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Spring has arrived here in Bloomington and I'm pleased to offer you the 2003 edition of the IUSPA Journal! I have had a wonderful first year as the coordinator of the Higher Education & Student Affairs master's program. We welcomed forty first-year students from across the nation. This is the largest class in recent memories and they have certainly brought many talents to us and will be wonderful additions to the field of Student Affairs. The second-year cohort members are looking forward to graduation and many of them are already successful in their job search efforts and have announced where they are off to in the coming year!

Our faculty continue to provide leadership in research, teaching and service. Trudy Banta provides excellent leadership within the IUPUI program. She has published the book Building a Scholarship of Assessment which has contributions from George Kuh, Vic Borden and others at IUPUI. Trudy was announced as the 2003 winner of the Sidney S. Sisulow Award given by the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) for "scholarly contributions to the field of institutional research. Deborah Carter, who continues to be an essential part of the HESA program, has recently received tenure and has been promoted to Associate Professor. Nancy Chism, also one of our key faculty for the IUPUI program, has had three recent publications regarding faculty development and learning environments. Don Hossler has been working with current and former IU doctoral students on a project funded by the Lumina Foundation to examine how the College Decision-Making Process has changed over the past fifty years.

Mary Howard-Hamilton has been named Chair of the HESA Program and has provided wonderful leadership for the master's and doctoral programs. George Kuh continues to expand the CSEQ and the NSSE through the grants received from The Pew Charitable Trust. George was the 2002 recipient of the Sidney S. Sisulow Award given by AIR. Doug Priest, previously the Associate Vice Chancellor for Budgetary Administration and Planning, has joined the faculty full-time. Doug recently collaborated with Don Hossler, Ed St. John and another author on a book regarding budgeting systems in public universities. Ed St. John has written several pieces recently on social class and college costs. Ed received the 2002 Leadership Award from the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE). Each of our faculty contribute to the field of Higher Education and Student Affairs through publications and acknowledgements, but also so much through their day-to-day interactions with the doctoral and master's students in the HESA program.

Interest in the master's program in Higher Education & Student Affairs remains high as we continue to attract new students to the program. We had approximately 95 students on campus during our two Outreach recruitment sessions in February. We expect a full class of talented students to join us in the fall. This year, we extended our Outreach program and began a doctoral student Outreach that had 20 students attend. We also continued to participate in a number of graduate preparation fairs.

The IUSPA Journal is one of the hallmarks of our program. As we pursue knowledge in higher education and student affairs, the student authors challenge themselves to submit articles that are reviewed and edited by their peers. The editorial team also has a wonderful opportunity to improve their skills in reviewing, critiquing and editing the submitted works. However, this opportunity continues only via your generous contributions. Please designate donations to the annual fund drive to go towards the Journal so that we can continue to produce this exceptional opportunity for our students and for you to receive as alumni. On behalf of the faculty, students, and staff of the program, thank you for your support and contributions to the HESA program. Through your continued efforts to refer talented students to the program and to financial support our program you provide the necessary elements to sustain our strong Higher Education & Student Affairs program at Indiana University!

Fraternity Men and Homosexuality: An Attitudinal and Environmental Assessment

Kerry Fleming, Jason Jones, Kevin McCord, & Eric Marc Ratner

Through a self-administered survey, this study examined the levels of homophobia within Greek chapters at a public Research 1 institution in the Midwest. Additionally, various environmental factors within each chapter were assessed in order to determine which factors within the fraternal living environment might influence attitudes toward homosexuality. Confrontation of negative messages and quality GLB-related programming were found to be significant deterrents of homophobia. This research suggests the necessity of more diversity education within Greek chapters that teaches members how to effectively confront negative messages within their chapter houses.

Over the past few years, issues of gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) students have joined racial, religious, and ethnic concerns at the forefront of diversity research. Although studies regarding attitudes and perceptions toward GLB students on college campuses are easy to find, little research has explored the influence of the fraternal living environment on members' attitudes toward homosexuality (Case, 1996). Unfortunately, what little research does exist regarding GLB issues within the fraternity environment shows substantial levels of discrimination against prospective members perceived as possibly gay, even to the extent of dismissing them from membership (Case, 1996).

