Report of Findings: Peer Accountability

Prepared by Plaid, LLC. for the North American Interfraternity Conference

In Fall 2022, the North American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) engaged in a study with a goal of better understanding the perspectives, knowledge, and experiences of undergraduate men related to peer accountability. The ideal outcome of this research is to gain greater awareness of how undergraduate men understand and engage in behaviors related to peer-to-peer accountability, especially how they develop competence and motivation to engage in peer accountability-related behaviors.

Research Methods

This study employed an electronic survey methodology with a target audience of current undergraduate men studying at institutions of higher education in the United States. The goal of the study is to draw comparisons between undergraduate men who are affiliated with fraternities and those who are not currently affiliated with fraternal organizations. Participants in this study were recruited through collaboration with campus professionals at five host institutions. Host institutions included:

	Governance Control	*Undergraduate Student Population*	*Regional Location*
Institution 1	Public	46,000	Southeast
Institution 2	Private	4,900	Southeast
Institution 3	Public	20,200	Southwest
Institution 4	Public	26,800	Southeast
Institution 5	Public	14,700	Southeast

Population numbers were sourced from publicly available data, such as institution websites or the U.S News and World Report.

These institutions were selected to participate in this study as they met the following criteria:
- A fraternity/sorority community with strong engagement (11%+ or greater)
- Fraternity residential facilities available
- Diverse geographical representation
- Has a medium or larger undergraduate student population (i.e. larger than 5,000 students)

Students were engaged via email to encourage participation in the study. Invitation and reminder messages were sent to contact lists of undergraduate men either by a campus administrator using an anonymous link or by a Plaid staff member through Qualtrics. Data was collected on a rolling basis throughout the Fall 2022 semester and concluded on November 18th.

Throughout the Fall 2022 semester, 524 current undergraduate men responded to the survey. 203 students indicated current membership with a fraternity organization, with 307 indicating they had never sought membership and additional 14 who were former members. Those indicating former membership were included in the non-member population for analysis.

Table 1 outlines the various demographics, characteristics, and backgrounds that the respondents of the study they represented.

Table 1. Respondent Demographics

	Members (n=203)	Non-Members (n=321)
Academic Year		
First-Year	8%	28%
Sophomore	21%	25%
Junior	32%	27%
Senior or older	38%	20%
Racial/Ethnicity Identity*		
American Indian/Alaska Native	3%	3%
Hispanic or Latino	9%	6%
Asian	2%	3%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1%	0%
Middle Eastern or North African	0%	2%
White (non-Hispanic)	82%	75%
Black (non-Hispanic)	3%	8%
Another race or ethnicity (please specify)	0%	1%
I prefer not to respond	1%	3%
Residence Location		
On-Campus	44%	55%
Off-Campus	56%	45%
Residence Type		
House, apartment, condo, etc.	63%	51%
Residence hall	14%	47%

Fraternity facility	22%	-
Another residence type (please specify)	1%	2%
Living Situation		
With roommate(s)	91%	75%
With parent(s)/guardian(s)	3%	9%
With spouse/partner	1%	6%
Alone	4%	8%
Other	1%	1%

Of the students who indicated being members of fraternities, most reported being members of their organization for at least one year with the majority (55%) being members of their chapters for at least two years (Table 2).

Table 2. Length of Membership Among Fraternity Members

	(n=201)
First Semester of Membership	17%
First Year of Membership	26%
Second Year of Membership	27%
Third Year of Membership or Longer	28%

Campus involvement was examined within this study due to the opportunities for peer interactions that exist within involvement activities. In examining campus involvement, respondents were most likely to be involved in a club or organization related to their major or minor or intramural or club sports. A greater percentage of respondents who are members of fraternities report being more involved in other organizations and activities on campus (Table 3). One involvement opportunity in which students who are not members were slightly more involved than fraternity members includes residence life and housing.

