

1-1-2008

Student Spiritual Development Associated With Fraternity Affiliation

Jason B. Goldfarb

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Counseling and Student Development](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Goldfarb, Jason B., "Student Spiritual Development Associated With Fraternity Affiliation" (2008). *Masters Theses*. 127.
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/127>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

STUDENT SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH
FRATERNITY AFFILIATION

GOLDFARB

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.



Author's Signature

05/08/08

Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

Author's Signature

Date

This form must be submitted in duplicate.

Student Spiritual Development Associated With
Fraternity Affiliation

(TITLE)

BY

Jason B. Goldfarb

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in College Student Affairs

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2008

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

April 28, 2008
DATE

Charles J. Oberly
THESIS DIRECTOR

4.28.08
DATE

[Signature]
DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL HEAD

Student Spiritual Development Associated with Fraternity Affiliation

by

Jason B. Goldfarb

B.S., Millikin University, Decatur, IL, 2005

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Science in College Student Affairs Degree

Department of Counseling and Student Development
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL

Spring, 2008

Thesis Committee:

April 28, 2008
Date

Charles G. Eberly
Director of Thesis

04-28-08
Date

JAY ALLACE
Committee Member

4/28/08
Date

Barbara Powell
Committee Member

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between fraternity affiliation, spirituality and associated beliefs and values as measured by a survey instrument (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004c) that contained 19 factor scales. Factors were grouped within categories of spirituality, religiosity, and other related qualities (Lindholm, Park, Curley, & Schwartz, 2008). In addition, the relationship between fraternity affiliation and spirituality was examined via six planned analyses based on present research dealing with implied outcomes of fraternity membership. Finally, a scale was developed from items within the College Students Beliefs and Values Survey to assess respondents' relative levels of hegemonic masculinity.

Significant differences were found regarding measures of spirituality and associated beliefs and values between fraternity members and non-affiliated participants, including six planned analyses dealing with alcohol use, frequency of partying, interacting with persons of different races or ethnic backgrounds, leadership training, and respondents' relative levels of hegemonic masculinity.

Dedication

I want to dedicate this thesis to my late fraternity brother Rahul Kavuri. While he is no longer with us, his presence was always with me since he inspired this study. Rahul was a “True Gentleman” of Sigma Alpha Epsilon and was loved by many. Phi Alpha, Rahul, you are truly missed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the people that have made it possible to complete this thesis. I want to thank everyone at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles for allowing me to use the data set from the College Students' beliefs and values study. I also would not have been able to conduct the present study without the generous donation The John Templeton Foundation gave to the HERI.

I want to especially thank my advisor Dr. Charles Eberly. Without his continuous support, I could not have been able to complete this thesis. I would also like to acknowledge the contribution of my other committee members: Dr. James Wallace and Dr. Barbara Powell.

I have been fortunate to have unquestioned support from my entire family including my mother Elaine, father Alvin, and sister Deborah. I would also like to thank my Fiancé Meghan Sims for her unconditional love and support.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Appendixes	viii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Research Question(s)/Hypothesis	3
Significance of the Study	5
Limitations of the Study	5
Definitions of Terms	7
Summary	9
2. Review of Literature	11
Influence of Fraternities on Various Aspects of Membership Development ..	11
Positive Elements of Fraternity Culture	12
Negative Elements of Fraternity Culture	15
College Men and Hegemonic Masculinity	17
General Discussions of Spirituality and Faith Development	18
The Development of Spirituality in Male and Female College Students ..	19
Relationship Between Ethnic Identity and Spiritual Development	20
Summary	21
3. Methodology	22
Design of the Study	22
Research Subject Selection	23
Instrument	23
Data Collection	29
Treatment of Data	29
Summary	30

4. Results/Findings	32
Survey Design	32
Internal Consistency Reliability	32
Fraternity Membership and College Students' Beliefs and Values	32
Leadership Training and College Students' Beliefs and Values	33
Partying and College Students' Beliefs and Values	34
Alcohol Consumption and College Students' Beliefs and Values	36
Exposure to Diversity and College Students' Beliefs and Values	38
Hegemonic Masculinity and College Students' Beliefs and Values	40
Summary	41
5. Discussion/Recommendations/Conclusion	42
Discussion	45
Recommendations from the Results of the Present Study	49
Recommendations for Future Research	50
Conclusion	51
References	53
Appendixes	62

List of Appendixes

Appendixes	Page
1. Research Consent Documents	62
Institutional Review Board Consent	62
Higher Education Research Institute Consent	63
2. College Students' Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Study Documents	64
College Students' Beliefs and Values Survey	64
College Students' Beliefs and Values Factor Scale Table	68
3. Thesis Study Charts/Tables	76
Hegemonic Masculinity Scale	76
Internal Consistency Reliability	77
Fraternity Membership and CSBV	78
Leadership Training and CSBV	79
Leadership Training/Affiliation and CSBV	80
Partying and CSBV	82
Partying/Affiliation and CSBV	84
Beer Consumption and CSBV	86
Wine/Liquor Consumption and CSBV	88
Wine/Liquor Consumption/Affiliation and CSBV	90
Exposure to Diversity and CSBV	92
Exposure/Affiliation and CSBV	93
Hegemonic Masculinity and CSBV	95
Hegemonic Masculinity/Affiliation and CSBV	97

Chapter I

Introduction

Phi Beta Kappa, the first American fraternity, was founded at the College of William and Mary on December 5, 1776. Friendship, morality, and learning were the founding principles of this organization. Phi Beta Kappa's motto derived from its Greek letters, "[l]ove of wisdom the guide of life" (Robson, 1966, p. 23).

Since the establishment of Phi Beta Kappa, other fraternal organizations have built upon these principles. Embedded in these fraternal ideals are the concepts of building guiding principles for living a more fulfilled life. Since spirituality is often cited as a key component needed to attain a fulfilled life (Love & Talbot, 1999), a study of fraternal organization membership and its relationship to measures of spirituality among members is necessary. A key question to be asked is whether or in what manner do fraternities enhance their members' spiritual development?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the correlation between fraternity membership and measures of spirituality, and to determine how the level of spirituality of fraternity members compares to the level of spirituality among non-affiliated male students. As the review of literature revealed, there has been little quantitative or qualitative research that examines spiritual development of fraternity members. This study expands the existing research in the area of spiritual development as well as the research on the impact of Greek life on male students and the purpose it serves in their human development. The goal of the present study was to determine whether there is a relationship between fraternity affiliation and selected measures of spirituality.

Ryan and Fiorito (2003) found that, in general, there was a positive relationship between religious involvement and mental health. Individuals who revealed being highly devoted to their faith displayed a high level of personal well-being. In addition, Walker and Dixon (2002) found a positive correlation among African-American students on measures of spirituality ($r = .33$), spiritual beliefs ($r = .37$) and religious participation ($r = .28$) for spring semester grades, and a positive correlation of .23 for European American students between cumulative grades and religious participation. Among European American students, the authors also found a significant difference between “those reporting no suspensions having higher levels of religious participation” (p. 115).

As Chickering and Reisser (1993) noted in their description of Parks’ faith development theory, there is “a spiritual quest to make sense out of life experiences and to seek patterns, order, coherence, and relation among the disparate elements of human living” (p. 58). This active spiritual quest during college allows young adults to begin to shape their own spiritual and religious beliefs, and to move away from their parents’ beliefs and towards independence.

Even though a thorough search of literature was carried out for the present study on spiritual development of college fraternity members, little empirical research was identified that specifically focused on fraternity members and spiritual development. Eberly (1970) did suggest in his four-year longitudinal study of the impact of fraternity membership on attitudes and values that spiritual issues were important:

Greeks selected fraternity, family, and Church as three of their most reinforcing influences on original attitudes and beliefs during college. These three factors, among others, might be taken to represent ‘traditional American values,’ to be

honored and preserved from a fraternity point of view. It then might follow that fraternity group selection and self-selection into fraternities should be such that those selected are the most likely, throughout their college experience, to honor those values (p. 102).

Eberly's longitudinal data were collected from 1958 to 1962. More recent research using data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) supported Eberly's conclusions. Hayek, Carini, O'Day, and Kuh (2002) found that compared to other students, fraternity and sorority members had greater "levels of engagement in educationally effective practices," including "experiences and exposure to diversity" and "self-reported gains in various educational and personal growth areas" (p. 657). However, the Hayek, et al. study did not directly address the issue of student spirituality and beliefs.

The information gained from this study comparing affiliated and non-affiliated college men on issues of spirituality and beliefs could help reframe the popular conception of Greek life and possibly address some of the negative behaviors associated with fraternity membership. Analyzing the level of self-reported spiritual development among male members of Greek letter fraternities may reveal a need to enhance programming at both the national and local chapter level, create programs, or possibly find ways of reinforcing college fraternal organizations' core values, particularly as they address issues of spirituality.

Research Question(s)/Hypothesis

This study examined the relationship between fraternity members and non-affiliated participants' spirituality using a survey instrument (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004c) that contained 19 factor scales. Factors were grouped within categories

of spirituality, religiosity, and other related qualities (Lindholm, Park, Curley, & Schwartz, 2008). It was hypothesized that there will be a significant difference between the measured spirituality of fraternity members and measured spirituality among non-affiliated male respondents. There is some evidence (Eberly, 1970; Hayek, et al. 2002) to support the hypothesis that there is a difference between the measured levels of spirituality of these two groups.

To further examine the relationship between fraternity membership and the development of spirituality, six planned analyses were conducted based on present research dealing with fraternity membership. The planned analyses consisted of comparison tests between fraternity leaders and rank-and-file members (Wall & Markwell, 2003), the number of hours in a typical week members spend partying (Kuh & Arnold, 1993), how frequently fraternity members drank beer, how frequently fraternity members drank wine or liquor (Bartholow, Sher, & Krull, 2003; Capraro, 2000; Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, & Blane, 2006; Wall & Markwell, 2003), and how often fraternity members socialized with a person of a different racial or ethnic group (Hayek, et al. 2002; Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sinclair, 2004). Finally, a scale was developed to assess respondents' relative conformity to hegemonic masculinity (Harris, 2006; Edwards, 2007). The study examined these research questions to observe the relationship between fraternity membership and spiritual development, and whether there is any support that fraternity members self-report differential levels of spiritual development compared to those who have not joined such organizations.

Significance of the Study

Examining the relationship between fraternity membership and spiritual development and determining how the level of spirituality of fraternity members compares to the spiritual development of non-affiliated male students is quite significant. The current study is important since there have been few studies that focus on spirituality in college students. In addition, there are few studies of specific student organizations and their focus on the spiritual development of members (Eberly, 1967; Sidanius, Van Laar, Levin, & Sinclair, 2004; Temkin & Evans, 1998). Since fraternities have a wide reaching impact as major social outlets on college campuses, it would seem logical to determine whether members of these organizations self-report different levels of spiritual development compared to non-members.

Second, fraternity rituals espouse positive ideals (Brooks, 1967; Callais, 2005; McMinn, 1979), yet actual fraternity life is often observed as a negative influence (Bartholow, Sher, & Krull, 2003; Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, & Blane, 2006; Kuh & Arnold, 1993) on those who belong. This study explored whether there is any relationship between fraternity membership and spiritual development. In addition, the present study could help identify specific changes needed in the programming or advising of Greek organizations to support spiritual development. According to Hayek, et al. (2002), there is a need to explore the impact of organizational programming that supports character development.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to the present study. First, all six planned analyses were based on self-reported information comparing fraternity members and non-affiliated

participants. The self-report bias could lead to participants concealing or overly reporting the number of hours in a typical week members and non-members spend partying, drinking beer, drinking wine or liquor, and/or socializing with a person of a different racial or ethnic group. Also, some students might not be willing to reveal how “spiritual” they actually are. They may feel uncomfortable discussing this subject matter, particularly as it relates to their personal values. Respondents may also (no matter how hard the instrument developers work to eliminate this factor) confuse spirituality with organized religious beliefs and institutions (Bryant, 2006).

The College Student Beliefs and Values Survey (CSBV) asked only if students joined a fraternity or sorority after entering college (Question 6: Item 1, Appendix C), but the item did not enable respondents to indicate whether the organization joined was traditionally White (North American Interfraternity Conference, National Panhellenic Council), traditionally Black (National Pan-Hellenic Conference) or other ethnic heritage (National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations). Also, the Principal Investigator (PI) did not request racial classification data from the HERI for the purposes of the present study. However, Bryant (2006) reported that only four percent of total respondents were Black, four percent were Asian, and two percent were Latino/a. Some results may be confounded based on the inability of the PI to control for racial identity within fraternity affiliation. If racial identity were available, actual numbers of participants based on Bryant’s percentages may well have been too small to carry out inferential statistical analyses (Glass & Stanley, 1970).

Definitions of Terms

The following definition of terms includes concepts important to the understanding of the present study.

Binge Drinking: “A ‘binge’ is a pattern of drinking alcohol that brings blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to 0.08 gram percent or above. For the typical adult, this pattern corresponds to consuming 5 or more drinks (male), or 4 or more drinks (female), in about 2 hours. Binge drinking is clearly dangerous for the drinker and for society” (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2004, ¶ 2).

Fraternity: “A social association of the students or alumni of a college or university, usually having a name consisting of three Greek letters, such as ‘Phi Beta Kappa’ ” (Oxford English Dictionaries, 1989, ¶ 1).

Fraternity Ritual: A right of passage “in initiating fraternity new members; many groups use a ritual in conducting formal chapter meetings, in the ceremonies for installing officers, and for memorial services” (Anson & Marchesani, 1991, p. I-13). Rituals are always used in conducting fraternal business, and marking stages of membership (Driver, 1991).

Hazing: “‘Hazing’ refers to any activity expected of someone joining a group (or to maintain full status in a group) that humiliates, degrades or risks emotional and/or physical harm, regardless of the person's willingness to participate” (StopHazing.org, 2005, ¶ 1).

Hegemonic Masculinity: “Masculinity, as it has been traditionally defined, hierarchically positions men above women and some men above other men based on

race, sexual orientation, class, religion, age, ability, and other social group memberships” (Edwards, 2007, p. 21).

High-Risk Drinking: “High risk drink refers to drinking in a way that increases the risk of negative consequences” (Outside The Classroom, 2005, ¶ 3).

National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (NALFO): The National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations “is an umbrella council for Latino Greek Letter Organizations. Mission Statement: The purpose of NALFO is to promote and foster positive interfraternal relations, communication, and development of all Latino Fraternal organizations through mutual respect, leadership, honesty, professionalism and education” (National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations, 2007, ¶ 1).

Northern-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC): “The North-American Interfraternity Conference [formerly known as the National Interfraternity Conference] advocates for the needs of its member fraternities through enrichment of the fraternity experience; advancement and growth of the fraternity community; and enhancement of the educational mission of the host institutions” (Northern-American Interfraternity Conference, 2007, ¶ 1).

National Panhellenic Conference (NPC): “The National Panhellenic Conference provides support and guidance for its 26 member inter/national sororities/women’s fraternities and serves as the national voice on contemporary issues of sorority life” (National Panhellenic Conference, 2005, ¶ 3).

National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC): “The National Pan-Hellenic Council, Incorporated is currently composed of nine (9) International Greek letter Sororities and Fraternities... and promotes interaction through forums, meetings and other mediums for

the exchange of information and engages in cooperative programming and initiatives through various activities and functions” (National Pan-Hellenic Council, 2007, ¶ 1).

Rank and File Member: “the individuals who constitute the body of an organization, society, or nation as distinguished from the leaders” (Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary, 2007, ¶ 2).

Spirituality: “An elusive construct imbued with multiple meanings, spirituality has been defined in the research literature as the process of seeking personal authenticity, genuineness, and wholeness; transcending one’s current locus of centrality (i.e., recognizing concerns beyond oneself); developing a greater connectedness to self and others through relationships and community; deriving meaning, purpose, and direction in life; and openness to exploring a relationship with a higher power or powers that transcend human existence and human knowing” (Bryant, 2006, p. 1).

Summary

As previously noted, relatively few studies dealing with spiritual development in college students are known to exist. In particular, there are very few studies dealing with spirituality development among members of Greek organizations on campuses across the United States. This paucity in the literature is clearly reflected in the review of literature below.

This study was an initial attempt to evaluate the relationship between fraternities and the spiritual development of its members and to determine how the level of spirituality of fraternity members compared to the levels of spirituality of non- Greek affiliated male participants. Presently, Greek organizations are under attack across the country for their negative activities (DeBard, Lake, & Binder, 2006; Wall, 2006). It is

important to learn whether there is a positive relationship between fraternity membership and spirituality, a key area of human development. If the present study finds that fraternity members have a greater level of measured spirituality than do non-Greek affiliated participants, this information could help reshape the public's negative opinion of fraternities. Also, if the present study concludes that fraternity members have a lower level of spirituality than non-affiliated participants, then the study could possibly indicate the need to reevaluate programming and advisement within these organizations.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

Little research has focused on the relationship between American college fraternities and members' spiritual development; however, there is a need for such research. The only applicable studies found thus far have focused on the influence of fraternities on various aspects of members' social development, the development of spirituality in male and female college students, and the relationships between ethnic identity and spirituality development.

Influence of Fraternities on Various Aspects of Members' Development

Many influences impact fraternity members' development. While few studies dealt with spirituality in college student life, many of the extant studies touched upon general factors that also have an impact on the spiritual development of fraternity men. However, these general factors may be moderated by special characteristics found among fraternity members (e.g., values of academics, brotherhood, ritual, leadership). Therefore, it is necessary to review the literature regarding the general social development of fraternity members and then later discuss the impact of these studies on the analysis of spiritual development.

