;
l. Leadership positions previously held in the organization;
m. Leadership positions currently held in the organization; and
n. Leadership positions to which members may aspire.

2. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research
   extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their self-
   reported patterns and level of alcohol consumption.

3. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research
   extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of
   selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute
   to their consumption of alcoholic beverages.

4. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research
   extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their
perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life.

5. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding selected effects of alcohol consumption.

6. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their level of involvement in selected aspects of university campus life.

7. To describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to other students’ consumption of alcoholic beverages.

8. To describe at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States social fraternity leader behavior as reflected by the perceptions of the members of that fraternity as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI).

9. To determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the current organizational leadership (as measured by scores on the LBDQ) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.
10. To compare the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States by whether or not the student held a leadership position within the organization.

11. To compare the effectiveness of the current leadership of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States as perceived by the members of the organization with the self perceived leadership effectiveness of students who served as the president of the organization.

12. To compare at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States the level of alcohol consumption of fraternity members in leadership positions with those members who were not in leadership positions.

13. To determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported frequency of attendance at organized worship services/meetings and the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

14. To determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States.

Methodology

The target population for this study was defined as all students enrolled in colleges and universities who were active members of social fraternities. The accessible
population was defined as students currently enrolled in one research extensive university located in the southern portion of the United States who were active members of social fraternities. The sample consisted of all students who were active members of six social fraternities selected through a stratified, cluster random sampling procedure.

The instrument utilized in this study consisted of three parts. The first part of the instrument used was the Alcohol Use and Drinking Behavior survey (AUDB), a researcher designed instrument developed to measure alcohol consumption patterns and perceptions of selected alcohol related issues and effects using a combination of questions emerging from the current literature and from the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (1994a). The newly designed instrument focused on members’ patterns of behavior regarding alcohol consumption and the relationship of these patterns of behavior to negative consequences experienced or perceived. It also reflected the degree to which these patterns of behavior were impacted and influenced by the actual level of involvement and/or leadership positions held in college and fraternity life, and by religious beliefs and/or attendance at organized worship services/meetings. The second part was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This instrument was used to measure specific aspects of the leader behavior of presidents of social fraternities as perceived by the membership of that fraternity. The third part of the instrument was a researcher developed scale, the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI), which was designed to measure perceived leader effectiveness. The instrument was composed of 12 items focusing on the traits that have been shown in the literature (Miller, 1981) to be related to leader effectiveness. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their chapter president exhibited each of these traits.
Data for this study were collected using descriptive survey techniques. Specific steps in the data collection included contacting the presidents of the six chapters to provide them with a brief description of the purpose of the study, securing their approval for their chapters to participate, agreeing on a scheduled date and time to administer the survey, and finally, administering the survey. A total of 207 active members from the six randomly selected chapters participated in the survey, which was administered by the researcher.

Findings

The first objective of the study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on fourteen selected demographic characteristics. It was determined that the largest group of respondents ($n = 81$, 40.1%) were sophomores, and only three respondents (1.5%) reported their classification as freshman. The mean age for all respondents was 20.2 years ($SD = 1.08$), and the majority of the respondents in the study indicated that they were either 19 or 20 years of age.

In terms of ethnicity, the majority reported that they were “White (non-Hispanic)” ($n = 194$, 96%). All other ethnic groups were reported by three or fewer respondents. Of the 200 respondents who reported on marital status, 199 (or 99.5%) indicated that they were single, and only one (.5%) indicated that he was married. The respondents reported on their living arrangements both in terms of “Where” they lived and “With Whom” they lived. The majority ($n = 115$, 56.9%) indicated that they lived in a “House/apartment/etc.,” but, living in the “Fraternity House” was the second most
frequently reported response (n = 84, 41.6%). In regard to who they lived with, the majority of respondents (n = 117, 56.5%) indicated that they lived “With Roommate(s).” The second most frequently reported response (n = 39, 18.8%) was “Alone.”

Regarding employment, respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they were employed, where they worked (on-campus or off-campus) and how many hours they worked. Slightly more than 58% (n = 118) indicated that they were currently employed, and 84 (41.6%) of the respondents indicated that they were not currently employed. Of the 118 who were employed, 36 (32.1%) indicated that they were employed on campus and 76 (67.9%) were employed off campus. The mean number of hours worked per week by those who indicated they were employed was 16.8 (SD = 7.33). The fewest number of hours worked per week was two, and the most was 45.

In reporting on the level of parental income, the largest group of respondents indicated the “Greater than $150,000” category (n = 45, 23.9%). The second largest response category was the “$85,001-100,000” category (n = 40, 21.3%). Only 3.7% (n = 7) reported their parents’ income level to be “Less than $35,000.” When asked to indicate where they were a legal resident, the majority of the respondents (n = 181, 86.6%) reported that they were residents of the state of Louisiana. The residency of the other 21 respondents included eight other states.

Reporting on religious preference, more than 68 percent (n = 136) of the 199 respondents indicated that they were Catholic. There were 18 (9.0%) respondents who indicated that they were Methodist, and 13 (6.5%) who indicated that they were Baptist. In terms of their level of participation in organized worship services/meetings during a
typical month, participants were provided three available response options. The first of these was “Attend one or more services/meetings per month” which was selected by 92 (50.8%) of the 181 participants who provided useable data for this item. Forty-six (25.4%) reported that they attend less than one service/meeting per month, and 44 (24.3%) indicated that they attend on “Special Occasions” only. Ten (5.5%) reported not attending any services/meetings in a typical month.

Of the 203 respondents who reported on their level of volunteer activity during a typical month, 42.9% (n = 87) indicated that they did not volunteer at all or did so less than one hour per month, and 53.7% (n = 109) volunteered between one and fifteen hours during a typical month. Seven (3.4%) respondents reported volunteering 16 or more hours during a typical month.

Participants were asked to indicate which of the 10 listed leadership positions they had previously held, were currently holding or those to which they aspired. Only 11 (5.3%) of the 207 respondents indicated that they had previously or were currently holding the position of president of their chapter. Of those who aspire to a leadership position, 37 (17.9%) indicated that they were interested in serving as chapter president, 36 (17.4%) expressed aspirations for vice president, and 45 (21.7%) expressed interest in serving as pledge trainer.

The second objective of this study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their self-reported patterns and level of alcohol consumption. The findings for this objective were based on responses to questions focusing on whether or not the
respondents had ever consumed alcohol, if they had ever binged and, if so, the number of times within the last two weeks, the average number of drinks they had consumed in a week, and the extent to which their alcohol use had changed within the last 12 months. Of the 205 total responses, only five (2.4%) indicated that they had not consumed alcohol. More than one-third (n = 72, 36.0%) of the respondents reported that they had consumed five or more drinks in one sitting between 3-5 times within the past two weeks. Of the 198 respondents who reported on the question of binge drinking, 196 (99.0%) indicated they did binge drink, with 86.7% (n = 170) reporting they binged in high school and 190 (91.8%) indicating they binged in college.