Peer groups, in the form of Greek organizations, serve as some of the strongest socializing agents on college campuses, exerting great influence over the social and academic behavior of their members (Kuh, 1982). Consequently, these negative attitudes have forced numerous others to remain in the closet for fear of threats and harassment from fellow members. Not only does this hostile environment ignite issues of equal access, but it also stagnates the essential processes of student development, thereby undermining a principal goal of the college experience (Highhen, Bean, & Sampson, 2000). The purpose of this research, therefore, is three-fold: to collectively assess fraternity members' attitudes toward homosexuality, to explore the nature of the fraternity living environment, and to draw relationships between the two.

Literature Review

Greek Values and Group-Think

The relevant literature acknowledges the importance of student culture, in the form of fraternities and sororities in the undergraduate population. Greek letter organizations represent thriving sub-cultures on their respective campuses, providing undergraduates with a wealth of values and norms for
other members to inherit through membership (Love, Boschini, Jacobs, Hardy, and Kuh, 1993). In a study of American fraternities, Rayburn (1993) lists fraternal values such as, “academe, brotherhood, culture, diversity, loyalty, individuality, tradition, religion, and leadership” (p. 25). Interestingly, Rayburn (1993) cites “culture” and “diversity” as being of least importance to the fraternity members surveyed.

Fraternities lack the necessary support for diversity within their chapters for many reasons (Johnson, 1970). Members who endure shared experiences tend to lose their individuality and begin to develop a collective attitude or groupthink mentality that is socially acceptable for their surrounding fraternity environment (Nuwer, 1999). Since these values exclude an appreciation for diversity in their membership, gay students are left behind.

Campus Climates

In a review of twenty-four studies on campus diversity, Berrill (1992) noted that 80 percent of GLB college students had been verbally harassed; 44 percent had been threatened with violence; 33 percent had been chased or followed; and 17 percent had been physically assaulted. In another study of GLB students, data show that 31 percent of GLB students left school for at least one semester, and 33 percent either dropped out or transferred because of harassment issues (Sherrill & Hardesty, 1994). These statistics demonstrate the hostility of the campus climate for students struggling with issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. Such environments can have a drastic effect on the identity development of homosexuals. For example, the “Identity Pride” stage in Cass’s (1979) model of homosexual identity formation states that GLB students must address an oppressively heterosexual living environment to progress to the next developmental level. However, in order to avoid a hostile environment, they will be prone to act like a heterosexual if it appears to be the overriding norm within their peer group (Blumenfeld, 1992).

This is certainly the case within the Greek environment (Case, 1996; Blumenfeld, 1992; Hughes, 1991). Case (1996) distributed a 32-question self-administered survey to GLB fraternity/sorority undergraduates and alumni across the country, the results of which demonstrated that Greek chapters often discriminate against prospective pledges if they suspect them to be gay or lesbian. In Case’s (1996) study, negative attitudes toward homosexuality were naturally linked to the unwelcoming climate within Greek chapter houses, but perceptions of surrounding chapters in the community were also cited as a major issue.

Additional Influences

Homophobia is not only a product of a campus living environment; attitudes towards homosexuality can and are often learned before a student joins a fraternity or sorority (Case, 1996). Other factors that can affect an individual’s attitude toward homosexuality include previous relationships with homosexuals and education on homosexual issues.

Many gay students feel invisible to their family and peers and are unable to maintain close, positive, and honest relationships with their peers. Galupo and St. John (2001) found that friendships between homosexual and heterosexual students proved to be rewarding experiences for both parties in the friendship. While sharing the general benefits of friendship, the relationships were found to be mutually supporting of each other, regardless of sexual orientation, while also promoting both cognitive and social-emotional development (Galupo & St. John, 2001). Establishing cross-sexual orientation (e.g., friendships between homosexuals and heterosexuals) relationships in high school allows for understanding and familiarity between both groups (Lee, 2002).