Fraternities' influences on their members' development can be either positive (Brooks, 1967; Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967; Hébert, 2006; Owen & Owen, 1976; Sigma Phi Epsilon, 1995) or negative (Bartholow, Sher, & Krull, 2003; Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, & Blane, 2006; Kuh & Arnold, 1993; Nuwer, 2004; Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sinclair, 2004). Some of the positive influences are a focus on academics (Hébert, 2006), brotherhood (Sigma Phi Epsilon, 1995), ritual

(Brooks, 1967; Callais, 2005; Eberly, 1967; Owen & Owen, 1976) and leadership (Alpha Tau Omega, 2004; North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2006; Sigma Alpha Epsilon, 2005; Sigma Phi Epsilon, 2007). Some of the negative effects include hazing (Nuwer, 1999, 2004), drinking behaviors (Bartholow, Sher, & Krull, 2003; Capraro, 2000; Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, & Blane, 2006; Kuh & Arnold, 1993), and ethnocentricity (Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sinclair, 2004).

Positive Elements of Fraternity Culture

Fraternity rituals, through symbols or myths, communicate the philosophical or religious meaning of the organization. Eberly (1967) measured the perceptions of a sample of fraternity members regarding the influence of fraternity rituals on members. A majority of the participants reported that rituals should have a high value in their moral development but unfortunately they did not. Owen and Owen (1976) described how the spiritual elements of fraternities' rituals reinforced feelings of reverence and brotherhood for many members. Callais (2005) explained that the ritual is an important component of students' developmental process because it helps students transition from one stage of their lives to the next. Brooks (1967) described the fraternity ritual to be, "based solely on intellectual, moral, and spiritual pursuits" (p. 198).

Another positive aspect of fraternity life is a focus on academic development. In their review of literature Debard, Lake, and Binder (2006) reported that current data found no significant difference between average Greek member grade point averages (GPAs) and those of non-Greek students. Hébert (2006) focused on gifted students and demonstrated that Greek organizations promoted high academic standards for their members. These academic standards of excellence were promoted not only by the single

campus fraternity chapter, but were also encouraged through their national organizations by the awarding of scholarships and by national recognition of those individual members with the highest GPAs.

Brotherhood is another positive aspect of fraternity life that can be related to the development of spirituality. Brotherhood helps foster individual growth in a supportive group environment. An example that demonstrates the importance of a supportive environment is Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity's *Balanced Man Project* (Sigma Phi Epsilon, 1995). One of the key components of this program based on student development theory is that every new member is assigned to a different brother mentor to guide new members through each of the Sigma, Phi, and Epsilon challenges, as well as problems new members are having in both university and personal life. Some of these concerns might be homesickness, academic progress, assimilating with chapter members, and building respect for oneself and others. Parks (1986) described in her faith development model for young adults how mentoring communities are important for individuals to grow spiritually. Mentoring communities challenge the individual's beliefs while cultivating a nurturing and inclusive environment. Clearly, positive models of brotherhood can have an impact on fraternity members' spiritual development.

Developing leadership skills and moral stature as a result of fraternity membership is a long-standing assertion (Maxwell, 1901). Sermersheim (1996) found that Greek leaders developed or learned a wide array of different leadership traits during their Greek leadership experience. Several of the traits Sermersheim reported have a specific relationship to the present study: dealing with diversity, values clarification, leadership skills, and confidence in personal abilities. Many of the participants in her

study (95%) credited their Greek leadership experience to have “‘prepared’ to ‘extremely prepared’ [them] for their chosen profession” (p. 57). The leading college textbook used for undergraduate leadership training, *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make a Difference* (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007), depicted fraternity leadership only in terms of a trying process where leaders associated themselves with individuals who were either academically dishonest or unwilling to follow national or university policies. There was not a single reference in the text to support the concept that the fraternity experience facilitated proactive leadership development. Even though such negative depictions of fraternity members among current leadership literature exist, most national fraternities emphasize the benefits of leadership training within the fraternity context and offer some type of leadership workshop or school to its members (e.g., Alpha Tau Omega, 2004; North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2006; Sigma Alpha Epsilon, 2005; Sigma Phi Epsilon, 2007).

In 1935 Sigma Alpha Epsilon was the first fraternity or sorority to create a leadership school. The leadership school builds upon the fraternity’s original mission, which was an undergraduate educational fraternity – creating a “fraternal experience to make the collegiate years more meaningful for its members” (Sigma Alpha Epsilon, 2005, p. 72). Alpha Tau Omega, in 1986, founded the Leadershape program as a leadership institute for its members. From its original mission, the Leadershape program is an independent leadership program offering both non-affiliated and affiliated, male and female undergraduates the opportunity to develop their leadership abilities through learning value-based decision making, interpersonal skills, and realizing their personal potential (Alpha Tau Omega, 2004). Sigma Phi Epsilon (2007) offers a wide array of

different leadership opportunities for its members known as “The Leadership Continuum” (§ 1). The five programs offered are meant to help emphasize the fraternity’s values to its members. The top-level program is a ten-day trip to Greece, where members study the origins of Western Civilization accompanied by a professor of religion and a professor of philosophy (Sigma Phi Epsilon, 2007).

An example of a leadership program that offers Greek members an experience to interact with both fraternity and sorority members is the Undergraduate Interfraternity Institute (UIFI). The institute is hosted by North-American Interfraternity Conference, offering a five-day leadership program to Greek members wanting “to explore, define, and enhance their leadership skills, personal awareness, commitment to their fraternity or sorority, and grow to expect values based action from themselves and those they lead” (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2006, § 1).

Negative Elements of Fraternity Culture

Hazing has devastating consequences that could lead to mental and/or physical harm and a possible breakdown in spiritual development (Nuwer, 2004). According to a website dedicated to eliminating hazing (<http://www.stophazing.org/>), individuals who have been hazed reported that the only consequences of hazing, based on their experiences, were feelings of mistrust, victimization, and alienation. These feelings have a negative effect on individuals’ spiritual growth. Individuals at the “Young Adult Faith Stage” (p. 73) in their spiritual development have a fragile image of themselves, and negative or humiliating comments from fellow fraternity members can be detrimental to individuals’ spiritual development (Parks, 1986).

High risk drinking behaviors and their consequences are another negative attribute associated with fraternity membership. Bartholow, Sher, & Krull (2003) found a high correlation between Greek involvement and heavy drinking, indicating that the more involved a fraternity member was, the more likely that individual was to heavily consume alcohol. Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, and Blane (2006) discovered that most fraternity members considered themselves “Drinkers” (97%), “Heavy Drinkers” (83%), and “Binge Drinkers” (86%) (p. 145). Capraro (2000) found that the nature of all-male college fraternities may mean that men drink more alcohol more often within fraternities in order to live up to an unhealthy standard of masculinity operant within the groups. That unhealthy standard of masculinity was identified as “hegemonic masculinity” in other works (Edwards, 2007; Harris, 2006).

Kuh and Arnold (1993) examined the immense pressure put on new members to consume alcohol. For example, during “pledgeship”, there were rules and regulations that did not allow new members to drink alcohol during certain events but during these events active brothers were usually intoxicated. Furthermore, during most weekends and “social” events, new members were encouraged to interact socially with fellow members and heavily drink alcohol. The entire pledge process institutionalized an alcoholic culture within the organization. Even though the problem of binge drinking is still prevalent, Caron, Moskey, and Hovey (2004) found that Greek students in 2000 compared with Greek students six years earlier, drank less frequently, consumed less alcohol, and felt less pressure by others to drink.

Ethnocentricity is another negative characteristic of fraternities; however, some studies support, and others refute, the idea that fraternities breed prejudiced ideas and

beliefs. For example, Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, and Sinclair (2004) found that White students were more likely than racial minority students to join fraternities because of the inclusive nature of these organizations. The authors of the study found that “[w]hite students were significantly underrepresented among nonmembers of sororities and fraternities (standardized residual = -3.1, $p < .01$) and significantly and substantially overrepresented among the members of these Greek organizations (standardized residual = 7.4, $p < .01$)” (p. 100). Furthermore, they discovered evidence that white students who were part of a fraternity shared similar points of view and negative opinions of “others”.

Hébert (2006) found that gifted students attributed their positive Greek experience to being surrounded by a diverse group of men from whom they were able to learn from each other’s differences. This experience provided members the opportunity to become well-rounded individuals. Pike (2003) reported that fraternity members compared to their non-affiliated counterparts, expressed higher levels of collaborative learning and that, in general, fraternity members found the campus environment to be more supportive.

College Men and Hegemonic Masculinity

Edwards (2007) and Harris (2006) addressed issues dealing with hegemonic masculinity. Edward’s (2007) study revealed that men during college felt large amounts of pressure and strain to conform to unrealistic societal perceptions of what it means to be a man. Every male in the study responded, to some level, feeling that they were unable to become the ultimate perception of what a man is, and subsequently felt marginalized. When these individuals tried to liberate themselves from the pressure of trying to live up to the quintessential definition of what it means to be male, they felt overwhelmed rather than liberated.

Harris (2006) discovered that when college males experienced the pressures from both external and internal influences (e.g., personal perceptions, peer groups, campus involvement, etc.), they adopted behaviors such as “misogyny, alcohol consumption, homophobia, having a work hard/play hard mentality, and male bonding” (p. 191). The participants in his study perceived that all of these behaviors and attitudes were common among college males.

Fraternities have been identified as groups that foster atmospheres that encourage hyper-masculine behaviors such as high-risk drinking and hazing (Nuwer, 1999). Edward’s (2007) literature review revealed that fraternities are perceived as being organizations of upper-class males that support homophobic and misogynistic beliefs. Due to the exclusive nature of these organizations, members felt pressure to try to conform to the traditional male gender role, and that pressure consequently could explain the reason for their greater use of alcohol when compared to their non-affiliated counterparts. In contrast, Harris (2006) found that as a result of the male bonding that occurs in fraternities, members reported that they were able to share their most personal and vulnerable feelings within the group.

General Discussions of Spirituality and Faith Development

A review of previous research in the area of faith and/or spiritual development yielded little information on the topic, especially in the area of student development. Some of the key individuals who have made a significant impact in the research on faith or spirituality development are Fowler (1996), Parks (1986), Love (1999), and Talbot (1999). There are two edited works, *Spirituality in Higher Education* (Hoppe & Speck, 2005) and *The Implications of Student Spirituality for Student Affairs Practices*

(Jablonski, 2001), which focused on issues of spirituality in higher education as well as their importance for those working in student affairs. These two works contained essays that can be used to infuse general spiritual concepts into student programming. Lindholm (2006) used a mixed method design to examine college students' perceptions and beliefs regarding spirituality. Lindholm's findings are part of an ongoing study of college students' beliefs and values conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California Los Angeles. Most participants in the study consider spirituality to be "a core 'part of who they are' and the 'values that [they] live by' " (p. 85). In addition, of the individuals who reported high religious involvement, twenty percent revealed high levels of psychological distress compared to participants who stated low levels of religious involvement (34%) (p. 91).

The Development of Spirituality in Male and Female College Students

In a comparison study of male and female students, Buchko (2004) found that prayer occurred more frequently in women's lives, but during stressful times men were found to pray more often than women. However, Buchko's findings failed to support the hypothesis that women believed, more than men, that the connection with a higher being played an important role in their everyday lives. Women, however, were significantly more likely than men to look to religion for advice or guidance in times of trouble. Also, women felt more comfortable and secure than men with the degree to which they incorporated religion into their lives.

Bryant (2006) reported a significant difference between male and female college students among all of the 13 factors specifically focused on issues of spirituality and religiosity (e.g., spirituality, equanimity, religious engagement, etc.) that she examined in

the pilot administration of the CSBV Survey. Women reported having higher levels of twelve of the thirteen factors (e.g., spirituality, commitment to religion, religiousness, and religious/social conservatism, etc.). Alternatively, when compared to women, men only reported having a higher level of spiritual/religious growth.

With fraternities being all male organizations, the present studies might shed more light on the spiritual development of college males. Most research suggests that women are more spiritual than men. Emmons (2000) revealed that spiritual intelligence suggests that people who are able to employ spiritual resources to get through traumatic events are more likely to survive the trauma than people who do not do so.

Relationship Between Ethnic Identity and Spirituality Development

Chae, Kelly, Brown, and Bolden (2004) compared four different ethnic groups: African Americans, Latino Americans, Asian Americans, and White Americans and relationships between ethnic identity and spiritual development. They found that White Americans identified less with their ethnicity than did African, Latino, and Asian Americans. Also, African, Latino, and Asian Americans were found to be more spiritual than White Americans using The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Spirituality Ends Measure, and Spirituality Means Measure. Since the majority of fraternity/sorority organizations with large memberships primarily have White American members, this study has implications primarily for the spiritual development of White Americans who are members of college fraternities and sororities.

Zarvell (1993) discovered that in organizations with members from the same ethnic backgrounds, members were greatly influenced by the primary culture of the organization. Individuals joining these groups come into the fraternity experience with

their own religious and spiritual beliefs, their own socio-cultural background, and the values that they shared with their peers. The latter was most affected by the little diversity that is portrayed in fraternity life. What these groups are missing by not being diverse is a community in which individuals are able to explore who they are and how that relates to others (Hoppe & Speck, 2005). This exploration plays a key role in the spiritual growth of individuals.

Summary

As demonstrated in the review of literature, there have been few studies that have focused on the relationship between the American College Fraternity and members' spiritual development. The only related studies focused on the influence of fraternities on various aspects of members' social development, the development of spirituality in male and female college students, and the relationships between ethnic identity and spirituality development. The third chapter will reveal the methodology used in the present study.

Chapter III

Methodology

Design of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to examine the spirituality of fraternity members as compared to non-affiliated male respondents. In this study, quantitative methodology as described below was used.

To carry out the study, a data set from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) 2003 pilot survey instrument "College Students' Beliefs and Values" (CSBV) was used (Appendix C). First, the data set was sorted based on gender. Then the data for males (N = 1,211) were sorted based on the following survey questions:

- Question six (Since entering college have you:) item one (Joined a social fraternity or sorority)
- Question six (Since entering college have you:) item eight (Participated in leadership training)
- Question seven (During the past year, how much time did you spend during a typical week doing the following activities?) item 5 (Partying)
- Question eight (For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college.) item 5 (Drank beer)
- Question eight (For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college.) item 6 (Drank wine or liquor)

- Question eight (For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college.) item 1 (Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group) (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004c).

Finally, a scale was developed from available CSBV items to approximate a measure of hegemonic masculinity (Appendix E). The scale was used to examine respondents' relative position in terms of traditional conceptions of hyper-masculinity in relation to the College Students' Beliefs and Values Factor Scales (Appendix D, http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/factor_table.pdf).

Research Subject Selection

Data for the present study has been provided with permission by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) (Appendix B). The HERI student research participants had to meet the following criteria: have an updated local address, participated in the HERI Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Fall 2000 freshman survey, still be enrolled during spring semester 2003, and have given the HERI permission, during the CIRP Fall 2000 survey, to contact them for help with future research projects (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004b). HERI provided the PI with the records of 3,680 students with personal identification omitted. Responses of 1,211 male students were analyzed for the purposes of the present study.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to measure each fraternity member's and non-affiliated participant's spirituality was the *College Students' Beliefs and Values Survey (CSBV)*. The Higher Education Research Institute staff at UCLA created this survey with the

assistance of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP). The original study employing the CSBV pilot study was designed as a longitudinal follow up of third-year undergraduate students who had first enrolled as freshmen at a diverse sample of colleges and universities that participated in the 2000 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) annual Survey of Entering Freshman (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004b, p. 1).

The HERI staff examined many definitions of “spirituality” that scholars in the areas of business, education, and other fields developed before creating the CSBV survey. Survey developers also investigated other measurements of “spirituality” and “religiousness” that were developed by psychologists and measurement specialists. The HERI staff found that not one single survey they analyzed fit their needs for the project due to the narrow focus on specific aspects of spirituality or religiosity in many of the studies reviewed.

The HERI staff sought to develop a survey instrument that would be inclusive of all students’ beliefs whether or not their spiritual beliefs stemmed from personal religious convictions or from other sources. As a result the HERI instrument included both spiritual beliefs and perspectives while also incorporating spiritual practices and behaviors. Most importantly, the HERI staff wanted to create a survey that was user friendly—a survey short in length and that used easy to comprehend terminology (Appendix C).

After the HERI staff developed the criteria for the survey instrument and administered the 175 item pilot survey, a factor analysis of the data resulted in identifying 19 principal factors (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004d). The 19 principal

components factors measured six broad areas of spirituality, (1) Religious/Social Conservatism, (2) Religious Skepticism, (3) Self-Esteem, (4) Equanimity, (5) Psychological Distress, and (6) Spiritual Distress. The final pilot survey instrument factor scales included measures of spirituality, aesthetically-based spiritual experience, religious commitment, self-esteem, equanimity, spiritual distress, psychological distress, spiritual/religious growth, growth in global/national understanding, growth in tolerance, growth in leadership, religious engagement, charitable involvement, religious/social conservatism, religious skepticism, spiritual quest, social activism, artistic orientation, and compassionate self-concept (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004a). Cronbach alpha reliabilities for the 19 scale factors as reported ranged from .97 to .65 (Appendix D).

HERI did not establish verbal definitions of each factor based on the pilot survey, but instead supplied lists of the items loading on each factor as a method for readers to determine for themselves what was represented in each factor. For the purposes of this thesis, the Principal Investigator (PI) has stipulated his own description of what each factor measures below. Wherever possible, the PI used definitions for the factors based on subsequent research by HERI (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004e).