Table 3, Campus Involvement

	Members (n=183)	Non-Members (n=285)
Club or organization related to major or minor	56%	44%
Intramural or club sports	80%	34%
Religious or interfaith group	32%	19%

Residence life or housing	14%	15%
Intercollegiate athletics	21%	13%
Professional fraternity	51%	5%
Political or social action groups	17%	11%

Findings

Understanding of Accountability and Intervention

In comparing initial conceptualization of accountability and intervention, fraternity members have a higher level of agreement (M=5.97, SD=1.81) in their belief that they know how to hold their friends/peers accountable compared to unaffiliated undergraduate men (M=5.65, SD=1.90). Additionally, fraternity members report a higher level of agreement (M=5.88, SD=1.19) in the belief that practicing accountability with friends/peers sometimes involves intervention when compared to unaffiliated undergraduate men (M=5.59, SD=1.70). Independent t-tests conducted on both items indicate statistically significant differences between the levels of agreement among the fraternity affiliated and unaffiliated undergraduate men in this study (Table 4).

Table 4, Perceived Understanding of Accountability

	Members (n=181)	Non-Members (n=279)
I know how to hold my friend(s)/peer(s) accountable.*	5.97	5.65
Practing accountability with friend(s)/peer(s) sometimes involves intervention.*	5.88	5.59

*Indicates statistically significant difference observed in means. Full t-test analyses are listed in the Appendix.

Comfort and Confidence in Engaging in Peer Accountability

This study also examined the level of comfort and confidence that undergraduate men hold related to providing accountability and intervening with friends and peers on a variety of topics. Comfort and confidence level were measured by allowing participants to rate their comfort or confidence in holding friends/peers accountable on a variety of topics using a scale from 0 through 10, with 10 indicating the highest self-rating of comfort or confidence.

Table 5, Reported Mean Comfort Level in Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=170)	Non-Members (n=265)
Academics*	7.53	6.77

Alcohol or Substance Use	7.24	6.83
Dating/romantic relationships	6.49	6.12
Sexual relationships*	6.05	5.46
Professional/career*	7.06	6.50
Personal goals*	7.65	7.06
Hazing*	7.84	6.19

*Indicates statistically significant difference observed in means. Full t-test analyses are listed in the Appendix.

T-tests indicated statistically significant difference in means in comfort levels between fraternity members and unaffiliated undergraduate men. Fraternity members had statistically higher comfort levels in providing accountability in the following areas:
- Academics
- Sexual relationships
- Professional/career
- Personal goals
- Hazing

Table 6, Reported Confidence Level in Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=170)	Non-Members (n=265)
Academics*	7.60	6.85
Alcohol or Substance Use*	7.42	6.52
Dating/romantic relationships*	6.73	6.11
Sexual relationships*	6.34	5.42
Professional/career*	7.11	6.40
Personal goals*	7.59	6.83
Hazing*	7.90	5.92

*Indicates statistically significant difference observed in means. Full t-test analyses are listed in the Appendix.

T-tests indicated statistically significant difference in means in confidence levels in providing accountability in all areas studied indicating fraternity members reported higher levels of confidence in holding their peers accountable. To further analyze comfort and confidence in providing accountability to peers, composite scales were created to develop a total score for reported levels of comfort and confidence related to peer accountability. The composite scales were created taking the total possible rating (i.e. 10 points for being very comfortable or confident) and multiplying it by 7, the number of areas of possible intervention (i.e. academics,

alcohol or substance use, etc.). This created a composite score of 70 maximum points for comfort level and 70 maximum points for confidence level, in which a higher number increates an increased level of comfort or confidence. Details on the strength of the validity of this scale are included in the Appendix.

Table 7, Composite Comfort and Confidence Levels of Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=203)	Non-Members (n=321)
Composite Comfort Level*	41.75	37.09
Composite Confidence Level*	42.45	36.35

*Indicates statistically significant difference observed in means. Full t-test analyses and information regarding the Cronbach's Alpha is listed in the Appendix.

When comparing the composite scores for comfort and confidence levels, t-tests indicated that statistically significant differences were observed between the means reported by fraternity members and unaffiliated undergraduate men. With fraternity members reporting higher means for both comfort level and confidence level related to engaging in peer accountability.

Previous Engagement & Methods Used in Peer Accountability Behaviors

To further understand peer accountability, this study examined the reported past experiences of respondents related to engaging in peer accountability and intervention as well as the types of behaviors they have engaged in to provide accountability to their peers.

To understand their history of accountability related behaviors, respondents were asked to what extent they had engaged in a variety of behaviors while in college. They were able to respond that they had not engaged in the activity, had engaged to some extent, or had engaged in the activity. Table 8 outlines the percentage of respondents who reported they had participated in accountability related behaviors to some extent while in college.

