TABLE OF CONTENTS

LARRY D. LONG AND ALEX SNOWDEN

The purpose of this study was to determine if undergraduate fraternity and sorority members who serve as chapter officers report different experiences and gains compared to non-officers. The researchers sampled 3,008 fraternity members and 3,745 sorority members from the aggregate results of the institutions that used the AFA/EBI Fraternity/Sorority Assessment during the 2009-2010 academic year. Differences by leadership experience were tested using Cliff's delta. The researchers found significant differences in the development of chapter officers and non-officers for eight of nine educational gains measures with chapter officers reporting greater gains in these areas. Chapter officers were also more likely to be satisfied with their fraternity/sorority experience than non-officers. There was no statistically significant difference in the alcohol use of officers and non-officers.

KATIE M. WARBER, MELISSA E. TAYLOR, AND DANA C. MAKSTALLER

This study examined group salience (i.e., prominence, relevance) as a moderating variable in intergroup contact between fraternity/sorority members and non-members. Specifically, it examined how salience moderates the relationship between non-member perceptions of intergroup contact and stereotypical behavior of fraternity and sorority members. Results revealed little support for membership salience as a moderator of non-member perceptions of contact quality with members and non-member perceptions of stereotypical member behavior. Main effects were found regarding non-member levels of trust and self-disclosure and perceptions of fraternity/sorority members as deviant.

MATTHEW W. BROSI, JOHN D. FOUBERT, R. SEAN BANNON, AND GABE YANDELL

College women's exposure to pornography is growing nationwide. A limited amount of research exists documenting the negative effects of pornography on women's attitudes and behavior related to sexual assault. The present study surveyed sorority members at a Midwestern public university on their pornography use, rape myth acceptance, bystander efficacy, and bystander willingness to help in potential sexual assault situations. Results showed that women who view pornography are significantly less likely to intervene as a bystander and are more likely to believe rape myths. Implications for women's personal safety and for the advisability of consuming pornography are discussed.

      OF STEREOTYPES AMONG MEMBERS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK
      SORORITIES
      Natalie T. J. Tindall, Marcia D. Hernandez, and Matthew W. Hughey

      *This study examined how stereotypes among alumnae members of historically Black sororities affected
      their experiences as both undergraduate and graduate members. This research contributes to the
      literature on skin color bias and to the stereotypes of Black women. For the majority of women we
      surveyed for this research, the myths and stereotypes surrounding skin color bias, intra-racial group
      relations, beauty, and femininity of different historically Black sororities influenced the initial
      perceptions of members in each group. The findings include some commonality among stereotypes
      about the oldest sororities (Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta), yet stereotypes about the
      other organizations (Zeta Phi Beta and Sigma Gamma Rho) varied due to age, college life experience,
      and the geographic location of the interviewees. Implications and considerations for future research
      are included.*

54   FRATERNITY AND SORORITY THRIVING: A RESIDENTIAL PERSPECTIVE
      Matthew Vetter

      *When provided with the space and resources common to residential learning communities, frater-
      nity and sorority residences are often viewed as synonymous to the risky behaviors associated with
      fraternal organizations. The purpose of this study was to compare the levels of thriving of fraternity
      and sorority members in various living environment to their nonaffiliated peers using the Thriving
      Quotient. Fraternity and sorority members' type of residence was not found to be associated with stu-
      dent thriving, although living closer to campus was positively associated with Social Connectedness
      and negatively associated with Engaged Learning. Fraternity and sorority membership overall was
      positively associated with Academic Determination and Social Connectedness, and negatively associ-
      ated with Engaged Learning. Implications for intentionally creating living-learning communities and
      maximizing the residential experience of fraternity and sorority residences are discussed.*

2011–2012 EDITORIAL TEAM

GENERAL INFORMATION

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors advances the study of college fraternities and sororities through a peer reviewed academic journal promoting scholarly discourse among partners invested in the college fraternal movement. The vision of Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors is to serve as the premier forum for academic discourse and scholarly inquiry regarding the college fraternity and sorority movement.

Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors is published biannually. Past issues of Oracle are available on the AFA website.

SUBMISSIONS:
Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors accepts submissions focused on articulating research involving fraternity and sorority members at the collegiate, alumni, inter/national organization, and volunteer advisory levels. Manuscripts should be written for the student affairs generalist who has broad responsibility for educational leadership, policy, staff development, and management. Articles on specialized topics should provide the generalist with an understanding of the importance of the program to student affairs overall and fraternity/sorority advising specifically.

Research articles for Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors should stress the underlying issues or problems that stimulated the research; treat the methodology concisely; and, most importantly, offer a full discussion of results, implications, and conclusions. In the belief that AFA readers have much to learn from one another, we also encourage the submission of thoughtful, documented essays or historical perspectives.

Visit http://afa1976.org for more detailed submission guidelines.