Responding to the more specific question of “Have you ever consumed alcohol in a manner that meets this definition of binge drinking?”, 193 reported and 180 (93.3%) respondents indicated “Yes.” For those who answered “Yes” to drinking in a manner that met the definition of binge drinking, 156 (81.7%) indicated they binged in high school, and 180 (95.7%) indicated they binged as college students. When asked to indicate the average number of drinks consumed per week (from the survey; “A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.”), the range was from 0 to 89 with a mean level of drinks per week of 21 (SD = 17.450). The largest response group (n = 69, 34.9%) reported consuming between one and ten drinks per week. More than one-third (n = 71, 35.9%) reported consuming more that 20 drinks per week. One (.5%) respondent reported consuming no drinks at all.

The last question on alcohol consumption asked respondents to characterize changes in their alcohol consumption in the last 12 months. Out of the 197 responses,
42 (21.3%) indicated their level of consumption had increased, 96 (48.7%) indicated their level of consumption was about the same and 59 (29.9%) reported their level of consumption had decreased.

The third objective of the study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to their consumption of alcoholic beverages. Since using the data strictly as ordinal data would have limited the ability of the researcher to summarize the collected information, the data were summarized by computing a mean score for each of the 19 individual items. The negative experience, due to drinking, reported most frequently by the respondents was “Had a hangover” which had a mean of 4.9 (SD = 1.43). The negative experience reported least frequently was “Seriously tried to commit suicide” (M = 1.1, SD = 0.42).

To further summarize the data regarding the negative experiences of active chapter members due to drinking, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the data. The number of factors to be extracted was determined to be three, and the researcher labeled the sub-scales as “Lack of Self Control,” “Physical Control,” and “Cry For Help.” The researcher computed scale scores for each of the three identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. For “Lack of Self Control,” the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 1.0 to a high 5.7 with an overall mean of 3.3 (SD = 1.11). The second scale was “Physical Control”
and had individual subject means ranging from 1.0 to 5.5 with a mean score for the 
group of 1.6 (SD = .80). The third scale “Cry For Help” had an overall mean rating of 
1.3 (SD = .53) with individual subject scores ranging from 1.0 to 4.7.

Objective four of the study was to describe students who were members of 
social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United 
States on their perceptions regarding the relationships between alcohol consumption 
and selected aspects of college and fraternity life. The variables 

included in measuring components of this construct were measured using two 

different scales: one linked to behaviors in which respondents engaged as related to 
alcohol consumption and one linked to attitudes concerning selected aspects of college 
and fraternity life.

Regarding the first scale, eight specific behaviors were presented for response 
and a behavior score was computed from these responses. The exhibited behavior 
related to alcohol consumption reported most frequently by the respondents was “Heard 
someone else brag about his/her alcohol use” which had a mean of 3.9 ( SD = 1.63). 
The behavior exhibited reported least frequently by the respondents was “Told a sexual 
partner who was drunk that they were not attractive” (M = 1.2, SD = .68). To further 
summarize this data, the researcher used factor analysis and determined the number of 
factors to be two and labeled those sub-scales as “Maturity Issues” and “Decision-
Making Issues.” The researcher also computed scale scores for each of the two 
identified sub-scales, and these sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the 
items included in each of the respective factors. For “Maturity Issues”, the individual
subject mean scores ranged from a low of 1.0 to a high of 5.0 with an overall mean of 1.4 (SD = .62). “Decision-Making Issues” had individual subject means ranging from a low of 1.0 to a high of 6.0 with an overall mean score of 2.7 (SD = 1.01)

Alcohol consumption as related to attitudes concerning selected aspects of college and fraternity life was measured by scoring the responses to a question designed to measure their degree of agreement/disagreement with each of 24 perception statements regarding alcohol consumption. The item respondents most strongly agreed with was “Being a fraternity member helps me meet people,” which had a mean of 4.3 (SD of .97). The item with which respondents most strongly disagreed was “No one can be a member of a fraternity unless they drink alcohol” (M = 1.3, SD = .61).

To further summarize the data, the researcher used factor analysis and identified four factors in the scale. The factors were identified as “Alcohol Consumption As Influenced By Peer Pressure Of Fraternity Members,” “Alcohol Consumption As An Integral Part Of The Fraternity Social Experience,” “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals,” and “Alcohol Consumption As An Important Part Of Being A Fraternity Member And Leader.”

After the four sub-scales were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the four identified sub-scales. The first scale “Alcohol Consumption As Influenced By Peer Pressure Of Fraternity Members” had individual subject mean scores ranging from a low of 1.0 to a high of 4.2 with an overall mean of 1.8 (SD = .65). “Alcohol Consumption As An Integral Part Of The Fraternity Social Experience,” the second scale, had individual subject means ranging from 1.0 to 5.0 (M = 2.8, SD = .63). The third scale, “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And
Ideals,” had an overall mean rating of 1.7 (SD = .80) with individual subject scores ranging form 1.0 to 5.0. With an overall mean rating of 1.8 (SD = .53), the fourth scale, “Alcohol Consumption As An Important Part Of Being A Fraternity Member And Leader,” had individual sub-scale scores ranging from 1.0 to 3.7.

The fifth objective of the study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their perceptions regarding selected effects of alcohol consumption. The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they perceived that alcohol consumption had each of 13 different listed outcomes. The effect receiving the largest number of “Yes” responses was “Breaks the ice” (n = 188, 94.5%). The effect receiving the smallest number of “Yes” responses was “Makes food taste better” (n = 69, 34.8%). To further summarize the data, the researcher calculated an alcohol effects score which was defined as the total number of “Yes” responses to the 13 items in the scale. The actual range of scores was from a low of 1 to a high of 13 with a mean for the group of 9.4 (SD = 2.87).

Objective six of the study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on their level of involvement in selected aspects of university campus life. Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent, within the last year, they had participated in any of the 13 activities listed in the question. The level of participation indicated for items was varied, but the activity in which the highest level of participation was reported was “Social fraternity” which had a mean of 3.3 (SD = .61).
The activity in which respondents reported the lowest level of participation was “Minority and ethnic organizations” (M = 1.1, SD = .34).

To further summarize the data regarding levels of participation in the 13 listed campus activities and university life by active chapter members of social fraternities, the researcher used factor analysis and determined that there were three underlying constructs in the scale. The factors were identified as “Fraternity,” “Other Campus Groups,” and “Athletics.” The researcher also computed scale scores for each of the identified sub-scales. The first sub-scale, “Fraternity,” had individual subject mean scores ranging from a low of 1.4 to a high of 4.0 with an overall mean of 2.8 (SD = .61). “Other Campus Groups” was identified as the second sub-scale and had individual subject mean scores ranging from 1.0 to 3.0 with an overall mean of 1.3 (SD = .38). The third sub-scale, “Athletics,” had an overall mean rating of 2.2 (SD = .73) and individual subject mean scores ranging from 1.0 to 4.0.