Table 8, Accountability Behaviors

	Members (n=164)		Non-Members (n=257)	
	Engaged to some extent	Engaged in this activity	Engaged to some extent	Engaged in this activity
Intervened when a friend/peer was behaving in an unsafe manner.	42%	45%	35%	35%
Intervened when a friend/peer was violating a campus policy.	46%	26%	35%	13%
Intervened when a friend/peer was breaking a law.	39%	30%	28%	20%
Intervened when a friend/peer was engaging in hazing behaviors.	23%	28%	17%	11%
Intervened when a friend/peer was using or misusing alcohol or other substances.	38%	38%	33%	28%
Provided accountability to a friend/peer related to their health and safety.	43%	43%	35%	34%
Provided accountability to a friend/peer related to their use of alcohol or other substances.	41%	40%	33%	28%
Provided accountability to a friend/peer related to their professional goals.	43%	40%	38%	29%
Provided accountability to a friend/peer related to their academics.	34%	56%	35%	37%
Provided accountability to a friend/peer related to their dating or romantic relationships.	47%	37%	38%	29%
Provide accountability to a friend/peer related to sexual relationships.	46%	29%	32%	22%

Through this comparison, a greater percentage of fraternity members report past experiences engaging in peer accountability behaviors than unaffiliated undergraduate men in all areas examined. When looking at the percentage of students who have engaged in peer accountability behaviors fully, there are double digit (between 10%-19%) percentage point differences between fraternity members and unaffiliated men who participated in this study in the following areas:
- Providing accountability related to academics (19% ppt difference)
- Intervening when a friend was engaging in a hazing behavior (17% ppt difference)

- Intervening when a friend was using or misusing alcohol or other substances (13% ppt difference)
- Intervening when a friend was violating a campus policy (13% ppt difference)
- Providing accountability related to a friend's use of alcohol or other substances (12% ppt difference)
- Providing accountability to a friend related to professional goals (11% ppt difference)
- Intervening when a friend was engaging in an unsafe manner (10% ppt difference)

Participants were also asked about the specific actions and behaviors they have taken when they have provided accountability or engaged in intervention related behaviors. Table # outlines the percentage of respondents who had engaged in various accountability/intervention related actions. This item was structured so that participants could select all options that aligned with their past behaviors so the data presented in Table 9 is not intended to total 100%. It should be read as the percent of respondents of the population selected the given option in their response.

Table 9, Accountability/Intervention Actions

	Members (n=154)	Non-Members (n=212)
Had one-on-one in-person conversation with a friend/peer	96%	91%
Sent a message electronically to a friend/peer	82%	78%
Engaged the help of another friend/peer to have a conversation with a friend/peer	72%	58%
Shared resources with a friend/peer	42%	38%
Have a one-on-one video conversation with a friend/peer	20%	21%
Accompanied a friend/peer to an appointment, service, event, etc. to provide accountability or support	18%	16%
Engaged the help of a parent or guardian to have a conversation with a friend/peer	16%	15%
Engaged the help of a campus administrator or faculty member to have a conversation with a friend/peer	6%	9%
Engaged the help of law enforcement	5%	5%
Took another action	1%	1%

In comparing the experiences of fraternity members and unaffiliated peers, fewer differences emerged in the reported intervention and accountability actions they take. A few areas of note where differences did emerge:

- A greater percentage of fraternity members reported in engaging the help of another friend/peer to have a conversation with a friend/peer.

- While still a small number, a greater percentage of unaffiliated undergraduate men indicated they have engaged the help of a campus administrator or faculty member in a conversation with a friend.

Training and Awareness of Accountability Policies

Within this study, training was measured by if a respondent indicated they had received or participated in an prior educational experience related to peer accountability or intervention. 40% of respondents in this study indicated prior participation in training or educational experiences related to providing accountability to friends or peers. When factoring in fraternity membership, there is a notable difference in the portion of students who have participated in prior training related accountability among fraternity members when compared to the unaffiliated undergraduate men.

Table 10, Past Training Experience Related to Peer Accountability or Intervention

	Members (n=162)	Non-Members (n=252)
Engaged in prior training or education	57%	29%
Had not engaged in prior training or education	43%	71%

Those who indicated participating in prior training were asked to specify in what settings or organizations they previously received training related to accountability. This item was structured so that participants could select all options that aligned with their past training experiences so the data presented in Table 11 is not intended to total 100%. It should be read as the percent of respondents of the population selected the given option in their response. Additionally, this question was only made visible to those who had indicated a past experience with training or education related to peer accountability and intervention.

