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ABSTRACT

This research explores the friendship patterns exhibited by members of four MIT fraternities. Variation in the number and percentage of "close" friends who live in the fraternity is explored as a response to:

1. Length of residence in the fraternity
2. Participation in non-fraternity group activities
3. The structural properties of the fraternity.

Empirical evidence was collected through interviews with the house presidents and detailed questionnaires distributed to freshmen, sophomores and juniors of the four fraternities.

The findings are summarized below:

1. The fraternities serve as the predominant source of friends for its members.

2. Each class in the fraternity manifests strikingly different characteristics. Most notably, the members of the sophomore class have the lowest average number of friends and the highest proportion of their friends within the fraternity.

3. There is only equivocal evidence that participation in outside activities leads to a lower proportion of friends within the fraternity.

4. The direction and strength of association between a respondent's evaluation of the fraternity and the number of fraternity friends he has is a function of the fraternity within which he resides and the length of residence in the fraternity.

5. The members of the two fraternities which contain conflictual subgroups have a higher proportion of their friends within the fraternity than the members of the fraternities lacking articulated subgroups.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Few will argue that associations with other persons, if not defined, are at least limited by class background, physical location, age, sex and personal preference. As one progresses in the life cycle, acquaintances come from an increasingly larger set of social institutions in our society. The child's primary associations occur almost exclusively within the nuclear family. As the child grows and attends schools, his peer group and teachers play increasingly dominant roles in the child's life. By adulthood most individuals have learned to play a number of roles which are appropriate to the multiplicity of associations that are played out in numerous social settings and institutions. We learn a set of roles that dictate behavior in business, in political and social organizations, in religious institutions, in the family and the list of possible social interactions goes on.

Among our acquaintances, a group of individuals, our friends, form outside and across the social institutions within which initial contacts are made. To our friends we present our individuated self. We often refer to presenting our true self only to our friends. It is also among these persons, most notably (we would also include one's parents, spouses and children) that social relations become a desired ends unto themselves.

Most students' college careers coincide with a transitional period between adolescence and adulthood. For students at
a residential college, such as MIT, this has implications for whom they will likely associate with. For many students it is the first time that they will be free of the direct influence of their family for an extended period of time. On the other hand they have yet to assume professional roles, acquire a family, participate in community affairs or other adult activities which would bring the student in direct contact with the larger adult world. Consequently most students interact with a group of individuals quite restricted in age and life orientation. Values and attitudes propagated by adult institutions, the university, and the professions, are filtered through the student's peer group.

The Scope of the Study

The peer group is critical to the formation of the student's attitudes towards his study and future professional goals, to his adoption of adult life styles, and to the success with which the student will be able to establish satisfactory social relations with other persons of both sexes. The short time of this study precluded any systematic study of the socialization process that occurs within the living group. Instead I have focused on the necessary preconditions for the socialization process, the existence of a strong social relations network. I have used as an index the "close" friends of the members of the fraternities under study.

This study is an exploration into the patterns of friendships of college students and how the patterns are affected by the institutional arrangements of the university and the students' living group. In particular I will investigate the distribution
of friends of MIT students living in four fraternities. My de-
pendent variable will be the number or alternatively the percent
of all "close" friends each respondent indicates is a member of
his fraternity. The study investigates the variation of the
dependent variable as a response to participation in non-frater-
nity organized activities and as a response to variation in se-
lected social-structural variables associated with the frater-
nities. In the next few paragraphs, I will outline arguments
along which the paper proceeds and present a summary of the study
design to explore the questions raised below.

The study starts on the premise that one can identify
natural groups that serve as potential pools or friendships.
Such groups circumscribe a group of individuals in a primary re-
lationship with one another. This study looks at one obvious
group, the fraternity, but sections or suites of dormitories
operate as analogous structures, though their boundaries are not
as well defined as those of the fraternity. We also assume that
extracurricular activities, such as athletic teams or clubs have
the potential to act as primary or alternate reference groups
for the fraternity member.

The first area which will be explored is the distribu-
tion of friends the fraternity men have. If the fraternity is
the dominant social center of most members than we would expect
that the largest number of friends would also live in the
fraternity. Yet there will of course be members with friends out-
side the fraternity and a not inconsiderable number. One group,
women, are exclusively found outside the fraternity. In addition
we will want to distinguish between two other groups external to the fraternity. The first group is composed of both male and female friends whom the fraternity men met before entering MIT. The second group is composed of male friends external to the fraternity whom the fraternity man met after coming to MIT. This group will be of particular interest to us, since this one will be the truest measure of the attractiveness and social closure of the fraternity.

Variation in the number and percentage of friends for each individual to be studied can be examined in terms of three approaches. First we might examine socioeconomic class background. The criteria by which one selects friends, and the disjuncture that might occur if one encounters individuals at school from a different class may work to alter the distribution and numbers of friends in a systematic fashion. This paper will not examine the implications of class background. First because most of the students in this study come from families with fathers employed in white collar, management or professional jobs. The possibility that lower class students might have undergone anticipatory socialization also obscures any data that we can collect on this variable.

The second approach is to consider the availability and attractiveness of alternate organized activities either on campus or in the community. Will the involvement in such groups lead a person to form friends outside the fraternity more than the uninvolved person?

We finally will consider the social environment of the fraternity itself, either through the eyes of the individual or
as an objective state of the fraternity. We will want to ask what sort of structural requirements are necessary for the extended and intense interaction that go towards the formation of friends. Will decrease in internal tension, high group participation, and a sense of solidarity lead to more friends in the fraternity for its members as opposed to a less endowed fraternity? Will the existence of visible subgroups lead to fewer friends because of increased tension or do they serve to facilitate more friends because of the greater interaction within the subgroups which result in times of intergroup conflict? Finally, will marked difference in the perception as to the condition of the house be the result of dissatisfaction of a fraternity member and consequently be associated with a decrease in the number of his friends who come from the fraternity?

Study Design

The orientation of this study is descriptive and exploratory rather than theoretical and definitive. The line of argument and questions outlined above will be examined utilizing empirical data gathered from questionnaires distributed to a sample of MIT fraternity men. The reader should note that at times the empirical evidence is used to support concrete and specific hypotheses or phenomena. At other times the empirical evidence is taken to suggest the elaboration of some of the more simplified or incorrect arguments outlined above for further research.

The four fraternities under study were selected on the basis of interviews I conducted with ten house president. I have selected four fraternities which manifest structural differ-
ences, such as the visibility of internal subgroups and the amount of participation in non fraternity activities, which I thought would lead to systematic variation in the dependent variable, the location of "close" friends. Similarly the tools of analysis were selected because I thought they might prove to be useful in analyzing the variation in the dependent variable. The definition of sample and the definition of variables, leave much to be desired in terms of methodological rigor. This is not as great a problem as it seems since my intent is to explore the phenomenon of friendship patterns and propose to testable hypotheses for future study. I utilize the data not as much to test hypotheses, though this I do, but rather to tease out critical variables, to test the efficacy of alternate methodological strategies and to construct models and hypotheses that more adequately explain the results of the empirical study. In addition to the empirical data, the author draws on his personal experience as a former member of an MIT fraternity.

The paper is divided into nine chapters and an appendix. In Chapter II I discuss the theory and literature which pertains to this study. The third chapter discusses the unique relation of fraternities to MIT and their organizational characteristics. The fourth and fifth chapters discuss the sample population and the nature of the four fraternities. The sixth chapter describes the distribution of friendship patterns of the members of the fraternities and the variation amongst members of different fraternities and of different classes. The seventh chapter attempts to explain the variation of the friendship patterns in
terms of access to alternate group activities. The eighth chapter attempts to explain the variation of friendship patterns in terms of social structural properties of the fraternities. A concluding chapter and appendix complete the thesis. Most of the data referred to in the main body of the text appears in the appendix as well as a sample questionnaire.

The interviews with the presidents occurred during January and early February 1972. The questionnaires were administered during February. Consequently, the freshman class had resided in the fraternities one full semester and had assumed full membership in the fraternities.
I think it instructive to review the literature I have read which informed and focused the attention of this study. I remind the reader that this study is essentially empirical, descriptive and exploratory. There is little attempt to explain the findings in terms of previous theory. Nor do I attempt to test hypotheses which are presented in the literature. The questions I am addressing are tangential to most everything I have read. Nevertheless at times I do refer to explanations and findings from other person's works to generalize upon the findings of this study. In the end I am informed by the theory and findings of others and these have limited and direct my line of reasoning.

The sociological and psychological journals contain numerous articles measuring the change in students attitudes and values as a response to college life and its various organizational settings. There are also a number of books which one invariably consults in a study of this sort. Theodore Newcomb and Kenneth Feldman have collected the results of the numerous studies on the impact of college on students in volume which is best described as an annotated bibliography. The volume is organized into chapters each summarizing the findings of a number of studies related by a common theme. The editors then comment on the generalizability of the studies. Another useful volume, also edited by Theodore Newcomb with Everett K. Wilson is College Peer Group.
Problems and Prospects for Research. This book is a collection of essays on peer group influence on the values and attitudes of students, especially as they arise out of the organizational rubric of the university. The book also discusses the research problems and conceptual frameworks which can be used for this type of study. An earlier collection of essays edited by Nevitt Sanford, The American College round out the triumvirate of books which are often cited in empirical studies on student subcultures.

I need not exhaustively review the material as it relates to the impact of college upon students. This can be found in theses of Margaret Lambrinides and Bertram C. Shlensky. Taken together the findings tend to be far from conclusive. Often contradictory hypotheses will find support from different colleges or even different classes at the same college. Newcomb observes that in general the findings "raise questions about how distinguishable kinds of students respond differentially to varying experiences in different settings, but they do not provide answers." Newcomb also suggests that at best the studies show that students tend to adapt socially rather than change intellectually.

There is general agreement among most of the sociologists that peer group influence is inherently conservative. Differences among groups are due to self reflection and group recruitment which, except for arbitrary placement (by administrative decree), occur because students choose to live with others with similar attitudes and interests. Though changes in student's values are
possible, the previous eighteen years of socialization and the high degree of selectivity leading to homogamous relations suggest that a major change among the majority of students is unlikely. Yet the student subculture exerts strong normative controls. It sets norms which control studying, dating, stratification, drinking, political activity, the question of the use of drugs, relations to faculty and parents.  

While fraternities at MIT no longer act as overt filters of certain ethnic and class group, as Robin Williams states, he is correct in observing that the fraternities still constitute closed segments of the campus society that develop ingroup solidarity which serve to promote close and satisfying friendship ties. Individuals living in dorms form around structures whose closeness and identity in many respects mirror the essential organizational characteristics of a fraternity.

The studies of Vreeland and Bidwell, Newcomb and Gamson among others discuss the properties of the peer group necessary for most affect upon changing the individual's attitudes. Zelda Gamson enumerates six conditions under which peer groups will be most effective:

a. High frequency of interaction with group members
b. active concern by group with changing members
c. strong group solidarity
d. high member attraction to the group
e. use of many sanctions by the group
f. high group isolation from other sources

Newcomb adds to this list the size and homogeneity. It should be large enough to allow for the formation of intimate friends yet small enough so that everyone recognizes each other. The group should be similar by sex, age, social class and religious affiliation.
Studies of MIT Students

The generalizations we have encountered above tend to converge at MIT to reinforce the central position of the living group in the lives of the students. A number of previous studies have investigated the dominance of the living group and the fashion in which it mediates between the student and MIT.

Kenneth Browning studied the socialization of students in two departments, he found that 87% of the fraternity members and 48% of the dormitory residents of his sample identified most strongly with their living group. The next strongest identification was with MIT in general and a very few identified with activities or departments among the fraternity members.16

The study which seems most similar to mine, is a thesis done by Margaret Lambrinides previously cited. She studied the way in which students utilized the dormitory and the types of interactions that occur within it. She compares the dormitory with the fraternity experience. Her findings were rather predictably student oriented, an end to compulsory common meal plan, more coed living, flexible living arrangements and more privacy. Her study also lends evidence to the dominance of the peer group over the formal university structure. The only encroachment of the administration in an attempt to influence the students, the house master-tutor program, has been unsuccessful. In general tutors are not used and students go to their peers for help. The house-master-tutor plan appeared to have little effect on the amount of meaningful contact the students had with faculty.17
Reference Group

Muzafer Sherif's reference group analysis presents us with a useful conceptual framework within which to consider the friendship patterns of fraternity members. The reference group is one in which the individual relates himself as a member or aspires to relate himself psychologically. The reference group anchors a person's feeling of success and failure in related activities of the group. Conceptually the definition embodies many subtleties which make it hard to apply. Often a reference group is confused with a comparison group. A comparison group might act as a benchmark but it does not necessarily embody the allegiance which a reference group implies. Further one must take into account that a person may simultaneously maintain a number of reference groups. For these reasons it can not be uncritically assumed that a fraternity is a reference group for all its members. One method used to identify reference groups was to assume that if the members chose to join the group, which is clearly the case of the fraternity, then it was one.