Another factor that influences this understanding between sexualities is the quantity and content of sex education for young people. A lack of sufficient sex education can result in young adults, particularly men, forcefully asserting their own views of sexuality and social acceptance, often in the form of violence (Van de Ven, Bornholt, & Bailey, 1996). Effective sexual orientation education allows for individuals to learn respecting diversity among their peers by recognizing how mere phrases can hurt or injure another individual (Plummer, 2001). Additionally, education that teaches individuals to view sexuality on a continuum is likely to dissuade feelings of homophobia (Griffin, 1998; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953).

Higher education literature thoroughly explores the benefits of student involvement in Greek life, and it also examines the reasons why Greek communities systematically discourage diversity. However, developing a better understanding of the attitudes of fraternity men toward homosexuality, as well as establishing relationships between those attitudes and various environmental influences of Greek life will enable student affairs professionals to concentrate their problem-solving efforts into more efficient solutions for changing the fraternal culture.

Methodology

Participants

The researchers surveyed fraternity members at a large, Midwestern, Research I, state-supported institution. The sample came from eighteen of the nineteen traditional fraternal chapters that have on-campus residences at the study university. One fraternity was eliminated from the sample pool because the chapter’s status with the university was under review. Of all the fraternities contacted, a total of six agreed to allow the researchers to administer the survey to interested members. A total of 181 surveys were
distributed and collected from members who agreed to participate. The study sample included 46 freshmen (25.4%), 65 sophomores (35.9%), 44 juniors (24.3%), and 25 seniors (13.8%). The mean age of the participants was 19.69 years. Sixty-three (34.8%) of the participants self-identified themselves as holding a leadership position within their chapter.

Instrument

Researchers have grappled with the difficulties of accurately and quantitatively measuring attitudes toward homosexuality. Between 1971 and 1978, at least 31 reports of attitudinal studies of homosexuality were published (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). Hudson and Ricketts (1980) point out that many instruments have blurred the distinction between “intellectual attitudes toward homosexuality...and affective responses toward homosexuality” (p. 358). The former focuses on legality and morality, while the latter measures irrational feelings of discomfort, fear, and anger toward homosexuals. Weinberg (1972) defined homophobia in terms of fear of being in close proximity with homosexuals, and Hudson and Ricketts (1980) chose this definition as a model to create their Index of Homophobia (IAH).

The researchers included additional questions at the end of Hudson and Ricketts’ (1980) Index. The researchers’ survey, in turn, consists of the following sections: fraternity members’ attitudes towards sexual orientation, adapted from the Index of Homophobia (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980), consisting of 24 questions on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree); a comparison of the individuals’ perceptions of themselves and their respective chapter houses regarding homosexuality, consisting of three pairs of questions on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree); and questions regarding social and physical environments within the house related to how negative messages about homosexuals are encountered and addressed within the chapter. These eighteen questions regarding social and physical environments were on a four-point Likert-type scale from 1 (never) to 4 (often). The survey closed with additional questions about policies and programming regarding sexual orientation in and out of the fraternity and a section pertaining to the participant’s demographics.

Procedure

The researchers administered surveys to groups of fraternity members within their respective chapter houses over a three-week period. Fraternity presidents of the selected chapter houses were contacted for permission to conduct the survey. The surveys were administered at weekly chapter business meetings for each fraternity. At least one researcher was present to administer the survey and answer participants’ questions.

Data Analysis

According to Hudson and Ricketts (1980), a mean score of 0-25 is regarded as high grade non-homophobic, a mean score between 25 and 50 is regarded as low grade non-homophobic, between 50 and 75 is regarded as low grade homophobic, and high grade homophobic refers to mean scores above 75. In other words, the higher the score, the higher the level of homophobia. Scores were calculated in accordance with the methods used by Hudson and Ricketts (1980).

Questions from Section B were split into three pairs (1 and 2), (3 and 4), and (5 and 6). The first question of each pair reflects how a participant would personally respond to homosexuality within the chapter house, while the second question asks for a participant’s opinion about how the house as a whole would feel. Comparisons for the mean responses in Section B were used to see if the difference between the two questions in each pair was significant.