Table 11, Types of Past Training Experiences

	Members (n=92)	Non-Members (n=74)
Program sponsored by college or university	74%	74%
Program sponsored by fraternity chapter or national organization	78%	-
Program sponsored by campus club or organization	17%	22%
Program as a part of an academic course	18%	23%
Program sponsored by a community organization	12%	19%

When examining the types of training and education experiences of respondents, those with past training experiences reported predominantly receiving training through their college or university, with no observable difference between fraternity members and unaffiliated undergraduate men. However, a slightly greater percentage of fraternity members reported

receiving training through their chapter or national organization than from their college or university.

To gauge awareness of formal policies and processes, respondents were asked if there were any formal policies or processes related to accountability that existed within the campus involvement activities they indicated being a member of. Using display logic, respondents only provided information about the involvement activities for which they previously indicated being a member of earlier in the instrument (i.e if they reported being a member of student government in the opening demographic questions). Table 12 outlines the percentage of respondents who were aware of formal policies or processes related to accountability within their involvement activities as well as the percentage who were unsure.

Table 12, Awareness of Formal Accountability Policies/Processes Based on Campus Involvement

	Members		Non-Members	
	Yes	Unsure	Yes	Unsure
Club or organization related to major or minor	56%	31%	58%	27%
Intramural or club sports	64%	20%	60%	28%
Religious or interfaith group	63%	31%	61%	28%
Residence life or housing	88%	4%	62%	21%
Intercollegiate athletics	61%	31%	77%	9%
Professional fraternity	72%	21%	58%	33%
Political or social action groups	46%	35%	62%	23%

In terms of awareness of formal accountability policies and practices, little differences were observed between fraternity members and unaffiliated undergraduate men. While not comparable to the unaffiliated student population, 94% of respondents who identified as fraternity members indicated they were aware of formal policies and processes that existed within their fraternity related to accountability.

Drivers and Barriers to Practicing Peer Accountability

In addition to examining the past experiences in practicing peer accountability and intervention, this study explored factors that can serve as motivation as well as barriers or challenges to intervening. Table 13 outlines the percentage of respondents who identified barriers as either a moderate or extreme barrier or challenge to practicing peer accountability.

Table 13, Identified Barriers or Challenges in Practicing Peer Accountability

	Members (n=153)	Non-Members (n=242)
Fear of retaliation by my friend(s)/peer(s)	17%	28%
Fear of rejection by my friend(s)/peer(s)	24%	31%
Fear of the friendship ending	26%	36%
Fear of being kicked out of a club/organization	13%	17%
Fear of a club/organization being closed down or banned on campus	24%	11%
Fear of involvement of campus administration	25%	19%
Fear of bullying or being made fun of	13%	17%
Not knowing how to properly hold someone accountable	18%	26%
Fear of getting in trouble with my college/university	23%	23%
Fear of getting in trouble with law enforcement	24%	26%

Aside from a few notable differences, fraternity members and unaffiliated students identified many of the same barriers or challenges related to providing accountability to peers. For both groups, fear of the friendship ending was the greatest barrier or challenge cited. After that shared top challenge, fraternity members cited barriers/challenges related to authority (i.e. campus administration, law enforcement, or their organization being closed) as a barrier whereas unaffiliated peers gravitated towards challenges related to peer interactions (i.e. rejection and retaliation from peers).

Using a three-point scale (i.e. This does not motivate me, somewhat motivates me, Greatly motivates me), participants were asked to rate various forms of motivation to why they would engage in peer accountability or intervention activities. Table 14 outlines the percentage of respondents who indicated various types of motivation would greatly motivate them to engage in accountability or intervention behaviors with their friends/peers.

Table 14, Identified as Greatly Motivating for Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=156)	Non-Members (n=242)
Keeping my friend(s)/peer(s) healthy and safe	79%	76%
Encouraging the personal growth of my friend(s)/peer(s)	75%	65%
Encouraging the professional growth of my friend(s)/peer(s)	67%	61%
Encouraging the academic success of my friend(s)/peer(s)	72%	62%
Following campus policies	32%	33%
Obeying the law	51%	47%
Someone may repay the favor for me in the future	33%	32%
Following the policies/rules of a club/organization I am a part of	49%	34%
Protecting a club/organization I am a part of	65%	37%
Being accepted by my friend(s)/peer(s)	38%	42%
Acting in alignment with my values	80%	72%

For both fraternity members and unaffiliated men, acting in alignment with values, keeping friends safe and healthy, and encouraging personal growth of friends/peers serve as the top sources of motivation to engage in peer accountability. When factoring in what respondents identified as somewhat motivating, some variation does start to emerge between those who identify as members of fraternities and those who do not.