Sherif goes on to discuss the alienated person who dislodges himself from the reference group roles systems and norms. The alienated person then lacks stable anchors and stable guides to action. This Sherif contends is psychologically painful and results in a normless state which cannot be endured for long. Thus a person will attempt to restore these anchors by finding groups compatible with his orientation.

I cannot, within the scope of this study, systematically
apply reference group analysis to examine the behavior of its members. But assuming that the fraternity is at least similar to a reference group, following the line of argument, fraternity members with a large number of friends outside the fraternity should be associated with alienation and the individual's search for new reference groups.
CHAPTER II.


6. Feldman and Newcomb, p. 49.


10. *Ibid.*, p. 346-347. Also see Lambrinides, p. 117 for statement affirming this observation at MIT.


15. Newcomb in Sanford, p. 482.


17. Lambrinides, p. 99. (Note: while the tutors did not
Footnotes

Chapter II.

function successfully academically, some students felt they succeeded socially).


CHAPTER III. THE ORGANIZATION OF MIT FRATERNITIES

The first MIT fraternity dates back to before the turn of the century. Today there are twenty-nine fraternities housing about 1,200 undergraduates or just under 1/3 of the MIT undergraduate student population. Houses range in size from twenty members to seventy members with most houses having about forty members. While other fraternity systems are dying or dead at major eastern universities, MIT fraternities have continued to demonstrate a resilience and continuing popularity, which may be explained by a unique set of circumstances. First the fraternities have been flexible to change, though this at times has not come without crisis. The fraternities during the past several years shifted from a traditional to a more casual notion of what a fraternity should be in keeping with sentiment prevalent among today's college students. My interviews with the college president and an article in The Tech\(^1\) point to a radical reorientation towards the treatment of freshmen. The fraternities have eliminated the humiliating hazing practices for more constructive ways of integrating the freshmen into the house. The group identities of the houses have changed. This will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

A second circumstance is the continuing deficiency of housing facilities on the MIT campus. The administration has taken a sympathetic, or at least hands off, view towards the
fraternities, as they are necessary if the dormitories are not to become drastically overcrowded. The fraternities were also the fortunate recipients of the refugees from the poor social and living conditions of the dormitories. This is now changing. MIT has recently begun to take a more active interest in making the dormitories more desirable.2 For the first time the fraternities must compete with the dormitory system which is in some cases more preferable physically and socially. (Coed living, as much as possible with the low number of women attending MIT, is an on going institution in three of the dormitories. For many reasons unclear to me it has only been affected in a few fraternities.) Despite the turmoil of the late '60's and early '70's no MIT fraternity has failed in recent history.

The Physical Aspects of the Fraternity

Most of the twenty-nine fraternities are located in town houses in Back Bay Boston. A few of the houses maintain their former elegance, the open spiral staircase, stained wood work, parquette floors and ornate fire places. But time and abuse have taken their toll and most houses have lost this elegance and taken on a liven in and friendly feel. The open staircases are closed because of fire laws, white wash covers the wood work to ease the maintenance and cleaning. The remaining walls of the common rooms are often covered with wall paper in bland printed patterns. Yet each house retains the elegant style in its chapter room, in which the brotherhood holds its weekly meeting, and possibly the foyer and dining room.

The members' rooms are often decorated with colorful
posters and art objects. The walls are painted in contrasting and energetic colors. Beds are ingeniously hung from the ceiling providing room and privacy in the cramped space which often requires that three or four men share a room. In general the houses reflect the individual character of its members and if there is to be agreement on anything, I am quite sure the members would point to their house.

The Organization of the Fraternity

We now turn from the physical character of the house to the social fabric and relations that bind and perpetuate the fraternity. The organizational components of the fraternity include its goals, selection of new members, the integration of new members, the distribution of work, governance, ritual, life style and status. Each of these may form the basis for cleavage within the fraternity.

Despite formal ties and responsibilities invested in the alumni associations and MIT, the fraternities act as self-governing units. Indeed their concern for maintaining individual integrity often leads them to carry on as independent city-states. On a routine basis, the undergraduates are responsible for maintaining the house, ordering food, paying the utility bills, providing social activities, maintaining good relations with the neighbors, collecting and setting room and board for its members. Indeed only in the most major of crises or the most fundamental policies do the alumni association or MIT intercede.
Goals

Most organizational goals of the fraternity are rarely articulated. Its goals, in addition to self perpetuity, and providing food and shelter, is to provide a closed network of social relations within which the individual will form friendships, attend social functions, talk, play cards, date and study.

Rush Week

To this end, it attempts to find individuals who mirror the existing character of the fraternity and who would be compatible with the personalities of the brotherhood. In general the houses attempt to find individuals who they consider socially acceptable, those individuals who they feel will fit into the fraternity. This is the purpose of rush week. Yet the pendulum swings both ways. Not only must the fraternity find individuals it wants, but it must attempt to sell itself by producing a super gloss finishing even if the impression may be misleading. In recent years most fraternities have turned away from a "hard" rush to a low key casual affair, which is not only more in keeping with the times, but economical.

Rushing at MIT also presents a unique set of conditions which have consequences for the fraternity. Rushing occurs over a four day period the week prior to the start of school. Though all students may rush, it is virtually a freshman rush. Between free food and entertainment and some not too subtle prods by MIT, almost all the freshmen visit at least one fraternity.
The short period and its occurrence before the start of school leads one to suspect that the rush may approach a random selection. This possibility is emphasized due to the lack of overt racial, class and ethnic screens which in the past may have aided in producing a more homogenous group. Despite the lack of overt criteria, the informal and subconscious feel one gets for a freshman by talking with him seems as effective in producing a selective class as any overt criterion. The system is far from fool proof and often the fraternities have found they have pledged a class much different from the rest of the house. No study exists to gauge the effectiveness of various styles of rush and their selectivity. It would certainly prove to be an interesting account. We may conclude, that despite the tendencies for rush to objectively operate in a random fashion, informal mechanism tend to work to produce a much more homogenous groupings than one might predict.

Pledge Training

Once the fraternity has secured a new freshman class, it turns its attention to integrating them into the social relations of the house. This is more commonly known as pledge training. Pledge training is characterized as either old style or new style. Old style, relied on fear and humiliation to create integration, much in the way Erving Goffman describes mortification of inmates in asylums as a way to break down a former self system and re-create a new one in line with the organizational requirements of the institution. This style assumed that the freshman was immature and irresponsible, he had to be molded into a brother.
In recent years the old style pledge training has come under attack as being inhumane and at times destructive. MIT fraternities have responded to the pressure and turned to requiring the freshmen to undertake constructive acts to demonstrate a desire and readiness to become a brother. It has also been traditional that the freshmen take on most of the house maintenance chores. One year of work for three years of leisure. This too has come under fire as creating an unnecessary caste system and that the example of brothers working will in itself create a conducive atmosphere in which to integrate the freshmen. Some fraternities have gone so far as to remove all distinctions between first term freshmen and the rest of the house.

Governance

The fraternity must also concern itself with operating the house. As with most small voluntaristic groups, a pretension towards participatory democracy exists. All house matters are voted upon in brotherhood meetings which all brothers are expected to attend. Any member can bring up a motion and initiate action. In actuality the responsibility of running the house is undertaken by a few individuals in key positions. Normally each house has a president; treasurer; a steward, who orders food, sets menus and deals with the cook; a house manager; who is responsible for the physical repair of the house; social chairman; the rush chairman and pledge trainer, who is responsible for the freshman class. The remaining members provide assistance during rush and cleaning the house in the beginning of September. Though with liberalized pledge training brothers are now undertaking
chores formally considered exclusively the responsibility of freshmen. It is also true that the brotherhood also participates as a group in intramural sports and parties sponsored by the house.

**Life Styles**

The fraternities represent a broad spectrum of life styles. There are three recurring themes along which all fraternities can be compared. The first is the conception and responsibility the brothers have towards the house. The second is the academic orientation of the house. The third orientation centers on the social styles of the fraternity. Houses tend to manifest similar clusters of these orientations, allowing one to describe houses as being either traditional or liberal. Most houses will manifest characteristics of both.

The traditional fraternity maintains much of the ritual. Its image as a fraternity is actively maintained. Even if hazing is gone, freshmen are still treated in an inferior way and are responsible for most of the work. The adherents to this type are most often characterized as straight laced, politically conservative and beer drinkers.

The archetype liberal fraternity tends to strive towards the communal ideal. Ritual is minimal or nonexistent. Egalitarianism is the predominant theme with house work distributed among the freshmen and the rest of the brotherhood evenly. There is probably a rejection of the traditional fraternity image, but as the conservative counterparts, the liberal adherents defend the integrity of their fraternity. The liberal houses tend to be much more loose and free in the life style. Among the liberal
fraternity types one will find the radical student and from their ranks come the drug users. Most houses will tend to have characters of both the conservative and liberal archtype fraternity. And in most houses there are internal factions which support one image over the other and often from the basis for cleavage and polarization.

In Chapter V a closer look will be given to the four fraternities under study.
CHAPTER III.


2. Lambrinides' thesis was part of a larger effort by MIT to reevaluate the attempts to bring educational experiences into the dormitories during the early '60's.

3. For a glimpse of what fraternities say they offer freshmen one should refer to Undergraduate Residence, MIT 1971-1972 in which the fraternities present themselves in one page statements and pictures to entice freshmen to visit their fraternities in the fall.

CHAPTER IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The individuals sampled for this study are freshmen, sophomores and juniors from four MIT fraternities. A discussion of the character of these four fraternities follows in Chapter V. This chapter sets forth the demographic profile for the respondents. Where appropriate, comparison will be drawn with a profile of the MIT class of '73 and statistics in regards to the general population of the United States.

For convenience and anonymity the four fraternities will simple be designated by the letters A, B, C and D. Fraternities A, B, and D have about 40 undergraduate members each, while fraternity D has about 50. Questionnaires (see appendix for copy) were distributed to all freshmen, sophomores and juniors associated with the houses. The seniors were excluded since it would have required hunting out a large proportion of this class who no longer lived in the house and were inactive in fraternity affairs. To sample only the active seniors would lose much of the desired richness, while attempting to locate entire population did not seem worth the effort given my time constraints and limited resources.

In one fraternity (A) it was necessary to consider members living in apartments. For this group I included all those apartment dwellers who had mailboxes in the fraternity house. This coincided with the President's judgement as to who was a
brother.

**TABLE 4.1**

**Distribution of sample by year and fraternity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity</th>
<th>Fresh.</th>
<th>Soph.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this way I have hoped to reach a sample which is large enough to conduct a comparative analysis among the fraternities, which covers enough years to do a longitudinal analysis, and which encompasses a good percentage of all individuals who were associated with the fraternity. If the sample has a bias, it undoubtedly errs towards sampling members with more friends from the fraternity and a greater satisfaction with the fraternity. In three of the four fraternities the response rate was above 70%
as Table 4.1 indicates. The table is self explanatory, but the reader should note the small sample of juniors which plagues much of the analysis. It is very difficult to explain the low response rate from Fraternity C. Possibly I did not apply strong-arm tactics or keep in touch with this fraternity as I did with others. Nor does it seem likely that a systematic bias may be introduced by the failure of disinterested persons to return the questionnaires.

The Demographic Profile of the Study Population

An overview of the sampled population indicates that, in comparison with the American populous, it is homogeneous and disproportionately from families with college educated parents holding white collar jobs, especially professional and management occupations. The population does not significantly differ from the backgrounds of other groups of MIT students except for lack of Jewish, Oriental and Black students.