The researchers then drew means comparisons and correlations between various sections of data. Means comparisons (T-tests) and correlations were drawn between scores on the IAH and various demographic and environmental factors. A stronger relationship of IAH scores to input factors, rather than environmental influences within the house, might weaken the notion that fraternity house living breeds high levels of homophobia.

Limitations

Limitations seemed to fall within two areas: (1) the environment in which the surveys were administered and (2) external influences. Each of the researchers visited the fraternity houses after a chapter meeting to administer the survey. While this was the best way to administer the survey to as many chapter members as possible in one sitting, the researchers noticed that chapter members were engaged in conversation and commentary with other members. This may have constituted a hostile environment, due to the confidential nature of the subject.

Additionally, while administering the surveys, the researchers identified a possible external influence. Since fraternity chapter presidents were contacted prior to the chapter meetings, there was ample time for any chapter presidents concerned about the reputation of their house to possibly influence their members to report socially desirable responses on the survey.

Results

Overall IAH Scores

A mean IAH score of 52.92 was found for the 181 participants. Individual scores ranged the full spectrum of the IAH from 0.00 to 100. Mean scores for specific chapters ranged from 44.21 to 58.67. The difference between these two extremes was found to be significant (p<.05).
Section B

The overall analysis of Section B found participants rating their respective chapter as less tolerant of homosexuals than they rated themselves. The mean response from all of the participants for the “T” or “Individual” questions in Section B (questions 1, 3, and 5) were 2.15, 2.04, and 2.84, respectively (see Table 1).

A greater mean score in Section B indicates higher perceived levels of discomfort with homosexuality. The mean responses to the “My house” questions in Section B, on the other hand, were all greater than the scores individuals gave themselves on matching questions. Questions 2, 4 and 6 simply replaced the word “T” from questions 1, 3, and 5 with the words “my house.” The mean scores for the “My house” questions (2, 4, and 6) were 2.62, 3.52, and 3.18, respectively. A paired samples comparison of the means in Section B, in turn, produced a significant difference (p<.05) between all paired questions (questions 1 and 2; 3 and 4; and 5 and 6, see Table 2 as it relates to corresponding data in Table 1). A greater mean score in Section B, therefore, indicates that the respondent tended to disagree more with the questions pertaining to the perceived attitudes of his respective chapter house.

Table 1: Mean Scores from Responses to Section B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Question 1: If a brother “came out” I would be supportive of that individual.
Question 2: If a brother “came out” my house would be supportive of that individual.
Question 3: If a brother were to bring a male date to house functions, I would be supportive.
Question 4: If a brother were to bring a male date to house functions, my house would be supportive.
Question 5: I would be comfortable if other fraternity knew that my chapter has a gay member(s).
Question 6: My house would be comfortable if other fraternity knew that my chapter has a gay member(s).

Section C

Section C of the survey instrument was designed to discover how negative messages are communicated and confronted. Jokes and verbal harassment occur more often than non-verbal forms of negative messages. Jokes, especially, occur more frequently across chapters with individual chapter means no lower than 2.83.

Section C investigated who, if anyone, confronts situations in which negative messages about gays are seen and/or heard. When the means from the confrontation subcategory of Section C were compared with IAH scores, t-tests showed that more confrontation of situations involving negative messages about gays from members, officers, and individuals in the chapter relates to less homophobia. Respondents who reported a score of 3 or greater (either sometimes or always confronts a situation) in this subcategory of Section C were compared with respondents who indicated less than 3 (either never or rarely confronts a situation). The mean IAH scores of these groups were found to be significantly different (p<.05) and show that lower IAH scores (i.e., lower levels of homophobia) relate to increased levels of confrontation in a chapter.

Non-discrimination Policies

Another comparison was made between IAH scores and participants’ responses to the questions in Section D pertaining to perceptions of a non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation. The validity of a participant’s response to the question “Does your fraternity have a non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation?” could not be verified (chapters do not necessarily disclose this information). A comparison of IAH scores between those who answered yes and those who answered no to this question demonstrated that those who believed that their chapter did not have a non-discrimination policy had lower IAH scores (M=50.38). Those who did know a policy existed had an IAH score of 54.83. This difference, however, was not found to be significant (p<.05). Furthermore, when the entire study group was analyzed, the majority of respondents (n=97) indicated that they did not know of the existence of such a policy.