The seventh objective of this study was to describe students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States on the level of selected negative consequences they had experienced that they would attribute to other students’ consumption of alcoholic beverages. Respondents were provided six possible negative consequences they might have experienced and asked to indicate whether or not they felt they had experienced each of these negative consequences as a result of other students’ consumption of alcoholic beverages. The effect to which the largest number of respondents indicated “Yes” was “Messes up your physical living space (cleanliness, neatness, organization, etc.)” (n =
102, 51.5%), followed closely by “Interrupts your studying” (n = 88, 44.4%). The negative consequence with the smallest number of respondents indicating “Yes” was “Interferes in other way(s)” (n = 13, 7.2%). Overall, only one of the six items received a “Yes” from the majority of the study participants, and the other five items received a “No” response from the majority of the participants. The researcher also calculated an alcohol effects score with a range of scores from a low of 1 to a high of 6 with a mean for the group of 1.5 (SD = 1.34).

Objective eight of the study was to describe at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States social fraternity leader behavior as reflected by the perceptions of the members of that fraternity as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI). The LBDQ is composed of 40 questions related to administrative leadership, presented in two major dimensions: “Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration”. Scores on the “Initiation of Structure” dimension ranged from a low of 26 to a high of 75 (the maximum possible score) with a mean for the 202 study participants that completed all parts of the instrument of 56.5 (SD = 8.67). On the “Consideration” dimension, the scores ranged form a low of 30 to a high of 73 with a mean consideration score of 53.2 (SD =6.85). The correlated t-test procedure was used to compare the mean scores on the two dimensions with the results indicating that presidents of social fraternities were perceived to have significantly higher orientation to the “Initiation of Structure” dimension than they had to the “Consideration” dimension (t_{201} = 9.45, p < .001).

In order to explain overall styles of leader behavior for chapter presidents, respondents were categorized as high or low on each dimension of perceived leader
behavior. The largest group (n = 90, 44.6%) included those who perceived their chapter presidents were high on both dimensions of leader behavior, initiation of structure and consideration. The smallest group (n = 15, 7.4%) was low initiation of structure– high consideration.

In addition to assessing leader behavior using the LBDQ, a second instrument designed by the researcher, the “Leadership Effectiveness Instrument” (LEI), was used to measure perceived leader effectiveness. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their chapter president exhibited each of 12 traits. The item respondents felt most frequently described their chapter president was “I feel that my fraternity president is confident,” which had a mean of 4.8 (SD = .74). The item which the respondents felt least frequently described their chapter president included “I feel that my fraternity president is a good motivator,” which had a mean of 3.9 (SD = .98). The mean rating on each of the items examined in the LEI ranged from a high of 4.5 to a low of 3.9.

To further summarize the data regarding the perceptions of active chapter members of social fraternities regarding leadership effectiveness of their chapter president, the researcher used factor analysis, and the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be one. The sub-scale was labeled “Perceived Leadership Effectiveness.” The researcher also computed a scale score for the sub-scale for “Perceived Leadership Effectiveness,” and the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 3.9 to a high of 4.8 with an overall mean of 4.1 (SD = .77).

The ninth objective of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the level of alcohol consumption and the perceptions of the effectiveness of the
current organizational leadership (as measured by the LBDQ and the LEI) among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States. To accomplish this objective the researcher employed the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient procedure. When these correlations were examined, a significant relationship was found between each of the LBDQ measures of leader behavior (“Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration” dimensions) and the number of drinks the respondents reported that they consumed per week. The calculated coefficient between the number of drinks per week and the “Initiation of Structure” dimension was $r = .19$ ($p = .008$). The calculated coefficient between the number of drinks per week and the “Consideration” dimension was $r = .18$ ($p = .01$). The nature of both of these associations was such that members who had higher perceptions of leader behavior of their chapter president tended to consume more drinks of alcohol per week. However, no significant relationship was found between the Leader Effectiveness score (as measured by the LEI) and the number of drinks per week ($r = .10$, $p = .16$).

Objective ten of this study was to compare the level of alcohol consumption among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States by whether or not the student held a leadership position within the organization. Respondents were grouped into two groups: those who currently hold or previously held a leadership position and those who did not or had not held a leadership position. The two groups were compared using the t-test procedure on their alcohol consumption score. When these groups were compared
on alcohol consumption, a significant difference was found ($t_{196} = 2.71, p = .007$). The mean number of drinks consumed by those who held leadership positions was 17.8 ($SD = 16.51$), and the number of drinks consumed by those who had not held leadership positions was 24.4 ($SD = 17.86$). Therefore, those who held leadership positions reported consuming significantly fewer drinks per week than those who had not held leadership positions.

The eleventh objective of this study was to compare the effectiveness of the current leadership of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States as perceived by the members of the organization with the self perceived leadership effectiveness of students who currently serve as the president of the organization. This objective was accomplished by determining the difference between the self perceived leadership as measured by the LBDQ dimension scores of the current president of the fraternities and the mean LBDQ dimension scores for the membership of the fraternities. In addition, a comparison was made of the current president’s self-perceived LEI score and the mean LEI score of the members.

The mean “Consideration” score for the non-leader group was 3.5 ($SD = .46$) and for the leader group the mean was 3.7 ($SD = .27$). The mean “Initiation of Structure” score for the non-leader group was 3.8 ($SD = .58$) and for the leader group the mean score was 4.1 ($SD = .50$). In order to accomplish this objective, the researcher constructed a confidence interval at each of four different levels of confidence around the mean of the non-leader group on each of the two measures of leader behavior (“Consideration” and “Initiation of Structure”). The finding in the
study is that the self-perceived “Consideration” and “Initiation of Structure” scores of the leaders of the fraternities are different from the perceptions of the non-leader group. Additionally, since the leader group scores were higher than the non-leader group scores on both dimensions of the LBDQ, and the 99.9% confidence interval did not capture the leader group mean, the interpretation is that a high degree of difference existed in the perceptions of the groups.

The researcher also utilized the confidence interval procedure to make a decision regarding the substantive significance between the mean LEI scores of the non-leader group (defined as all study participants except the current presidents of the organizations) and the leader group. The mean LEI score for the non-leader group was 4.1 ($SD = .78$) and for the leader group the mean was 4.3 ($SD = .61$). Since the leader group mean was not captured within the computed confidence interval at any of the specified levels of confidence, the finding is that the LEI scores of the leaders of the fraternities are highly different from the perceptions of the non-leader group.