HOW AND WHY: MOVING FORWARD TO PROMOTE HIGH QUALITY, PURPOSEFUL RESEARCH ON THE FRATERNAL EXPERIENCE

GUEST EDITORIAL

GEORGIANNA L. MARTIN

This issue of *Oracle* includes five articles meant to spark discussion on how professionals working with fraternities and sororities can enhance their work. First, Long and Snowden explored educational gains fraternity/sorority officers make in areas such as sense of belonging, interpersonal and intrapersonal competence, diverse interactions, and self-worth. Second, Warber, Taylor, and Makstaller investigated intergroup contact between fraternity/sorority members and non-members - reminding educators of the social power of in-group versus out-of-group affiliation in shaping perceptions and behavior. Third, Brosi, Foubert, Bannon, and Yandell examined sorority member exposure to pornography and its effects on bystander intervention and rape myth acceptance. Fourth, Tindall, Hernandez, and Hughey illuminated perceptions Black sorority women hold of historically Black sororities, revealing sources of tension and divisiveness. Finally, Vetter studied fraternity/sorority thriving across a variety of student residences.

This issue of *Oracle* also has the potential to provoke dialogue about "how" we conduct research on the fraternity/sorority experience — issues of quality and focus and "why" we conduct research on the fraternity/experience — issues of purpose. First, "the how:" how we conduct research is about our approach to research design. For example, if the study is quantitative, to what extent are the findings representative of and generalizable to the population being sampled? What were the researchers' intentions in selecting a particular sample for inclusion in the study while excluding others? If the study is qualitative, how well do the findings represent the voices of the study's participants? To what extent are criteria for trustworthiness such as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability met in the study? Next, "the why:" why we conduct research is about determining what is relevant for our field and ultimately is a reflection of our values and purpose.

For example, as educators and as researchers, we should ask ourselves what might prompt researchers to intentionally select sorority women for a study on women's bystander intervention and rape myth acceptance? ("the how") Where might there be a clear rationale for selecting sorority women for such research? Conversely, where might out-of-group perceptions or biases exist that lead researchers to select this particular student population? Perhaps more importantly, is this study about sorority women's pornography use and resultant attitudes toward sexual assault or is it about all women? The Brosi, Foubert, Bannon, and Yandell article in this issue of *Oracle* indirectly challenges us to consider the role women play in being complicit toward acts of violence against women. ("the why") Similarly, Tindall, Hernandez, and Hughey shed light on the ways in which stereotypes and perceptions of Black women in historically Black sororities create a divisive culture. I cite these two articles in particular because they prompt new conversations about issues we should be attending to in our work and research as educators. In addition to addressing the "how" and "why," research on the fraternal experience also should promote new considerations that raise questions we may not be asking as a field or perhaps are not exploring adequately. Moving forward, it is imperative for all educa-

tors interested and invested in the fraternal movement, whether from a practice-oriented or scholarly perspective, to consider the how, the why, and the promotion of new ideas behind research on the fraternity/sorority experience. As you read through this issue of *Oracle*, I encourage you to consider the following questions:

- How are these findings relevant to my own work with fraternity/sorority members? What implications for practice might I suggest to use this research at my institution/in my organization?

- Where do limitations exist in "the how" of the research presented in this issue? In what ways is "the how" of these articles strong?

- Where do limitations exist in "the why" of the research presented in this issue? In what ways is "the why" of these articles particularly strong?

- What might these findings suggest for the future of research on and practice with fraternity/sorority members?

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Georgianna L. Martin is a Clinical Assistant Professor in the Higher Education Program at Loyola University Chicago. Currently serving as an Associate Editor for Oracle, she has been an active member of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors for nine years. Georgianna previously served as the fraternity advisor at Millsaps College and is a member of Chi Omega Fraternity.

THE MORE YOU PUT INTO IT, THE MORE YOU GET OUT OF IT: THE EDUCATIONAL GAINS OF FRATERNITY / SORORITY OFFICERS

LARRY D. LONG AND ALEX SNOWDEN

The purpose of this study was to determine if undergraduate fraternity and sorority members who serve as chapter officers report different experiences and gains compared to non-officers. The researchers sampled 3,008 fraternity members and 3,745 sorority members from the aggregate results of the institutions that used the AFA / EBI Fraternity / Sorority Assessment during the 2009-2010 academic year. Differences by leadership experience were tested using Cliff's delta. The researchers found significant differences in the development of chapter officers and non-officers for eight of nine educational gains measures with chapter officers reporting greater gains in these areas. Chapter officers were also more likely to be satisfied with their fraternity / sorority experience than non-officers. There was no statistically significant difference in the alcohol use of officers and non-officers.

Most fraternal organizations promote the development of leadership skills as a benefit of joining a fraternity or sorority (Sermersheim, 1996). Through personal development programs, such as Alpha Gamma Delta's (n.d.) *The Alpha Gamma Delta Experience*, Beta Theta Pi's (n.d.) *Men of Principle*, and Sigma Phi Epsilon's (n.d.) *Balanced Man Program*, fraternal organizations try to develop stronger leaders and better citizens. Fraternities and sororities also offer a variety of other development opportunities, such as attending conferences and serving in positions of responsibility. These experiences may be useful in preparing undergraduate members for their future careers (Kelley, 2008). Despite the efforts by fraternal organizations, it is unclear if only members who serve in positions of responsibility experience gains in leadership skills or if all members benefit from the fraternal experience.