Programming that Addresses GLB Issues

Two questions in Section D inquired as to the respondents’ participation in or attendance at educational programs held (1) by the fraternity and (2) not held by the respondents’ fraternity. Respondents who attended programming sponsored by their chapter had a mean IAH score of 53.75. The mean IAH score for the respondents who indicated that they attended programming held outside their fraternity was 46.38. This is more than seven points below the overall mean IAH score (52.92), and it is significantly different.
(p<.05) from the mean IAH score of respondents who did not attend pro-
gramming held outside their fraternity (M=54.17).

Demographic Issues
In general, participants in this study were in the early years of their college careers, with a mean participant age of 19.69 years (SD=1.22). The average time spent residing in their respective chapter houses was 1.41 years (SD=0.49). Since age does not necessarily correspond with years spent in college, a T-test comparing mean IAH scores of underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores) and upperclassmen (juniors and seniors) was performed to investigate a possible significant difference in IAH scores. Those respondents who identified themselves as upperclassmen (n=69) had a mean IAH score of 50.89. The remaining 111 respondents who identified themselves as underclassmen had a mean IAH score of 54.06. This difference in means was not significant (p<.05).

The researchers also explored the possibility that previous, personal contact/experience with gay men may influence a respondents level of homophobia. A participants positive response to the question “Did you personally know any gay men in high school?” did, in fact, produce a significant relationship (p<.05) with IAH scores. A significant majority (n=128) of the participants indicated that they knew gay men in high school. These respondents’ mean IAH score was 50.60, more than 2 points below the overall IAH mean of 52.92. In contrast, the participants who indicated having no personal experience with gay men in high school had a mean IAH of 58.30. Individual previous interaction with gay men, however, did not seem to affect chapter-wide IAH scores.

The survey instrument’s final question asked the participants to place themselves along a seven-point continuum (Kinsey, et al., 1953) that ranks the respondents’ level of sexuality as it pertains to their thoughts, feelings, and relationship experiences. The scale ranges from 1 (completely heterosexual) to 7 (completely homosexual). The overall mean score for this question was 1.16 with a standard deviation of 0.72. Almost all of the respondents (n=164), in fact, rated themselves as completely heterosexual. Some respondents (n=10) ranked themselves as 2 (mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experience). One respondent ranked himself as completely homosexual, and the remaining respondents (n=7) placed themselves somewhere between 3 (mostly heterosexual with substantial homosexual experience) and 6 (mostly homosexual with substantial heterosexual experience).

When choosing to compare the difference in IAH score means of the respondents who ranked themselves as completely heterosexual versus the ten respondents who ranked themselves as mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experience, the researchers found that those who ranked themselves as mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experience had significantly (p<.05) lower IAH scores (M=43.31). Those who ranked themselves as completely heterosexual had a mean IAH score of 53.79.

Discussion
The intent of this study was to gauge levels of homophobia within fraternities at the campus of study, as well as to discover connections between these homophobia levels and environmental factors within each house. The research presented some interesting conclusions, as well as some useful implications for practitioners striving to create effective programming to reduce levels of homophobia within their campus Greek systems.

The study’s findings regarding levels of homophobia within the participating fraternities indicate that a variation between individual fraternal living environments does occur. The variances between chapters were related to environmental factors affecting individual’s level of homophobia. In some cases these factors also had an affect on the homophobia level of the entire chapter lending towards the notion of group think within fraternal living environments. Due to the number of variables involved, it is difficult to draw relationships between individual factors and chapter-wide homophobia.

An analysis of Section B of the study indicates that an individual respondent perceives himself as less homophobic than his fellow chapter members. This trend was reported across all six of the participating fraternities, and it confirms that “continuous interaction with an isolated group produces the understandings and attitudes that form the basis of student culture” (Hughes, 1962, p. 70). This study allowed the researchers to interpret such implications when compared to Rayburn’s (1993) assertion that individual values tend to converge upon entering the Greek environment. Additional research regarding the accuracy with which individuals report their own attitudes toward homosexuals could be used to educate Greek
members about the actual levels of homophobia within the chapter house.