Spirituality – Spirituality “includes believing in the sacredness of life, seeking out opportunities to grow spiritually, and believing that we are all spiritual beings” (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004e, p. 8).

Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience – Aesthetically-based spiritual experience involves “viewing a great work of art”, “listening to beautiful music”, and

“witnessing the beauty and harmony of nature” (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004c).

Religious-Commitment – Religious-commitment “includes following religious teaching in everyday life, finding religion to be personally helpful, and gaining personal strength by trusting in a higher power” (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004e, p. 8).

Self-Esteem – Self-esteem entails being highly self-confident, courageous, and demonstrating leadership ability.

Equanimity – Equanimity “involves feeling at peace/centered, being able to find meaning in times of hardships, and feeling strong connection to all humanity” (p. 8).

Spiritual Distress – Spiritual distress involves questioning one’s religious beliefs, feeling annoyed with G-d, and being dissatisfied with your religious beliefs.

Psychological Distress – Psychological distress entails feeling overwhelmed, stressed, and that life is full of stress and anxiety.

Spiritual/Religious Growth – Spiritual/religious growth involves brought upon positive change in one’s spiritual and/or religious beliefs.

Growth in Global/National Understanding – Growth in global/national understanding entails an understanding of issues facing one’s own local community, but also, national and global issues.

Growth in Tolerance – Growth in tolerance exhibits the ability to get along with people of different racial or cultural backgrounds and increasing knowledge of different racial or cultural backgrounds.

Growth in Leadership – Growth in leadership reflects a self-rating of both exhibiting leadership abilities and interpersonal skills associated with leadership activities.

Religious Engagement – Religious engagement “involves attending religious services, praying, and reading sacred texts” (p. 8).

Charitable Involvement – Charitable involvement “assesses behaviors such as participating in community service, donating money to charity, and helping friends with personal problems” (p. 8).

Religious/Social Conservatism – Religious/social conservatism “reflects opposition to such things as casual sex and abortion, [advocates] the use of prayer to receive forgiveness, and the belief that people who do not believe in G-d [sic.] will be punished” (p. 8).

Religious Skepticism – Religious skepticism “includes beliefs such as ‘the universe arose by chance’ and ‘in the future, science will be able to explain everything,’ and disbelief in the notion of life after death” (p. 8).

Spiritual Quest – Spiritual quest “reflects interest in the meaning/purpose of life, finding answers to the mysteries of life, and developing a meaningful philosophy of life” (p. 8).

Social Activism – Social activism includes wanting “[t]o make the world a better place”, influencing politics, and social values. (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004c, p. 7).

Artistic Orientation – Artistic orientation involves “creating artistic works”, being creative, and having the desire to “becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts” (p. 7).

Compassionate Self-Concept – Compassionate self-concept “reflects self-ratings on qualities such as compassion, kindness, generosity, and forgiveness” (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004e, p. 8).

Creation of the Hegemonic Masculinity Scale

A 20th scale was generated from CSBV items using classical measurement theory (Winston, 2000). The PI selected items from the CSBV that were consistent with descriptions of hegemonic masculinity found in two recent dissertations (Harris, 2006; Edwards, 2007). The list of selected items was forwarded to Dr. Frank Harris for his expert review, and he agreed that the items had face validity for the purposes of the present study (Frank Harris, personal communication, January 10, 2008). Items selected from the CSBV Survey for use in the hegemonic masculinity scale included self-reported participation in intercollegiate sports (Question 6: Items 8 and 9), spending a great deal of time exercising or participating in sports (Question 7: Item 4), low socialization with persons of a different race or ethnic group (Question 8, Item 1), becoming successful (Question 13, Item 11), well off financially (Question 13, Item 6), and becoming an authority in one’s field (Question 13, Item 2). Other items included self-reports of high self-confidence (Question 31, Items 24 and 25), leadership ability drive to achieve (Question 31, Items 7 and 16), hours partying during a typical week (Question 7, Item 5), frequency of alcohol consumption (Question 8, Items 5 and 6), and misogynistic attitudes

toward women, e.g., “the activities of married women are best confined to the home and family” (Question 29, Items 10 and 11).

Hegemonic Masculinity – Hegemonic masculinity as defined for the purposes of the present study involved being highly athletic, dominant (e.g., religion, ability, social group), exhibiting high alcohol use, and including misogynistic beliefs (Appendix E).

Data Collection

In late March 2003, a postcard was sent out to a random sample of about 250 third-year students at each of 47 universities across the country to notify the students that they would receive the survey in the mail with more information about the survey. In addition to the survey and associated information, surveys were randomly selected to include a monetary incentive (e.g., \$0, \$2, \$5). Two weeks later in early April 2003, the HERI mailed out the four page questionnaires with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study. Another attempt was made to get students to participate in the study by sending an email reminder to a sample of the total population. Two weeks after the email reminder a second survey was sent to the research participants. In the end 32% of the responses were usable for the study (Higher Education Research Institute, 2004b).

Treatment of Data

Both fraternity members and non-affiliated male data sets were examined by the present investigator to determine if the independent data sets had the same underlying factor structure as the original, combined set of the HERI data. Internal Consistency Reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) was calculated to test if the reliability of the 19 factor scales for affiliated and non-affiliated males were similar. If the factor structures were stable (e.g., underlying factors from both sub-sets were similar), then finding similar

reliabilities would strengthen the use of the survey factors for the present analysis. If the factor structures were somewhat different, this outcome would support the idea that there were underlying differences between the data sets of fraternity members and non-affiliated male participants. Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to determine significant differences, if any, between fraternity and non-affiliated participants on each of the 19 scaled factor scores.

In addition, six planned analyses of data subsets were examined. When analyzing these data sets, the same procedures were implemented as were used on the fraternity members and non-affiliated male data sets. The data sets included (1) participated in leadership training, (2) number of hours the participant spends partying in a typical week, (3) how frequently has the participant consumed beer, (4) how frequently has the participant consumed wine and or liquor, and (5) how frequently has the participant socialized with some of another racial or ethnic group. Scheffe` post-hoc tests were used to determine specific scale mean differences (Klockars & Hancock, 2000).

Furthermore, the data were examined for hegemonic masculinity based on four different levels: (1) Low (-1 SD or less than - 1 SD), (2) Medium-Low (Between -1 SD and the mean), (3) Medium-High (Between the mean and 1 SD), and (4) High (1 SD or greater than 1 SD) of hegemonic masculinity. When analyzing the data sets, the same procedures were implemented as were used on the fraternity members and non-affiliated male data sets.

Summary

This chapter has presented the research design, participants, the instrument, data collection, and treatment of the data used in the study. The subjects in the study consisted

of 1,211 male participants. Six planned analyses of data subsets were examined, which included (1) participation in leadership training, (2) number of hours the participant spends partying in a typical week, (3) frequency of beer consumption, (4) frequency of wine and or liquor consumption, and (5) frequency of socializing with some of another racial or ethnic group, and (6) participants reported level of hegemonic masculinity. The fourth chapter will present results from the data analysis.

Chapter IV

Results/Findings

Survey Design

The data reported below were collected by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles via a Pilot Survey on College Students Beliefs and Values (Appendix C, 2003). The current study analyzed the data for men only based on question six, item one, "Since entering college, have you: joined a social fraternity or sorority." The data were factor analyzed by staff members at HERI (2004), and for the purposes of the present study the same factors were used. Since all relationships between variables are reported in terms of correlations, no causality of any kind can be inferred from these results (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

Internal Consistency Reliability

The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of the 19 CSBV scale factors was determined for affiliated and non-affiliated participants (Appendix F). Comparing the Cronbach-Alpha reliabilities of each factor demonstrated that affiliated and non-affiliated students responded to the items comprising the factors with comparable consistency and at a high enough level of reliability to analyze the group data with dependable outcomes.

Fraternity Membership and College Students' Beliefs and Values

Appendix G displays the results of a one-way MANOVA examining the relationship between fraternity membership and 20 scale factors (e.g., 19 CSBV factors and the hegemonic masculinity scale developed for the purposes of this study). Affiliated participants, compared to non-affiliated participants, reported higher levels of religious

skepticism ($F(1,665) = 7.66, p = .006$) and hegemonic masculinity ($F(1,665) = 34.75, p < .001$). Non-affiliated participants demonstrated higher levels of spirituality ($F(1,665) = 9.23, p = .002$), religious commitment ($F(1,665) = 13.03, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(1,665) = 16.22, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(1,665) = 14.35, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(1,665) = 22.89, p < .001$) compared to affiliated participants.

Leadership Training and College Students' Beliefs and Values

To observe the relationship between leadership training and the 20 measures developed from the *CSBV*, a one-way MANOVA was executed (Appendix H).

Leadership training was designated by student responses to Question Six, Item 10: "Since entering college, have you: Participated in leadership training?" Participants who self-reported leadership training, compared to individuals who did not self-report leadership training, exhibited higher levels of spirituality ($F(1,665) = 61.93, p < .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(1,665) = 45.93, p < .001$), religious commitment ($F(1,665) = 36.71, p < .001$), self-esteem ($F(1,665) = 13.23, p < .001$), equanimity ($F(1,665) = 28.39, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(1,665) = 41.25, p < .001$), growth in global/national understanding ($F(1,665) = 11.14, p = .001$), religious engagement ($F(1,665) = 67.61, p < .001$), charitable involvement ($F(1,665) = 82.43, p < .001$), religious/social conservatism ($F(1,665) = 33.22, p < .001$), spiritual quest ($F(1,665) = 12.86, p < .001$), social activism ($F(1,665) = 29.14, p < .001$), and compassionate self-concept ($F(1,665) = 10.20, p = .001$). Male survey respondents who did not participate in leadership training were more religiously skeptical ($F(1,665) = 27.07, p < .001$) compared to respondents self-reporting leadership training.

Subsequently, a one-way MANOVA test was performed to examine the multiple relationships between fraternity membership and leadership training on the 20 measures (Appendix I). Individuals that reported participating in both leadership training and a social fraternity demonstrated the highest levels of self-esteem ($F(3,663) = 5.31, p = .001$) and charitable involvement ($F(3,663) = 28.75, p < .001$) compared to all other participants. Participants who were involved in leadership training but were not involved in a social fraternity revealed the highest levels of spirituality ($F(3,663) = 25.52, p < .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(3,663) = 18.58, p < .001$), religious commitment ($F(3,663) = 18.33, p < .001$), equanimity ($F(3,663) = 10.12, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(3,663) = 21.05, p < .001$), growth in global/national understanding ($F(3,663) = 4.85, p = .002$), religious engagement ($F(3,663) = 30.23, p < .001$), religious/social conservatism ($F(3,663) = 21.23, p < .001$), spiritual quest ($F(3,663) = 4.86, p = .002$), and social activism ($F(3,663) = 10.67, p < .001$) than all other respondents. Individuals who reported being affiliated with a social fraternity and did not participate in leadership training exhibited the highest levels of religious skepticism ($F(3,663) = 12.44, p < .001$) and hegemonic masculinity ($F(3,663) = 14.33, p < .001$) compared to all other survey participants.

Partying and College Students' Beliefs and Values

To observe the relationship between numbers of hours partying and the scale factors, a one-way MANOVA was executed (Appendix J). The independent variable, partying, had to be condensed due to the lack of participants who indicated that they partied twenty-one hours or more during a typical week. The variable was reduced to

three different values (1- zero to less than one hour a week, 2- one to five hours a week, 3- six to over thirty hours a week).

Individuals who indicated they partied for zero or less than one hour in a typical week demonstrated higher levels of spirituality ($F(2,664) = 27.50, p < .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(2,664) = 13.39, p < .001$), religious commitment ($F(2,664) = 59.32, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(2,664) = 49.82, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(2,664) = 104.95, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(2,664) = 109.94, p < .001$). Individuals who indicated that they partied heavily, from six to over thirty hours in a typical week, exhibited higher levels of religious skepticism ($F(2,664) = 53.91, p < .001$) and hegemonic masculinity ($F(2,664) = 288.94, p < .001$).

To further examine the relationship between partying and fraternity membership, a one-way MANOVA test was performed to examine both partying and fraternity affiliation (Appendix K). Due to the lack of affiliated participants who reported they typically did not party or partied less than an hour a week, the variable had to be combined with (one to five hours) to have a large enough sample to run the MANOVA test. The MANOVA categories were (1) partying zero to five hours per week, and (2) partying six to more than thirty hours per week.

Participants who partied between zero and five hours typically in a week and were not fraternity members, reported higher levels of spirituality ($F(3,663) = 12.58, p < .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(3,663) = 6.61, p < .001$), religious commitment ($F(3,663) = 23.73, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(3,663) = 20.09, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(3,663) = 36.06, p < .001$), and religious/social

conservatism ($F(3,663) = 38.67, p < .001$). Individuals who partied heavily, from six to over thirty hours in a typical week, and were affiliated with a fraternity demonstrated higher levels of psychological distress ($F(3,663) = 4.81, p = .003$), religious skepticism ($F(3,663) = 19.23, p < .001$), and hegemonic masculinity ($F(3,663) = 112.78, p < .001$). Non-affiliated participants who indicated that they partied heavily revealed higher levels of self-esteem ($F(3,663) = 3.79, p = .01$) than all other participants.

Alcohol Consumption and College Students' Beliefs and Values

Four one-way MANOVA tests were completed to examine the relationship between the frequency of alcohol consumption and the scaled measures. The first test that was performed examined the connection between the measures and the participants' frequency of consuming beer since entering college (e.g., Not at all, Occasionally, or Frequently) (Appendix L). Beer consumption was indicated by student responses to Question Eight, Item Five: "For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college: Drank beer?"

Participants who reported to not having consumed beer since entering college revealed higher levels of spirituality ($F(2,664) = 18.68, p > .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(2,664) = 5.09, p = .006$), religious commitment ($F(2,664) = 60.61, p < .001$), equanimity ($F(2,664) = 13.24, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(2,664) = 52.76, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(2,664) = 89.06, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(2,664) = 114.62, p < .001$) than all other participants. While participants who reported that since entering college they consume beer frequently, exhibited higher levels of religious skepticism ($F(2,664) = 62.44, p < .001$) and hegemonic masculinity ($F(2,664) = 178.91, p < .001$).

To further explore this connection between alcohol consumption and the scaled measures, another one-way MANOVA was executed examining the relationship between the frequency of consuming wine or liquor since entering college and the factor scales (Appendix M). Wine and liquor consumption was revealed by student responses to Question Eight, Item Six: “For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college: Drank wine or liquor?” Participants who reported that they had not drunk either wine or liquor since entering college reported higher levels of spirituality ($F(2,664) = 8.72, p = .001$), religious commitment ($F(2,664) = 43.71, p < .001$), equanimity ($F(2,664) = 6.86, p = .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(2,664) = 39.19, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(2,664) = 65.29, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(2,664) = 91.97, p < .001$). Participants who indicated that they drank wine or liquor on occasion since entering college exhibited a greater growth in understanding global and national issues ($F(2,664) = 5.54, p = .004$) than all other participants. Individuals who stated that they consumed wine or liquor frequently since entering college, displayed higher levels psychological distress ($F(2,664) = 4.70, p = .009$), religious skepticism ($F(2,664) = 41.41, p < .001$), and hegemonic masculinity ($F(2,664) = 166.16, p < .001$).

Two, one-way MANOVA tests, using the same independent variables (e.g., consume beer and consume wine or liquor), were completed but now examining the relationship between fraternity membership and alcohol consumption. Unfortunately, only one of the tests results could be used because there was not a large enough sample of affiliated participants who either did not drink wine or liquor or frequently drank wine or liquor since entering college. Furthermore, when examining the relationship between

fraternity membership and drinking beer, there was a lack of affiliated participants who had never consumed beer since entering college. Due to the insufficient sample of affiliated participants who had never drunk alcohol since entering college, the groups “not at all” and “occasionally” were collapsed (Appendix N).

Participants who did not drink beer or who occasionally drank beer since entering college and were not affiliated, reported higher levels of spirituality ($F(3,663) = 9.06, p < .001$), religious commitment ($F(3,663) = 23.56, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(3,663) = 21.73, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(3,663) = 22.09, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(3,663) = 36.21, p < .001$). Individuals who were not affiliated and who drank beer frequently since entering college, reported higher levels of religious skepticism ($F(3,663) = 20.67, p < .001$) compared to all other participants, while affiliated participants who consumed beer on a frequent basis since entering college demonstrated the highest level of hegemonic masculinity ($F(3,663) = 64.74, p < .001$).

Exposure to Diversity and College Student Beliefs and Values

To observe the relationship between the frequency of interaction with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college (e.g., not at all, occasionally, frequently) and the scale factors, a one-way MANOVA was executed (Appendix O). Due to the lack of participants who had not interacted with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college the groups “not at all” and “occasionally” were collapsed. Interaction with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college was revealed by student responses to Question Eight, Item One: “For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college: Socialized with someone of a different racial/ethnic group?”

Participants who reported having interacted with someone of different racial or ethnic group frequently, demonstrated higher levels of self-esteem ($F(1,665) = 15.81, p < .001$), equanimity ($F(1,665) = 7.77, p = .005$), growth in tolerance ($F(1,665) = 25.77, p < .001$), charitable involvement ($F(1,665) = 15.82, p < .001$), social activism ($F(1,665) = 14.61, p < .001$), and compassionate self-concept ($F(1,665) = 11.73, p = .001$) compared to participants that indicated not at all or occasionally.