The researchers of the current study sought to compare the experiences and gains of chapter officers and non-officers concerning educational gains, satisfaction, and alcohol use. Educational gains were defined as members' growth in abilities, such as personal development skills, interpersonal skills, and leadership skills, as a result of the fraternal experience. The researchers found significant differences between officers and non-officers in educational gains and satisfaction. There was no statistically significant difference in the alcohol use of officers and non-officers. The results of the study have implications for professionals and advisors who work with undergraduate fraternal organizations.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research on the leadership experiences of fraternity and sorority members has primarily focused on alcohol use (Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998; Fairlie, DeJong, Stevenson, Lavigne, & Wood, 2010; Gurie, 2002) and the differences in leadership practices of chapter officers (Adams & Keim, 2000; DiChiara, 2009; Snyder, 1992; Williams, 2002). Research on the alcohol use of leaders in fraternal organizations has shown mixed results. One study reported that fraternity leaders consumed more alcohol per week than general members (Cashin et al.) and another study reported the opposite (Gurie, 2002). In a follow-up study to the work of Cashin et al., Fairlie and her colleagues found no difference in the alcohol use of fraternity and

sorority members by leadership experience. The authors attributed the finding to the single-institution sample and suggested alcohol use may be variable across institutions. The authors recommended that additional research explore the differences in alcohol-related behaviors of officers and general members.

Much of the research on the leadership practices of fraternity and sorority officers has used the concepts described in *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2007) as a conceptual framework. Kouzes and Posner (2008) proposed that leaders exhibit universal practices that include modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. Theoretically, the authors suggested that assisting students in improving their behaviors in these five dimensions improves their overall effectiveness as leaders and followers. The practices of student leaders can be assessed using the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI; Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Adams and Keim (2000) used the SLPI to study the effectiveness and leadership practices of chapter presidents by gender at three institutions in the Midwest. The researchers found few differences in the leadership practices of fraternity and sorority leaders. Sorority presidents in the study were more comfortable in challenging the process and enabling others to act compared to fraternity leaders. In terms of effectiveness, fraternity leaders tended to overrate their capabilities and sorority leaders underrated their abilities. In a follow-up study at a single institution, DiChiara (2009) studied the difference in leadership practices of fraternity and sorority members by organization and governing council. DiChiara found no difference in the leadership practices of respondents by organization, meaning leaders of organizations within the same council tend to behave in similar manners. In respect to governing councils, the researcher found that respondents who were members of all-men's organizations were more competitive

and showed less respect for others compared to respondents who were members of all-women's organizations. The researcher suggested the differences might be due to gender rather than council differences. The study did not differentiate between the leadership experiences of respondents. The researcher suggested that future researchers explore the differences in the leadership experience of chapter officers and members who never served in an established leadership position.

Much of the research on the leadership experiences of fraternity and sorority members was conducted at single institutions (DiChiara, 2009; Fairlie et al., 2010; Sermersheim, 1996). Furthermore, few studies explored the outcomes of serving in a leadership role. The present study sought to fill the void in the extant literature by comparing the outcomes of chapter officers and general members using a national dataset. Specifically, the researchers asked: Do members of fraternal organizations who serve as chapter officers report different gains in learning outcomes, different levels of alcohol use, and overall satisfaction with fraternal life compared to their peers who never served as an officer in their organization?

The conceptual framework for this study was the concept of communities of practice. Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) described communities of practice as "groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (p. 4). The concept is based on the premise that people can learn from one another by sharing ideas and modeling behavior (social learning theory). The structure of communities of practice can range from informal (unrecognized) to formal (institutionalized). Wenger et al. described soccer moms and dads sharing ideas about parenting as an example of an unrecognized community of practice.

Concerning the fraternity/sorority advising

profession, advisors discussing programming ideas using the Association of Fraternal Leadership & Values' Twitter feed, #GreekChat, would be considered an unrecognized community of practice. The concept of communities of practice has also been applied to group learning within the student affairs profession (Blimling, 2001; Saunder & Cooper, 2009; Smith & Rogers, 2005). In fraternities and sororities, communities of practice exist in the context of organization and council executive board meetings, officer transition retreats, and officer roundtables. While unrecognized by fraternity and sorority members as communities of practice, these engagements enable officers to learn from one another by sharing ideas and suggesting best practices. Desired behavior may also be reinforced in these contexts through praise and peer support. Since non-officers are often excluded from these engagements, one may suspect that officers experience greater educational gains as a result of their fraternity or sorority membership than non-officers.