Other conclusions drawn from Section C indicate some practical implications for addressing social norming as it relates to change. Jokes and verbal harassment seem to be the most prevalent manifestations of homophobia within chapters. The frequency with which those messages were confronted, however, more significantly impacted IAH scores than their existence. The data seem to suggest that members' willingness to confront issues of homophobia within the house might work toward reducing chapter-wide homophobia. This connection between confrontation and IAH scores showed a strong relationship between environmental factors and a collective level of homophobia. Future research might attempt to establish which types of confrontations are most effective when dealing with homophobic jokes and verbal harassment.

Another way to decrease the underlying culture of homophobia might be to provide effective educational programming that includes issues of the GLB community. Attendance at outside programming demonstrated a significant connection to lower levels of individual homophobia. However, exposure to in-house programming did not show any significant impact upon chapter members' IAH scores. Future research should consider further practical implications regarding the components of effective diversity programming.

The data suggest that the existence or a perception of the existence of a GLB-inclusive non-discrimination policy is not enough to reduce levels of homophobia for individuals within a chapter. It is the opinion of the researchers that it is not only important that fraternities have a non-discrimination policy that includes GLB issues, but that it is also important for those policies to be explained and discussed in detail with all chapter members. Future research comparing fraternities that do have policies with those who do not may provide more in-depth connections between policies and homophobia.

Most demographic factors studied, such as the setting individuals surveyed grew up in, religion, strength of religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, and academic major, showed no significant influence on participants' IAH scores. Therefore, because these background factors did not prove to be significant factors influencing overall IAH scores, the researchers could only conclude that chapter house environments had (at least) a more-than- incidental effect on individual and house-wide attitudes towards homosexuals.

Contact with gay men in high school did show a significant impact on individual levels of homophobia. However, the social norming phenomenon of the fraternity environment seemed to eradicate its effect on the chapter-wide environment. Malaney (1990) asserts that contact with diverse indi- viduals quells feelings of prejudice. Fraternities, therefore, should consider the diversity of the members they recruit and the value of the impact of interaction with gay men on the level of their chapter's homophobia. This study showed that a majority of the participants had positive experiences with gay men in high school, and in turn, had lower levels of homophobia. It can be assumed that positive interactions with gay men in college would provide the same decrease in levels of homophobia.

The final factor to be considered is the respondents' placement of themselves on Kinsey, et al. (1953) sexuality scale. Although only eight percent of respondents reported having thoughts, feelings, and experiences that were not completely heterosexual, the survey data, seems to show that the ability to place one's sexuality on a continuum is significantly linked with low levels of homophobia. Respondents that reported being mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experiences would still likely regard themselves as being heterosexual. However, as Kinsey, et al. (1953) and Griffin (1998) suggest, individuals who were able to see the wide range of possible sexual thoughts, feelings, and behavior were less likely to be judgmental of those who display different styles of behavior.

These conclusions suggest some guidelines for student affairs practitioners who wish to apply this research to educational programming within the fraternity environment. The revelation that “Not everyone is as homophobic as I think they are” might supply hesitant individuals with enough courage to delve more deeply into the issues of homophobia. Educational programming should also address the prevalence of jokes and verbal harassment in informal settings, as well as how to effectively confront such negative messages. Members should be educated as to the existence of GLB-inclusive policies and both how to get them and how to successfully apply them to daily life within the fraternity. Finally, any education that addresses issues of homophobia should utilize the Kinsey, et al. (1953) continuum model of sexuality. Accenting this exploration with a panel presentation of gay individuals might provide fraternity members with a variety of perspectives on GLB issues. This might help members to establish links between the continuum model of sexuality and a representation of people in general, thereby blurring the line between what is and what is not socially acceptable.

This research has shown various linkages between environments and attitudes, but, as Love (1997) points out, strategies for changing a culture of homophobia must be tailored to the needs of individual environments. It is the hope of the researchers that this study will inspire others in the student affairs community to explore this area further in order to improve climates of homophobia within the collegiate Greek system.
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