To further explore the relationship between interacting with some of a different racial or ethnic background and the scale factors, a one-way MANOVA was performed to examine the relationship between fraternity membership and frequency of interaction with someone of another racial or ethnic group since entering college with the scale factors (Appendix P). Individuals who reported both frequently interacting with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college and being a member of a social fraternity demonstrated higher levels of self-esteem ($F(3,663) = 6.16, p < .001$), charitable involvement ($F(3,663) = 6.76, p < .001$), religious skepticism ($F(3,663) = 3.92, p = .009$), and hegemonic masculinity ($F(3,663) = 11.61, p < .001$) compared to the other groups. Participants who reported frequently interacting with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college and were not involved in a social fraternity revealed higher levels of spiritual/religious growth ($F(3,663) = 6.38, p < .001$), growth in tolerance ($F(3,663) = 9.36, p < .001$), social activism ($F(3,663) = 5.56, p = .001$), and compassionate self-concept ($F(3,663) = 4.02, p = .008$). Individuals who reported to have not at all or occasionally interacted with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college and were not members of a fraternity exhibited higher levels of

religious commitment ($F(3,663) = 4.94, p = .002$), religious engagement ($F(3,663) = 5.15, p = .002$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(3,663) = 9.36, p < .001$).

Hegemonic Masculinity and College Students' Beliefs and Values

Examining the relationship between the participants' level of hegemonic masculinity and the scale factors, a one-way MANOVA was executed using a scale that was developed to assess respondents' relative conformity to hegemonic masculinity (Appendix Q). Due to the lack of participants who demonstrated levels of either extreme or scarce (e.g., being more than two standard deviations) hegemonic masculinity, the two groups were combined with the groups that were between one and two standard deviations. The four hegemonic masculinity groups were categorized as: Low (-1 SD or less than - 1 SD), Medium-Low (Between -1 SD and the mean), Medium-High (Between the mean and 1 SD), and High (1 SD or greater than 1 SD).

Participants who displayed the lowest level of hegemonic masculinity reported higher levels of spirituality ($F(3,663) = 9.66, p > .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(3,663) = 8.77, p = .006$), religious commitment ($F(3,663) = 24.97, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(3,663) = 15.30, p < .001$), religious engagement ($F(3,663) = 51.56, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(3,663) = 60.37, p < .001$) than all other participants. Participants who reported the highest level hegemonic masculinity revealed higher levels of self-esteem ($F(3,663) = 53.98, p < .001$) and religious skepticism ($F(3,663) = 26.23, p < .001$).

To further examine the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and the scale factors, a one-way MANOVA was performed to examine both hegemonic masculinity and fraternity affiliation (Appendix R). Due to the lack of affiliated participants, the

hegemonic masculinity factor had to be condensed into two groups to have large enough samples to run the MANOVA test. The groups were split between low (less than the mean) and high (greater than the mean).

Individuals who reported both a low level of hegemonic masculinity and were affiliated demonstrated higher levels of religious engagement ($F(3,663) = 39.52, p < .001$) than all other groups. Participants who reported a low level of hegemonic masculinity but were non-affiliated revealed higher levels of spirituality ($F(3,663) = 8.82, p < .001$), aesthetically-based spiritual experience ($F(3,663) = 6.36, p < .001$), religious commitment ($F(3,663) = 20.33, p < .001$), spiritual/religious growth ($F(3,663) = 15.91, p < .001$), and religious/social conservatism ($F(3,663) = 48.52, p < .001$). Individuals who reported a high level of hegemonic masculinity and were a member of fraternity exhibited higher level of religious skepticism ($F(3,663) = 21.22, p < .001$). While participants who demonstrated a high level of hegemonic masculinity and were not a member of fraternity displayed a higher level of self-esteem ($F(3,663) = 33.30, p < .001$).

Summary

As the results have indicated, there were significant differences regarding measures of spirituality and associated beliefs and values between fraternity members and non-affiliated participants and among all six planned analyses. The fifth chapter will reveal implications from the findings of the present study and recommendations for future research.

Chapter V

Discussion/Recommendations/Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the correlation between fraternity membership and spirituality within its members, and to determine how the level of spirituality among fraternity members compared to the level of spirituality among the non-fraternity college male population. In addition to examining the relationship between fraternity membership and spirituality, six exploratory data analyses were conducted based on prior research. The exploratory analyses included examining variables related to participation in leadership training (Alpha Tau Omega, 2004; North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2006; Sigma Alpha Epsilon, 2005; Sigma Phi Epsilon, 2007), number of hours participants self-reported they spent partying in a typical week (Kuh & Arnold, 1993), how frequently participants consumed beer since entering college, how frequently participants consumed wine and or liquor since entering college (Bartholow, Sher, & Krull, 2003; Capraro, 2000; Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, & Blane, 2006; Kuh & Arnold, 1993), how frequently participants socialized with someone of another racial or ethnic group (Hayek, et al. 2002; Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sinclair, 2004), and participants' level of hegemonic masculinity based on a scale developed for the purposes of this study (Harris, 2006; Edwards, 2007).

A quantitative study solely examining Greek leaders at medium sized state university discovered that members developed or learned a wide array of different leadership traits during their Greek leadership experience (Sermersheim, 1996). Among these were dealing with diversity, values clarification, leadership skills, and confidence in abilities. The present study's findings also identified similar positive outcomes regarding

both affiliated and non-affiliated participants who were involved in leadership training. Individuals who reported participating in both leadership training and a social fraternity demonstrated the highest levels of self-esteem and charitable involvement (Appendix I) compared to non-affiliated participants who were involved in leadership training, and both affiliated and non-affiliated participants who were not involved in leadership training. Participants who were involved in leadership training but were not involved in a social fraternity revealed the highest levels of spirituality, aesthetically-based spiritual experience, equanimity, spiritual/religious growth, growth in global/national understanding, spiritual quest, and social activism compared to all other respondents.

Published qualitative research on the impact of alcohol abuse and fraternity membership (Kuh & Arnold, 1993) indicated “[t]he physical environments of the fraternity suggested alcohol played a prominent role in group life” (p. 331). In both members’ rooms and common areas of the fraternity house, there was alcohol paraphernalia, beer cans, and liquor bottles. Also, even though the fraternity’s national bylaws espoused positive ideals, the actual organizational culture was one that “typified the ‘college man’ culture, characterized by hedonistic, anti-intellectual behaviors and attitudes” (p. 331). Furthermore, due to the inclusive nature of the organization, members rarely challenged the current practices of the fraternity because they did not want to expose their self-esteem to peer criticism. The current study, using quantitative methods, showed similar findings: affiliated participants who partied heavily, from six to over thirty hours in a typical week, demonstrated high levels of psychological distress and religious skepticism (Appendix K).

Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sinclair (2004) found that White students who were part of a fraternity at the University of California at Los Angeles shared similar points of view and negative opinions of “others” in their study examining “the effects of both minority ethnic organizations among minorities and Greek organizations among Whites across a broad array of intergroup attitudes within the context of a highly diverse and selective university” (p. 98). Specifically Sindanius, et al. found that “[w]hite students were significantly underrepresented among nonmembers of sororities and fraternities (standardized residual = -3.1, $p < .01$) and significantly and substantially overrepresented among the members of these Greek organizations (standardized residual = 7.4, $p < .01$)” (p. 100). The authors reported that membership in Greek organizations was positively correlated with the pre-college level of students’ White ethnic identity development. Subsequently, White students who joined Greek organizations demonstrated increased opposition to a campus culture that was ethnically diverse, were resistant to interracial dating and marriage, and were more likely to support symbolic racism.

The results of the present study revealed that both affiliated and non-affiliated participants who frequently interacted with individuals of different racial or ethnic backgrounds exhibited positive beliefs and values (Appendix P), indicating possible member benefits if traditionally White fraternities were encouraged to be inclusive in nature. Individuals who reported both frequently interacting with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college and being a member of a social fraternity demonstrated the highest levels of self-esteem, charitable involvement, and religious skepticism compared to affiliated men who reported low levels of interracial/ethnic

interaction and non-affiliated participants who reported both high and low levels of interracial / ethnic interaction. Participants who reported frequently interacting with someone of a different racial or ethnic group since entering college but were not affiliated with a social fraternity reported the highest levels of spiritual/religious growth, growth in tolerance, social activism, and compassionate self-concept.

Fraternities have been identified as groups that foster atmospheres that encourage hyper-masculine behaviors (Edwards, 2007). Harris (2006) described hegemonically masculine males as those for whom “misogyny, alcohol consumption, homophobia, having a work hard/play hard mentality, and male bonding” (p. 191) were primary characteristics of their identity. Using a locally developed proxy scale assessing hegemonic masculinity using items from the CSBV Survey, the PI found quantitative outcomes that supported both Harris’s and Edward’s qualitative research. Fraternity members reported higher levels of hegemonic masculinity than non-affiliated participants. In particular, fraternity members who frequently partied or consumed liquor reported the highest levels of hegemonic masculinity compared to fraternity members who partied not at all or occasional and all other non-affiliated participants (Appendix Q, R). The results of the present study supported Capraro’s (2000) reasoning about the perception of masculinity among college males and men’s motivation for drinking. Males most sensitive to issues of hegemonic masculinity drink more than other males.

Discussion

There is a major focus on the importance of leadership training for college students in the field of student affairs (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). Results of the present study, in which respondents self-reported that they had participated in some

type of leadership training at some time between the first and third years of college, supported both the general literature on leadership and more specific literature that focused on leadership in the context of the college fraternity (Sermersheim, 1996). The emphasis that fraternal organizations place on leadership training, and the outcomes of the college fraternity experience that relate to later community leadership, are well founded. Based on these data, the student outcomes of leadership programs are an important mediating influence that liberalize and promote culturally positive beliefs and values.

The high-risk drinking environment to which fraternity members are exposed has caused a major concern among institutional leaders of higher education. Previous researchers have shown that such concerns are well-founded (Bartholow, Sher, & Krull, 2003; Capraro, 2000; Caudill, Crosse, Campbell, Howard, Luckey, & Blane, 2006; Kuh & Arnold, 1993) and the present study supported these findings. In both analyzing the relationships between drinking beer and student beliefs and values and drinking wine or liquor and student beliefs and values, the population of affiliated participants who did not consume beer or wine and liquor was too small to use the test results in the present study. This indicated that there are not a large proportion of fraternity members who abstain from drinking, and reinforces the value of substance-free programming.

One-way to reduce students' high risking drinking behavior is to sponsor non-alcoholic events that would be held later in the evening (Pulse: Division of Student Affairs, 2006). Holding late night events provides students the opportunity to engage in non-alcoholic related activities during a time when many alcoholic related events are held. Equally important is the need for fraternal organizations to recruit members who do

not already possess high-risk drinking behaviors. Fraternity men who exhibit such high risk drinking behaviors are also likely to demonstrate misogynistic and domineering traits (Edwards, 2007).

Promoting diversity is an ideal that most colleges and universities encourage amongst the entire campus, but research has indicated that fraternities that are exclusive in nature (e.g., being predominately White organizations) promote negative opinions of other individuals (Sindanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sinclair, 2004). Results of the present study, in which respondents self-reported the frequency of their socialization with someone of another racial or ethnic group, supported the need for fraternities to promote diversity among members. During recruitment, fraternity members should base their decisions on giving bids to new-members on their fraternity's values and principles rather than cultural norms and biases. Diversity promotes growth-inducing organizations.

While fraternities have been identified as organizations that foster hyper-masculine behaviors (Edwards, 2007), the results of this study indicated the need for promoting personal self-confidence as a counterpoint to conceptions of hegemonic masculinity. Edward's study revealed that "men put on a performance that was like a mask in that it allowed them to portray an image that conformed to society's expectations and cover up the ways they felt they didn't measure up to society's expectations" (p. 179). The "college man' culture" (Kuh & Arnold, 1993, p. 331) that promotes high risk drinking is parallel to Edwards concept of hegemonic masculinity.

The PI discovered in the present study statistically significant relationships between hegemonic masculinity and the frequency of drinking beer, drinking wine or liquor, and time spent partying. To help male students define and discover their personal

identity, universities, colleges and fraternal organization leaders should promote male gender identity programming that focuses on issues of men and masculinity (Friesema, 2008). This type of proactive men's programming will encourage participants to make important steps toward starting conversations to promote male students to become more comfortable with their sense of maleness and personal sense of masculinity.

Findings of the present study indicated that non-affiliated participants compared to affiliated participants demonstrated higher levels of spirituality, religious commitment, spiritual/religious growth, religious engagement, and religious/social conservatism. Fraternity members compared to non-affiliated men reported only a higher level of religious skepticism, meaning that fraternity men as reflected in the respondents from the CSBV Survey were more questioning of parental religious beliefs and practices and formal religious conventions. It would seem that current fraternity members may not have a strong spiritual or religious connection. Dr. Seth R. Brooks (1967), a past-president of Beta Theta Pi Fraternity, suggested that the fraternity ritual was a bridge between a young man's early life and his post-college life, during which many young men took a furlough from formal religious practice. Most fraternities have religiously based rituals that stress the important values and beliefs of the organization (Robson, 1976). Fraternity leaders should implement ritual-based educational programming that helps members connect their beliefs and values to a spiritual foundation.

Buchko (2004) found that men were not likely to turn to religion for advice during times of trouble. One impact of hegemonic masculinity on male resiliency is the inability to cope with trauma and the range of emotions associated with such experiences (Harris, 2006; Edwards, 2007). A reflection of the inability to cope with trauma and its emotional

challenges is the high-risk drinking associated with exaggerated masculine behavior (Capraro, 2000) often found in all-male societies.

Recommendations from the Results of the Present Study

The following suggestions for fraternal and other organizations are based on the findings in the present study:

1. Student Affairs practitioners should strongly promote leadership training to all of their students because of the positively related student outcomes (e.g., self-esteem, equanimity, charitable involvement, charitable involvement, etc.) associated with leadership training.

2. Fraternity affairs professionals should explore some of the leadership activities that non-affiliated participants were involved in because of the highly positive outcomes (e.g., equanimity, growth in global/national understanding, social activism). Student affairs professionals working with non-affiliated leaders should examine the leadership activities that fraternity members are involved in (e.g., self-esteem and charitable involvement) for similar positive learning outcomes. Collaboration between campus student affairs professionals and fraternity professionals would benefit the welfare of male students in general.

3. Support and encourage diversity and inclusive environments among all student organizations. As Rankin, Case, Windmeyer, Eberly, Hesp, Miller and Molasso (2007) have reported, the press for inclusivity within college fraternities has changed toward increased openness over the last four decades. Such openness to diversity is essential to the health of the overall college climate.

4. Encourage male students to be comfortable with their personal level of masculinity with a supportive and nurturing environment where they are able to reveal personal feelings. Programming needs to be developed and implemented that supports the expression of a wider range of emotional expressiveness among college males.

5. Fraternity officials should encourage character development and value-based programming that reinforces spiritual development and personal religious commitment.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research are based on the present study:

1. Fraternal affiliation was determined on the CSBV Survey by participants self-reporting whether they had joined a social fraternity since entering college. Future researchers could examine the spirituality and religiosity among members of different types of organizations (e.g., IFC, NPHC, NALFO), within a specific fraternal organization, or the quality of the chapters within a specific organization based on criteria such as chapter programming, adherence to Ritual and the quality of its performance within each chapter, and within sheltering institutions by public – private or Carnegie classifications.

2. The CSBV Survey asked only if respondents had experienced leadership training or not. The quality or type of leadership training was left undefined. Future researchers could examine the relationship of specific leadership programs such as UIFI (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2006) or Leadershape (Alpha Tau Omega, 2004) to participants' beliefs and values. In addition, researchers could conduct a longitudinal study examining the effects of leadership training in general or specifically

examining the learning outcomes of specific programs (Keeling, Wall, Underhile, and Dungy, 2008) related to students' levels of spirituality and associated factors.

3. The present study examined affiliated and non-affiliated participants' levels of hegemonic masculinity on a scale constructed by the PI from items within the CSBV Survey. Future researchers could perform qualitative studies in which they explored the "voices" of students who experienced programming that supported the expression of a wider range of emotional expressiveness among college males and the effects such programming has on students' beliefs and values. Quantitative researchers could develop and validate a scale of hegemonic masculinity that could be used as a proxy variable in multiple studies related to the understanding of male behavior in single-sex collegiate organizations such as fraternities and athletic teams. Practitioners need help to understand the underlying dimensions of masculinity in order to create successful character development programming that supports the value-based objectives of men's fraternities.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to examine the correlation between fraternity membership and the development of spirituality within its members, and to determine how the level of spirituality of fraternity members compares to the level of spirituality among the general college male population. There were significant differences on the 19 CSBV factors between fraternity members and non-affiliated male respondents. In addition, there were significant findings among the six planned analyses and the hegemonic masculinity scale developed from CSBV items for the purposes of this study. Analyzing the CSBV factor scales levels among male members of Greek letter fraternities, compared to non-affiliated participants, revealed a need to enhance local

chapter programming, create new programs, or find ways of reinforcing college fraternal organizations' core values, particularly as they address issues of spirituality and personal religious growth, and the healthy conception of manhood.