The twelfth objective of the study was to compare at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States the level of alcohol consumption of fraternity members in leadership positions with those members who were not in leadership positions. The researcher utilized a substantive comparison of the mean alcohol consumption levels of fraternity members who were in a leadership position (defined as president) and those who were not in a leadership position within the fraternity. To accomplish this, the researcher computed a confidence interval around the mean score of the non-leader group. The mean score for the non-leader group was 21.3 ($SD = 17.51$), and the mean score for the leader group was 10.7 ($SD = 159$).
Since the mean score for the leader group was not captured within the computed confidence interval at any of the specified levels of confidence, the finding was that the alcohol consumption of the leaders of the fraternities is lower than the alcohol consumption of the non-leader group.

Objective thirteen of the study was to determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported frequency of attendance at organized worship services/meetings and the level of alcohol consumption among students who are members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States. Participants were asked to indicate their attendance at organized worship services/meetings by marking the most appropriate of three available options: “Number of services/meetings per month” (including a space for the respondent to write in the number of services/meetings attended), “Attend less than one per month,” and “Attend on Special Occasions Only.” The researcher, using the oneway Analysis of Variance procedure, compared the response groups (on organized worship services/meetings attended) on the reported number of alcoholic drinks consumed per week. The group that indicated that they attended one or more organized worship services/meetings per month reported a mean number of drinks consumed per week of 19.9 (SD = 16.93). The groups that reported attending less than one service/meeting per month and on special occasions only reported 21.3 (SD = 17.25) and 25.6 (SD = 20.16) drinks per week respectively. When the analysis of variance test was calculated to compare these means, no significant differences were found between the groups ($F_{2,171} = 1.49, p = .23$).

The fourteenth objective of the study was to determine if a model existed that explained a significant portion of the variance in the current level of alcohol consumption
from selected demographic characteristics and perceptual and experiential factors among students who were members of social fraternities at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States. This objective was accomplished using multiple regression analysis with alcohol consumption as the outcome measure (dependent variable) and selected demographic, perceptual, and experiential factors used as antecedent measures (independent variables). Only variables contributing 1% or more to the explained variance were included in the model. The variable which entered the regression model first was the sub-scale labeled “Minor Problems” of the AUDB instrument scale reflecting active member’s negative experiences associated with drinking. Considered alone, this variable explained 22.8% of the variance in the level of alcohol consumption. Ten other variables explained an additional 22.6% of the variance in the level of alcohol consumption.

The two focus groups, one for members and one for presidents, aided the researcher in attempting to verify the accuracy of the information derived from the survey. The member group recognized the importance of the president’s position and those leadership qualities which the presidents should possess, especially respect. According to their discussion, if the president is not respected, he will most likely be ineffective in his role. Also, most participants in the group indicated that while their level of alcohol consumption had decreased since their freshman year, they continue to enjoy drinking. However, like the presidents, they recognized that they cannot drink excessively and also maintain their personal level of responsibility.

The member focus group also discussed many of the negative effects of excessive levels of alcohol consumption by chapter members. While they stated that drinking can
be somewhat of a “bonding” agent for some of the members, it has also certainly been that which has created problems for other members. In addition, the member focus group shared concerns related to the relationship of the president to the rest of the chapter, particularly as it relates to communication. Several members of the focus group felt that sometime the officers are so insulated from the rest of the chapter that it was difficult for the chapter to know what was going on. This reinforced their ideas regarding the need for the president to be respected.

The presidents acknowledged the difficulty of their leadership position and indicated that it was more demanding than they might have thought at the beginning of their term. They came to appreciate the aspects of “friendship” and “brotherhood” realized through their membership in the fraternity. To them, the fraternity became increasingly more like a family. The presidents also recognized the problems caused by excessive alcohol consumption among the members, but they were quick to indicate that the real “catalyst” with regard to problems associated with drinking within their chapters had more to do with the system, the culture and society itself. They saw themselves as positive role models, offering positive advise and demonstrating responsible behavior.

The theme most unique to the president focus group grew out of expectations—those that the presidents had for themselves and those expectations of them held by the fraternity system itself, the University, and society as a whole. They acknowledged a growing sense of responsibility regarding their role in the fraternity and the fraternity’s relationship with the various publics with whom they must be involved. But, they often felt that much of their effort was spent in a balancing act....trying to maintain harmony within the fraternity and at the same time trying to appease those who
were looking in with an even higher level of expectation. They often felt that their effectiveness was limited because of the circumstances which made their jobs more difficult. However, because of their level of commitment, they maintained a strong desire to accomplish as many of their goals as possible. In spite of their frustrations, individually they saw themselves as good role models and felt that they had been instrumental in achieving positive changes for their chapters.

**Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions, implications and recommendations were derived:

1. Fraternity members tend to have high bingeing levels which began while in high school. This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study: Almost all (n = 180, 93.3%) of the respondents indicated that they had consumed alcohol in a manner consistent with the stated definition of binge drinking. Greater than three-fourths (n = 156, 81.7%) of those reported they also binged in high school and almost all (n = 180, 95.7%) of the participants indicated they binged as a college student.

   This conclusion is also supported by earlier research which indicated that there is a general tendency for fraternity members to be engaged in excessive levels of alcohol consumption, practically defined by researchers as binge drinking (Faulkner, 1989; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo & Lee, 2000; Wechsler & McFadden, 1979). This is also consistent with studies which indicate that bingers continue their behavior into college (O’Connor, 1996). While Perkins (1997)
found that most fraternity members do not perceive themselves as bingers, responses from participants in this study reflect they binge and do so at a high level. More than one third (n = 72, 36%) of the respondents reported they consumed five or more drinks in one sitting between 3-5 times in the past two weeks. Another 50 (25%) of the respondents reported that they consumed five or more drinks in one sitting between 6-9 times during the past two weeks.

Based on this conclusion of the study, the researcher recommends that the university administration place increased emphasis on reducing binge drinking. To accomplish this, the researcher recommends collaborative efforts on the part of national officers, local alumni, parents and university officials to educate fraternity members and leaders regarding the magnitude and seriousness of binge drinking in the chapters so that they can personally speak to the problems and be part of the solution. These efforts might include designing and developing a program such as those presented by national fraternities (Kappa Sigma, 1999) and others representing a visible campus response by groups such as GAMMA (Greeks Advocating the Mature Management of Alcohol), BACCHUS (Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students) and TAAD (Talking About Alcohol and Drugs) (Enos & Pittayathikhum, 1996). If the efforts of these groups are also supported by reliable data, they can likely be more successful in fulfilling their purpose of addressing the problem and seeking collaborative involvement from all parts of the campus community. When they work cooperatively, they claim ownership of the idea and the potential for
solutions. When this happens, the level of enthusiasm is greater, and the desire for positive results is engendered in everyone (Riordan & Dana, 1998; Enos & Pittayathikhum, 1996). These efforts could help to reduce the excessive use and abuse of alcohol, incorporating this program into the policies and procedures of the university, and determining the mechanism to be used to monitor the success of the program. One possible component of the program might be for the university to require those fraternity members who have been disciplined for violations of the university alcohol policy to participate in an educational component of the program. In addition, the member(s) involved could be placed on probation and have their fraternity social privileges revoked until the program has been satisfactorily completed.