The typical respondent comes from a family with two other brothers and/or sisters. Members of Fraternity A tend to have no more than one other sibling, while members of Fraternity C often have three other siblings. Members of fraternities B and D fall in between.

A disproportionately large percent of the sample, 83%, listed their fathers' occupations as those we generally associate with white collar work. This is identical to the distribution of occupations of the fathers' of the members of the class of '73.¹ This figure is roughly double the percentage of white collar jobs held by Americans in general.² Furthermore the distribution of
white collar occupations for the fathers of both the fraternity members and the class of '73 are disproportionately from high status occupations; the professional and upper management occupations as opposed to the cleric, sales and service occupations. About 51% of the fraternity sample could be said to come from families in which the father holds a high status job. A comparative set of jobs include 50% of the fathers of the members of the class of '73. In contrast only 21% of the general population holds such high status jobs. 4

Again both the MIT population and the fraternity sample manifest similar trends in the employment of the mothers of the students. Fifty percent of the fraternity respondents' mothers and 60% of the class of '73 were listed as housewives. The remainder tended to be grammar school teachers, secretarial and clerical workers and nurses. Though I have no direct information, the pattern for the mothers is more in line with the profile of the job distribution for women in our society than the fathers' distribution mirrored the occupational structure for males.

Some differences exist in the distribution of occupations among the fathers of members of different fraternities. Members of fraternity A and B tend to have a higher proportion of their fathers in management positions. The fathers of fraternity C's members tend to have a decidedly professional bent, that is doctors, lawyers, dentists and academics. Fraternity D seems to have the largest number of members we might consider upward mobile. More of the fathers of its members are engineers and manual laborers than in any of the other fraternities.
The high proportion of college educated parents among the study population and the MIT students further buttress the notion that MIT serves an an elite university, educating sons and daughters of the upper social classes for elite occupations. The typical fraternity man's father and mother will have had some college. Just under 80% of the fathers of both the fraternity members and the Class of '73 have attended college. Again for both populations 39% of the fathers had attended graduate school. Sixty-four percent of the mothers of the fraternity population had attended some college and beyond, while a little less, 51%, of the class of '73's mothers had at least attended college. The high level of education of the parents can be best appreciated if it is compared to the 34% of the population in 1940 who enrolled in college. This population roughly coincides with the age cohort of most of parents of MIT students. A still smaller percent of that comparable age group, for the entire society, actually received a degree. There is some variation among fraternities. The most notable distinction can be drawn between Fraternity D and the remainder of the fraternities. Seventeen percent of the fathers of this fraternity went to graduate school, half as many as from each of the other fraternities. Fraternity D also had a slightly larger proportion of its father completing no more than high school. Coupled with the occupational characteristics cited above, Fraternity D appears to have members from a slightly lower socioeconomic standing than the other fraternities. The consequences of this difference are probably minimal when we compare the profiles to the society at large.
Similar to the MIT student body at large, the members of the fraternities are heavily concentrated in New England and the Mid Atlantic states. Fifty percent of both the study population and class of '73\textsuperscript{10} list these two regions as their home. It is very hard to analyze the distribution across the rest of the United States due to the small sample size. While the statistics do not indicate any marked departure from the geographical distribution among all MIT students, it is quite probable if we scrutinized the fraternities we would find a phenomenon of members clustered around very limited areas. This results from summer rushing, which brings would-be freshmen into contact with fraternity members over the summer. Attendance at one of these summer parties increases the likelihood of a freshman pledging a fraternity. As a byproduct, unintentional clustering results.

The major departure of the study population from the general MIT student population occurs in the distribution of religious denominations and races. Only one oriental and no blacks were among the respondents. In contrast, MIT has a significant number of orientals both foreign and American and a small black population. Why these groups are under represented is a result of two complimentary factors. There undoubtedly exists some prejudice, though rarely is it blatant among the members of the fraternities, and an antipathy towards fraternities among most of the orientals and blacks.

These houses are also under represented by Jewish students. Forty percent of the study population consider themselves Protestant, 20\% Catholic, 20\% atheist or agnostic, 12\% other or no
religion and only 8% Jewish. Fraternity B and D have the highest proportion of Protestants, 54% and 46% respectively. The members of fraternity A seems to be less concerned with religion, 45% of them listed no faith, agnostic or atheist. Fraternity C had a similar response but some of these used the term Christian and indeed religion was an element of conflict in this fraternity which will be discussed later. With the exception of Fraternity C there is no reason to believe that religious fervor is any higher than elsewhere on campus.

The lack of Jewish members is probably a result of the tendency for Jews to pledge at fraternities which also contain a high percentage of Jews, despite the insistence of most fraternities that they no longer retain ethnic distinctions. As with race, the forces that retain religious imbalance are subtle and not blatant or conscious to most of the fraternity members.

The respondents can be characterized as representing a homogeneous grouping across class, race and religion. The dominance of upper-middle class parentage conforms with the profile of the general MIT student body. We may conclude, except where noted, that from a sociological perspective the sample is not significantly different from a random sample of MIT students.
CHAPTER IV.
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6. In the Commission Report, there are a series of tables which indicate that the MIT has become increasingly egilitarian between 1960 and 1970.


8. Ibid.
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CHAPTER V. DESCRIPTION OF THE FRATERNITIES

The four fraternities under study were selected on the basis of interviews I conducted with presidents from ten MIT fraternities located in Back Bay. From the interviews I attempted to construct the character of each fraternity, the nature and intensity of issues confronting the houses, and the recent history of these issues. From the information gathered in the interviews, I isolated certain variables, level of group activities, level of non-fraternity activity and the visibility of subgroups or cliques. I then selected fraternities which manifested markedly different qualities along these dimensions. As it turned out Fraternities A and C manifested certain characteristics which contrasted with characteristics held in common between Fraternities B and D. Most important was the existence of articulated subgroups within fraternities A and C not visible in Fraternités D and B. Other distinctions between the two groups will be pointed to throughout this chapter.

Since I perform analysis comparing the two sets of fraternities, I think it very important that I present evidence that the division is not arbitrary. I will attend to this following a discussion of the fraternities. For now it is only necessary to point out that the first group of fraternities, A and C, may be considered as liberal or progressive fraternities. Fraternities B and D may best be thought of as traditional or conservative.

Before presenting the description of the fraternities
one final caveat. From one interview with the president of the fraternity there is little expectation that one can draw the definitive picture of the group. We are also saddled with the problem that his perspective may be biased. Finally as much as a month elapsed between the interview and the administration of the questionnaire. The validity of some of the statements may have been altered, especially those pertaining to the state and nature of issues that arise within the fraternity. I chose to talk with the president because I anticipated, that of all members, he would probably be the most knowledgeable of the affairs of the house and give the most rounded account. The president also served as an appropriate entrance to the house for the distribution of the questionnaire.

The following descriptions are divided into two parts. The first will present a descriptive account of the house culled mostly from the interviews but checked and at times augmented by comments from the questionnaires and statements extracted from the 1971 MIT yearbook, Technique. The second part discusses a quantitative measure of group properties of the fraternities. The tool was incorporated into the questionnaire administered to the fraternity men.

Fraternity A

The first thing one notices about Fraternity A is the house itself. It is in excellent condition and it is obvious that the brothers take great pride in the house. The president, an architect student, showed me around the many loft-like rooms. He pointed, with great pride, to the different character of each
room. He commented that the fraternity was planning to move to a new house across the river and saw in its planning a devise to bring the house together. The house was yours to live in, a place of your own.

Like most fraternities at MIT, it depicted itself as low key and diverse. The house had cut down on band parties except for a fancy New Year's Eve and Christmas party. The president also talked about seminars, conducted last year, discussing dating and coed living. He planned to repeat the seminar, this time discussing the nature of the fraternity.

At present the major issue is drugs. A very small group is violently opposed. There is a large group which tolerate its use or are social smokers. Another group uses drugs incessantly. Live-outs (fraternity members in apartments) are predominately smokers.

There is a lack of a common spirit and a problem of identity. The live-outs seems to catalyze the issue as to what is a fraternity. The persons living in the house resent the abuse that the live-outs show towards the house, stealing food, etc. There is also sensitivity towards the traditional fraternity stereotype among some of the brothers. The president hopes that the planning for the new house will prove to be a common focal point of interest for all the brothers.

While we must rely on the president for the flavor of the house, the issues that he discusses are corroborated from comments on the questionnaires. One of the more descriptive comments was:

...2. Issues of condoning marijuana use freely or with
certain restrictions imposed or not at all.

3. The fraternity as a modern living group with aspects of dorm and intimate friendships (Brotherhood) versus antiquated fraternity group which stressed monotone personalities, ambitions, background and was supposedly charged with brother-power.

At present, the fraternity seems to be coming to an end of transition that started possibly a year or more ago. From the 1971 Technique: "(the) last several months at ______ brought activity and change to the lives of the brothers." In our discussion, the president indicated that the last traditional pledge training occurred during his freshman year, 1969-71. Pledge training is now made of constructive activity for the freshmen. Freshmen chose to do a project with the aid of the brothers. All house chores are divided evenly. Though the house has moved rapidly to an egalitarian state devoid of most of the traditional paraphernalia, there is some value placed on the retention of certain ritual. Thus the juniors came into the house under conditions dissimilar to those encountered by the freshmen and sophomores.

Fraternity 'C'

I had visited this fraternity during rush week of my freshman year. I remember a straight laced conservative fraternity. Today that is all changed. In between it produced one of the campus's best known radicals and it has one of the most enlightened pledge training. Such changes do not come without problems. At present there is a sense of discomfort which prevades the house.

The fraternity's contribution to the 1971 yearbook was a poem. Its tone and theme suggest a fraternity in change,
venturing intrepidly into the unknown with results yet to be realized.

In an exploratory stance
We feel the old ways slip past
To leave in their place
An empty Space
Filled only with late night musings
Of new rooms to paint and fill.

Of the new rooms we know nothing
And can only greet them gainly
Until our lives pervade their walls
Like the paper that covers our desk top.

A year after the above statement, the fraternity is beset by a number of internal factions. The president termed the situation as not quite peaceful coexistence. Cleavage centers on the extent of one's responsibility to the house. The division roughly coincides with drug users and non-users though the fit isn't perfect. On the surface the issue raised is the distribution of chores. The polarized groups, which the president refers to as a "personality conflict", is limited to only a small percent of the house. He estimated that 60% of the members fall into a middle ground. The split has resulted in an undercurrent of dissatisfaction due to an inability to pull together as one fraternity.

The respondents listed a series of issues which they felt divided the house. Though no issue predominated; coed living, religion and drugs were repeatedly cited. Summarizing these comments, one member enumerated three groups.

One of these is called the "Jesus Freaks", this group is religious and considered by most to possess a feeling of superiority; they are conservative. Then there is the "bohemian element", the radicals. The latter is now more numerous.
than the former and there is bitter feeling among them (Sic). The third group is composed of miscellaneous individuals who are mostly dull. Of course we do not openly recognize those groups at meetings (certainly not by name) but they exist.

They (the bohemians) initiate issues of radical change in almost every aspect of the fraternity. Some of these issues threaten to literally divide the house. The major one is the insistence of the radical group to form a committee to acquire certain "herbs" for the private use of small groups during parties. It may yet receive enough votes.

Historically the house seems to have undergone a dramatic change when the present juniors were freshmen, during the school year of '69-'70. The house was polarized during the spring term coincident with the University strike against the Cambodian escapade. Similar to Fraternity A, the present juniors entered under conditions different from those experienced by the sophomores and freshmen.

Fraternity B

In contrast to Fraternities A and C, the next two fraternities seemed to have weathered the last three years with relatively minimal conflict, though both have nonetheless changed. Fraternity B, not so much because of a belief in the traditional way, but from indifference tends to approach change conservatively. The president described his fraternity as apathetic. The amorphous nature of the fraternity precluded the formation of groups around issues upon which cleavage would arise. When issues arise the president stated that the fraternity suppressed them. As an example, he remarked that when drugs had been introduced into the house it arose as an issue which was solved
by essentially prohibiting the use of all drugs (from the comments on the questionnaires it would seem that the use of drugs is once again upon the house). Change occurs in a very unconscious way. As the president illustrated, with some misgivings, the house literally forgot to have pledge training. Though some brothers may feel the end to pledge training a mistake and some may feel distraught from a lack of cohesion; the brothers too easily forget the issues and don't do anything about them.