References

- Alpha Tau Omega. (2004). *The Leadershape Institute*. Retrieved April, 2008, from http://ato.org/ug/lship_leadershape.shtml
- Anson, J. L., & Marchesani, R. F. (1991). *Baird's manual of American college fraternities*. Indianapolis, IN: Baird's Manual Foundation, Inc.
- Arnold, J. C. (1995). *Alcohol and the chosen few: Organizational reproduction in an addictive system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Bartholow, B. D., Sher, K. J., & Krull, J. L. (2003). Changes in heavy drinking over the third decade of life as a function of collegiate fraternity and Sorority involvement: A prospective, multilevel analysis. *Health Psychology, 22*(6), 616-626.
- Brooks, S. R. (1967). *In beta's broad domain: A collection of the memoirs and written and spoken words of Seth R. Brooks, D.D.* Oxford, OH: Beta Theta Pi.
- Bryant, A. N. (2006). Gender differences in spiritual development during the college years. *Spirituality in Higher Education: A National Study of College Students' Search for Meaning and Purpose*. 1-12.
- Buchko, K. J. (2004). Religious beliefs and practices of college women as compared to college men. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(1), 89-98.
- Callais, M. A. (2005). Helping fraternity and sorority members understand ritual. *Oracle: The Research of Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 1*(1), 32-37.
- Capraro, R. L. (2000). Why college men drink: Alcohol, adventure, and the paradox of masculinity. *Journal of American College Health, 48*, 307-316.

- Caron, S. L., Moskey, E. G., & Hovey, C. A. (2004). Alcohol use among fraternity and sorority members: Looking at change over time. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 47*(3), 51-66.
- Caudill, B. D., Crosse, S. B., Campbell, B. C., Howard, J., Luckey, B., & Blane, H. T. (2006). High-risk drinking among college fraternity members: A national perspective. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(3), 141-155.
- Chae, M. H., Kelly, D. B., Brown, C. F., & Bolden, M. A. (2004). Relationship of ethnic identity and spiritual development: An exploratory study. *Counseling and Values, 25*, 15-27.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd. Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W., Dalton, J. C., & Stamm, L. (2006). *Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeBard, R., Lake, T., & Binder, R. S. (2006). Greeks and grades: The first-year experience. *NASPA Journal, 43*(1), 56-68.
- Driver, T. F. (1991). *The magic of ritual: Our need for liberating rites that transform our lives and our communities*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Eberly, C. G. (1967). The influence of the fraternity ritual. *College Student Survey, 1*(1), 9-12.
- Eberly, C. G. (1970). *Critical thinking, attitudes and values associated with fraternity membership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

- Edwards, K. E. (2007). *"Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Emmons, R. A. (2000). Is spirituality intelligence? Motivation, cognition, and psychology of ultimate concern. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 10*(1), 3-26.
- Fowler, J. W. (1996). *Faithful change: The personal and public challenges of postmodern life*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Friesema, J. (2008, March 25). *Man: Who are you?* Educational presented to the Eastern Illinois University Interfraternity Council, Charleston, IL.
- Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C. (1970). *Statistical methods in education and psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Harris, F. (2006). *The meaning college men make of masculinities and contextual influences on behaviors, outcomes, and gender environment norms: A grounded theory study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Hayek, J. C., Carini, R. M., O'Day, P. T., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Triumph or tragedy: Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter organizations and other students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(5), 643-663.
- Hébert, T. P. (2006). Gifted university males in a Greek fraternity: Creating a culture of achievement. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 50*(1), 26-41.

- Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. (2004a). *College Students' Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Factor Scales Table*. Retrieved April 14, 2008, from http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/factor_table.pdf
- Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. (2004b). *College Students' Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Pilot Survey Methodology*. Retrieved December, 2007, from http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/Survey_Methodology.pdf
- Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. (2004c). *College Students Beliefs and Values Survey*. Retrieved April 14, 2008, from http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/about/2003_CSBV_Survey_Instrument.pdf
- Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. (2004d). *Development of the College Students' Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Survey*. Retrieved January 15, 2007, from http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/Survey_Development.pdf
- Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. (2004e). *The Spiritual Life of College Students: A National Study of Students' Search for Meaning and Purpose (Full Report)*. Retrieved April 13, 2008, from http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/spirituality/reports/FINAL_REPORT.pdf
- Hoppe, S. L., & Speck, B. W. (2005). *Spirituality in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jablonski, M. A. (2001). *The implications of student spirituality for student affairs practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Keeling, R. P., Wall, A. F., Underhile, R., & Dungy, G. J. (2008). *Assessment reconsidered: Institutional effectiveness for student success*. Washington, DC: International Center for Student Success and Institutional Accountability.
- Klockars, A. J., & Hancock, G. R. (2000). Sceffe's powerful f-protected pos hoc procedure. *Journal of Education and Behavioral Statistics*, 25(1), 13-19.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., & Arnold, J. C. (1993). Liquid bonding: A cultural analysis of the role of alcohol in fraternity pledgship. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34(5), 327-334.
- Lindholm, J.A. (2006). The "Interior" lives of American college students: Preliminary findings from a national study. In J.L. Heft, Ed. *Passing on the faith: Transforming traditions for the next generation of Jews, Christians, and Muslims* (pp. 75-102). New York: Fordham University Press.
- Lindholm, J.A., Park, J., Curley, J., & Schwartz, L. (2008, March). *Supporting undergraduate spiritual development: Perspective from a study of student beliefs & values*. Handout presented at the NASPA National Conference, Boston.
- Love, P., & Talbot, D. (1999). Defining spiritual development: A missing consideration for student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 37(1), 361-375.
- Maxwell, W. J. (1901). *Greek letter men of northeastern Pennsylvania*. New York: The College Book Company.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.

- McMinn, B. L. (1979). *A content analysis of the esoteric ritual manuals of national college social fraternities for men*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, Oxford.
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2007). *Rank and file*. Retrieved December 4, 2007, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rank%20and%20file>
- National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations (2007). *NALFO Definition*. Retrieved April 18, 2008, from <http://www.nalfo.org/>
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2004). *Binge Drinking Defined*. Retrieved November 22, 2006, from <http://www.svsu.edu/emplibary/Binge%20Drinking%20Defined.pdf>
- National Panhellenic Conference. (2005). *About NPC*. Retrieved April 18, 2008, from <http://www.npcwomen.org/about.aspx>
- The National Pan-Hellenic Council, Incorporated. (2007). *About the NP-HC*. Retrieved April 18, 2008, from <http://www.nphchq.org/about.htm>
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales. *Communication Research Reports*, 14(2), 145-156.
- North-American Interfraternity Conference. (2006). *Undergraduate Interfraternity Institute*. Retrieved April 13, 2008, from <http://www.nicindy.org/programs/UIFI/>
- North-American Interfraternity Conference. (2007). *Northern-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC)*. Retrieved April 29, 2008, from http://www.nicindy.org/about_us/

- Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Nuwer, H. (2004). *The hazing reader*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Outside The Classroom. (2005). *High Risk Drinking in College: AlcoholEdu Fact Sheet*. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from http://ohiosadd.org/docs/high_rise_drinking_in_college.pdf
- Owen, K. C., & Owen, S. M. (1976). Toward the year 2000: Perspectives on the American fraternity movement. *Fraternity for the Year 2000*, 1-24.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (1989). *Fraternity*. Retrieved November 22, 2006, from http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50089538?query_type=word&queryword=fraternity&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=1&search_id=QIN4-BBTPde-6033&hilite=50089538
- Parks, S. (1986). *The critical years: The young adult search for a faith to live by*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Penn State University, University Park, PA, Pulse: Division of Student Affairs. (2006, October). *Student activities & programming October 2006*. Retrieved May 3, 2007, from <http://www.sa.psu.edu/sara/pulse/144-StutActProg.pdf>
- Pike, G. R. (2003). Membership in a fraternity or sorority, student engagement, and educational outcomes at AAU public research universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 369-382.
- Rankin, S. R., Case, D. N., Windmeyer, S. L., Eberly, C. G., Hesp, G. A., Miller, G., & Molasso, W. (2007). *Experiences of LGBT people in fraternities and sororities: From 1960 to 2007*. Charlotte, NC: Lambda 10 Project.

- Robson, J. (1966). *The college fraternity and its modern role*. Menasha, WI: George Banta Company, Inc.
- Ryan, K., & Fiorito, B. (2003). Means-ends spirituality questionnaire: Reliability, validity and relationship to psychological well-being. *Review of Religious Research, 45*(2), 130-154.
- Sermersheim, K. L. (1996). Undergraduate Greek leadership experiences: A proven method for gaining career related and life-long skills. *Campus Activities Programming, 29*(3), 56-60.
- Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic enclaves and the Dynamics of social identity on the college campus: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(1), 96-110.
- Sigma Phi Epsilon. (2007). *The Leadership Continuum*. Retrieved April, 2008, from <http://www.sigep.org/leadership/default.asp>
- StopHazing.org. (2005). *Hazing Defined*. Retrieved November 22, 2006, from <http://www.stophazing.org/definition.html>
- Temkin, L., & Evans, N. J. (1998). Religion on campus: Suggestions for cooperation between student affairs and campus-based religious organizations. *NASPA Journal, 36*(1), 61-69.
- The phoenix: The manual of Sigma Alpha Epsilon* (10th ed.). (2005). Waukegan, IL: Lake County Press, Inc.
- The quest: A journey of brotherhood* (4th ed.). (1995). Richmond, VA: Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity.

- Walker, K. L., & Dixon, V. (2002). Spirituality and academic performance among African American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology, 28*(2), 107-121.
- Wall, A. (2006). On-line alcohol health education curriculum evaluation: Harm reduction findings among fraternity and sorority members. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(1), 29-45.
- Winston, S. C. (2000). Principles and applications of assessment in counseling. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Zarvell, R. K. (1993). *Student value congruency and Greek social organization cultures*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, Normal.

Appendix A

January 22, 2008

Jason Goldfarb
Counseling and Student Development

Thank you for submitting the research protocol titled, "The Role of Fraternities in the Spiritual Development of its Members" for review by the Eastern Illinois University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has reviewed this research protocol and effective 1/18/2008, has certified this protocol as Exempt from Further Review. The protocol has been given the IRB number 07-138.

The classification of this protocol as Exempt from Further Review is valid only for the research activities, timeline, and subjects described in the above named protocol. IRB policy requires that any proposed changes to this protocol must be reported to, and approved by, the IRB before being implemented. You are also required to inform the IRB immediately of any problems encountered that could adversely affect the health or welfare of the subjects in this study. Please contact me, or the Compliance Coordinator at 581-8576, in the event of an emergency. All correspondence should be sent to:

Institutional Review Board
c/o Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Telephone: 217-581-8576
Fax: 217-581-7181
Email: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

Thank you for your cooperation, and the best of success with your research.

John Best, Chairperson
Institutional Review Board
Telephone: 217-581-6412
Email: jbbest@eiu.edu

Appendix B

Dear Jason,

The HERI Data Access Committee approved your proposal entitled "The Role of Fraternities in the Spiritual Development of its Members".

Please note the following:

1. You are approved to conduct only the research described in your proposal. Any additional research must be applied for and approved of by the Higher Education Research Institute before any research takes place.
2. You are responsible for obtaining local institutional research board approval for your research.
3. We ask that you provide HERI with a copy of your research product (published paper, conference presentation, dissertation, etc).
4. You will be asked to sign a research agreement before we will provide you with access to the data.
5. This data access is granted for a period of one year from when you actually receive the dataset. After a year, we will require a status update and will grant another year extension is necessary. After two years, your access expires. If you need to extend access at that time you must reapply for another proposal review.
6. As a graduate student, the reduced data access fee will be \$250.

In closing, please contact Bill Korn (copied on this email), our Associate Director for Operations, to work out the details of your data access. Best of luck with your research, and we look forward to your results.

John H. Pryor
Director, Cooperative Institutional Research Program
UCLA Higher Education Research Institute
3005 Moore Hall, Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095
310.825.1925 v 310.206.2228 f

Appendix C (Continue)

9. Compared with when you first started college, how would you now describe your:
(Mark one for each item)

	Much Weaker	Weaker	No Change	Stronger	Much Stronger
Ability to think critically	5	4	3	2	1
Knowledge of people from different races/cultures	5	4	3	2	1
Religious beliefs and convictions	5	4	3	2	1
Leadership abilities	5	4	3	2	1
Interpersonal skills	5	4	3	2	1
Ability to get along with people of different races/cultures	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding of the problems facing your community	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding of social problems facing our nation	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding of global issues	5	4	3	2	1
Acceptance of people with different religious/spiritual views	5	4	3	2	1
Spirituality	5	4	3	2	1
Religiousness	5	4	3	2	1

10. How often have professors at your current college provided you with:
(Mark one for each item)

	Not At All	Occasionally	Frequently
Advice and guidance about your educational program	1	2	3
Respect (treated you like a colleague/peer)	1	2	3
Emotional support and encouragement	1	2	3
Opportunities to discuss the purpose/meaning of life	1	2	3
Negative feedback about your academic work	1	2	3
Intellectual challenge or stimulation	1	2	3
Opportunities to discuss coursework outside of class	1	2	3
Help in achieving your professional goals	1	2	3
Encouragement to discuss religious/spiritual matters	1	2	3

11. Your current religious preference: (Mark one)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Baptist | <input type="checkbox"/> Lutheran |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist | <input type="checkbox"/> Methodist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Eastern Orthodox | <input type="checkbox"/> Presbyterian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Episcopalian | <input type="checkbox"/> Quaker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hindu | <input type="checkbox"/> Roman Catholic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Islamic | <input type="checkbox"/> Seventh Day Adventist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish | <input type="checkbox"/> Unitarian/Universalist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LDS (Mormon) | <input type="checkbox"/> United Church of Christ |

Other Christian religion (specify below)

Other religion (specify below)

None

12. Do you consider yourself a Born-Again Christian?

- Yes
 No

13. Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following:
(Mark one for each item)

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Essential
Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts (acting, dancing, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Becoming an authority in my field	1	2	3	4
Influencing the political structure	1	2	3	4
Influencing social values	1	2	3	4
Raising a family	1	2	3	4
Being very well off financially	1	2	3	4
Helping others who are in difficulty	1	2	3	4
Making a theoretical contribution to science	1	2	3	4
Writing original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Creating artistic works (painting, sculpture, decorating, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Becoming successful in a business of my own	1	2	3	4
Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment	1	2	3	4
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life	1	2	3	4
Participating in a community action program	1	2	3	4
Helping to promote racial understanding	1	2	3	4
Becoming a community leader	1	2	3	4
Integrating spirituality into my life	1	2	3	4

14. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements:
(Mark one for each item)

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
Love is at the root of all the great religions	1	2	3	4
All life is interconnected	1	2	3	4
Believing in supernatural phenomena is foolish	1	2	3	4
We are all spiritual beings	1	2	3	4
It is futile to try to discover the purpose of existence	1	2	3	4
People can reach a higher spiritual plane of consciousness through meditation or prayer	1	2	3	4
The evil in this world seems to outweigh the good	1	2	3	4
Some religious traditions convey more truth than others	1	2	3	4
Most people can grow spiritually without being religious	1	2	3	4
People who don't believe in God will be punished	1	2	3	4
Non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers	1	2	3	4
The universe arose by chance	1	2	3	4
In the future, science will be able to explain everything	1	2	3	4
While science can provide important information about the physical world, only religion can truly explain existence	1	2	3	4

15. The relationship between science and religion is one of:
(Mark one)

- Conflict; I consider myself to be on the side of religion.
 Conflict; I consider myself to be on the side of science.
 Independence; they refer to different aspects of reality.
 Collaboration; each can be used to help validate the other.