Table 15, Identified as Either Somewhat or Greatly Motivating

		Members (n=156)	Non-Members (n=242)
Keeping my friend(s)/peer(s) healthy and safe	Somewhat	15%	19%
	Greatly	79%	76%
Encouraging the personal growth of my friend(s)/peer(s)	Somewhat	23%	30%
	Greatly	75%	65%
Encouraging the professional growth of my friend(s)/peer(s)	Somewhat	24%	31%
	Greatly	72%	61%
Encouraging the academic success of my friend(s)/peer(s)	Somewhat	29%	32%
	Greatly	67%	62%
Following campus policies	Somewhat	42%	40%
	Greatly	49%	33%
Obeying the law	Somewhat	38%	36%
	Greatly	51%	47%
Someone may repay the favor for me in the future	Somewhat	38%	38%
	Greatly	33%	32%
Following the policies/rules of a club/organization I am a part of	Somewhat	42%	43%
	Greatly	49%	34%
Protecting a club/organization I am a part of	Somewhat	28%	39%

	Greatly	65%	37%
Being accepted by my friend(s)/peer(s)	Somewhat	46%	40%
	Greatly	38%	42%
Acting in alignment with my values	Somewhat	17%	21%
	Greatly	80%	72%

The top 5 motivators identified by unaffiliated undergraduate men as as somewhat or greatly motivating to engage in accountability or intervention activities included:
- Keeping friends healthy and safe (95%)
- Encouraging personal growth (95%)
- Encouraging academic success (94%)
- Acting in alignment with values (93%)
- Encouraging professional growth and development (92%)

Similar themes emerged for fraternity members, but in a different order in terms of prominence:
- Encouraging personal growth (98%)
- Acting in alignment with values (98%)
- Encouraging academic success (96%)
- Encouraging professional growth and development (96%)
- Keeping friends healthy and safe (94%)
- Protecting a club/organization they are a part of (93%)

It is interesting that 93% of fraternity members were somewhat or greatly motivated to engage in accountability to protect a club or organization, compared to 76% of unaffiliated undergraduate men who felt similarly.

Perspectives on Belonging and Community
Table 16 outlines the level of agreement of respondents related to statements regarding their perspective on belongingness on campus and their perceived level of responsibility towards the growth and development of their peers.

Table 16, Perspectives on Belonging and Campus Community

	Members (n=158)	Non-Members (n=241)
I feel as though I belong on my campus*	5.90	5.18
I feel as though I am a valued member of my campus community*	5.66	4.86
I feel responsible to support the health and safety of my friends/peers	5.67	5.42

I feel responsible to support the personal development of my friends/peers*	5.72	5.34
I feel responsible to support the professional development of my friends/peers*	5.61	5.13

*Indicates statistically significant difference observed in means. Full t-test analyses are listed in the Appendix.

T-test analyses indicate fraternity members reported statistically significant higher mean agreement levels in their reported sense of belonging on campus and feeling of being a valued member of the campus community compared to their unaffiliated peers. Additionally, they reported higher means in agreement that were observed to be statistically significant in their reported feelings of responsibility to support the professional and personal development of their friends/peers compared to unaffiliated students. Statistically significant differences were not observed related to the reported sense of responsibility to support the health and safety of friends/peers, but both groups skewed towards agreement that they felt responsible for the health and safety of their friends/peers.