While the emphasis on the apathy may result in a distorted picture for the reader, since such an attitude is probably prevalent among many of the members of the other houses studied, still the fraternity hasn't submitted an article to Technique for the last two years. On the other hand, the brothers are active in campus activities and the house seems to provide a good deal of social events.

Issues do exist. There is questioning as to what a fraternity is, bidding criterion and talk of drugs. One respondent goes as far as to outline four groups which he suggests exist in the house. While this statement suggests the existence of subgroups, I will rely on the account of the president, that well defined groups do not exist. There is of course the possibility that the groups crystallized in the interim, between my talk with the president and the distribution of the questionnaires. The issues that were listed on the questionnaire, do not seem of the type around which polarity would arise. In contrast to the first two fraternities, no historical incident exists that would create disjuncture between any class and the other two.
Fraternity D

If Fraternity C most embodies the character of the "new" fraternity, then Fraternity D, with pride, most embodies the image of traditional fraternity spirit. The president described his fraternity as the most close knit on campus. In its statement in the 1971 Technique it emphasized that the fraternity retains its "respect for traditional fraternity pattern" while other fraternities have groped for new identities. To emphasize the strength of the fraternity, the president discussed the continued success the fraternity has had with rushing over the past several years and the exceptionally low rate of attrition among the house's upperclassmen. The members are active in campus activities, especially sports. Social life is plentiful with parties or social activities every weekend. Internal house activities tend to be centered in small group activities. These groups are quite fluid and no well defined cliques form. The house is characterized by a high spirit and satisfaction among its members.

The house is one of the few left that steadfastly maintains a traditional fraternity image. While pledge training could never be described as particularly harsh it has not undergone the drastic change it has in the other three houses. Attempts at reform have met with little enthusiasm among the brothers and freshmen are still not considered part of the house.

Hemphill's Measurement of Group Dimensions

Independent of the interviews with the presidents, I have
another means of characterizing the houses. The means is the measurement of group properties using a battery of statements devised by John K. Hemphill during the early '50's. Since extensive use will be made of this tool, I will depart from the description of the fraternities for the moment and discuss the dimensions, their meaning and application.

Hemphill set about to construct a number of scales or dimensions which would be "meaningful within sociological or psychological framework;" each should be "conceived as a continuum varying from the lowest degree to the highest degree;" and each should be relatively independent of all other dimensions in the descriptive system. On the basis of these criteria, Hemphill conceived, grouped and distilled 1,100 statements, describing attributes of groups, into fourteen dimensions composed of 150 statements. Statements were carefully screened and placed into the dimensions by five "judges." The battery of statements were then administered to 200 individuals associated with 35 groups. A number of statistical tests were performed to judge the reliability of the dimensions. The internal consistency of the statements forming any particular dimension were analyzed. Correlations between dimensions were computed and compared for independence. Hemphill pursued a fairly extensive procedure for testing the meaningfulness of these dimensions including questioning of selected respondents to check for agreement between the dimensions and the qualitative material. The initial wording of the statements and the scoring code are presented in the Handbook of Research and
I selected four of these dimensions which I thought would be sensitive to differences among the fraternities and would be critical to the social ecology necessary for the formation of friendships. The best way to present the selected dimensions is through the words of its designer:

**Hedonic tone** is the degree to which group membership is accompanied by a general degree of pleasantness or agreeableness. It is reflected by the frequency of laughter, conviviality, pleasant anticipation of group meetings and by the absence of griping and complaining.

**Participation** is the degree to which members of a group apply time and effort to group activities. It is reflected by the number and kinds of duties members perform by voluntary assumption of non-assigned duties and by the amount of time spent in group activities.

**Potency** is the degree to which a group has primary significance for his members. It is reflected by the kind of needs which a group is satisfying or has the potential of satisfying, by the extent of readjustment which would be required of members should the group fail, and by degree to which a group has meaning to their values.

**Viscosity** is the degree to which members of the group function as a unit. It is reflected by the absence of dissension and personal conflict among members, by the absence of activities serving to advance only the interests of individual group members, by the ability of the group to resist disrupting forces, and by the belief on the part of the members that the group does function as a unit.

The wording of the statements composing the dimensions can be found in the sample questionnaire in the appendix. Where possible I attempted to retain the wording of the statements presented. Certain statements had to be altered to make sense within the context of the fraternity. Also the word "group" was
replaced by the word "fraternity" where it appears.

Dimension scores were computed in the following fashion. The last several pages of the questionnaire contain a list of forty-four statements describing properties the fraternity may or may not embody. Each respondent was asked to consider how accurately each statement describes his fraternity. He was then asked to check one of five categories next to each statement:

1. Definitely true
2. Mostly true
3. Undecided or equally true or false
4. Mostly false
5. Definitely false

Each statement then receives a value of from 1 to 5, depending on the respondent's answer. A score of five implies a state that most approximates a positive sense of the definition of the dimension as presented above. The scores of a group of statements are then added together to form raw dimension scores for each respondent. These raw scores were retained instead of dividing by the number of statements in each dimension and computing a standardized score for each dimension. This was done to emphasize the distribution. The reader should note that statements one to five (see questionnaire) combine to form the hedonic tone dimension (a range of scores from 5 to 25); statements six to fifteen combine to form the participation dimension (a range of scores from 10 to 50); statements 16 to 30 combine to form the potency dimension (range from 15 to 75); and statements 31 to 42 combine to form the viscosity dimension (range from 12 to 60).
Statements 43 and 44 are not included in any dimensions.

In contrast to Hemphill's criterion for independence, these dimensions were selected due to their interrelation. Therefore, as the results bare out, the dimensions are anticipated to covary. I will make the intial assumption that conditions leading to higher scores are generally more desirable and are strived for by the fraternities. I will also consider higher scores as indicative of a more conducive atmosphere for the formation of friendships when everything else remains the same.

Since we lack benchmark comparisons the scores have no absolute reference, rather they will always be interpreted relative to other fraternities. It should be pointed out that the middle ground scores are potentially laden with ambiguous interpretations. Such a score may mean either the items are not pertinent to the fraternity, the items may represent some property that is equally true or false about the group, or it might be a result of the combination of an even split between high and low scores among the items of a particular dimensions. Despite these problems the analysis will proceed under the assumption that the dimensions retain a continuous property. 5

Dimension Scores for the Entire Study Population

Tables containing the average scores for each dimension, standard deviations and N's can be found in the appendix.

The distribution of scores for each dimension tend to conform to a normal distribution across the entire study population. Taking the entire population first, the average score for each dimension is close to the median value for the range of all
of the dimension scores. The standard deviations suggest a narrow distribution of the respondents' scores. Most of the scores fall within a range of 15% on either side of the average dimension score. Viscidity and Hedonic dimensions have a broader distribution than the participation and potency dimensions. For all the dimensions, the distribution of all scores encompasses all but the very ends of the dimensions.

The scores show only minor variation from the total population averages, when the population is broken down by year. The sophomores tend to have a slightly more critical outlook on the house, their average scores are lower on all four dimensions. Except for the hedonic dimension, the seniors show an increase in their average dimension scores, though not as great as those associated with the freshmen. The standard deviations for all dimensions are consistently smallest for the sophomore year and largest for the junior year. We might conjecture that this arises due to the longer exposure to each other among the sophomores leads to greater agreement among them than among the freshmen. The large standard deviation of the junior population is probably a statistical phenomenon. The sample size of the juniors is half that of the sophomores.

Dimension Scores by Fraternity

There is some variation from house to house. Between the highest and lowest average fraternity score there is a difference of 2.5 on the hedonic dimension, about 2.5 on the participation dimension, 4.84 on the potency dimension and 13.5 on the viscosity dimension. By inspection the viscosity dimension is
most sensitive to variations among the fraternities. This dimension measures the level of internal harmony. The high score is associated with Fraternity D, the most cohesive of the fraternities and the one least beset by disruptive issues. The lowest score is associated with Fraternity C, which had the most articulated subgroups. This dimension, at least, appears to reflect conditions as we anticipated.

Equally as important for this study is to prove that the division between Fraternities A and C and Fraternities B and D is justified. Justification can be produced from the dimension scores. Except for the participation dimension, Fraternities B and D exhibit higher mean dimension scores than Fraternities A and C. Nor is the participation dimension inconsistent with these results. Fraternities A, B and D virtually have the same scores on this dimension, and only Fraternity C has a noticeably lower score.

The distinction remains intact even when the fraternity populations are broken down by year and compared. For Fraternities A, B and C the sophomores have lower average scores on all dimensions than the freshmen. Interestingly enough the trend is the opposite in Fraternity D where sophomores score consistently higher than freshmen. The small size of the sample for the junior class makes extension of this analysis hazardous. The juniors in Fraternities A and B have the lowest average dimension scores for any year in their respective fraternities. Fraternity C will be skipped since there are only two junior respondents in this fraternity. With the exception of the potency dimension,
the average scores for the juniors of Fraternity D are the highest for any year in that fraternity. One may conjecture that the enthusiasm and activity associated with the incoming freshmen will wane the longer they are in the fraternity, leading to lower scores in the upper years, unless the strength of the organizational bonds are very strong. The exception is Fraternity D. The fraternity is characterized by the term "close knit" suggesting elements of strong cohesion within the fraternity. In contrast Fraternity B was characterized as amorphous, its brothers apathetic. Fraternities A and C also opted for weak organizational ties. These fraternities shy away from strong formal identities in favor of a weaker and more casual notion of group identity.

In closing the characteristics which are held in common by Fraternities A and C but distinct from Fraternities B and D will be enumerated. For each of the shared characteristics listed below for A and C the opposite or polar type can be associated with Fraternities B and D:

Fraternities A and C are:

1. Liberal or progressive in their attitude towards the identity of the fraternity and their attitude towards freshmen.

2. Characterized by the existence of articulated factions within the fraternity.

3. Relatively uninvolved or find unimportant campus activities.

4. Associated with lower dimension scores.

5. Have some of their brothers live physically away
from the main house.
Footnotes

CHAPTER V.
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5. Some readers may be confused by my use of the dimensions. In this chapter, all the respondents dimension scores are totalled and averaged for each fraternity. I assume that these average scores are indicative of certain objective social properties embodied by one fraternity in comparison with the others. In Chapter VIII I will also look at each respondent's dimension scores and discuss these in terms of the respondent's subjective evaluation of the social properties embodied by the fraternity. Some may charge that I am inappropriately applying the dimension in contradictory ways. On the contrary, obviously we can only assume that for any particular respondent his scores are a subjective response. But when all the individual scores are averaged for each fraternity, there is no reason not to expect that these scores approximate an objective evaluation of the house. Especially since these dimensions deal with interactions of the respondents with one and other.

Yet, this will be born out in subsequent chapters, I am more concerned in observing whether differences either among scores of individuals or among average scores of groups will be systematically associated with variations in friendship patterns.
CHAPTER VI. DESCRIPTION OF FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS

What Are Close Friends?

With the possible exception of the avowed hermit, we all desire to form and maintain friendships. It is the *sine qua non* of happiness. Our friends are drawn from individuals we meet at work, in school, our relatives, from our peer group, from people near where we live or some one we meet over a drink. The locations in which we meet potential friends is endless. Nor do we necessarily limit our friends due to temporal considerations. A friend may be some one we met a month ago or ten years ago. He or she may be a person we see everyday or some one we see once a year. Nor do spatial considerations delimit those we consider our friends. Some of our friends may live next door, others live 1,000 miles away. The network encompassing our friends transcends the rubric of the institutional setting within which we meet them. For we extract our friends, and they us, from these institutional settings and create a new institution of friends determined by our own ego. For each person his set of friends presents a unique institution, delimited by unique criteria and circumstance. Even ones own friends define new institutions of friendships oriented around their own egos.