16. Do you pray?

- Yes No (Skip to #18)

Appendix C (Continue)

17. If yes, why do you pray?
(Mark one for each item)

	Not At All			
	Occasionally	Frequently		
For help in solving problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To be in communion with God	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To express gratitude	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For emotional strength	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For forgiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To relieve the suffering of others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other _____	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. How often do you engage in the following activities?
(Mark one for each item)

	Daily	Several Times/week	Once/week	Monthly	Less Than Monthly	Not At All
Self-reflection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prayer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yoga, Tai Chi, or similar practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religious singing/chanting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reading sacred texts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other reading on religion/spirituality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following describes you.
(Mark one for each item)

	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	Not At All
Having an interest in spirituality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believing in the sacredness of life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling unsettled about spiritual and religious matters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believing only what I can see or can be explained	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling a sense of connection with God/Higher Power that transcends my personal self	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling a strong connection to all humanity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling disillusioned with my religious upbringing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having an interest in different religious traditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being committed to introducing people to my faith	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believing in the goodness of all people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being thankful for all that has happened to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeing each day, good or bad, as a gift	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeking to follow religious teachings in my everyday life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believing in life after death	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. Which of the following best characterizes your conception of or experience with God?
(Mark one)

<input type="radio"/> Universal spirit	<input type="radio"/> Divine mystery
<input type="radio"/> Higher Power	<input type="radio"/> Supreme Being
<input type="radio"/> Love	<input type="radio"/> None of the above
<input type="radio"/> Source of all existence	<input type="radio"/> Other _____

21. How do you view God or other Higher Power in relation to yourself?
(Mark all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Father-figure	<input type="checkbox"/> Beloved
<input type="checkbox"/> Mother-figure	<input type="checkbox"/> Master
<input type="checkbox"/> Friend	<input type="checkbox"/> Protector
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> None of the above
<input type="checkbox"/> Part of me	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

22. Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following:
(Mark one for each item)

	Not Important			
	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Essential	
Seeking out opportunities to help me grow spiritually	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reducing pain and suffering in the world	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attaining inner harmony	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attaining wisdom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeking beauty in my life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finding answers to the mysteries of life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Becoming a more loving person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Following faithfully the Laws and Rules taught by my religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving the human condition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Have you ever had a "spiritual" experience while:
(Mark one for each item)

	Not Applicable	Not At All	Occasionally	Frequently
In a house of worship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Listening to beautiful music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Viewing a great work of art	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participating in a musical or artistic performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engaging in athletics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Witnessing the beauty and harmony of nature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Making love	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meditating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other _____	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. Since entering college, please indicate how often you have:
(Mark one for each item)

	Occasionally	Frequently	Not At All
Participated in community food or clothing drives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped at local houses of worship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Performed other volunteer work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped friends with personal problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Donated money to charity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Felt angry with God	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Felt loved by God	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Struggled to understand evil, suffering, and death	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Questioned your religious/spiritual beliefs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Spent time with people who share your religious views	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Felt that your life is filled with stress and anxiety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Been able to find meaning in times of hardship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expressed gratitude to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Felt at peace/centered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Explored religion online	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Found new meaning in the rituals and practices of my religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attended a class/workshop or retreat on matters related to religion/spirituality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

25. The ultimate spiritual quest for me is:
(Mark one)

To discover who I really am

To know what God requires of me

To become a better person

To know my purpose in life

To make the world a better place

Other _____

I do not consider myself to be on a spiritual quest

Appendix C (Continue)

26. In what ways have the following experiences changed your religious/spiritual beliefs?
(Mark one for each item)

	Not Applicable No Change Strengthened Weakened	
New ideas encountered in classes	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Romantic relationship	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Financial difficulties	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Personal injury or illness	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
"Break up" with romantic partner	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Parents' divorce or separation	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Death of a close friend or family member	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Other crisis involving a friend or family member	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Epiphany/Conversion/Mystical event	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Natural disaster	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Campus tragedy	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
The events of September 11 th , 2001	(W) (S) (N) (C)	
Other	(W) (S) (N) (C)	

27. How many of your close friends:
(Mark one for each item)

	None Some Most All	
Share your religious/spiritual views?	(A) (M) (S) (N)	
Belong to a campus religious organization?	(A) (M) (S) (N)	
Are searching for meaning/purpose in life?	(A) (M) (S) (N)	
Go to church/temple/other house of worship?	(A) (M) (S) (N)	

28. Please indicate the extent to which you engage in the following activities:
(Mark one for each item)

	Not At All To Some Extent To A Great Extent	
Searching for meaning/purpose in life	(3) (2) (1)	
Trying to change things that are unfair in the world	(3) (2) (1)	
Accepting others as they are	(3) (2) (1)	
Having discussions about the meaning of life with my friends	(3) (2) (1)	

29. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements:
(Mark one for each item)

	Disagree Strongly Disagree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Agree Strongly	
What happens in my life is determined by forces larger than myself	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Whether or not there is a Supreme Being is a matter of indifference to me	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
It doesn't matter what I believe as long as I lead a moral life	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
I have never felt a sense of sacredness	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
I gain spiritual strength by trusting in a Higher Power	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
I find religion to be personally helpful	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
I know someone I can turn to for spiritual guidance	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Abortion should be legal	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
The death penalty should be abolished	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
If two people really like each other, it's all right for them to have sex even if they've known each other for only a very short time	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
The activities of married women are best confined to the home and family	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Marijuana should be legalized	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
It is important to have laws prohibiting homosexual relationships	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society	(4) (3) (2) (1)	

30. My spiritual/religious beliefs:
(Mark one for each item)

	Disagree Strongly Disagree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Agree Strongly	
Have helped me develop my identity	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Are one of the most important things in my life	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Give meaning/purpose to my life	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Help define the goals I set for myself	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Provide me with strength, support, and guidance	(4) (3) (2) (1)	
Lie behind my whole approach to life	(4) (3) (2) (1)	

31. Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age. We want the most accurate estimate of how you see yourself.
(Mark one for each item)

	Lowest 10% Below Average Average Above Average Highest 10%	
Altruism	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Compassion	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Cooperativeness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Courage	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Creativity	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Dependability	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Drive to achieve	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Emotional health	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Empathy	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Forgiveness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Generosity	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Gratefulness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Helpfulness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Humility	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Kindness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Leadership ability	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Loyalty	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Open-mindedness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Patience	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Physical health	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Religiousness/religiosity	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Respectfulness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Self-awareness	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Self-confidence (intellectual)	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Self-confidence (social)	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Self-understanding	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Spirituality	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Understanding of others	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	

32. Please rate your satisfaction with your current college on each of the aspects of campus life listed below.
(Mark one for each item)

	No Experience/Can't Rate Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied	
Relevance of coursework to everyday life	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Sense of community on campus	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Opportunities for religious/spiritual reflection	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Career counseling and advising	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Amount of contact with faculty	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Interaction with other students	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Respect for diverse spiritual/religious beliefs	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	
Overall college experience	(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)	

THANK YOU!



Appendix D

College Students' Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Factor Scales Table

Spirituality (Cronbach's alpha=.86)

Personal goal^a: Integrating spirituality into my life

Belief^b: We are all spiritual beings

Belief^b: People can reach a higher spiritual plane of consciousness through meditation or prayer

Self-description^c: Having interest in spirituality

Self-description^c: Believing in the sacredness of life

Personal goal^a: Seeking out opportunities to help me grow spiritually

Spiritual experience while^d: Listening to beautiful music

Spiritual experience while^d: Viewing a great work of art

Spiritual experience while^d: Participating in a musical or artistic performance

Spiritual experience while^d: Engaging in athletics

Spiritual experience while^d: Witnessing the beauty and harmony of nature

Spiritual experience while^d: Meditating

On a spiritual quest^e

Self-rating^f: Spirituality

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 36) on Spirituality: 21%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (< 23) on Spirituality: 17%

Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience (Cronbach's alpha=.78)

Spiritual experience while^d: Viewing a great work of art

Spiritual experience while^d: Listening to beautiful music

Spiritual experience while^d: Witnessing the beauty and harmony of nature

Spiritual experience while^d: Participating in a musical or artistic performance

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 8) on Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience: 35%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 4) on Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience: 21%

Appendix D (Continue)

Religious Commitment (Cronbach's alpha=.97)

My spiritual/religious beliefs^s: Are one of the most important things in my life
My spiritual/religious beliefs^s: Provide me with strength, support, and guidance
My spiritual/religious beliefs^s: Give meaning/purpose to my life
Belief^s: I find religion to be personally helpful
Belief^s: I gain spiritual strength by trusting in a Higher Power
Self-rating^s: Religiousness/religiosity
My spiritual/religious beliefs^s: Lie behind my whole approach to life
Experience^s: Felt loved by God
My spiritual/religious beliefs^s: Have helped me develop my identity
Self-description^s: Feeling a sense of connection with God/Higher Power that transcends my personal self
Reason for prayer^s: Help in solving problems
Reason for prayer^s: Emotional strength
Self-description^s: Seeking to follow religious teachings in my everyday life
My spiritual/religious beliefs^s: Help define the goals I set for myself

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 44) on Religious Commitment: 31%
Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 21) on Religious Commitment: 15%

Self-Esteem (Cronbach's alpha=.79)

Self-rating^s: Self-confidence (intellectual)
Self-rating^s: Self-understanding
Self-rating^s: Courage
Self-rating^s: Emotional Health
Self-rating^s: Self-awareness
Self-rating^s: Self-confidence (social)
Self-rating^s: Leadership Ability

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 28) on Self-Esteem: 28%
Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 20) on Self-Esteem: 10%

Appendix D (Continue)

Equanimity (Cronbach's alpha=.75)

Self-description^a: Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed

Experience^b: Felt at peace/centered

Self-description^c: Being thankful for all that has happened to me

Self-description^c: Seeing each day, good or bad, as a gift

Experience^b: Been able to find meaning in times of hardship

Self-description^c: Feeling a strong connection to all humanity

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 16) on Equanimity: 26%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 11) on Equanimity: 15%

Spiritual Distress (Cronbach's alpha=.65)

Experience^b: Questioned your religious/spiritual beliefs

Self-description^c: Feeling unsettled about spiritual and religious matters

Experience^b: Struggled to understand evil, suffering, and death

Experience^b: Felt angry with God

Self-description^c: Feeling disillusioned with my religious upbringing

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 11) on Spiritual Distress: 20%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 7) on Spiritual Distress: 33%

Psychological Distress (Cronbach's alpha=.66)

Experience^b: Felt overwhelmed by all I had to do

Experience^b: Felt that your life is filled with stress and anxiety

Experience^b: Felt depressed

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 8) on Psychological Distress: 26%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 5) on Psychological Distress: 21%

Appendix D (Continue)

Spiritual/Religious Growth (Cronbach's alpha=.88)

Self-change^d: Religious beliefs and convictions

Self-change^d: Religiousness

Self-change^d: Spirituality

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 12) on Spiritual/Religious Growth: 29%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 8) on Spiritual/Religious Growth: 18%

Growth in Global/National Understanding (Cronbach's alpha=.82)

Self-change^d: Understanding of social problems facing our nation

Self-change^d: Understanding of global issues

Self-change^d: Understanding of the problems facing your community

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 13) on Growth in Global/National Understand: 32%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 9) on Growth in Global/National Understand: 11%

Growth in Tolerance (Cronbach's alpha=.70)

Self-change^d: Ability to get along with people of different races/cultures

Self-change^d: Knowledge of people from different races/cultures

Self-change^d: Acceptance of people with different religious/spiritual values

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 13) on Growth in Tolerance: 23%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 9) on Growth in Tolerance: 19%

Growth in Leadership (Cronbach's alpha=.71)

Self-change^d: Leadership abilities

Self-change^d: Interpersonal skills

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 9) on Growth in Leadership: 32%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 6) on Growth in Leadership: 11%

Appendix D (Continue)

Religious Engagement (Cronbach's alpha=.87)

Activity^k: Reading sacred texts
Activity^k: Religious singing/chanting
Experienceⁿ: Helped at local houses of worship
Behavior^m: Joined a religious organization on campus
Activity^k: Other reading on religion/spirituality
Experienceⁿ: Attended class/workshop or retreat on matters related to religion/spirituality
Experienceⁿ: Attended a religious service
Close friends^m: Belong to a campus religious organization
Close friends^m: Go to church/temple/or other house of worship
Experienceⁿ: Found new meaning in the rituals and practices of my religion

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 26) on Religious Involvement: 20%
Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 12) on Religious Involvement: 20%

Charitable Involvement (Cronbach's alpha=.68)

Experienceⁿ: Participated in community food or clothing drives
Experienceⁿ: Performed other volunteer work
Experienceⁿ: Donated money to charity
Experienceⁿ: Helped friends w/ personal problems
Personal goal^p: Participating in a community action program

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 13) on Charitable Involvement: 15%
Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 8) on Charitable Involvement: 22%

Religious/Social Conservatism (Cronbach's alpha=.82)

Beliefⁿ: People who don't believe in God will be punished
Self-description^r: Being committed to introducing people to my faith
Beliefⁿ: If two people really like each other, it's all right for them to have sex even if they've known each other for only a very short time (reverse coded)
Beliefⁿ: Abortion should be legal (reverse coded)
Reason for prayer^r: Forgiveness
Relationship to Godⁿ: Father-figure
Close friends^m: Share your religious/spiritual views

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 20) on Religious/Social Conservatism: 16%
Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 10) on Religious/Social Conservatism: 20%

Appendix D (Continue)

Religious Skepticism (Cronbach's alpha=.85)

Self-description^f: Believing in life after death (reverse coded)

Belief^g: While science can provide important information about the physical world, only religion can truly explain existence (reverse coded)

Belief^h: It doesn't matter what I believe as long as I lead a moral life

Beliefⁱ: What happens in my life is determined by forces larger than myself (reverse coded)

Belief^j: Whether or not there is a Supreme Being is a matter of indifference to me

Belief^k: I have never felt a sense of sacredness

Belief^l: The universe arose by chance

Belief^m: In the future, science will be able to explain everything

Relationship between science and religionⁿ: Conflict; I consider myself to be on the side of science

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 23) on Religious Skepticism: 15%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 13) on Religious Skepticism: 30%

Spiritual Quest (Cronbach's alpha=.83)

Personal goal^o: Finding answers to the mysteries of life

Personal goal^p: Attaining inner harmony

Personal goal^q: Attaining wisdom

Personal goal^r: Seeking beauty in my life

Personal goal^s: Developing a meaningful philosophy of life

Engaged in^t: Searching for meaning/purpose in life

Engaged in^u: Having discussions about the meaning of life with my friends

Personal goal^v: Becoming a more loving person

Personal goal^w: Improving the human condition

Close friends^x: Searching for meaning/purpose in life

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 29) on Spiritual Quest: 28%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 20) on Spiritual Quest: 15%

Appendix D (Continue)

Social Activism (Cronbach's alpha=.81)

Ultimate spiritual quest^a: To make the world a better place

Personal goal^b: Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment

Personal goal^b: Reducing pain and suffering in the world

Personal goal^b: Influencing the political structure

Personal goal^b: Influencing social values

Personal goal^b: Helping others who are in difficulty

Personal goal^b: Helping to promote racial understanding

Personal goal^b: Becoming a community leader

Engaged in^c: Trying to change things that are unfair in the world

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 24) on Social Activism: 17%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 15) on Social Activism: 21%

Artistic Orientation (Cronbach's alpha=.70)

Personal goal^b: Creating artistic works

Personal goal^b: Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts

Personal goal^b: Writing original works

Self-rating^c: Creativity

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 12) on Artistic Orientation: 14%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 6) on Artistic Orientation: 29%

Appendix D (Continue)

Compassionate Self-Concept (Cronbach's alpha=.78)

Self-rating^a: Kindness
Self-rating^b: Compassion
Self-rating^c: Forgiveness
Self-rating^d: Empathy
Self-rating^e: Generosity
Self-rating^f: Helpfulness

Percent of students who are "high" scorers (≥ 25) on Compassionate Self-Concept: 25%

Percent of students who are "low" scorers (≤ 19) on Compassionate Self-Concept: 18%

^a Personal goal measured on a 4 point scale, "Not important" to "Essential"

^b Belief measured on a 4 point scale, "Disagree strongly" to "Agree strongly"

^c Self-description measured on a 3 point scale, "Not at all" to "To a great extent"

^d Spiritual experience measured on a 3 point scale, "Not at all" to "Frequently"
(^e "Not applicable" recoded as "Not at all")

^e Being on a spiritual quest measured on a 2 point scale, "No" or "Yes"

^f Self-rating measured on a 5 point scale, "Lowest 10%" to "Highest 10%"

^g My spiritual/religious beliefs measured on a 4 point scale, "Disagree strongly" to "Agree strongly"

^h Experience measured on a 3 point scale, "Not at all" to "Frequently"

ⁱ Reason for prayer measured on a 3 point scale, "Not at all" to "Frequently"

^j Self-change measured on a 5 point scale, "Much weaker" to "Much stronger"

^k Activity measured on a 6 point scale, "Not at all" to "Daily"

^l Behavior measured on a 2 point scale, "No" or "Yes"

^m Close friends measured on a 4 point scale, "None" to "All"

ⁿ Relationship to God measured on a 2 point scale, "No" or "Yes"

^o Relationship between science and religion measured on a 2 point scale, "No" or "Yes"

^p Engagement measured on a 3 point scale, "Not at all" to "To a great extent"

^q Ultimate spiritual quest measured on a 2 point scale, "No" or "Yes"

Revised and posted October 2004

Appendix E

Hegemonic Masculinity (Cronbach Alpha = .681)

Athleticism

Question 6: Since entering college have you:

Item 8: Participated in: intercollegiate football or basketball

Item 9: Participated in: other intercollegiate sport

Question 7: During the past year, how much time did you spend during a typical week doing the following activities?

Item 4: Exercising/sports

Dominance: religion, ability, social group, etc.

Question 8: For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college.

Item 1: Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group (reverse code)

Question 9: Compare with when you first started college, how would you now describe your:

Item 2: Knowledge of people from different races/cultures (reverse code)

Question 13: Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following:

Item 2: Becoming an authority in my field

Item 6: Being very well off financially

Item 11: Becoming successful in a business of my own

Question 31: Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age. We want the most accurate estimate of how you see yourself.

Item 7: Drive to achieve

Item 16: Leadership ability

Question 31: Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age. We want the most accurate estimate of how you see yourself.

Item 24: Self-confidence (intellectual)

Item 25: Self-confidence (social)

Question 19: Please indicate the extent to which each of the following describes you.

Item 5: Feeling good about the direction in which my life is heading

High Alcohol Use

Question 7: During the past year, how much time did you spend during a typical week doing the following activities?

Item 5: Partying

Question 8: For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college.