2. Fraternity members generally feel that alcohol facilitates bonding within the fraternity. This conclusion is based on findings presented during the member focus group. Comments shared by the member focus group reflected that many members felt that alcohol produced a special bond within the brotherhood.

Participant Four in the member focus group stated, “Alcohol is the lubricant of conversation, and it seems to enhance the bond which develops among the members.” One of the concerns expressed in the member focus group, however, was that this may be the only bonding experience that some members ever experience. Participant Three in the president focus group shared, “The fraternity has been like a family to me. It’s just really personal.” This conclusion is also supported in the literature. Baer, Kivlahan and Marlatt (1995)
acknowledged that many of the bingers in fraternities have been bingeing since high school. They also concluded that many of the bingers are looking for a place and a group that will condone and support their drinking pattern. The fraternity sometimes becomes the place where new members evolve from excessive drinkers to positive contributing members (Clay, 1999). Chapters can play a major role in helping shape and mold them for their future roles (Winston, 1987), as well as being their home away from home, a place where they bond with the other members.

The researcher recommends that within the fraternity system, appropriate university personnel and Greek alumni jointly coordinate and implement specific educational efforts which focus on the importance of information regarding the history and heritage of their own fraternity. The process should discuss how and why “bonding” occurs, what role, if any, alcohol plays in the bonding process, and that bonding can occur without excessive alcohol consumption. One component of this emphasis could include joint discussion groups comprised of actives, pledges and alumni which meet at designated times during the fall semester following the chapter’s formal pledging program.

3. Fraternity members do perceive negative consequences from their level of alcohol consumption. This conclusion is based on the finding that in the “Negative Experiences” scale, the mean score for the first scale, “Lack of Self Control”, which contained 11 items, was 3.3 (SD = 1.11) and was classified in the “Twice” response category, and the mean score for “Physical Control”, the second scale
which included four items, was 1.6 (SD = .80) which placed it in the “Once” category.

This conclusion is consistent with earlier research which involved the drinking behavior of university students, in general, and fraternity members specifically (Hendren, 1989; Sherry & Stolberg, 1987; Tyler & Kyes, 1992; Wechsler & McFadden, 1979). Fraternity members tend to drink more because their habits and practices have been shaped by cultural and social values regarding alcohol. Some of these cultural influences began much earlier during middle school and high school, but they continued to impact the levels of alcohol consumption of those in college, particularly those who joined fraternities (Borsari & Carey, 1999; Hersch, 1999). Because they have or find more reasons to drink, fraternity members are more likely to be involved in many of the negative experiences associated with excessive alcohol consumption.

This researcher recommends that the educational programming for social fraternities be modified to include greater emphasis on the negative experiences resulting from excessive alcohol consumption. However, for the programming efforts to be more productive for the fraternity members, it would be beneficial to include personal testimonies from those who can share their negative experiences resulting from excessive alcohol consumption. Effective programming in the fraternity system focusing on responsible alcohol use continues to be an important part of what local alumni, national officers and university administrators are doing to help reduce alcohol abuse.
and irresponsible behavior among fraternity members (Hylden, 1999; Kappa Sigma Fraternity, 1999; Reisberg, 2000; Riordan & Dana, 1998; Wechsler, Nelson, & Weitzman, 2000).

4. Fraternity members acknowledge that high levels of alcohol consumption are not consistent with the ideals and rituals of the fraternity. This conclusion is based on the following findings: when sub-scale scores were examined, the factor which received the most positive response score was the sub-scale “Alcohol Consumption As A Reflection Of Fraternity Rituals And Ideals” sub-scale which had a mean score of 1.7 (SD = .80). The items in the scale were recoded so that lower response values reflected more positive relationships between alcohol consumption and selected aspects of college and fraternity life. Therefore, the mean score of 1.7 indicates disagreement with the premise that alcohol consumption is a reflection of the fraternity’s rituals and ideals.

Each of the fraternity rituals have some degree of spiritual emphasis and references to a personal belief in God or some higher power woven throughout their formal initiation experience. However, a significant number of those members participating in the study indicated that they rarely attend worship services/meetings. Based on the information they reported, active attendance at worship services/meetings is not something which these fraternity members equate with a deeper or stronger commitment to the fraternity ritual or value systems. This perspective was strongly echoed in the member focus group when Participant Four indicated that “the fraternity is
not a church. If members want a religious experience, they should go to church.”

This conclusion is consistent with earlier studies which suggest that fraternities are attempting to correct some of the problems which currently exist, particularly as they relate to excessive alcohol consumption by members and the inconsistencies with fraternity values and ideals (Arnold & Kuh, 1992; Borsari & Carey, 1999; Reisberg, 2000).

The researcher recommends that the national officers and the local alumni become more involved with their chapters to increase the level of understanding of fraternity members regarding the fraternity ritual and those values and ideals upon which the fraternity was founded. The importance of this effort will be enhanced if the chapter will invite their national officer who is charged with the responsibility of overseeing member proficiency in the ritual to periodically participate in their formal initiation activities. During other initiations, the chapter can utilize the knowledge and abilities of local alumni who are proficient in the fraternity’s ritual to provide strong leadership and support for this effort. In addition, whenever possible, chapters should invite alumni representatives to become involved on appropriate committees which assist with initiation and other chapter activities. The researcher further recommends research to determine the knowledge level of members as related to fraternity rituals and ideals.

5. Fraternity active chapter members had high perceptions of the president’s leader behavior. This conclusion is based on the following findings in the
study: In response to items on the LBDQ, the largest group (n = 90, 44.6%) included those who perceived their chapter presidents were high on both dimensions of leader behavior-“Initiation of Structure” and “Consideration”.

For the sub-scale score from the LEI scale labeled “Perceived Leadership Effectiveness,” the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 3.9 to a high of 4.8 with an overall mean of 4.1 (SD = .77) placing the scale in the “Usually” category.

This conclusion is also based on findings presented during the member focus group, but is not supported by the literature. Comments shared by the member focus group reflected that active chapter members feel that the presidents have a very difficult job and perform more than satisfactorily given the circumstances within which they must function. The member group recognized the importance of the president’s position and the desirability of those leadership qualities which the presidents should possess, especially respect. According to their discussion, if the president is not respected, he will most likely be ineffective in his role.

The researcher recommends that within the fraternity system, specific programmatic steps should be taken by the national officers, the local alumni and the university administration to better educate chapter officers, particularly the presidents, in terms of leadership. This cooperative effort should be designed and implemented in such a way that the presidents are challenged to see the big picture as it relates to the concept of leadership. They need to be taught many different aspects of leadership including leadership styles, values
and ethics, and important concepts such as developing a vision for an organization, formulating critical strategies, and planning and implementing effectively. One possible way in which this might be accomplished is to require newly elected officers to attend leadership development workshops planned and organized by the administrative unit which coordinates student organizations on campus.