Precisely because friendships are so pervasive, precisely because they cut across structures by which we normally classify individuals and relations, it becomes difficult to develop a definition of friends with sociological utility. Yet a
lack of good definition should not deter us. There are certain similarities from which we can generalize as to what one might mean by a friend. We relate to our friends in a similar fashion. As opposed to persons associated with work, school or even peer group, to our friends we attempt to present a part of ourselves which we hide from other acquaintances and we expect that our friends will reciprocate. We consider this side of ourselves our true self. Exactly how many friends we have and where they are located is a result of a complex interrelation determined by our own expectations and the institutional settings which we come into contact with. This chapter and the following two begin to grapple with these issues. This chapter is, in a sense, an attempt to define the term friend describing and analyzing the friendship patterns of the fraternity men under study.

The best way to begin is with a presentation of the definition of "close" friends which appeared on the questionnaire and some comments by the respondents to the definition:

Among our many close acquaintances, there is a group of individuals with whom we are particularly close. Sometimes we feel free to confide our self-doubts, hopes, fears and problems with such individuals. Most of us would consider these persons our "close" or "good" friends. Consider the persons you know, both living in and out of the fraternity, both male and female....

The intent of this statement was not so much to define "close" friends as to crystalize in the respondent's mind his conception of friends. I worded the question so that it would provoke the individual to consider his widest possible circle of intimates, especially to push his thoughts outside the fraternity and MIT. While most respondents, at least tacitly were able to deal
with the conception of close friends, as presented, some respondents did comment on some of the difficulties encountered in isolating their close friends:

It takes time to form really close friends and I feel not all these people at _______ are what I consider close friends yet.

or

It is difficult to say "he is my closest friend", I have friends I have known for years yet I feel confident in someone else I've known only a year; primarily because of the close contact via the frat. I don't however feel this makes the less close.

The desire to confide with another or express ones feeling varies considerably across the sample. First the more inhibited:

...By close friend I mean someone I could confide in without feeling I had to sacrifice my pride in acquiring their attention.

or

I have confided my personal problems to none.

Other are quite open:

I'm open with most people, have few inhibitions concerning my inner feelings...

or

I'm a very open person (I think) at least among my frat brothers and girl friends of same. I would feel reasonably natural in confiding in almost one of these.

These comments illustrate the richness and variation one's criteria for a close friend can take on. Yet despite the difficulties some found, only two of the 87 respondents didn't list a set of close friends. This paper will not explore further the implications for differing expectations and outlook on the selection of close friends, rather it will be concerned with the outcome, the
number and location of friends.

The Number of Close Friends

We will first consider the distribution of the number of close friends. The number of close friends will vary from person to person due to the goodness of fit between one's expectations and the persons one comes in contact with. In turn the person one comes in contact with is dictated by the level of access to different sources of persons. The second part of the argument will be analyzed in Chapter VII.

Each respondent was asked to record the number of close friends (from now on referred to simply as friends) he had. The second question asked the individual to order his first ten friends and list for each age, sex, length of friendship, course number if the person attended MIT and the friends who were members of the fraternity.

Of the 87 questionnaires three could not be used. Of the remainder, the respondents listed having from zero to 20 close friends. The bulk of respondents said they had three, four, five or six close friends. This range encompassed 60% of the respondents. Fifteen of the respondents listed 5 friends. The average for all respondents was 6.4 friends and the median is about 5.5. Freshmen have almost one more friend on the average (7.1) than the sample mean, while the sophomores have the fewest; a friend less than the sample mean (5.4). The seniors are at sample mean (6.5). The differences between the means of freshmen and seniors seems mostly due to a broader distribution among the freshmen. Both samples have a median of 6.25. In other words, the signi-
significant trend seems to be a temporary decrease in the number of friends during the sophomore year.

Though it is not perfect each fraternity reflects the pattern described for the entire study population. Members of Fraternities A, B and D have, on the average, about six to seven friends, the actual range is between 6.4 and 7.1 friends. On the average, members of Fraternity D have two more friends than the members of Fraternity C, with an average of 4.8 friends. While half the respondents from D have 7 or more friends, more than half the respondents from C (10 of 18) have fewer than five friends.

The Age of Friends

As might be expected most of the fraternity man's friends tend to be about the same age. The freshman's close friends are about 18 and a half, the sophomores' friends average 20 years and the juniors' friends are 21 years old. The standard deviations for each of the years are 3.8, 1.1 and 2.6 respectively. Rarely do the respondents have adult friends, persons markedly older than they. Though a few respondents listed persons in their forties and some younger adults could be recognized as say a professor. There were variations of about one year between fraternities, but this seems unimportant. The average length of friendships is between three and four years. There are no consistent variations here when the sample is controlled for year and fraternity.
The Location of Friends

The major dependent variable of this study is the distribution of friends between the fraternity and outside of it. We will investigate its components in detail in the remainder of this chapter. First we will look at the statistics for the number of friends who reside in the respondent's fraternity. Out of compassion for the reader I have taken liberty with the presentation of statistics in order that they may be presented in a readable fashion. Except where noted, the statistics are averages of the portion of the sample under consideration. Systematic presentation of the data can be found in the appendix. Despite my care to Americanize the statistics, one will find reference to i's and I's of friends.

For the entire sample, 46% or just under half the typical fraternity man's friends are members of his fraternity. There is considerable variation among the members of the different fraternities. Members of Fraternities A and C have a considerably higher percentage of fellow brothers for their friends (49% and 57% respectively) than members of Fraternities B and D (39% and 42% respectively). On the average, the sophomores have the highest percent of their friends in the fraternity, 51% followed by juniors, 47% and finally freshmen with 41%. The standard deviations for all these figures are quite high between 23 and 30 percent.

The percentages, presented above, can be translated into the following numbers of friends. The typical fraternity man will have just under three of his fraternity brothers for friends, more
precisely 2.9. On the average members of Fraternity A consider 3.3 or more than three of their brothers in the fraternity as close friends. For Fraternity B the average dips to slightly more than 2.6. The typical member of Fraternity C had about 2.7 brothers for close friends, while members of Fraternity D had almost three brothers for close friends. Compared with the total number of friends, the variation of fraternity friends is much more restricted among the fraternities.

If we now turn to the average number of friends for each class, we find that the range of friends is even more restricted. On the average, the members of each class have about three friends from the fraternity. The actual statistics are; three fraternity friends for each freshman and junior and 2.8 fraternity friends for each sophomore.

As might be expected there are some respondents with none of their friends in the fraternity while others have all their friends from the fraternity. Three respondents listed none of their fraternity brothers among their closest friends. Four persons listed all their friends as living in the fraternity. The latter group each had either one, three or four friends.

Next let us consider what type of relationship exists between the total number of friends a respondent lists and the number of them who are also his fraternity brothers. For the entire population, a Pearson correlation coefficient of .647 was computed between the number of friends in the fraternity and the total number of friends. Signifying that, regardless of the number of total friends one has, a constant proportion of these
will come from the fraternity. Pearson correlation coefficients were also computed for the populations of each fraternity. In all Fraternities except A there is a high and significant correlation between the number of friends living in the fraternity and the total number of friends. Fraternity A has only a slight but positive correlation. Next we can consider the correlation between the per cent of friends living in the fraternity and the total number of friends. Fraternity C and D both have insignificant correlations as anticipated. Though Fraternity A has a marked negative correlation reflecting a relatively invariant number of friends for all members suggested by the finding previously mentioned. Finally the population of Fraternity B recorded a positive correlation at a significant level less than .05. With some notable exceptions, the number of friends one has covaries proportionately with the number of friends who live in the fraternity. Consequently there is little concern that bias may be introduced into the analysis due to variation in the total number of friends.

**Friends Outside the Fraternity**

One might suspect that with between 40 and 60 percent of a fraternity man's friends outside the fraternity it does not act as closed a social system as might be expected. Yet a glance at the breakdown of this portion of the respondents' friends, indicates that they are mainly women and persons met before the respondent came to MIT. Only a small fraction can be classified as males the respondent met after coming to MIT who live outside the fraternity.
Female Friends

It might be considered chauvenistic to isolate females and suggest that males tend to seek female companionship for different reasons and in different ways, but it is true for most males nevertheless. Women, in these fraternities, are precluded from formally joining and living in the fraternity. By definition then, all females must reside outside the fraternity. Though I have no direct evidence, I believe a careful study of the fraternities would reveal that within any house, the brothers would know clusters of women from the same school, if not the same dormitory.

Twenty respondents didn't include a woman among their best friends. Thirty-five respondents listed one female among their friends and the remainder, twenty-nine, listed two or more female friends. Only three respondents listed as many as four females for friends. Surprisingly enough, even for these four the females accounted for less than 40% of all their friends.

With some exceptions the juniors have the highest percentage of female friends followed by the freshmen. (Freshmen, 23%; sophomores 18% and juniors, 28%; 22% for the entire sample). This is about 1.6 female friends for each freshman, just under one for each sophomore and 1.8 female friends for each junior. The difference between the freshmen and juniors seems inconsequential. We can conjecture that freshmen are still considering girl friends from home, while many sophomores have already broken these ties but not reformed new relations. Juniors have had more time and
being older are in a better position to meet new women.

Old Friends

The second most populous group of friendships are those formed before the respondents came to MIT. The grouping includes both males and females. There is some overlap then between this group and women friends. Though not perfect for all fraternities, the percentage of ones old friends tapers off as one continues in college. Over half of a freshman's friends (51%) are pre-MIT friends. Sophomores and juniors retain only 33% and 30% of their pre-MIT friends. This trend holds true in all fraternities except B.

Non-Fraternity-Male Friends Met After Coming to MIT

The final group of friends, which can only be described in the following awkward terminology as non-fraternity-males-met-after-coming-to-MIT are probably the group one should consider in determining the extent of social closure embodied by the fraternity. By this index, the fraternity appears quite closed. This group forms only ten or a smaller percent of the average fraternity man's closest friends. This is much less than one per respondent. Indeed only twenty respondents listed having one or more such friends. Only four individuals have two such friends. In most cases the friends were first met during the respondent's freshman year which is not too surprising, since the MIT first year tends to bring together a large number of the freshmen in large classes and lectures. Let us note in passing, only one of these friends came from the same major as the respondent. Twelve
were associated with respondents with high level of participation in campus activities. Only four freshmen listed having such friends. Eleven sophomores and five juniors had formed one or two such friendships. We may conclude that his group seems to take up some of the slack experienced by those upperclassmen who have terminated high school friendships.

These low percentages indicate just how closed or powerful the fraternity is in dictating the social relations of its members. Alternatively it may be indicative of a lack of competing sources for friends. It should also be noted how little variation in these figures can explain the variation of in-house friends.

Summary

Of course with any generalization there will be radical exceptions, this study is no different. Yet there are three instructive findings worth keeping in mind. 1) When asked to list all his close friends, the fraternity man listed more than half of them from outside the fraternity. 2) Systematic variation among the components of friends exists across fraternity and years-in-the-fraternity. 3) Despite the large portion of friends that are outside the fraternity only a very small number are males met after coming to MIT. This finding demonstrates the centrality of the fraternity to the respondents' social relations. This observation can be extended to the students residing in the MIT dormitory system. Lambrinides found that on the average 2.7 of the 3.3 friends of her sample resided in the dormitory they lived in.¹ (The much smaller figure for the total number of friends in her study is probably accounted because her question
asked for MIT friends. Note that the 2.7 friends living in the
dormitory is quite close to the 2.9 friends who live in the fra-
ternity for my sample.

I will end this chapter by proposing a tentative explana-
tion of the statistics presented in this chapter. The essential
social dynamics of college is one of transition. The results of
the questionnaires bare this out. As an individual progresses
through college he terminates his pre-MIT friends and makes new
friends. Recall the sharp drop in the percentage of pre-MIT
friends between the freshman and sophomore years. There is also
a sharp drop in the total number of all close friends in the
sophomore year which is made up by the junior year. This suggests
that a lag exists between the time most respondents end old
friendships and find new friends. The information from the ques-
tionnaires suggest that the lag results because of the relative
low efficacy of social settings besides the fraternity to foster
the meeting and forming of potential friends. Almost immedia-
tely the respondents picked up on fraternity members for friends,
while it wasn't until the junior year that the respondents had
reformed a full compliment of female friends and established male
friends from outside the fraternity.
Footnotes

CHAPTER VI.