Summary

In an examination of undergraduate student perspectives and experiences related to peer accountability and intervention, the following primary themes emerged in this study:

- Fraternity members report higher levels of reported understanding of how to practice accountability and the role intervention plays in accountability.
- Fraternity members report higher levels of comfort and confidence in regards to practicing peer accountability.
- A greater portion of students who identified as fraternity members reported prior experiences in engaging in peer accountability behaviors compared to unaffiliated undergraduate men, especially in regards to providing accountability related to academics, hazing, alcohol or substance misuse, campus policy violation, professional goals, and when friends are engaging in an unsafe manner.
- Over half (57%) of students who identified as fraternity members indicated participating in a training or educational experience related to peer accountability or intervention. Of those fraternity members who have received, most received training from their college/university (74%) and their fraternity (78%).
- There were subtle, not notable differences between the cited barriers/challenges cited by respondents based on their fraternity affiliation. After fear of the friendship ending as their top barrier, fraternity members identified issues such as involvement of campus administration, getting in trouble with law enforcement or the university, or having their organization closed as the next most challenging issue to practicing accountability.
- Regarding motivation to engage in peer accountability, fraternity members and their unaffiliated peers did not differ drastically. One area of note is that nearly two-thirds (65%) of fraternity members in the study reported being greatly motivated by protecting the club/organization they are a part of to engage in accountability compared to 37% of unaffiliated peers who felt similarly.
- Fraternity members report a greater sense of belonging and feeling of being a valued member of their campus community than their unaffiliated peers. They also cite a greater responsibility to support the personal and professional growth of their friends/peers.

Appendix

Table 4, T-test Analysis for Perceived Understanding of Accountability

	Members (n=181)		Non-Members (n=279)		T-Test Findings		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value	df	t-value
I know how to hold my friend(s)/peer(s) accountable.*	5.97	1.81	5.65	1.90	0.0012	457	2.5483
Practicing accountability with friend(s)/peer(s) sometimes involves intervention.*	5.88	1.19	5.59	1.70	0.022	457	2.2977

Table 5, T-test Analysis for Reported Mean Comfort Level in Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=170)		Non-Members (n=265)		T-Test Findings		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value	df	t-value
Academics*	7.53	2.00	6.77	2.30	0.0005	433	3.5351
Alcohol or Substance Use	7.24	2.57	6.83	2,72	0.1178	433	1.5671
Dating/romantic relationships	6.49	2.36	6.12	2.82	0.1561	433	1.4209
Sexual relationships*	6.05	2.71	5.46	3.18	0.0464	433	1.9979
Professional/career*	7.06	2.39	6.50	2.63	0.0253	433	2.2445
Personal goals*	7.65	2.15	7.06	2.67	0.0159	433	2.421
Hazing*	7.84	3.15	6.19	3.55	0.0001	433	4.9394

Table 6, T-test Analysis for Reported Mean ConfidenceLevel in Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=170)		Non-Members (n=265)		T-Test Findings		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value	df	t-value
Academics*	7.60	2.13	6.85	2.67	0.0159	433	3.2843
Alcohol or Substance Use*	7.42	2.42	6.52	3.55	0.0001	433	3.4373
Dating/romantic relationships*	6.73	2.53	6.11	2.44	0.0011	433	2.2743
Sexual relationships*	6.34	2.82	5.42	2.81	0.0006	433	3.0816
Professional/career*	7.11	2.36	6.40	2.92	0.0234	433	2.8367
Personal goals*	7.59	2.15	6.83	3.17	0.0022	433	2.3727
Hazing*	7.90	3.01	5.92	2.66	0.0048	433	6.1814

Table 7, T-Test for Analysis for Composite Comfort and Confidence Levels of Engaging in Peer Accountability

	Members (n=203)		Non-Members (n=321)		T-Test Findings		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value	df	t-value
Composite Comfort Level* (Cronbach's alpha=0.78)	41.75	21.33	37.09	20.76	0.0136	522	2.4767
Composite Confidence Level* (Cronbach's alpha=0.86)	42.45	22.20	36.35	21.51	0.0019	522	3.1233

Table 16, T-test Analysis for Perspectives on Belonging and Campus Community

	Members (n=158)		Non-Members (n=241)		T-Test Findings		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value	df	t-value
I feel as though I belong on my campus*	5.90	1.35	5.18	1.62	0.0001	396	4.7561
I feel as though I am a valued member of my campus community*	5.66	1.53	4.86	1.72	0.0001	394	4.7271
I feel responsible to support the health and safety of my friends/peers	5.67	1.43	5.42	1.45	0.1126	357	1.5906
I feel responsible to support the personal development of my friends/peers*	5.72	1.35	5.34	1.44	0.01	382	2.5882
I feel responsible to support the professional development of my friends/peers*	5.61	1.34	5.13	1.58	0.0018	395	3.1388