<center>METHODOLOGY</center>

Overview of the Instrument

Data for this study were drawn from the aggregate results of the institutions that utilized the AFA/EBI Fraternity/Sorority Assessment survey during the 2009-2010 academic year. Educational Benchmarking, Inc. developed the survey in partnership with the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors. The instrument measured demographic characteristics and educational gains in terms of sense of belonging, diverse interactions, interpersonal relationship skills, interpersonal competence, leadership skills, personal development skills, healthy behaviors, self-worth, intrapersonal competence, collaboration, principled dissent, and effective chapter leadership. The survey also measured student satisfaction in terms of housing, safety and security, and fraternity/sorority programming (AFA/EBI Assessment Committee, 2010).

Overview of the Dataset

The dataset consisted of responses from 9,462 participants attending 16 predominantly White, four-year institutions across the United States. The dataset was not nationally representative and primarily included students attending large, public, research institutions. Since most fraternal organizations only allow initiated members to hold a position of leadership, respondents who indicated they had been members of their organization for less than two semesters were removed from the analysis. After controlling for missing values using list-wise deletion, the final sample consisted of 3,008 (44.5%) fraternity members and 3,745 (55.5%) sorority members. Approximately 30% of the respondents were sophomores, 34% were juniors, and 30% were seniors or older. About 84% of the sample identified as White/Caucasian.

Selection of Data and Variables

The variables of interest included two grouping variables and 13 outcome variables. The grouping variables were *Officer* and *Organization*. *Officer* was a dichotomous variable based on the chapter leadership experience of the respondents (Non-officer, Officer) and *Organization* was a dichotomous variable for the type of fraternal organization (Fraternity, Sorority). The outcome variables included measures of educational gains, alcohol use, and satisfaction.

Educational gains

Nine measures of educational gains were studied: Sense of Belonging, Diverse Interactions, Interpersonal Relationship Skills, Interpersonal Competence, Leadership Skills, Personal Development Skills, Healthy Behaviors, Self-Worth, and Intrapersonal Competence. The factors were based on questions that asked respondents to report to what extent their fraternity/sorority experience enabled them to develop a particular skill. The response options

ranged from: 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Extremely*).

Alcohol use

Two measures assessed the alcohol use of respondents. The first measure was the reported frequency of alcohol consumption per week. The response options were: "I do not consume alcohol," "Once per week or less," "Two to three times per week," "Almost every day," and "Every day." The second measure, *Binge Drinking*, was a dichotomous variable that represented the prevalence of excessive alcohol use. Binge drinking is commonly defined as consuming five or more alcoholic drinks per sitting for males and four or more drinks per sitting for females (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, & Lee, 2000); however, because of design limitations, the researchers of the current study defined binge drinking as consuming five or more drinks per sitting for all participants. The measure was derived from a question that prompted respondents to report how many drinks they typically consumed per sitting. The response options were "Do not consume alcohol," "1-2 drinks," "3-4 drinks," "5-6 drinks," "7-8 drinks," and "More than 8 drinks." Respondents who indicated they did not consume alcohol were removed from the analysis. The other response options were collapsed into two categories: (1) Consumed between 1 and 4 drinks per sitting and (2) Consumed 5 or more drinks per sitting.

Satisfaction

Differences in satisfaction were assessed by two measures. The first measure was the factor *Overall Satisfaction with Fraternity/Sorority Experience*. The factor had the same response categories as the educational gains measures. The second measure of satisfaction was *Anticipated Alumni Involvement*. It can be posited that students who are more satisfied with their experience are more likely to be involved postgraduation (Gaier, 2005). Anticipated alumni involvement was measured using a question that asked respondents: "Do you plan to be involved in your fraternity/sorority (locally, re-gionally, and/or nationally) after graduation?" The response categories were "Will definitely be involved," "Will likely be involved," "Will likely not be involved," and "Will definitely not be involved." For analytical purposes, the variable was dichotomized (Does not anticipate involvement, Anticipates involvement).

Statistical Approach

Student affairs researchers have criticized the practice of analyzing ordinal-based outcomes assessments using statistical procedures designed for continuous variables (Romano, Kromrey, Coraggio, & Skowronek, 2006). Many national outcome assessments, such as the National Study of Student Engagement, are based on Likert-type scales that are ordinal in nature. While procedures designed for continuous variables, such as the student's *t*-test and the analysis of variance, are robust, they are not as efficient as ordinal methods when procedural assumptions do not hold (Hess & Kromrey, 2004; Kromrey & Hogarty, 1998). The data produced by the AFA/EBI Fraternity/Sorority Assessment are ordinal in scale. An appropriate ordinal method for analyzing the data is the use of the dominance statistic *d* (Cliff, 1993, 1996a).

The dominance statistic *d*, also known as Cliff's delta, is defined as the probability that scores from one group are higher than the scores of another group, minus the reverse probability. The authors of the current study perceived the advantage of Cliff's delta to be the statistic's dual role as a test statistic for inferential analyses and a measure of effect size. As an effect size measure, the statistic represents the degree of non-overlap between two distributions. The magnitude of *d* ranges from 0 (distributions are identical) to 1 (distributions are different). The sign of the value indicates the direction of dominance (Cliff, 1996b).