1. Lambrinides, p. 103.
CHAPTER VII. THE ANALYSIS, PART I

I have divided the analysis into two parts. The first analysis looks for variation of the percentage of fraternity friends as a response to the availability of alternate group activities for the selection of friends. The second analysis seeks to explain the variation as a function of properties manifested by the house. This analysis will be explored in Chapter VIII. Clearly both analyses may be operative or only one of them. They may act independently, to reinforce or to conflict.

The distribution of friends inside and outside the fraternity, for any given individual, will be a reflection, of his access to alternative arenas for forming friendships, the relative effectiveness of these alternate arenas to facilitate the "acquaintance process", and the length of time he is associated with the group. Such alternate arenas may be the classroom, after school activities such as sports and clubs or community groups such as political parties or community associations. The effectiveness of these arenas will be dictated by the amount and intensity of interaction between members facilitated by the structural properties of the group. The effectiveness will also be dictated by the importance the individual attaches to the activity and his disaffection from the fraternity. Finally there are certain friends, such as women and adult males, who, by definition, can not live in the fraternity. Therefore the arenas for meeting these people are not
in direct competition with the fraternity. Hence they do not have to manifest as effective an organizational ambience as the fraternity to be successful. Consequently we would expect to find that persons who consider outside activities relatively important will have larger percentages of their friends external to the fraternity than individuals who do not participate or find unimportant such group activities.

The Activities

The fourth question on the questionnaire asks the respondent to rank in order of importance to him five possible arenas in which activities, he may undertake, occur. The five arenas are formal fraternity activities, informal fraternity activities, campus activities, community activities and individual activities. Except for individual activities, it is assumed that the person is involved in activities that bring him in contact with individuals within the organizational context of the activity. The respondents were asked to rank the arenas in importance to them. The value '1' was assigned to the most important. In this way all the respondents' ranks for a particular activity can be averaged, and an aggregate ranking can be computed for the entire sample or subpopulations. Alternatively we can select subpopulations of individuals who consider a particular activity as most important. The respondent is asked to list the amount of time he spends in these activities, this information has only been put to limited use.

About half of the sample, 42 respondents listed individual activities as most important. Individual activities also have the highest average aggregate rank, 2.1. The next highest is
informal fraternity activities with almost 65% of the total population indicating that these activities were either first or second in importance. The third most important was closely contested between formal and campus activities. Thirty-two respondents listed formal activities as third most important while 31 individuals listed campus activities as second or third most important. Eleven fraternity men listed campus activities as most important while only five indicated formal activities as most important.

Community activities were pursued by very few individuals. These findings reinforce the predominance of the living group in the lives of these students, though campus activities are important and pursued by a good part of the population. The majority of freshmen and sophomores actively participate in some campus activity, only a minority of the juniors consider campus activities very important.

We are now prepared to explore the relation between participation in non-fraternity activities with the distribution of friends. The analysis will be approached in a number of ways. Whatever the method the intent is to demonstrate that individuals who tend to participate in outside activities will tend to have more friends on the outside since these will serve as alternative if not competing arenas for sources of friends.

The study population is divided into individuals who substantially participate in non-fraternity activities and those who don't. In the following paragraphs we will refer to the averages in Table 7-1. For the entire population Table 7-1 demonstrates that those who find outside activities important have a
TABLE 7.1

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF FRATERNITY FRIENDS FOR RESPONDENTS WHO CONSIDER CAMPUS ACTIVITIES IMPORTANT AND UNIMPORTANT, BROKEN DOWN BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Frat friends</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

smaller number of their friends in the fraternity. The association holds strongly for freshmen. There is virtually no difference for the two groups of the sophomore population. While the seniors exhibit a reversal, with persons with outside activities having more friends on the average in the fraternity. Thus the averages for the entire sample hides trends which are marked by difference as a consequence of the length of time the individual has lived in the fraternity.

If we take a second look at these figures, and isolate the two subgroups, we find that, for persons with outside activities, the longer the person lives in the fraternity the larger the portion of his friends will be in the fraternity. The reverse appears true for persons without activities. The results indi-
cate a much more complex dynamics than originally anticipated.

The next step will be to control for fraternity. Since the fraternity samples are so small we will take the liberty to combine the populations of Fraternities A and C and combine the populations of Fraternities B and D. These couplings, as has already been indicated, represent structural similarities between fraternities.

The combined totals for A and C support the hypothesis. Those members who participate in outside activities have an average of 46% of their friends in the fraternity as opposed to 63% for individuals not participating in campus activities. For Fraternities B and D the opposite is true. Persons with campus activities have 45% of their friends in the fraternity while only 36% of the friends of the remaining individuals live in the fraternity.

When the subpopulations are broken down by year we note the following. For both fraternity groupings, the freshmen with campus activities have a smaller percentage of fraternity friends than those freshmen without campus activities. The juniors of both fraternity groupings also conform to the trend described for the entire sample. Juniors with campus activities have a greater percentage of fraternity friends. Only in the sophomore year do the groupings make a difference. In Fraternities A and C those without campus activities have the larger percentage of fraternity friends. In Fraternities B and D the opposite holds, sophomores with campus activities have a larger percentage of fraternity friends.
An alternative way of testing the relationship between participation in outside activities and friendship patterns is to consider the variation in the average rank-order for campus activities among the fraternities. The previous chapter presented statistics showing that the members of Fraternity B and D have a lower percentage of their friends living in the fraternity than the members of Fraternities A and C. If the aggregate rank order for campus activities is broken down by fraternity, we can associate with Fraternities B and D an average rank order which is more than a full rank higher than the average ranks for Fraternities A and C. The result implies that members of Fraternity B and D are considerably more involved in campus activities and consequently as the model predicts will have a smaller percentage of friends in the fraternity.

The findings will have to interpreted carefully. On one hand the first set of results stress the importance of the length of time the individual has been in the fraternity. Each year manifests a distinctive orientation. The freshman and junior members manifest pronounced but opposite orientation. In contrast, the members of the sophomore class seem to be affected by the orientation of the fraternity.

The second set of results show that there is a positive association between the rank order for the importance of campus activities and the proportion of friends outside the fraternity. For reasons not yet explained the result appears to be mediated through differences of the fraternities. For Fraternities B and D have members who are more active in campus activities and have
fewer friends in the fraternity than the members of Fraternities A and C. Despite the temptation the results indicate that no simple association will be very explanatory.

At the risk of further confusing the issue let us isolate the twenty respondents who included among their friends, non-fraternity males they met after coming to MIT. While this accounts for a very small percent of the respondents, the rarified sample may lead to clarification of the hypothesis. The reader should note that we have reversed our methodology. Instead of starting with persons active in campus activities, we are starting with persons with this group of outside friends and looking for involvement in campus activities. The results which we presented in the last chapter are not unqualified. More than half are associated with campus activities, not much larger than the number for the entire sample. Yet, the mean rank-order score of this group for campus activities is 2.9 almost one rank above the sample mean of 3.7. Consequently the support is equivocal at best. Even when we look at the percentage of friends who live in the fraternity for this group the results are disquieting. Fifty percent of this group's friends live in the fraternity, slightly above sample average. The question then remains, what group of friends is decreased due to the presence of this group? There is a slight decrease in the average number of female friends among this group from the total population average, a drop from 22% to 16%. This group retains only 22% of their old friends as compared with about 40% for the entire sample. The figures suggest that a shift occurred away from pre-MIT
friends towards this group of nonfraternity males.

The analysis in this chapter belies any simplistic explanation relating the location of friends with access to alternate organized activities. First we noted different trends for each year in the fraternity. In the freshman year the strong association between the importance of organized campus activity and a high proportion of friends external to activities must be considered next to the fact that only four of the freshmen actually listed friends which may have presumably been formed in these activities. The reverse correlation exists among the juniors. Equally disconcerting is the disproportionate number of friends which the upperclassmen have who probably come from campus activities, despite this reverse trend. I will hold off until the concluding chapter any speculation as to the import of these findings.
CHAPTER VIII. ANALYSIS PART II

We will have recourse, in this chapter, to use both the information from the interviews with the presidents and the Hemphill group dimension scores collected from the questionnaires. The reader should note that the information from the interview and the dimension scores are meant to serve as a check on the validity of the other. The material from the interviews presents us with descriptive richness, but it is unstructured and subject to the biases of the interviewee. In contrast the broad sample of the questionnaires adds objectivity to the description of the fraternity and allows us to consider the respondents’ evaluations of the fraternity against a common index. Nevertheless the dimensions lack a strong descriptive power provided by the interviews. Hopefully, each source of information reinforces the other to create a descriptive credibility and structure each alone lacks.

Two lines of argument will be pursued in this chapter. The first will look for association between an individual's subjective perceptions as to the social condition of the house, and the number and percentage of fraternity friends he may have. It is assumed that high dimension scores can be associated with a more favorable attitude towards the house. Which in turn will be conducive for the formation of friends within the fraternity. Consequently we would expect that higher dimension scores would be associated with a greater number of friends within the frater-
nity. The second argument pays more attention to the **objective** properties of one fraternity as compared with those of the other fraternities. Distinct differences in structural properties, it is hypothesized, should lead to systematic differences in the distribution of friends among the fraternities. Though I have presented the arguments as though they were independent, the reader should note otherwise. **Objective** conditions of a fraternity leading to a low number of fraternity friends for all or most of its members may also coincide with perceived conditions that are associated with an individual who has a small number of fraternity friends.

The First Line of Argument, Alienation

One of the questions which initiated this study asked, does alienation from the fraternity lead one to a psychological state in which personal evaluation of the social conditions of the fraternity are markedly different from the evaluation of others not so alienated? With apologies to Muzafer Sherif, among the alienated or marginal persons a different social network would arise. Their friends would tend to form outside the fraternity as they sought out a new reference group. If they found no such reference group, we might conjecture, that they will have fewer friends or tend to retain "friendships" with persons they knew from home. Since no direct index of alienation exists on this questionnaire, it is assumed that a more critical outlook on the fraternity or lower scores is associated with an index for alienation. If this hypothesis is true, than there should be positive correlation between the number of friends in the fra-
ternity and dimension scores.

To test this hypothesis Spearman rank order correlation coefficients have been computed between the percentage of fraternity friends and the dimension scores. Correlation coefficients were also computed between the number of fraternity friends and the dimension scores. A high positive correlation will lend support to the assumption that persons who have fewer friends in the fraternity do so because of dissatisfaction with the perceived social environment.

The coefficients give only weak support for this argument, for both the sample and when broken down by fraternity. Though most of the correlations are positive, they are normally smaller than .3, and the significance level is rarely better than .05.

If the correlations are weak, this in part may be due to structural distinctions which result from differences in year and fraternity. These considerations were controlled for by regrouping the fraternities into Fraternities A and C and combining the populations of Fraternities B and D. Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were then computed for these groups broken down by year in the same fashion as the entire study population. The matrix of correlation coefficients exhibit patterns which suggest that associations exist between the respondent's dimension scores and the number of fraternity friends he lists. The statistics indicate that a complex relationship exists between the fraternity he resides in and the length of his residency which account for the strength and direction of association. Our analysis has consequently moved towards a fusion of the indi-
dual's possible sense of alienation coupled with the structure of the fraternity. In the next few paragraphs the trends of the correlations will be presented by year and fraternity grouping.

The freshmen of Fraternities A and C have consistently higher and more significant correlation coefficients than the freshman population of Fraternities B and D. This generalization is most pronounced for the correlations between the hedonic and potency dimensions and the number and percent of friends living in the fraternity. The figures are presented in Table 8.1. Note that only for the correlation between potency and the number of friends in the fraternity is a coefficient produced for the freshmen of Fraternities B and D which is more significant than .05.