6. Fraternity members who have held leadership positions consumed fewer drinks per week than those not in a leadership role. This conclusion is based on the following findings in the study: The mean score for the non-leader group was 21.3 (SD = 17.51), and for the leader group, the mean was 10.7 (SD = 12.37). Each of the specified confidence intervals for this mean reflect that the mean score for the leader group was not captured within the computed confidence interval for the non-leader group at any of the specified levels of confidence. Therefore, the finding is that the alcohol consumption of the leaders of the fraternities is lower than the alcohol consumption of the non-leader group. Additionally, the interpretation is that a high degree of difference existed in the alcohol consumption of the groups.

This conclusion is based on findings presented during the president focus group, and is in contrast to the findings presented in earlier studies indicating that as a result of chapter leaders’ excessive alcohol consumption and binge drinking, they are becoming more the source of the problem rather than the solution (Cashin, Presley & Meilman, 1998). “Nearly 74% of
fraternity leaders reported having engaged in binge drinking as compared to 50% of those not in leadership roles” (Anderson, 1997, p. A20). Reflections from the presidents centered more on changes occurring around them that necessitated adjustments in their personal patterns of behavior with regard to alcohol consumption. Because of the deaths of a number of fraternity members on a national scale, the presidents felt that those in leadership roles were forced to re-evaluate how they were leading their chapters. They had to look at how they, as presidents, consume alcohol, the quantity they consume, and when they felt they could drink at all. As a result of these and other cultural and societal influences on patterns of behavior related to alcohol consumption, the presidents indicated that because of their responsibility as president, their behavior is different than before they were president. As Participant One expressed it, “At fraternity social events, I do not drink at all, or rarely drink. I have to keep my eye on everybody else.” The presidents also felt that, in addition to their leader responsibilities, previous difficulties related to their excessive alcohol consumption prompted them to alter their drinking behavior.

Perhaps the feelings or beliefs of the presidents which seemed most to be in conflict with the literature are those regarding the source of the drinking problems within the chapters. While the literature indicates that the leaders are the real problem drinkers within the chapters, the presidents strongly disagree. As Participant Three in the president focus group stated,
“The catalyst for problems regarding drinking with the fraternities is the system itself. It’s the culture. Most of them (members) drank in high school, many of them drink with their parents, they joined a fraternity, and they attend a university that has rightly or wrongly been identified as a party school. It was the leadership of my fraternity that gave me positive advice regarding drinking, and I believe we are attempting to do the same thing today.”

As a group, the presidents indicated that they felt it was foolish to think that they were the problem drinkers in the chapters. As Participant One stated, “I have been to other universities where the president might have been considered the problem drinker, but not here.”

The researcher recognizes that certain issues might not have been addressed in this study, and therefore recommends that subsequent studies investigate the relationship which exists between perceived leader behavior and other aspects of alcohol consumption among university students who are members of social fraternities. One of the issues to be addressed might be the relationship between the level of knowledge and understanding of the fraternity ritual and ideals by members and leaders. The researcher further recommends the replication of this study at other research extensive universities in the southern portion of the United States. Rigorous research focusing on the relationship between perceived leader behavior and alcohol consumption among university students who are members of social fraternities will ensure a thorough understanding of the challenges facing those in leadership roles and how universities, national officers and local alumni can assist them in meeting those challenges and improving the image of the fraternity.
7. Entering freshmen in colleges and universities who join fraternities encounter significant challenges upon their arrival in their new environment. They are met with continuing or increasing peer pressure issues, determining how and where to meet new people and make new friends, responding to decisions regarding the mature management of alcohol and others. This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study: The item respondents most agreed with was “Being a fraternity member helps me meet people,” which had a mean of 4.3 (SD = .97). This perception was followed closely by “a person can enjoy being in this fraternity without drinking alcohol” (M = 4.2, SD = 1.20).

This conclusion is also similar to outcomes of other studies which indicated there is a general tendency for fraternity members to encounter difficulties fitting in and finding where they belong. They want to find a group with whom they can relate and enjoy the collegiate experience, particularly as it relates to social activities in general and drinking specifically (Darkes & Goldman, 1993; Borsari & Carey, 1999). They are also being influenced by peer pressure to experience new behaviors particularly as related to alcohol consumption (Tyler & Kyes, 1992; Sherry & Stolberg, 1987).

Based on this conclusion, the researcher recommends that the university administration, along with the fraternity officials and alumni, develop a program that would focus on the relationship between an individual’s sense of self-worth/self-concept and their level of alcohol consumption. To accomplish this,
the researcher recommends an approach that could both strengthen the already existing foundation that some students bring with them as they enter the university and the fraternity system, and possibly help establish a strong decision-making foundation for those who enter the university and the fraternity system with a lack of self-worth and self-concept. This emphasis might include incorporating presentations by a motivational speaker or a psychologist as part of the pledge education program to assist the new members in their efforts to develop themselves more fully. In addition, the new members could be paired with a member of the alumni chapter who could serve as a mentor for them beyond their peers in the chapter.

8. The environment of the college and university campus, although academic in nature, offers opportunity for students to become involved in activities which inhibit their academic progress, especially in the area of alcohol consumption. Changes in collegiate environments have influenced the alcohol consumption patterns of college students in general and fraternity men specifically (Brennan, Walfish & AuBuchon, 1986; Carter & Kahnweiler, 2000). Although the drinking age was raised to 21 by congressional action in 1984, alcohol continues to be readily available, both on campus and off campus, to the collegiate population, most of whom are under the legal drinking age. Many students arrive on campus with certain expectations or perceptions regarding their use of alcohol (Brown, Creamer & Stetson, 1987; Borsari & Carey, 1999), and once there, encounter other environmental circumstances
which influence their alcohol consumption behavior. One of these circumstances involved joining a fraternity for some students (Enos & Pittayathikum, 1996).

The researcher recommends that college and university administrators be challenged to envision new ways of changing or altering the environment of the college campus as related to the availability of alcohol and the policies governing its consumption on the campus. This would perhaps require policy changes impacting resident halls, fraternity and sorority houses and rental facilities on the campus which cater to social activities offering alcoholic beverages. In addition, the university may be forced to revisit its policies governing the possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages in athletic facilities on university property.

9. Many freshmen arrive on college and university campuses with binge drinking patterns already well established during their high school experience. This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study: A significant portion of the respondents (n = 156, 81.7%) indicated they had consumed alcohol in high school in a manner defined as “consuming five or more drinks in a single sitting.” Responding to the question “Do you binge drink as a college student?”, 180 (95.7%) indicated “Yes”.