The researchers assessed the difference in the experiences of officers and general members by conducting dominance analyses for the outcome measures. An overall analysis and separate

TABLE 1

Differences in Educational Gains, Alcohol Use, and Satisfaction by Leadership Experience

Measure	Non-officer (n = 1,446)		Officer (n = 5,307)				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*D*	*Z*	*Sig.*
Educational Gains							
Sense of Belonging	5.98	1.17	6.23	1.00	.118	6.20	<.001
Diverse Interactions	5.47	1.39	5.72	1.24	.106	6.25	<.001
Interpersonal Relationship Skills	5.96	1.11	6.22	0.92	.138	8.14	<.001
Interpersonal Competence	5.41	1.27	5.82	1.06	.190	11.00	<.001
Leadership Skills	5.05	1.49	5.88	1.10	.340	20.23	<.001
Personal Development Skills	5.09	1.45	5.62	1.19	.222	12.90	<.001
Healthy Behaviors	5.54	1.47	5.59	1.36	.001	0.03	.973
Self-Worth	5.71	1.22	6.08	0.99	.184	10.74	<.001
Intrapersonal Competence	5.57	1.36	5.96	1.14	.171	10.09	<.001
Alcohol Use							
Frequency of Alcohol Use	1.51	0.57	1.52	0.55	.010	0.60	.551
Binge Drinking	1.33	0.47	1.35	0.48	.016	1.05	.295
Satisfaction							
Overall Satisfaction with Fraternity/Sorority Experience	5.81	1.28	6.16	1.07	.173	10.34	<.001
Anticipated Alumni Involvement	1.66	0.47	1.81	0.39	.148	10.84	<.001

Note: Positive values of *d* correspond to higher ratings for officers and negative values correspond to higher ratings for non-officers. Statistical significance and practical significance were set at the .05 and .10 levels, respectively. Differences that are both statistically and practically significant are in bold.

analyses for fraternities and sororities were conducted using SAS 9.0 and a macro developed by Hogarty and Kromrey (1999). Effect sizes greater than .10 were deemed practically significant.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1 presents the results of the overall analysis of the differences in educational gains, alcohol use, and satisfaction by leadership experience. Compared to respondents who never held a leadership position within their organization, officers reported greater gains for all of the educational gains measures except for the Healthy Behaviors factor. The greatest differences existed for Leadership Skills ($d = .340$), Personal Development Skills ($d = .222$), and Interpersonal Competence ($d = .190$). There was no statistically significant difference by leadership experience for the Healthy Behaviors factor ($d = .001$, $p > .05$).

A difference by leadership experience was also found for the satisfaction measures. Officers rated the Overall Satisfaction with Fraternity/Sorority Experience factor higher than general members ($d = .173$, $p < .001$) and were more likely to anticipate being involved post-graduation ($d = .148$, $p < .001$).

The researchers found no difference in the alcohol use of respondents by leadership experience. On average, both officers and non-officers tended to consume alcohol one to three times per week. Of the respondents who reported they consumed alcohol, 33% of non-officers and 35% of officers reported binge drinking. The results of the analysis by fraternity and sorority membership revealed further differences in the experiences of officers and general members (see Table 2 and Table 3).

Compared to fraternity members who never served in a leadership role within their organization, officers were more likely to report greater gains in Diverse Interactions, Interpersonal Relationship Skills, Interpersonal Competence, Leadership Skills, Personal Development Skills,

Self-Worth, and Intrapersonal Competence as a result of their fraternity experience. There was no statistically significant difference for Healthy Behaviors. The difference for Sense of Belonging was statistically significant, but trivial ($d < .10$).

For women's fraternal organizations, officers reported greater gains compared to general members for Sense of Belonging, Interpersonal Relationship Skills, Interpersonal Competence, Leadership Skills, Personal Development Skills, Self-Worth, and Intrapersonal Competence. The difference for Healthy Behaviors was non-significant. The difference for Diverse Interactions was statistically significant but trivial ($d < .10$).

In terms of satisfaction, the results of the analysis by fraternity or sorority membership reveal similar findings as the results of the overall analysis. Respondents who served in a leadership role were more satisfied with their experience and were more likely to anticipate being involved post-graduation compared to respondents who never served in a leadership role within their organization. Sorority general members had a tendency to engage in more drinking sessions per week compared to officers, but the difference was trivial ($d < .10$).

SUMMARY DISCUSSION

The study differed from previous research on leadership development in fraternal organizations by focusing on the educational gains and satisfaction of chapter officers. Significant differences between officers and non-officers were found for eight of the nine educational gains measures. Fraternity and sorority members who served as chapter officers reported greater gains in Sense of Belonging, Diverse Interactions, Interpersonal Relationship Skills, Leadership Skills, Personal Development Skills, Self-Worth, and Intrapersonal Competence as a result of their fraternity or sorority experience compared to respondents who never served in a leadership position.