A very different trend arises for the sophomore respondents. While the level of significance is seldom better than .05, the signs of the coefficients do suggest a rather drastic difference between the two Fraternity groupings. For Fraternities A and C, in all but one case the coefficients are negative and range between -.17 and -.48. In other words, where there is correlation it tends to show that, for sophomore members of Fraternities A and C, the higher they score the dimension, or presumably the higher the attractiveness of the group, the lower the percentage and the lower the number of friends they have within the fraternity. For sophomores in Fraternities B and D the coefficients are positive or extremely small. This generalization is most embodied in the correlations between the Hedonic dimension and the number and percentage of friends within the fraternity, and the
TABLE 8.1

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR HEDONIC AND POTENCY DIMENSIONS AND THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF FRATERNITY FRIENDS FOR THE FRESHMEN SUBPOPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th></th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Frat. friends</td>
<td>% of friends in Frat.</td>
<td># of Frat. friends</td>
<td>% of friends in Frat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>.2791</td>
<td>.2347</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.2579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. = .008</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frats. A and C</td>
<td>.5770</td>
<td>.6534</td>
<td>.5122</td>
<td>.4541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17</td>
<td>Sig. = .008</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frats. B and D</td>
<td>-.0154</td>
<td>-.0867</td>
<td>.4462</td>
<td>.1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=18</td>
<td>Sig. = .476</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

participation dimension and the number of friends. The coefficients are presented in Table 8.2.

TABLE 8.2

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE HEDONIC AND PARTICIPATION DIMENSIONS FOR THE SOPHOMORE SUBPOPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th></th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Frat. friends</td>
<td>% of friends in Frat.</td>
<td># of Frat. friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>.0743</td>
<td>-.0935</td>
<td>-.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. = .346</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frats. A and C</td>
<td>-.2047</td>
<td>-.4819</td>
<td>-.3773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 14</td>
<td>Sig. = .241</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frats. B and D</td>
<td>.3209</td>
<td>.3184</td>
<td>.3405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17</td>
<td>Sig. = .105</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reliability of the junior year is questionable because of the small sample size (N=16). Yet the juniors produced the largest and most significant correlations. The coefficients associated with the juniors of Fraternities A and C tend to be positive with a range between .11 and .55. Unfortunately the small sample size, six respondents, leaves even the largest coefficient relatively insignificant with a significance of .129. The positive trend is much stronger for Fraternities B and D. The coefficients vary between .45 and .81. Only the correlation coefficient between viscosity and the percent of friends within the fraternity is less significant than .05. The strongest correlations occur for the Hedonic dimension. Table 8.3 presents these correlation coefficients.

**Table 8.3**

**Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients for the Hedonic Dimension and the Number and Percent of Friends Within the Fraternity for the Junior Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of friends</td>
<td>% of friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the Frat.</td>
<td>in the Frat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N=16</td>
<td>.6933</td>
<td>.5368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.= .001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frats. A and C</td>
<td>.4630</td>
<td>.5508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>Sig.= .178</td>
<td></td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frats. B and D</td>
<td>.8087</td>
<td>.7362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>Sig.= .002</td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Second Line of Argument, Fraternity Structure

Before considering plausible explanations for the patterns
described above, there are some observations concerning the nature of the fraternities and the percentage of friends within the fraternity which can now be fruitfully pulled together. This discussion will follow the second line of reasoning presented at the beginning of this chapter concerning the objective nature of the house.

Recall that Fraternities A and C have larger averages for the percentage of friends within the fraternity than Fraternities B and D. Yet Fraternities A and C have lower dimension scores and contain conflictual subgroups lacking in the other two fraternities. One might brush aside all structural differences between the fraternities and point to the greater importance which members of Fraternities B and D place on campus activities as an explanation for the lower percentage of friends within the fraternity for these houses. From the analysis of Chapter VII, this explanation is equivocal, since few of the friends outside the fraternity, in fact, can be associated with campus activities.

I can suggest, and only suggest, a possible explanation in terms of the structural differences between the two groups of fraternities. The existence of subgroups within the fraternity is unsettling from an organizational perspective. There is less group activities, there is more grumbling and dissatisfaction. Consequently the lower dimension scores. At the same time members are less likely to identify with or derive support from the fraternity as a whole than if the house lacked conflict. In such a weakened state, we may hypothesize, that primary allegiances are shifted from the formal fraternity rubric to the different sub-
groups. The conflictual relation between groups creates extremely strong bonds of solidarity and interaction as the members of the group orient negatively against opposing factions. While the fraternity is a weak setting for the formation of friendships, the subgroups become extremely effective in this regard. This is similar to the phenomenon that occurs when a nation unifies against the threat by an external enemy.

Within the fraternity settings where no conflict exists, or no subgroups appear, members have no recourse but to identify with the entire fraternity. While we have seen that this is a strong source for identification, it is not as strong as subgroups in conflict. Or so the distinction between Fraternities A and C in contrast to Fraternities B and D would suggest.

In this chapter and the preceding two, evidence has been presented that illustrates, that length of residency in the fraternity critically informs the respondents of each class in different ways. Instead of finding a linear function over time, the function is better described as discontinuous or curvilinear. Both the freshmen and the juniors tend to act consistently across all fraternities, while sophomores exhibit much sharper distinctions along fraternity bounds. These distinctions should have been apparent in the presentation, in the beginning of this chapter, of the matrix of correlation coefficients by year and fraternity grouping. I will now review the results and suggest some tentative explanations for further study.

I do not have any ready explanation for these results, but the selection of fraternity friends, by freshmen, especially
from Fraternities A and C, is most sensitive to the scores on the hedonic and potency dimensions. The strong significance of the hedonic dimension holds for all years. The conviviality and pleasure one derives from the fraternity, which this dimension measures, common sense tells us, is very important in producing a social environment conducive for creating close ties with other persons. However the relative significance of the potency dimension in the formation of fraternity friends is unique to the freshman year. Possibly being the newest members and least secure, it becomes important that one derive a sense of self esteem and prestige from living in the fraternity as a prerequisite to becoming part of the fraternity and forming new friends.

The sophomore year presents interesting problems, especially the negative correlations associated with the sophomores from Fraternities A and C. One tentative explanation points to the nature of the sophomore as being the most critical and conservative in house matters. Even if the sophomores had not gone through a severe pledge training, which is the case for sophomores in Fraternities A and C, among them are most likely to be the individuals who most desire to return to traditional fraternity ways particularly less relaxed pledge training. Due to the egalitarian tendency of Fraternities A and C, these fraternities are most likely to exhibit the falling out of the sophomores. If indeed, the sophomores in Fraternity A and C are a conservative group, then they may look with disfavor upon certain conditions which up to now we have considered positive factors in creating appropriate settings for the formation of friendships. Consequently the
negative correlations for sophomores in Fraternities A and C.

Finally the juniors for both groups, especially Fraternities D and B manifest a strong association between the numbers and percent of friends with high dimension scores. Time may serve to allow the objective properties of the fraternity to play themselves out. Those least liking the fraternity have had time to establish friendships outside the fraternity. The larger correlations in Fraternities B and D suggest the greater sensitivity towards characteristics of the fraternity due to the lack of subgroups which intercede or create alternative primary associations.
CHAPTER IX. CONCLUSION

With varying degrees of clarity, a number of independent and dependent variables have been defined and investigated. The dependent variables center on the list of "close" friends for each respondent. In particular we have alternated between the number of "close" friends in the fraternity and the percent of all "close" friends in the fraternity. The independent variables include the length of residence in the fraternity (I have used the college class as the value), the level of participation in non-fraternity activities, the visibility of subgroups within the fraternity and Hemphill's group dimensions.

Analysis of the relation of the dependent variable to the independent variables has produced the following findings:

1. The fraternity serves as the predominant source of friends for its members.

2. Each class in the fraternity manifests strikingly different characteristics. Most notably the sophomores manifest a decrease in the average number of "close" friends and the highest proportion of friends in the fraternity.

3. Members of Fraternities A and C have a larger proportion of their friends in the fraternity than members of Fraternities B and D. We also noted that Fraternities A and C contained conflictual subgroups absent in Fraternities B and D, and the members of the former fraternities participated less in
non-fraternity activities.

4. The direction and strength of correlation between a respondent's dimension scores and the number of his fraternity friends is a function of both the fraternity he belongs to and his length of residency in the fraternity.

The Dominance of the Fraternity

The most unequivocal finding of the research was confirmation of the dominance of the fraternity as the organizational setting within which the respondents form their closest friends. The centrality of the fraternity to the members social relations seems to be generalizable to include all MIT living groups, both fraternities and dormitories. Confirming the importance of initial contacts, we found that, on the average, each freshman respondent listed three fellow brothers as "close" friends. This number remained virtually constant for both the sophomore and junior classes. This finding suggests that students tend to quickly associate with individuals within his immediate living group whom he will remain close to through the rest of school.

Length of Residence in the Fraternity

Each year, one lives in the fraternity, presents its own peculiar phase in a period of transition between adolescence and adulthood. Recurrent throughout this investigation is the indication that each class represents distinct structural characteristics. Keeping in mind the questionnaire was administered at the start of the second semester, we noted that the sophomores consistently deviated from any linear relationship we may have wished
to construct between Year and any other variable. In terms of
a shift in one's friendships, there occurs during the sophomore
year a lag between the termination of pre-MIT friends and the form-
ation of new friends, both male and female, outside the frater-
nity. We may characterize each class in the following way:

1. Freshmen: Their relative newness to MIT and in-
securities probably emphasizes the potency of the fraternity as
one's center for social life.

2. Sophomores: Now that they are removed from their high
school by a year and a half they have effectively severed their
ties with the past. Yet they are now only beginning to form new
relations outside the fraternity.

3. Juniors: The length of stay at MIT is finally be-
ginning to erode the grip of the fraternity. The most notable
distinction between the sophomore and junior classes is the in-
creased number of female friends among the juniors.
While I didn't study the seniors, I would speculate that they would
continue the trends of the juniors, acquiring more friends from out-
side the fraternity.

These characterizations are helpful only if the following
is kept in mind. It so happens that class and length of resi-
dency in the fraternity coincide for all but one respondent
(he was discounted when year was controlled for). If either of
these two identities do not coincide we should anticipate differ-
ent results. In reality, the distinction between classes is also
not as sharply defined as I have presented it. If I had sampled
during a different part of the year my association with the
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classes would probably have been different. Finally, we should not expect that any one individual will necessarily conform to this model.

There is need for further research into the phenomenalogic differences between classes. Is there an inherent structural property due to a coincidence in the length of stay in the house and the year in college, which fosters different outlooks and concerns common to all members of a particular class? Or is it simply a manifestation of differences between age cohorts, which occur due to change in admission criteria or particular historical events.

Activities Analysis

Initially I assumed that increased participation in non-fraternity organized activities would result in a decreased proportion of friends from within the fraternity. The results of the study lend only equivocal support to this observation. For the entire sample, those involved in campus activities do indeed have a smaller proportion of their friends within the fraternity than the inactives. For further support, I pointed to the association between the lower proportion of friends in the fraternity and the higher level of participation in campus activities among members of Fraternities B and D. However, when the sample is controlled for year, this observation is contradicted among the members of the junior class and the members of the sophomore class in Fraternities B and D.

Further doubt as to the viability of the observation is cast by the very predominance of the fraternity and the inadequacies of the tools to directly link friendship formations with
participation in activities. The small number of male friends outside the fraternity precluded a systematic analysis of the argument. Indeed most of the variation we found could not be explained away by this small number of individuals. We also did not include females in this analysis though clearly some, though I would expect a small number, may have been initially encountered in a campus activity. The questionnaire worked well in so far as it presented the importance and level of participation in outside activities among the respondents. But it failed to provide the necessary tools for an analysis which could consider directly whether a friendship was formed in the different arenas of activities. Consequently this analysis generated weak support for the initial model. Further research should attempt to refine the analytical tool to provide a direct link between friendships and specific place of formation.

The Structure of the Fraternities

Chapter VIII ended with a tentative explanation relating the structural differences and the variation in friendship patterns among the fraternities. There is no need to repeat this here. Rather, I will consider the utility of the structural variables.

I used two distinct but interrelated variables. The first, the existence of subgroups within the fraternity, was determined from the interviews with the presidents and confirmed by comments on the questionnaires. Use of this variable does present limited problems not discussed in the main body of the paper. Subgroups may be conflictual, benign or in harmony, though in most fraternities, where subgroups exist, the factions are probably in con-
lict. Related to this is the degree of articulation and polarization that one can associate with the subgroups. This is not easily gotten from one interview. Despite these cautions, the variable has considerable merits for further use.