Item 5: Drank Beer

Item 6: Drank wine or liquor

Misogyny

Question 29: Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements:

Item 10: If two people really like each other, it's all right for them to have sex even if they've known each other for only a very short time

Item 11: The activities of married women are best confined to the home and family

Appendix F

*Internal Consistency Reliability of 2003 CSBV Pilot Study^a, Affiliated, and Non-Affiliated Participants
(Cronbach Alpha)*

Variable	Overall ^a	Affiliated	Non-Affiliated
Spirituality	0.86	0.862	0.855
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	0.78	0.797	0.799
Religious Commitment	0.97	0.936	0.946
Self-Esteem	0.79	0.692	0.782
Equanimity	0.75	0.690	0.749
Spiritual Distress	0.65	0.722	0.675
Psychological Distress	0.66	0.632	0.645
Spiritual/Religious Growth	0.88	0.821	0.798
Growth in Global/National Understanding	0.82	0.721	0.796
Growth in Tolerance	0.70	0.679	0.67
Growth in Leadership	0.71	0.680	0.654
Religious Engagement	0.87	0.878	0.879
Charitable Involvement	0.68	0.621	0.63
Religious/Social	0.82	0.77	0.802
Religious Skepticism	0.85	0.799	0.803
Spiritual Quest	0.83	0.838	0.83
Social Activism	0.81	0.813	0.81
Artistic Orientation	0.70	0.693	0.716
Compassionate Self-Concept	0.78	0.759	0.769

^a 2003 Pilot Study of College Students' Beliefs and Values Conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA

Appendix G

Means and Standard Deviations of Affiliated and Non-Affiliated Participants and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated		Non-Affiliated		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(1, 665)	η^2
Spirituality	36.36	5.97	38.23	6.19	9.23**	0.014
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.08	2.32	10.66	2.45	5.56	0.008
Religious Commitment	39.59	8.28	42.49	7.96	13.03***	0.019
Self-Esteem	26.73	3.75	25.99	4.07	3.35	0.005
Equanimity	14.15	2.17	14.39	2.27	1.13	0.002
Spiritual Distress	8.41	2.12	8.60	2.04	0.87	0.001
Psychological Distress	6.06	1.26	6.20	1.33	1.18	0.002
Spiritual/Religious Growth	9.98	2.46	10.96	2.41	16.22***	0.024
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.77	1.75	11.92	1.76	0.85	0.001
Growth in Tolerance	11.31	1.73	11.17	1.74	0.66	0.001
Growth in Leadership	8.25	1.14	8.14	1.19	0.97	0.001
Religious Engagement	20.50	7.16	23.32	7.50	14.35***	0.021
Charitable Involvement	10.57	1.91	10.14	1.93	5.05	0.008
Religious/Social Conservatism	15.42	3.89	17.36	4.09	22.89***	0.033
Religious Skepticism	17.96	4.25	16.82	4.14	7.66*	0.011
Spiritual Quest	25.93	4.92	26.44	5.26	0.94	0.001
Social Activism	19.26	4.07	19.76	4.23	1.42	0.002
Artistic Orientation	8.05	2.52	8.27	2.69	0.69	0.001
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.53	3.39	22.64	3.22	0.11	0.000
Hegemonic Masculinity	49.24	6.47	45.28	6.76	34.75***	0.050

* $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^aResults of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(19,661)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix H

Means and Standard Deviations of Involvement in Leadership Training and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Yes		No		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(1, 665)	η^2
Spirituality	40.00	5.59	36.35	6.15	61.93***	0.085
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	11.27	2.26	10.02	2.43	45.93***	0.065
Religious Commitment	44.12	7.07	40.38	8.43	36.71***	0.052
Self-Esteem	26.78	4.06	25.64	3.93	13.23***	0.020
Equanimity	14.88	2.12	13.95	2.27	28.39***	0.041
Spiritual Distress	8.79	1.98	8.41	2.10	5.67	0.008
Psychological Distress	6.19	1.28	6.16	1.34	0.06	0.000
Spiritual/Religious Growth	11.47	2.23	10.28	2.48	41.25***	0.058
Growth in Global/National Understanding	12.15	1.68	11.69	1.78	11.14***	0.016
Growth in Tolerance	11.27	1.76	11.14	1.72	0.95	0.001
Growth in Leadership	8.49	1.05	7.92	1.21	40.69***	0.058
Religious Engagement	25.47	7.53	20.85	6.88	67.61***	0.092
Charitable Involvement	10.97	1.85	9.67	1.79	82.43***	0.110
Religious/Social Conservatism	18.05	4.12	16.24	3.95	33.22***	0.048
Religious Skepticism	16.07	3.95	17.74	4.21	27.07***	0.039
Spiritual Quest	27.18	4.91	25.74	5.33	12.86***	0.019
Social Activism	20.68	3.92	18.94	4.26	29.14***	0.042
Artistic Orientation	8.37	2.66	8.12	2.65	1.42	0.002
Compassionate Self-Concept	23.09	3.14	22.28	3.29	10.20***	0.015
Hegemonic Masculinity	45.26	6.74	46.54	6.93	5.69	0.008

* $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20,646)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .998$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix I

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/Involvement in Leadership Training and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated				Non-Affiliated				MANOVA ^a	
	Yes		No		Yes		No		F(3,663)	η^2
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Spirituality	38.07	5.97	34.76	5.55 ²	40.51	5.39 ^{1,2}	36.66	6.22 ¹	25.52***	0.104
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.53	2.23	9.67	2.34 ²	11.47	2.23 ^{1,2}	10.09	2.44 ¹	18.58***	0.078
Religious Commitment	41.02	7.88	38.25	8.48 ²	44.94	6.62 ^{1,2}	40.79	8.37 ¹	18.33***	0.077
Self-Esteem	27.27	3.79	26.22	3.68	26.65	4.13	25.53	3.97	5.31***	0.023
Equanimity	14.66	1.98	13.67	2.24 ²	14.93	2.16 ^{1,2}	14.01	2.28 ¹	10.12***	0.044
Spiritual Distress	8.75	2.01	8.10	2.19	8.80	1.97	8.47	2.08	2.48	0.011
Psychological Distress	6.22	1.31	5.90	1.19	6.18	1.28	6.21	1.36	1.01	0.005
Spiritual/Religious Growth	10.58	2.31	9.43	2.49 ²	11.71	2.15 ^{1,2}	10.44	2.45 ¹	21.05***	0.087
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.78	1.70	11.73	1.81	12.25	1.67 ¹	11.69	1.78 ¹	4.85**	0.021
Growth in Tolerance	11.29	1.89	11.33	1.59	11.27	1.73	11.10	1.74	0.63	0.003
Growth in Leadership	8.61	0.98 ²	7.92	1.18	8.46	1.06 ¹	7.92	1.22 ^{1,2}	13.82***	0.059

*p \leq 0.01; **p \leq 0.005; ***p \leq 0.001

^{1,2,3,4} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,644), p \leq 0.001, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix I (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/Involvement in Leadership Training and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated				Non-Affiliated				MANOVA ^a	
	Yes		No		Yes		No		F(3,663)	η^2
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Religious Engagement	22.36	7.54 ³	18.56	6.36 ²	26.30	7.33 ^{1,2,3}	21.26	6.92 ¹	30.23***	0.120
Charitable Involvement	11.31	1.76 ^{2,4}	9.89	1.80 ^{3,4}	10.88	1.87 ^{1,3}	9.63	1.79 ^{1,2}	28.75***	0.115
Religious/Social Conservatism	16.02	4.18 ³	14.86	3.54 ²	18.59	3.94 ^{1,2,3}	16.51	3.97 ¹	21.23***	0.088
Religious Skepticism	16.97	4.14	18.92	4.16 ²	15.83	3.87 ^{1,2}	17.51	4.19 ¹	12.44***	0.053
Spiritual Quest	26.46	4.63	25.44	5.16	27.38	4.97 ¹	25.79	5.37 ¹	4.86**	0.022
Social Activism	19.93	3.93	18.63	4.12 ²	20.87	3.90 ^{1,2}	18.99	4.29 ¹	10.67***	0.046
Artistic Orientation	8.17	2.53	7.94	2.53	8.43	2.70	8.16	2.68	0.74	0.003
Compassionate Self-Concept	23.08	3.23	22.02	3.47	23.09	3.13	22.33	3.26	3.56	0.016
Hegemonic Masculinity	48.68	6.49 ³	49.76	6.45 ^{1,2}	44.36	6.53 ^{2,3}	45.91	6.85 ¹	14.33***	0.061

*p≤0.01; **p<0.005; ***p≤0.001

^{1,2,3,4} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,644), p<0.001, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix J

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Partied and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	1 ^b		2 ^c		3 ^d		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(2, 664)	η^2
Spirituality	39.74	5.83 ^{1,2}	37.33	5.78 ¹	35.47	6.40 ²	27.50***	0.076
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	11.06	2.37 ^{1,2}	10.41	2.43 ¹	9.85	2.38 ²	13.39***	0.039
Religious Commitment	45.4	6.88 ^Δ	40.83	7.46 ^Δ	37.58	8.41 ^Δ	59.32***	0.152
Self-Esteem	25.83	4.20	26.02	4.00	26.82	3.68	3.20	0.010
Equanimity	14.74	2.27 ¹	14.17	2.17	13.90	2.24 ¹	8.20***	0.024
Spiritual Distress	8.51	1.93	8.69	2.18	8.49	2.09	0.60	0.002
Psychological Distress	6.14	1.39	6.19	1.30	6.20	1.19	0.12	0.000
Spiritual/Religious Growth	11.77	2.17 ^Δ	10.41	2.36 ^Δ	9.60	2.37 ^Δ	49.82***	0.130
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.74	1.69	11.97	1.78	12.01	1.82	1.67	0.005
Growth in Tolerance	11.18	1.70	11.26	1.77	11.13	1.77	0.31	0.001
Growth in Leadership	8.09	1.30	8.12	1.09	8.36	1.06	2.37	0.007

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^Δ Significant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1,2,3} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,645), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .998$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b Less than one hour; ^c Between one and five hours; ^d Six to over thirty

Appendix J (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Partied and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	1 ^b		2 ^c		3 ^d		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(2, 664)	η^2
Religious Engagement	26.90	7.23 ^Δ	21.28	6.64 ^Δ	17.87	5.03 ^Δ	104.95***	0.240
Charitable Involvement	10.34	1.98	10.14	1.93	10.13	1.83	0.90	0.003
Religious/Social Conservatism	19.29	3.50 ^Δ	16.14	3.73 ^Δ	14.27	3.47 ^Δ	109.94***	0.249
Religious Skepticism	15.29	3.57 ^Δ	17.70	3.98 ^Δ	19.11	4.25 ^Δ	53.91***	0.140
Spiritual Quest	26.94	5.35	26.13	4.88	25.64	5.31	3.49	0.010
Social Activism	19.84	4.29	19.89	4.18	19.04	4.05	2.32	0.007
Artistic Orientation	8.46	2.75	8.07	2.54	8.06	2.64	1.77	0.005
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.83	3.23	22.59	3.20	22.30	3.35	1.37	0.004
Hegemonic Masculinity	41.10	4.88 ^Δ	47.08	5.19 ^Δ	53.00	5.08 ^Δ	288.93***	0.465

* $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^Δ Significant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1, 2, 3} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20, 645)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .998$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b Less than one hour; ^c Between one and five hours; ^d Six to over thirty

Appendix K

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Membership and Frequency of Partying and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated			Non-Affiliated			MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)		
	1 ^b		2 ^c	1 ^b		2 ^c	F(3, 663)	η^2	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Spirituality	37.94	5.48 ²	34.23	5.98	38.75	5.99 ^{1,2}	6.54 ¹	12.58***	.054
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.50	2.26	9.52	2.30 ¹	10.81	2.44 ¹	2.42	6.61***	.029
Religious Commitment	42.04	7.79 ³	36.29	7.83 ^{2,3}	43.52	7.44 ^{1,2}	8.65 ¹	23.73***	.097
Self-Esteem	26.89	3.86	26.52	3.63	25.76	4.13	3.71	3.71*	.017
Equanimity	14.54	1.95	13.62	2.34	14.47	2.29	2.19	3.14	.014
Spiritual Distress	8.36	2.07	8.48	2.20	8.63	2.04	2.04	0.43	.002
Psychological Distress	5.71	1.24 ¹	6.52	1.13 ¹	6.24	1.35	1.19	4.81**	.021
Spiritual/Religious Growth	10.73	2.48 ³	8.98	2.06 ^{2,3}	11.21	2.33 ^{1,2}	2.46 ¹	20.09***	.083
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.86	1.52	11.62	2.03	11.85	1.77	1.68	1.69	.008
Growth in Tolerance	11.54	1.54	11.00	1.94	11.17	1.75	1.68	1.20	.005
Growth in Leadership	8.16	1.14	8.38	1.14	8.10	1.22	1.03	1.65	.007

* $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^{1, 2, 3, ...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20,644)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b 1: From less than an hour to five hours

^c 2: From six hours to over 30 hours

Appendix K (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Membership and Frequency of Partying and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated			Non-Affiliated			MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)		
	1 ^b		2 ^c	1 ^b		2 ^c	SD	η^2	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(3, 663)	η^2	
Religious Engagement	23.57	7.25 ^{3,4}	16.37	4.48 ^{2,4}	24.46	7.54 ^{1,2}	5.14 ^{1,3}	36.06***	.140
Charitable Involvement	10.57	1.84	10.58	2.02	10.20	1.97	1.70	2.34	.010
Religious/Social Conservatism	17.10	4.34 ^{3,4}	19.15	3.85 ^{2,4}	16.28	3.87 ^{1,2}	4.45 ^{1,3}	38.67***	.149
Religious Skepticism	17.10	4.34	19.15	3.85 ²	16.28	3.87 ^{1,2}	4.45 ¹	19.23***	.080
Spiritual Quest	26.19	4.89	25.60	4.98	26.63	5.20	5.49	1.43	.006
Social Activism	19.49	4.09	18.96	4.05	19.93	4.26	4.07	1.78	.008
Artistic Orientation	8.06	2.48	8.04	2.60	8.32	2.69	2.67	0.46	.002
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.90	2.92	22.04	3.91	22.69	3.26	3.06	0.93	.004
Hegemonic Masculinity	46.30	5.85 ^{2,4,5}	53.19	5.01 ^{3,5}	43.44	5.74 ^{1,2,3}	5.14 ^{1,4}	112.78***	.338

* $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p \leq 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^{1,2,3,...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20,644)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b 1: From less than an hour to five hours

^c 2: From six hours to over 30 hours

Appendix L

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Consumed Beer and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Not at All		Occasionally		Frequently		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(2, 664)	η^2
Spirituality	39.69	5.80 ^{1,2}	37.51	6.00 ¹	35.94	6.39 ²	18.68***	0.053
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.95	2.49	10.41	2.27	10.21	2.58	5.09**	0.015
Religious Commitment	45.98	6.69 ^A	41.08	7.50 ^A	37.65	8.39 ^A	60.61***	0.154
Self-Esteem	26.08	4.16	25.94	4.22	26.55	3.38	1.17	0.003
Equanimity	14.95	2.12 ^{1,2}	14.10	2.24 ¹	13.90	2.31 ²	13.24***	0.038
Spiritual Distress	8.36	1.92	8.62	2.12	8.78	2.11	2.10	0.006
Psychological Distress	6.08	1.34	6.17	1.32	6.31	1.25	1.46	0.004
Spiritual/Religious Growth	11.91	2.09 ^A	10.56	2.36 ^A	9.52	2.37 ^A	52.76***	0.137
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.64	1.77	12.01	1.67	12.01	1.85	3.44	0.010
Growth in Tolerance	11.06	1.70	11.28	1.74	11.24	1.79	1.07	0.003
Growth in Leadership	8.22	1.18	8.07	1.24	8.24	1.04	1.47	0.004

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^ASignificant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1,2,3,...}Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^aResults of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,645), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .998$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix L (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Consumed Beer and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Not at All				Occasionally				Frequently				MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(2, 664)	η^2		
	Religious Engagement	27.44	7.21 ^A	21.23	6.74 ^A	18.88	5.68 ^A	18.88	5.68 ^A	89.06***	0.212			
Charitable Involvement	10.43	1.98	10.09	1.93	10.16	1.83	10.16	1.83	2.14	0.006				
Religious/Social Conservatism	19.71	3.53 ^A	16.28	3.65 ^A	14.35	3.41 ^A	14.35	3.41 ^A	114.62***	0.257				
Religious Skepticism	14.85	3.57 ^A	17.67	3.89 ^A	19.08	4.14 ^A	19.08	4.14 ^A	62.44***	0.158				
Spiritual Quest	26.90	5.41	26.08	5.06	26.02	5.12	26.02	5.12	1.97	0.006				
Social Activism	19.95	4.16	19.56	4.21	19.47	4.27	19.47	4.27	0.76	0.002				
Artistic Orientation	8.44	2.66	8.16	2.53	8.04	2.87	8.04	2.87	1.20	0.004				
Compassionate Self-Concept	23.08	3.40	22.55	3.25	22.07	2.94	22.07	2.94	4.55	0.014				
Hegemonic Masculinity	40.96	5.39 ^A	46.95	5.65 ^A	51.71	5.59 ^A	51.71	5.59 ^A	178.91***	0.350				

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^A Significant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1,2,3,...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,645), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .998$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix M

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Consumed Wine or Liquor and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Not at All		Occasionally		Frequently		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(2, 665)	η^2
	Spirituality	39.25	5.57 ^{1,2}	37.26	6.41 ¹	36.89	6.24 ²	8.72***
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.75	2.46	10.37	2.43	10.71	2.38	1.92	0.006
Religious Commitment	45.45	6.79 ^A	40.87	7.84 ^A	37.46	8.65 ^A	43.71***	0.116
Self-Esteem	25.79	4.11	26.12	4.00	26.99	3.82	2.93	0.009
Equanimity	14.78	2.15 ¹	14.15	2.24 ¹	13.98	2.41	6.86***	0.020
Spiritual Distress	8.26	1.85	8.75	2.12	8.63	2.19	3.93	0.012
Psychological Distress	5.98	1.36	6.23	1.26	6.44	1.33	4.70*	0.014
Spiritual/Religious Growth	11.82	2.13 ^A	10.42	2.39 ^A	9.59	2.48 ^A	39.19***	0.106
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.60	1.72 ¹	12.09	1.72 ¹	11.84	1.87	5.54*	0.016
Growth in Tolerance	11.03	1.61	11.30	1.80	11.20	1.80	1.70	0.005
Growth in Leadership	8.17	1.18	8.14	1.19	8.18	1.15	0.06	0.000