Gains in leadership abilities had the most

TABLE 2

Differences in Educational Gains, Alcohol Use, and Satisfaction within Fraternity by Leadership Experience

Measure	Non-officer (n = 529)		Officer (n = 2,479)				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*D*	*Z*	*Sig.*
Educational Gains							
Sense of Belonging	6.11	1.06	6.27	0.95	.080	2.89	.004
Diverse Interactions	5.53	1.37	5.78	1.22	.108	3.95	<.001
Interpersonal Relationship Skills	6.01	1.03	6.21	0.88	.113	4.11	<.001
Interpersonal Competence	5.57	1.15	5.88	0.99	.156	5.61	<.001
Leadership Skills	5.28	1.39	5.92	1.06	.282	10.19	<.001
Personal Development Skills	5.29	1.33	5.69	1.11	.172	6.12	<.001
Healthy Behaviors	5.51	1.50	5.48	1.38	-.039	-1.39	.166
Self-Worth	5.78	1.17	6.08	0.96	.151	5.44	<.001
Intrapersonal Competence	5.71	1.23	6.01	1.06	.149	5.49	<.001
Alcohol Use							
Frequency of Alcohol Use	1.60	0.61	1.63	0.57	.046	1.73	.083
Binge Drinking	1.52	0.50	1.51	0.50	-.012	-0.49	.626
Satisfaction							
Overall Satisfaction with Fraternity/Sorority Experience	5.98	1.22	6.25	1.01	.137	5.09	<.001
Anticipated Alumni Involvement	1.72	0.45	1.82	0.38	.108	5.06	<.001

Note: Positive values of *d* correspond to higher ratings for officers and negative values correspond to higher ratings for non-officers. Statistical significance and practical significance were set at the .05 and .10 levels, respectively. Differences that are both statistically and practically significant are in bold.

TABLE 3

Differences in Educational Gains, Alcohol Use, and Satisfaction within Sorority by Leadership Experience

Measure	Non-officer (n = 917)		Officer (n = 2,828)		D	Z	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD			
Educational Gains							
Sense of Belonging	6.00	1.18	6.20	1.04	.134	6.21	<.001
Diverse Interactions	5.57	1.32	5.70	1.23	.096	4.42	<.001
Interpersonal Relationship Skills	6.00	1.13	6.23	0.94	.156	7.21	<.001
Interpersonal Competence	5.46	1.29	5.78	1.11	.201	9.12	<.001
Leadership Skills	5.08	1.49	5.83	1.12	.368	17.38	<.001
Personal Development Skills	5.14	1.46	5.57	1.24	.243	11.17	<.001
Healthy Behaviors	5.67	1.41	5.71	1.32	.038	1.69	.091
Self-Worth	5.84	1.16	6.10	1.00	.204	9.30	<.001
Intrapersonal Competence	5.65	1.35	5.94	1.18	.179	8.24	<.001
Alcohol Use							
Frequency of Alcohol Use	1.46	0.53	1.41	0.51	-.048	-2.34	.019
Binge Drinking	1.22	0.42	1.20	0.40	-.022	-1.28	.199
Satisfaction							
Overall Satisfaction with Fraternity/Sorority Experience	5.85	1.24	6.09	1.10	.178	8.31	<.001
Anticipated Alumni Involvement	1.63	0.48	1.79	0.40	.167	9.41	<.001

Note: Positive values of *d* correspond to higher ratings for officers and negative values correspond to higher ratings for non-officers. Statistical significance and practical significance were set at the .05 and .10 levels, respectively. Differences that are both statistically and practically significant are in bold.

pronounced difference for both fraternity and sorority members. Research outside of the fraternity/sorority context has found that simply partaking in leadership activities may produce gains in leadership skills (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). This suggests that either non-officers are not engaged in the activities of their chapter or fraternal organizations do not provide enough opportunities for non-officers to gain leadership skills. Another finding was that there was no difference in the gains in Healthy Behaviors of respondents. Given that the Healthy Behaviors factor had the lowest mean score for fraternity officers and the second lowest mean score for sorority officers, it seems officers feel less influenced to make healthy choices regarding alcohol and drug use than what one would expect. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of Cashin and his colleagues (1998).

The researchers found that fraternity and sorority leaders had similar views toward alcohol use as general members, despite having more responsibility for their organizations' operations. Within the context of communities of practice, officers model and reinforce the behaviors that are deemed acceptable within an organization. Thus, changing the officers' attitudes regarding alcohol use may change the attitudes of all the organization's members.

The researchers found no relationship between the leadership experience of fraternity members and alcohol use. Fraternity respondents who served as chapter officers consumed alcohol at comparable rates as general members. This supports recent research (Fairlie et al., 2010) that found no difference in the alcohol use of officers and non-officers and counters older studies that found chapter officers tended to consume greater (Cashin et al., 1998) or smaller (Gurie, 2002) quantities of alcohol compared to members who never served as a chapter officer.