This conclusion is also supported by earlier research which indicated that binge drinking in high school continues to be a great concern for parents and officials alike (Borsari & Carey, 1999). Of even more concern is the percentage
increase in the number of binge drinkers in high school (Goodwin, 1992; background, 1998), and information which indicates youth/adolescents are increasingly drinking at a younger age (Wechsler, Kuh & Davenport, 1996; Hersch, 1999). Many agencies and individuals, searching for solutions, have focused their efforts for these age groups on disseminating information and developing educational programs as ways of addressing the problem and studying possible solutions (Grant, Hartford, Chou, Pickering, Dawson, Stinson & Noble, 1991).

The researcher recommends that university officials and fraternity leaders and alumni work with parents and others who potentially impact and influence high school and middle school students, challenging them to become more informed and more pro-active in their response to drinking behavior by their adolescents. This effort could be developed using the concept or model of a think tank comprised of leaders from the concerned areas. They could be charged with the responsibility of formulating recommendations to be accepted and supported by all parties involved: high schools and middle schools, school boards, university officials, fraternity leaders and alumni and local chapter leaders. By cooperating and working collectively to reach decisions which reflect input from all interested groups, the results could have a greater impact and send a clear, consistent message to today’s youth that along with legal issues, there are greater issues, such as their health, about which they need to be concerned.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Alcohol Use and Drinking Behaviors
Among College Fraternity Members

This survey instrument is designed to examine the use of alcoholic beverages among college students. The materials gained from your responses will be used to provide basic descriptive information to the university only. Please be completely open and honest in providing information about yourself and your use of alcohol. Your individual responses will not be identified in any way with your name. Additionally, specific information will not be associated with your fraternity by name. All results will be presented as aggregated information with no individual or specific group summaries.

1. Have you ever consumed alcoholic beverages?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No
   If No: (A) Skip to question #12

2. Think back over the last two weeks. How many times have you had five or more drinks* at a sitting? (Please darken the appropriate response)
   ☐ None   ☐ 3-5 times   ☐ 6-9 times   ☐ Twice or 10 or more times

3. Average # of drinks* you consume a week: Please darken the appropriate number and write it in the box

   (If less than 10, code answers as 00, 01, 02, etc.)

* A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.

4. Have you ever consumed five or more drinks in one sitting?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No
   If Yes:
   (A) Did you do this in high school? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   (B) Do you do this as a college student? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. During the past 30 days, to what extent have you engaged in each of the following behaviors:

   Please indicate by darkening one response for each item listed.
   The response scale includes:
   ☐ Refused an offer of alcohol
   ☐ Bragged about your alcohol use
   ☐ Heard someone else brag about his/her alcohol use
   ☐ Carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, etc.
   (Do not count hunting situations or weapons used as part of your job)
   ☐ Experienced peer pressure to drink
   ☐ Thought a sexual partner who was drunk was not attractive
   ☐ Told a sexual partner who was drunk that they were not attractive

* Sur-Scan by CAT 578-1145 #13
6. Please indicate how often you have experienced the following due to your drinking during the last year (12 months) by darkening one response for each item listed.

The response scale includes:
- Never
- Once
- Twice
- 3-5 Times
- 6-9 Times
- 10 or More Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>3-5 Times</th>
<th>6-9 Times</th>
<th>10 or More Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Had a hangover.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Performed poorly on a test or important project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Been in trouble with police, residence hall or other college authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Damaged property, pulled fire alarm, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Got into an argument or fight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Got nauseated or vomited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Driven a car while under the influence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Missed a class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Been criticized by someone I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Thought I might have a drinking problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Had a memory loss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Done something I later regretted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Been arrested for DWI/DUI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Have been taken advantage of sexually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Have taken advantage of another sexually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Tried unsuccessfully to stop drinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Seriously thought about suicide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Seriously tried to commit suicide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Been hurt or injured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Within the last year, to what extent have you participated in any of the following activities? Please indicate your level of participation by darkening one response for each item listed.

The response scale includes:
- Not Involved
- Attended
- Active Involvement (Non-Leader)
- Leadership Position (Non-Leader)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not Involved</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Active Involvement (Non-Leader)</th>
<th>Leadership Position (Non-Leader)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Intramural or club sports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social fraternity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-1. Attended regular chapter meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-2. Attended chapter social functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-3. Participated in chapter community service projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-4. Participated in fraternity academic programs (i.e., tutorials, study sessions, academic success sessions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Religious and interfaith groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. International and language groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Minority and ethnic organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Political and social action groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Music and other performing groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Student newspaper, radio, TV, magazine, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. To what extent has your alcohol use changed within the last 12 months?
(please darken the appropriate one)
- Increased
- About the same
- Decreased
9. Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each of the following items regarding alcohol consumption by darkening one response for each item listed.

The response scale includes:

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Uncertain
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My drinking patterns in high school influenced my decision to join a fraternity</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I joined a fraternity because I wanted to be part of a group that shared my attitudes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Fraternities are known to have liberal attitudes toward drinking alcohol</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Drinking is an important part of the college experience</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. College is more meaningful as part of a fraternity</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I drink alcohol to have positive social experiences</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I have more fun when I drink alcohol</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Binge drinking is an expected part of belonging to a fraternity</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Binge drinking is an expected part of being a fraternity leader</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. No one can be a member of a fraternity unless they drink alcohol</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Fraternity ideals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. My fraternity ideals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of members</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. My fraternity rituals are accurately reflected by the alcohol consumption behavior patterns of our members</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. A person has to drink to fit in with this fraternity</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Drinking helps me meet people</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Being a fraternity member helps me meet people</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. The attitudes of my fraternity brothers influence my drinking patterns</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Members who live in the fraternity house are expected to drink more than those who live out of the house</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. I drink because of the peer pressure from my fraternity brothers</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. My fraternity brothers influence the amount of alcohol I drink</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. My fraternity brothers pressure me to participate in binge drinking</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. A person can enjoy being in this fraternity without drinking alcohol</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Leaders in my fraternity exhibit alcohol consumption patterns that are more responsible than those of our general membership</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. For each of the following statements, indicate whether or not you believe alcohol has that effect? (Please darken (1) Yes or (2) No for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Breaks the ice</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Enhances social activity</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Makes it easier to deal with stress</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Facilitates a connection with peers</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Gives people something to talk about</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Facilitates male bonding</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Facilitates female bonding</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Allows people to have more fun</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Gives people something to do</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Makes food taste better</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Makes me sexier</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Makes me sexier</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Facilitates sexual opportunities</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. In which of the following ways does other students' drinking interfere with your life on or around campus? (Please darken □ Yes or □ No for each item) □ Yes □ No

a. Interrupts your studying ................................................. □ Yes □ No
b. Makes you feel unsafe ........................................................ □ Yes □ No
c. Messes up your physical living space (cleanliness, neatness, organization, etc.) .................................................. □ Yes □ No
d. Adversely affects your involvement on an athletic team or in other organized groups ........................................ □ Yes □ No
e. Prevents you from enjoying events (concerts, sports, social activities, etc.) .................................................. □ Yes □ No
f. Interferes in other way(s) ........................................................ □ Yes, please specify:

Binge Drinking is defined as consuming five or more drinks in one sitting.