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^ASignificant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1, 2, 5} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,645), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .997$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix M (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Consumed Wine or Liquor and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Not at All		Occasionally		Frequently		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(2, 665)	η^2
Religious Engagement	26.94	7.36 ^{1,2}	21.06	6.81 ¹	19.16	5.85 ²	65.29***	0.164
Charitable Involvement	10.26	2.02	10.16	1.86	10.35	1.97	0.45	0.001
Religious/Social Conservatism	19.54	3.48 ^A	16.07	3.80 ^A	14.29	3.48 ^A	91.97***	0.217
Religious Skepticism	15.17	3.78 ^{1,2}	17.77	3.89 ¹	18.85	4.53 ²	41.41***	0.111
Spiritual Quest	26.57	5.26	26.13	5.21	26.62	5.06	0.65	0.002
Social Activism	19.59	4.03	19.63	4.13	20.02	4.86	0.38	0.001
Artistic Orientation	8.15	2.53	8.22	2.62	8.45	3.10	0.42	0.001
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.86	3.30	22.61	3.28	22.09	2.99	1.91	0.006
Hegemonic Masculinity	40.94	4.89 ^A	47.63	6.05 ^A	52.35	5.62 ^A	166.16***	0.334

* $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^ASignificant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1, 2, 3} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20,645)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .997$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix N

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/How Frequently Individuals Consumed Beer and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated			Non-Affiliated			MANOVA ^a		
	NA/O ^b			NA/O ^b			(Between groups effects)		
	Mean	SD	Frequently	Mean	SD	Frequently	F(3,663)	η^2	
Spirituality	36.73	5.36	35.84	38.75	6.06 ¹	35.99	6.24 ¹	9.06***	0.039
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	9.99	1.97	10.22	10.76	2.43	10.21	2.51	3.39	0.015
Religious Commitment	40.77	7.90	37.94	43.64	7.43 ^{1,2}	37.50	8.32 ¹	23.56***	0.096
Self-Esteem	27.07	3.98	26.25	25.83	4.20	26.70	3.38	2.82	0.013
Equanimity	14.39	2.07	13.80	14.49	2.25	13.94	2.34	2.71	0.012
Spiritual Distress	8.10	1.88	8.84	8.57	2.05	8.75	1.98	1.80	0.008
Psychological Distress	5.75	1.19	6.49	6.19	1.34	6.23	1.26	3.63	0.016
Spiritual/Religious Growth	10.46	2.35	9.31	11.27	2.33 ^{1,2}	9.63	2.33 ¹	21.73***	0.090
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.76	1.63	11.75	11.16	1.74	11.23	1.75	1.01	0.005
Growth in Tolerance	11.35	1.64	11.25	11.16	1.74	11.26	1.75	0.29	0.001
Growth in Leadership	8.17	1.18	8.37	8.13	1.22	8.18	1.02	0.66	0.003

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p < 0.001

^{1,2,3}... Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20,644)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b NA/O: Not at All or Occasionally

Appendix N (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/How Frequently Individuals Consumed Beer and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated			Non-Affiliated			MANOVA ^a			
	NA/O ^b		Frequently	NA/O ^b		Frequently		F(3,663)	η^2	
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Religious Engagement	21.92	7.60	18.53	6.01 ²	24.30	7.56 ^{1,2}	19.06	5.53 ¹	22.09***	0.091
Charitable Involvement	10.55	1.90	10.61	1.94	10.19	1.96	9.93	1.74	2.19	0.010
Religious/Social Conservatism	16.30	4.19 ²	14.20	3.07 ³	18.04	3.90 ^{1,2,3}	14.20	3.57 ¹	36.21***	0.141
Religious Skepticism	17.68	4.32	18.39	4.15 ²	16.22	3.92 ^{1,2}	19.42	4.11 ¹	20.67***	0.086
Spiritual Quest	25.72	4.99	26.24	4.84	26.56	5.26	25.91	5.27	0.84	0.004
Social Activism	19.32	3.94	19.18	4.27	19.80	4.23	19.62	4.28	0.53	0.002
Artistic Orientation	8.07	2.37	8.02	2.75	8.32	2.63	8.05	2.94	0.52	0.002
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.94	3.29	21.96	3.46	22.76	3.33	22.13	2.66	2.00	0.009
Hegemonic Masculinity	47.08	6.31 ^{2,4,5}	52.24	5.45 ^{3,5}	43.86	6.17 ^{1,2,3}	51.45	5.66 ^{1,4}	64.74***	0.227

*p < 0.01; **p ≤ 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^{1,2,3,...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,644), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b NA/O: Not at All or Occasionally

Appendix O

Means and Standard Deviations of How Frequently Individuals Socialize with Someone of a Different Racial Group and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	NA/O ^b		Frequently		MANOVA ^a (Between-groups effects)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(1, 665)	η^2
Spirituality	37.71	6.26	38.08	6.11	0.59	0.001
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.46	2.48	10.65	2.39	1.04	0.002
Religious Commitment	42.27	7.95	41.64	8.24	1.01	0.002
Self-Esteem	25.53	3.78	26.75	4.18	15.81***	0.023
Equanimity	14.11	2.26	14.59	2.23	7.77**	0.012
Spiritual Distress	8.63	1.93	8.50	2.17	0.77	0.001
Psychological Distress	6.24	1.34	6.10	1.28	1.99	0.003
Spiritual/Religious Growth	10.81	2.40	10.75	2.49	0.09	0.000
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.74	1.73	12.04	1.77	4.95	0.007
Growth in Tolerance	10.87	1.71	11.54	1.70	25.77***	0.037
Growth in Leadership	8.09	1.17	8.24	1.19	2.71	0.004
Religious Engagement	23.13	7.62	22.47	7.39	1.28	0.002
Charitable Involvement	9.93	1.86	10.52	1.95	15.82***	0.023
Religious/Social Conservatism	17.39	4.02	16.60	4.19	6.16	0.009
Religious Skepticism	16.69	4.01	17.39	4.33	4.66	0.007
Spiritual Quest	25.92	5.28	26.79	5.09	4.70	0.007
Social Activism	19.07	4.10	20.30	4.23	14.61***	0.021
Artistic Orientation	8.10	2.65	8.37	2.66	1.72	0.003
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.20	3.37	23.06	3.07	11.73***	0.017
Hegemonic Masculinity	45.81	6.91	46.20	6.84	0.51	0.001

*p < 0.01; **p ≤ 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,646), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .998$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b NA/O: Not at All or Occasionally

Appendix P

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/Frequency Socializing with Someone of a Different Racial or Ethnic Group and the Results of a MANOVA of them

Measures	NA/O ^b		Frequently		NA/O ^b		Frequently		MANOVA ^a	
	Affiliated		Non-Affiliated		Between-groups effects					
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(3, 663)	η^2		
Spirituality	36.65	6.30	36.12	5.72	37.91	6.24	38.58	6.11	3.69	0.016
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.13	2.49	10.04	2.18	10.52	2.48	10.80	2.42	2.49	0.011
Religious Commitment	40.64	8.08	38.73	8.41 ¹	42.58	7.90 ¹	42.39	8.04	4.94**	0.022
Self-Esteem	26.11	3.33	27.24	4.02 ²	25.41	3.86 ^{1,2}	26.63	4.21 ¹	6.61***	0.027
Equanimity	14.02	2.10	14.25	2.22	14.12	2.29	14.68	2.23	3.26	0.015
Spiritual Distress	8.56	1.80	8.28	2.35	8.65	1.96	8.55	2.13	0.58	0.003
Psychological Distress	6.07	1.20	6.04	1.31	6.28	1.36	6.12	1.28	1.09	0.005
Spiritual/Religious Growth	10.36	2.57	9.67	2.34 ^{1,2}	10.89	2.37 ¹	11.03	2.46 ²	6.38***	0.028
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.76	1.47	11.75	1.96	11.73	1.78	12.12	1.71	2.45	0.011
Growth in Tolerance	11.16	1.57	11.43	1.86	10.81	1.74 ¹	11.57	1.66 ¹	9.36***	0.041
Growth in Leadership	8.27	1.22	8.24	1.07	8.05	1.15	8.23	1.22	1.46	0.007

*p ≤ 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^{1,2,3} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(20,644), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda); ^b NA/O: Not at All or Occasionally

Appendix P (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/Frequency of Socializing with Someone of a Different Racial/Ethnic Group and the Results of a MANOVA of them

Measures	Affiliated						Non-Affiliated			MANOVA ^a	
	NA/O ^b		Frequently		NA/O ^b		Frequently		Between-groups effects		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(3, 663)	η^2	
Religious Engagement	21.13	7.09	19.99	7.22 ¹	23.52	7.67 ¹	23.11	7.32	5.15**	0.023	
Charitable Involvement	10.18	1.84	10.90	1.92 ¹	9.88	1.86 ¹	10.42	1.95	6.76***	0.030	
Religious/Social Conservatism	15.82	4.08	15.09	3.73 ^{1,2}	17.69	3.94 ¹	16.99	4.22 ²	9.36***	0.041	
Religious Skepticism	17.58	4.38	18.30	4.14	16.52	3.92	17.15	4.35	3.92*	0.017	
Spiritual Quest	25.91	4.36	25.96	5.36	25.92	5.45	27.01	5.00	2.30	0.010	
Social Activism	18.65	3.68	19.76	4.32	19.15	4.17 ¹	20.44	4.20 ¹	5.56***	0.025	
Artistic Orientation	8.04	2.55	8.06	2.52	8.11	2.68	8.45	2.69	0.96	0.004	
Compassionate Self-Concept	21.98	3.73	22.99	3.03	22.25	3.30	23.08	3.08	4.02*	0.018	
Hegemonic Masculinity	49.20	6.41 ^{1,3}	49.27	6.56 ^{2,4}	45.16	6.82 ^{1,2}	45.40	6.70 ^{3,4}	11.61***	0.050	

* $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^{1,2,3...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(20,644)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .996$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

^b NA/O: Not at All or Occasionally

Appendix Q

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Level of Hegemonic Masculinity and MANOVA Results

Measures	Low						Medium-Low		Medium-High		High		MANOVA ^a	
	Mean		SD		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(3, 663)	η^2		
Spirituality	39.67	5.15 ^{1,2}	38.50	6.20 ³	37.21	5.96 ¹	35.67	6.91 ^{2,3}	9.66***	0.042				
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	11.34	2.33 ^{1,2}	10.66	2.37 ³	10.35	2.32 ¹	9.75	2.64 ^{2,3}	8.77***	0.038				
Religious Commitment	45.69	6.02 ^{1,2}	43.17	7.71 ^{3,4}	40.49	8.07 ^{1,3}	37.55	8.58 ^{2,4}	24.97***	0.102				
Self-Esteem	23.21	3.38 ^A	25.58	3.90 ^A	27.07	3.55 ^A	29.02	3.29 ^A	53.98***	0.196				
Equanimity	14.42	2.25	14.38	2.34	14.32	2.16	14.22	2.26	0.19	0.001				
Spiritual Distress	8.68	1.99	8.71	2.07	8.50	2.13	8.23	1.93	1.53	0.007				
Psychological Distress	6.40	1.40	6.21	1.29	6.01	1.27	6.15	1.33	2.25	0.010				
Spiritual/Religious Growth	11.58	2.31 ^{1,2}	11.15	2.34 ³	10.40	2.45 ¹	9.70	2.37 ^{2,3}	15.30***	0.065				
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.50	1.55	11.89	1.79	11.93	1.83	12.25	1.68	3.48	0.015				
Growth in Tolerance	11.17	1.55	11.23	1.67	11.32	1.91	10.90	1.76	1.35	0.006				
Growth in Leadership	7.90	1.15	8.21	1.30	8.27	1.08	8.35	1.06	3.54	0.016				

*p ≤ 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^ASignificant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1, 2, 3, ...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(19,645), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .997$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix Q (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Level of Hegemonic Masculinity and MANOVA Results

Measures	Low		Medium-Low		Medium-High		High		MANOVA ^a	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F(3, 663)	η^2
	Religious Engagement	27.86	6.89	24.18	7.51	20.75	6.49	17.60	5.16	51.56***
Charitable Involvement	10.34	2.10	10.23	1.84	10.13	1.88	10.25	2.04	0.33	0.001
Religious/Social Conservatism	19.89	3.11 ⁴	17.88	3.84 ⁴	15.72	3.85 ⁴	14.01	3.38 ⁴	60.37***	0.215
Religious Skepticism	14.93	3.16 ^{1,2}	16.41	3.94 ^{3,4}	18.03	4.33 ^{1,3}	19.06	4.10 ^{2,4}	26.23***	0.106
Spiritual Quest	26.72	4.99	26.45	5.33	26.06	5.02	26.25	5.51	0.46	0.002
Social Activism	19.08	4.06	19.67	4.08	19.80	4.11	20.11	4.81	1.21	0.005
Artistic Orientation	8.32	2.79	8.30	2.78	8.15	2.46	8.11	2.59	0.23	0.001
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.13	2.83	23.06	3.11	22.49	3.61	22.40	3.21	2.66	0.012

* $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

⁴Significant differences amongst all of the groups.

^{1,2,3} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(19,645)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .997$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix R

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/Level of Hegemonic Masculinity and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated						Non-Affiliated						MANOVA ^a	
	Low			High			Low			High			F(3, 663)	η^2
	Mean	SD	SD	Mean	SD	SD	Mean	SD	SD	Mean	SD	SD		
Spirituality	37.71	5.74	5.99 ²	35.65	5.99 ²	5.90 ^{1,2}	39.03	5.90 ^{1,2}	5.90 ^{1,2}	37.06	6.42 ¹	6.42 ¹	8.82***	0.038
Aesthetically-Based Spiritual Experience	10.26	2.13	2.42	9.99	2.42	2.40 ¹	10.96	2.40 ¹	2.40 ¹	10.20	2.46 ¹	2.46 ¹	6.36***	0.028
Religious Commitment	42.81	7.45	8.23 ²	37.90	8.23 ²	7.26 ^{1,2}	44.14	7.26 ^{1,2}	7.26 ^{1,2}	40.07	8.33 ¹	8.33 ¹	20.33***	0.084
Self-Esteem	24.98	3.90 ^{3,4}	3.34 ^{2,4}	27.65	3.34 ^{2,4}	3.90 ^{1,2}	24.79	3.90 ^{1,2}	3.90 ^{1,2}	27.76	3.67 ^{1,3}	3.67 ^{1,3}	33.30***	0.131
Equanimity	14.29	2.27	2.12	14.08	2.12	2.31	14.41	2.31	2.31	14.36	2.22	2.22	0.48	0.002
Spiritual Distress	8.50	2.17	2.11	8.36	2.11	2.02	8.73	2.02	2.02	8.42	2.05	2.05	1.30	0.006
Psychological Distress	5.95	1.34	1.21	6.11	1.21	1.32	6.31	1.32	1.32	6.04	1.32	1.32	2.47	0.018.001
Spiritual/Religious Growth	10.98	2.44	2.32 ²	9.46	2.32 ²	2.32 ^{1,2}	11.33	2.32 ^{1,2}	2.32 ^{1,2}	10.42	2.44 ¹	2.44 ¹	15.91***	0.067
Growth in Global/National Understanding	11.55	1.47	1.88	11.86	1.88	1.75	11.79	1.75	1.75	12.10	1.74	1.74	2.02	0.009
Growth in Tolerance	11.60	1.40	1.88	11.16	1.88	1.65	11.16	1.65	1.65	11.18	1.86	1.86	0.79	0.004
Growth in Leadership	8.00	1.08	1.15	8.39	1.15	1.27	8.05	1.27	1.27	8.26	1.04	1.04	2.73	0.012

*p ≤ 0.01; **p < 0.005; ***p ≤ 0.001

^{1, 2, 3, ...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: F(19,645), p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = .995$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)

Appendix R (Continue)

Means and Standard Deviations of Fraternity Affiliation/Level of Hegemonic Masculinity and the Results of a MANOVA

Measures	Affiliated			Non-Affiliated			MANOVA ^a			
	Low		High	Low		High	F(3, 663)	η^2		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Religious Engagement	25.45	7.18 ^{3,4}	17.90	5.64 ^{2,4}	25.37	7.56 ^{1,2}	20.33	6.33 ^{1,3}	39.52***	0.152
Charitable Involvement	10.67	1.91	10.53	1.92	10.21	1.93	10.04	1.92	2.10	0.009
Religious/Social Conservatism	17.86	3.83 ^{3,4}	14.14	3.28 ^{2,4}	18.62	3.72 ^{1,2}	15.51	3.89 ^{1,3}	48.52***	0.180
Religious Skepticism	16.55	4.31	18.73	4.04 ²	15.85	3.68 ^{1,2}	18.25	4.36 ¹	21.22***	0.088
Spiritual Quest	25.83	5.37	25.99	4.69	26.63	5.20	26.17	5.36	0.66	0.033
Social Activism	18.81	3.28	19.50	4.42	19.56	4.16	20.05	4.32	1.32	0.006
Artistic Orientation	7.76	2.69	8.20	2.44	8.38	2.79	8.11	2.53	0.91	0.004
Compassionate Self-Concept	22.74	2.99	22.43	3.59	22.76	3.06	22.47	3.44	0.47	0.002

* $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p < 0.005$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

^{1, 2, 3, ...} Significant differences between the groups with the same superscript.

^a Results of MANOVA for the Group main effect: $F(19, 645)$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = .995$ (F value is Wilks' lambda)