Longitudinal research on the alcohol use of fraternity and sorority members has revealed that alcohol consumption rates of affiliated students are decreasing (Wechsler et al., 2000). The non-significant difference may be because fraternity members are beginning to consume alcohol more responsibly. This is supported by the finding that the prevalence of binge drinking in the sample was lower than the national average of 60% for fraternity members (Wechsler et al., 2000). While there was a statistically significant difference in the number of drinking occasions for sorority women by leadership experience, the difference does not warrant an intervention. Previous research on sorority women's alcohol use reported no difference by leadership experience (Cashin et al., 1998; Fairlie et al., 2010).

A positive relationship between leadership experience and satisfaction was found. Fraternity and sorority members who served as chapter officers reported higher levels of satisfaction with their overall experience compared to members who never served in a leadership position. Chapter officers were also more likely to anticipate being involved in their organization post-graduation. The difference was more pronounced for sorority respondents. Seventy-nine percent of sorority officers anticipated being involved as alumnae, whereas only 63% of non-officers anticipated being involved after graduation. The difference in anticipated involvement may be because non-officers were less satisfied with their sorority experience, but it may also be because non-officers were less informed of ways to be involved in the organization as alumnae.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The researchers uncovered several differences in the fraternity/sorority experience of the respondents by leadership experience. Foremost, the research findings showed that members who serve as chapter officers experience an increase in abilities that make them better individuals, both socially and profession-

ally. This demonstrates that the leadership development efforts of advisors, campus-based professionals, and organization staff can have positive effects on fraternity and sorority officers' personal development. This, however, leads us to question the fraternity/sorority advising profession's effectiveness in developing non-officers.

In a speech at the annual meeting of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, Barry Posner (2010) described five principles of leadership development. These principles assert that leadership is a skill that can be learned through feedback and practice, leadership is everyone's business, leadership is about serving others, leadership is future-focused, and leadership is personal. Posner emphasized the development of leadership skills is for everyone and it should not be limited to just those persons who have the good fortune of being elected or appointed to leadership roles.

The issue that arises from the findings of the current study is the apparent disservice to members who do not become officers as illustrated by the lower gains and satisfaction reported by non-officers. Fraternities and sororities promote leadership development, personal growth, and a satisfactory college experience as results of fraternal membership. As supporters of the fraternal movement, we have to address the issue of whether or not membership development initiatives are truly effective in developing all members of an organization.

As supporters of the fraternal movement, we have to address the issue of whether or not membership development initiatives are truly effective in developing all members of an organization. Our findings suggest that we are succeeding at developing the abilities of officers, however we may be under developing the abilities of non-officers by not allocating sufficient resources to these members. This indicates a lack of equal opportunity for general members who do not hold a leadership role. Shertzer and Schuh (2004) noted: "If all students are to be encouraged and empowered in leadership, then those charged with developing college students' leadership need to shift to a new paradigm as well" (p. 128). The research findings illustrated that more emphasis should be placed on offering educational opportunities for non-officers. Chapter advisors, organization staff, and campus-based professionals (advisors) can be integral in developing these opportunities for non-officers. Specifically, advisors should:

- Ensure they are creating environments in which all members are treated as leaders and non-officers are not "just members."
- Create or maintain a philosophy of developing every member as a leader and implement a model or framework for leadership development (Posner, 2010).
- Foster communities of practice in fraternities and sororities in which members can teach and learn from one another. Conceptually, this could be a learning community where members engage in discussions about leadership development and share ideas about best practices.
- Educate new staff members and advisors on contemporary leadership practices to ensure they are capable of educating undergraduate fraternity and sorority members. Once trained, these fraternity and sorority advocates can work to ensure every student who joins a fraternal organization has the opportunity to grow as a leader.
- Develop a membership education task force consisting of advisors, officers, and members not in leadership roles. This committee should explore where development is lacking and discuss how to reach members not in leadership roles. This in turn will give credibility and a stronger buy-in from the student population because the core needs are being

met by all parties involved.

- Assess the educational experiences of members periodically to ensure goals and objectives are being met and use the findings to make programmatic adjustments when needed.

The researchers do not assume all who join organizations would fully utilize opportunities should they arise and be open equally to all. We simply believe that by allowing open training to all members at both the campus and organizational level, fraternal organizations can develop stronger and more competent leaders. As professionals in the business of developing students, we must make sure we are developing all of our students and not systematically neglecting a subpopulation of members. It is our responsibility to make the necessary tools for success available to all of our members and to support our members in developing strong competencies.

Future Research

Future research might explore other outcomes of serving in a leadership position in a fraternal organization, such as academic performance and persistence until graduation. This would provide additional insights into the experiences of fraternity and sorority members. Future research might also explore why differences in anticipated post-graduation involvement exist. There is little research on this topic within the fraternal context. Finally, researchers should consider conducting additional research on fraternal organizations as communities of practice.