Though the second variable, Hemphill's group dimensions, actually had the potential to provide four variables, I chose to consider the dimensions as though they were one variable. I did this partly because alone each dimension was inconsistent in its sensitivity, and partly because they tended to covary and were consequently not independent. I only isolated the dimensions for illustrative purposes. The group dimensions have many weaknesses. Despite my attempt at rewording some of the statements, problems resulted due to some ambiguities and inappropriateness of the statements in terms of the fraternity. There was also a much narrower distribution of scores than I had anticipated. This is particularly troublesome, since, as I have already pointed out there is some ambiguities in interpreting middle ground scores. Nevertheless, where there is evidence, from the interviews and written material on the fraternities, the scores measure correctly the relative differences in the properties of the fraternities. Short of participant-observation methods this is the best way we have of getting an objective picture of the fraternity. It also served to collect a comparable set of the respondents' own evaluations. Only further study will verify the reliability of the dimensions.

As a byproduct of scrutinizing the variables, this study illuminates a complex relation, between the length of residence in
the fraternity and the structural properties of the house, which contribute to affect the behavior of the individual. While each individual is readily classified by fraternity and class, no clear hierarchy exists to explain which of the two comparison groups takes precedence. The findings of my research suggest that for the freshman and junior classes the fraternity plays only a secondary role in explaining results, while in the sophomore class we find significant differences resulting from affiliation with structurally different fraternities.

Further Research

Further research is needed to understand the implications of the dominance of the living group in the social relations of these students. Research should focus on the comparison between living groups and other institutional settings which the students come into contact with. The intention would be to understand the structural differences and how the students differentially relate to various organizations leading to the predominance of the living group.

Another avenue of research may consider critically how the students conceptualize their close friends. Possibly students develop relations in other activities which they find equally satisfactory, but classify differently than close friends, and they are equally satisfied to allow these relations to remain within the organizational rubric within which they were originally formed.

Finally more research must be directed towards understanding the consequences for those persons, the alienated ones,
who attempt to find new reference groups outside the living group. Implicit in this statement is that the dominance of the living group for most of the students, precludes the existence of alternate viable sources of friends. For the majority of students who are able to adapt and form successful relations within their living groups, they will not actively look elsewhere for friends. For the minority of persons who dislike or find incompatible their living group, their size and concentration may not be large enough to support a series of alternate sources for friends. For these students MIT may become a place of despondency and isolation. The questions remain to be answered; how many such persons there are and how successful are they in finding friends outside their living group?
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APPENDIX A: TABLES

TABLE A.1  THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLOSE FRIENDS LIVING IN THE RESPONDENT'S FRATERNITY, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

TABLE A.2  THE AVERAGE PERCENT OF CLOSE FRIENDS LIVING IN THE RESPONDENT'S FRATERNITY, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

TABLE A.3  THE AVERAGE RAW DIMENSION SCORE FOR THE HEDONIC TONE DIMENSION, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

TABLE A.4  THE AVERAGE RAW DIMENSION SCORE FOR THE PARTICIPATION DIMENSION, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

TABLE A.5  THE AVERAGE RAW DIMENSION SCORE FOR THE POTENCY DIMENSION, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

TABLE A.6  THE AVERAGE RAW DIMENSION SCORE FOR THE VISCIDITY DIMENSION, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

TABLE A.7  THE AVERAGE PERCENT OF CLOSE FRIENDS LIVING IN THE RESPONDENT'S FRATERNITY, BROKEN DOWN BY IMPORTANCE OF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES, FRATERNITY GROUPING AND CLASS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity A</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of frat friends</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity B</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophs.</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>All Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of frat friends</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity C</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophs.</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>All Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of frat friends</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity D</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophs.</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>All Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of frat friends</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fraternities</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophs.</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>All Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of frat friends</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE A.2

THE AVERAGE PERCENT OF CLOSE FRIENDS LIVING IN THE RESPONDENT'S FRATERNITY, BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>40. %</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>52.</td>
<td>49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>34. %</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>54. %</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>56.</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>32. %</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>15. %</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Fraternities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of frat friends</td>
<td>42. %</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recomputed average but not standard deviation.

**Sum of fraternity N's greater than total sample N due to addition of cases in B and D which are not included in total sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Fraternities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophs.</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>All Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity A</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity B</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity C</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity D</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fraternities</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE A.5

*THE AVERAGE RAW DIMENSION SCORE FOR THE POTENCY DIMENSION*,
BROKEN DOWN BY CLASS AND FRATERNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity A</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity B</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity C</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity D</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Fraternities</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE A.6

The average raw dimension score for the viscosity dimension, broken down by class and fraternity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity A</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity B</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity C</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity D</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Fraternities</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophs.</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>All Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension score</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE A.7
THE AVERAGE PERCENT OF CLOSE FRIENDS LIVING IN THE RESPONDENT'S FRATERNITY, BROKEN DOWN BY IMPORTANCE OF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES, FRATERNITY GROUPING AND CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Activities Important</th>
<th>Fraternities A &amp; C</th>
<th>Fraternities B &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Activities Unimportant</th>
<th>Fraternities A &amp; C</th>
<th>Fraternities B &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fraternity friends</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE
The questions that follow ask for information about yourself, about your close friends, and about the activities in which you participate. The questionnaire should take you about twenty-five minutes to complete. It is possible that you may find some of the questions a bit difficult to answer. In such cases, please answer as best you can, but there is no need to dwell on any one question too long. Feel free to add any comments you may have on the questions, in the margins or on the back of the questionnaire.

Your answers to these questions will be tabulated along with those of a selected sample of M.I.T. students. This data will serve as the basis for my senior thesis in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning. The topic is on student relationships. The results of this survey will be available late in the Spring. I thank you in advance for your time and help.

Peter Messeri '72

1. Among our many acquaintances, there is a group of individuals with whom we are particularly close. Sometimes we feel free to confide our self-doubts, hopes, fears, and problems with such individuals. Most of us would consider these persons our "close" or "good" friends. Consider the persons you know, those living both in and out of the fraternity, both male and female. How many individuals would you consider your close friends? ______ (Please write in the number)
2. Now, please fill in the following table with the requested information about these close friends. Fill in the column furthest to the left with the information pertaining to the person you consider to be your closest friend. In the next column record the information about your second closest friend, and so on, until you have recorded information for the number of friends you have specified above. It is not necessary to fill in all the columns and if you have specified more people than the table permits, only include the first ten. Ranking ones closest friends is often difficult, so don't spend much time worrying about this. A rough approximation will be okay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. How old is this person?

b. Sex is (M or F)

c. How long ago did you first meet this person?

d. If this person attends(ed) MIT what is (was) his or her major (course # or undesignated)

e. Does (did) your friend live in the fraternity?

3. If you had difficulty with either of the first two questions, please comment.
4. What are your nonacademic activities? Below are listed five categories under which one or more activities in which you may be engaged may be classified. Consider each of the categories. Order them in terms of the importance to you of the activity(ies) which fall into the category. In the first column, write '1' next to the category which is most important to you; '2' next to the second most important, and so on. Rank only those categories which contain activities in which you are engaged. In the next column, specify the approximate number of hours per week you spent last semester on the activities in each category you ranked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Order of Importance to you</th>
<th>Average Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Formal and required fraternity activities (for example, brotherhood meetings, officer duty, house chores, IFC meetings, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Informal and social fraternity activities (for example, parties, intramurals, playing cards, watching TV, drinking, group discussions, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Campus activities (for example, varsity sports, student government, literary publications, honorary sororities, religious organizations, clubs, music or theater groups, SDS, NRC, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Community and other off-campus activities (for example, volunteer work, community organizations, political parties, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Individual activities (for example, painting, photography, reading, writing, playing an instrument, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How many of the friends that you listed on the second page did you first meet through campus (nonfraternity) or a community activity while at M.I.T.? _________.

5b. Would it bother you to be called a "fraternity man"? _______.

Background Information

6. My fraternity is _________.

7. My age is _________.

8. My year at M.I.T. is _________.

9. Do you live in an apartment? _________.

10. I have lived in the fraternity for _________. years.

11. My major at M.I.T. is (course number or undesig.) _________.

12. In what city and state did you spend the greatest part of your life before coming to M.I.T.? ________________.
   city state

13. What is your father's occupation? Please be as specific as possible.
    If he is out of work, retired or deceased, list the occupation he was usually employed at ________________________________.

14. What is your mother's occupation? Please be as specific as possible.
    If she is out of work, retired or deceased, please indicate the occupation she was normally employed at ________________________________.

15. How many brothers and sisters do you have? _________.

16. List the ages of your:
   Brothers _______ _______ _______ _______
   Sisters _______ _______ _______ _______
NOTE: For the next series of questions, check or circle the most appropriate answer.

17. Are you: White Black Asian Other please specify

18. Is your religion: Protestant Catholic Jewish
Agnostic Atheist Other please specify

19. How far did your parents go in school? (Check one in each column.)

Your father
- Eighth grade or less
- Some high school, but did not finish
- High school graduate
- Some college, but did not finish
- College graduate
- Post-graduate study

Your mother

About Your Fraternity

The questions that follow make it possible to describe certain characteristics of your fraternity. The items simply describe characteristics of groups: they do not presume to judge whether the characteristic is desirable or undesirable.

In considering each item, please go through the following steps:

1) Read the item carefully.
2) Think about how well the item describes your fraternity.
3) After each statement, check one of the five columns.

(a) If the item you are considering tells something that is
definitely true, check the first column.

(b) If the item you are considering tells something that is mostly true, check the second column.

(c) If the item that you are considering tells something that is to an equal degree true and false, or you are undecided about whether it is true or false, check the third column.

(d) If the item that you are considering tells something that is mostly false, check the fourth column.

(e) If the item that you are considering tells something that is definitely false, check the fifth column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Personal dissatisfaction with the fraternity is too small to be brought up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Members continually grumble about the work they do for the fraternity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The fraternity does its work with no great vim, vigor or pleasure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A feeling of failure prevails in the fraternity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There are frequent intervals of laughter during brotherhood meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>There is a high degree of participation on the part of the members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. If a member of the fraternity is not productive, he is not encouraged to remain.

8. Work of the fraternity is left to those who are considered most capable for the job.

9. Members are interested in the fraternity but not all of them want to work.

10. The fraternity has a reputation for not getting things done.

11. There is usually lively and meaningful discussion during chapter meetings.

12. The work of the fraternity is well divided among brothers.

13. Every member of the fraternity does not have a job to do.

14. There is little desire among most members for group activities.

15. There are long periods during which the fraternity sponsors no house activity.

16. The members allow nothing to interfere with the progress of the fraternity.

17. Members gain a feeling of being honored by being recognized as part of the fraternity.

18. Membership in the fraternity is a way of acquiring social status.

19. Failure of the fraternity would mean little to the individual members.

20. The activities of the fraternity take up less than 10% of most members' waking time.

21. Most members gain in self-esteem from their membership in the fraternity.

22. A mistake by one member of the fraternity might result in hardship for all.

23. The activities of the fraternity take up over 30% of most members' waking time.
24. Membership in the fraternity serves as an aid to academic achievement.

25. Failure of the fraternity would mean nothing to most members.

26. Most members would lose their self-respect if the fraternity should fail.

27. Membership in the fraternity gives members a feeling of superiority.

28. The activities of the group take up over 20% of the time most members are awake.

29. Failure of the fraternity would lead to embarrassment for most members.

30. Members are not rewarded for effort put out for the fraternity.

31. There are two or three members of the fraternity who generally take the same side on any fraternity issue.

32. Certain members are hostile to other members.

33. There is constant bickering among members of the fraternity.

34. Members know that each one looks out for the other as well as for himself.

35. Certain members of the fraternity have no respect for other members.

36. There is a constant tendency towards coniving against one another among parts of the fraternity.

37. Members of the fraternity work together as a team.

38. Certain members of the fraternity are responsible for petty quarrels and some animosity among other members.

39. There are certain tensions among subgroups that tend to interfere with the fraternity's activity.

40. Certain members appear incapable of working as part of the fraternity.
41. There is an undercurrent of feeling among members that tends to pull the fraternity apart.

42. Certain members are considered uncooperative.

43. Being a member of the fraternity helps in meeting girls.

44. There are issues which have divided the members of the fraternity into two or three well defined groups. List the issue(s), if any, below.