12. Have you ever consumed alcohol in a manner that meets this definition of binge drinking?

□ Yes □ No

If Yes:  
(A) Did you binge drink in high school? □ Yes □ No
(B) Do you binge drink as a college student? □ Yes □ No

13. If you volunteer any of your time on or off campus to help others, please indicate the approximate number of hours per month and the principal activity:

Example: Baton Rouge Food Bank, Habitat for Humanity, etc.

□ Don't volunteer, or less than 1 hour □ 10-15 hours
□ 1-4 hours □ 16 or more hours
□ 5-9 hours

Principal volunteer activity is: ____________________________

If you participate in more than one, please list and indicate the number of hours: ____________________________

14. Which leadership positions have you held or do you currently hold in your fraternity? (Mark all that apply)

□ President □ House Manager
□ Vice President □ Rush Chairman
□ Pledge Trainer □ Social Chairman
□ Secretary □ Alumni Chairman
□ Treasurer □ Other (please specify): ____________________________

15. To which, if any, leadership positions do you aspire? (Mark all that apply)

□ President □ House Manager
□ Vice President □ Rush Chairman
□ Pledge Trainer □ Social Chairman
□ Secretary □ Alumni Chairman
□ Treasurer □ Other (please specify): ____________________________

16. In a typical month (30 day period), how many organized worship services/meetings do you attend?

□ # of services/meetings per month
□ Attend less than one per month
□ Attend on "Special Occasions" only

Please mark □ Yes or □ No for each item.

17. Do your religious beliefs influence your drinking behaviors?

□ Yes □ No

18. Does your participation in organized worship services/meetings influence your drinking behavior?

□ Yes □ No
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19. Please indicate your religious preference:
   - Catholic
   - Eastern (Buddhism, Hinduism, etc)
   - Jewish
   - Protestant:
   - Baptist
   - Methodist
   - Presbyterian
   - Non-denominational
   - Other (please specify):

Please indicate the appropriate response for the following:

20. Classification: 21. Age:
   - Fr
   - So
   - Jr
   - Sr
   - Gr

22. Ethnic origin:
   - American Indian/Alaskan Native
   - Hispanic
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - White (non-Hispanic)
   - Black (non-Hispanic)
   - Other:

23. Marital status:
   - Single
   - Married
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed

24. Living arrangements:
   (A) Where:
   - House/apartment/etc
   - Fraternity house
   - Residence hall
   - Other:
   (B) With whom: (Mark all that apply)
   - With Roommate(s)
   - With Spouse
   - With Children
   - Alone
   - With Parents
   - Other:

25. Employment:
   (Please darken the appropriate response)
   During the current semester, are you employed?  \(\square\) Yes  \(\square\) No
   If yes, is your current position:
   - On campus
   - Off campus
   Approximately how many hours per week do you work? \(\square\)

26. Parent's level of income:
   - Less than \$35,000
   - \$35,001-50,000
   - \$50,001-65,000
   - \$65,001-89,000
   - \$85,001-100,000
   - \$100,001-120,000
   - \$120,001-150,000
   - Greater than \$150,000

27. Of which state/country are you a legal resident?
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LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

As you respond to the following questions, please respond to each one as it relates to the person in your chapter who currently serves as President.

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your president. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your president.

Note: The term "group," as employed in the following items, refers to your chapter. The term "members," refers to all current initiated members of the chapter. The term "superiors," refers to alumni advisors, national fraternity officers and university officials.

Published by
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Copyright 1957

DIRECTIONS:
a. READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
d. Darken in one of the five ovals following the item to show the answer you have selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does personal favors for group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Makes his attitudes clear to the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does little things to make it pleasant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tries out his new ideas with the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acts as the real leader of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is easy to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rules with an iron hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Finds time to listen to group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Criticizes poor work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gives advance notice of changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Keeps to himself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Looks out for the personal welfare of the individual group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assigns group members to particular tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is the spokesman of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Schedules work to be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Refuses to explain his actions</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Keeps the group informed</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Acts without consulting the group</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Backs up the members in their actions</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Treats all group members as his equals</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Gets what he asks for from his superiors</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Is willing to make changes</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Is friendly and approachable</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Asks the group members to follow standards and regulations</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Fails to take necessary action</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Lets group members know what is expected of them</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Speaks as the representative of the group</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Sees to it that group members are working up to their capacity</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Lets other people take away his leadership in the group</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Keeps the group working together as a team</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Effectiveness Instrument (LEI)

Please read over the following instrument and answer it to the best of your ability.

Instructions: Please darken the oval of the response to the statement that you feel most nearly describes your fraternity president as an individual. Select only one response for each statement.

I feel that my fraternity president is......

1. overall a strong leader..............................(1) NEVER 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

2. honest and sincere with others..................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

3. responsible and dependable.....................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

4. an effective communicator........................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

5. a good listener....................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

6. a good motivator..................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

7. a good encourager................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

8. confident.........................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

9. decisive............................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

10. cooperative......................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

11. organized........................................(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

12. an effective leader for our organisation........(1) 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE MEMBER FOCUS GROUP

1. Objective: How do social fraternity members’ perceptions of the behavior exhibited by their chapter presidents impact their alcohol consumption?

2. Questions
   a. Introductory remarks and participant introductions
   b. Introductory questions
      i. What can you tell me about yourself? (Demographic information)
      ii. Describe your time/experiences as a fraternity member.
      iii. Which leadership positions, if any, have you held or do you aspire to?
   c. Transitional questions
      There has been significant media coverage in this country regarding the level of alcohol consumption by college students in general and fraternity members specifically.
      i. What are some particular points you can share regarding your alcohol consumption?
      ii. What are some effects that you think result from your alcohol consumption, both good and bad?
   d. Key questions
      Think for a moment about the leadership in your fraternity, specifically the president.
      i. What is your opinion of the leader behavior exhibited by your chapter president?
      ii. How does his behavior influence your alcohol consumption?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE PRESIDENT FOCUS GROUP

1. Objective: How do social fraternity members’ perceptions of the behavior exhibited by their chapter presidents impact their alcohol consumption?

2. Questions
   a. Introductory remarks and participant introductions
   b. Introductory questions
      iii. What can you tell me about yourself? (Demographic information)
      ii. Describe your time/experiences as a fraternity member.
      iii. Which leadership positions, if any, have you held or do you aspire to?
   c. Transitional questions
      There has been significant media coverage in this country regarding the level of alcohol consumption by college students in general and fraternity members specifically.
      i. What are some particular points you can share regarding your alcohol consumption?
      ii. What are some effects that you think result from your alcohol consumption, both good and bad?
   d. Key questions
      Think for a moment about the leadership in your fraternity, specifically the president.
      i. What is your opinion of the leader behavior exhibited by you as chapter president?
      ii. How has being in a leadership position influenced your alcohol consumption?
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