While the researchers of the current study used the communities of practice concept to hypothesize the direction of the relationship between leadership experience and educational gains, the researchers did not assess the extent to which groups of officers behaved as a community of practice. Future research might explore this. Qualitative methods including direct observation and personal interviews or focus groups would be informative.

Limitations

The findings should be interpreted in light of the study's limitations. First, as an exploratory study the research design did not include statistical controls. The examined differences may become amplified or diminished once background characteristics are taken into account. Second, while the research was a multi-institutional study, the sample mostly represented large, research institutions. The findings may have limited generalizability to other campus contexts. Despite these limitations, the results provide an improved understanding of the outcomes of membership in a fraternity or sorority.

REFERENCES

Adams, T., & Keim, M. (2000). Leadership practices and effectiveness among Greek student leaders. *College Student Journal, 34*(2), 259-270.

AFA/EBI Assessment Committee (2010). *AFA/EBI fraternity/sorority assessment: Summary report 2009*. Retrieved from Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors website: http://fraternityadvisors.org/KnowledgeCenter/Assessment.aspx

Alpha Gamma Delta. (n.d.). *The Alpha Gamma Delta Experience*. Retrieved from http://www.alphagammadelta.org/EducationandLeadership/AGDExperience.html

Beta Theta Pi. (n.d.). *Men of Principle*. Retrieved from http://www.betathetapi.org/about-beta/history/men-of-principle

Blimling, G. S. (2001). Uniting scholarship and communities of practice in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 381-396.

Cashin, J. R., Presley, C. A., & Meilman, P. W. (1998). Alcohol use in the Greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 59*, 63-70.

Cliff, N. (1993). Dominance statistics: Ordinal analyses to answer ordinal questions. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 494-509.

Cliff, N. (1996a). Answering ordinal questions with ordinal data using ordinal statistics. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 31*, 331-350.

Cliff, N. (1996b). *Ordinal methods for behavioral data analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cress, C., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 15-27.

DiChiara, A. N. (2009). Fraternal leadership: Differences in leadership practices among four governing councils. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 16-29.

Fairlie, A. M., DeJong, W., Stevenson, J. F., Lavigne, A. M., & Wood, M. D. (2010). Fraternity and sorority leaders and members: A comparison of alcohol use, attitudes, and policy awareness. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 36*, 187-193. doi: 10.3109/00952990.2010.491878

Gaier, S. E. (2005). Alumni satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience and the impact on alumni giving and participation. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 5*, 279-288.

Gurie, J. R. (2002). *The relationship between perceived leader behavior and alcohol consumption among university students who are members of social fraternities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://etd.lsu.edu

Hess, M. R., & Kromrey, J. D. (2004, April). *Robust confidence intervals for effect sizes: A comparative study of Cohen's d and Cliff's delta under non-normality and heterogeneous variances*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.

Hogarty, K. Y., & Kromrey, J. D. (1999, April). *Using SAS to calculate tests of Cliff's delta*. Paper presented at the SAS Users Group International conference, Miami Beach, FL. Retrieved from http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi24/Posters/p238-24.pdf

Kelley, D. R. (2008). Leadership development through the fraternity experience and the relationship to career success after graduation. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 3*(1), 1-12.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *Student leadership practices inventory* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2008). *The student leadership challenge: Five practices for exemplary leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kromrey, J. D., & Hogarty, K. Y. (1998). Analysis options for testing group differences on ordered categorical variables: An empirical investigation of Type I Error Control and statistical power. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints, 25*, 70-82.

Posner, B. Z. (2010, December). *Why 5? The research behind 'The student leadership challenge.'* Presentation at the annual meeting of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, Phoenix, AZ.

Romano, J., Kromrey, J. D., Coraggio, J., & Skowronek, J. (2006, February). *Appropriate statistics for ordinal level data: Should we really be using t-test and Cohen's d for evaluating group differences on the NSSE and other surveys?* Paper presented at the meeting of the Florida Association of Institutional Research, Cocoa Beach, FL.

Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (2009). Orientation in the socialization process. In A. Tull, J. B. Hirt, & S. A. Saunders (Eds.), *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration: A guide for new professionals and their supervisors* (pp. 109-128). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Sermersheim, K. L. (1996). Undergraduate Greek leadership experiences: A proven method for gaining career related and life-long skills. *Campus Activities Programming, 29*(3), 50-60.

Shertzer, J. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal, 42*, 111-131.

Sigma Phi Epsilon. (n.d.). *Balanced Man Program*. Retrieved from http://www.sigep.org/memdev/bmp.asp

Smith, S. F., & Rodgers, R. F. (2005). Student learning community of practice: Making meaning of the student learning imperative and principles of good practice in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*, 472-486.

Snyder, N. L. (1992). *Empowering leadership and achieving style: A study of gender differences between fraternity and sorority presidents* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M., & Lee, H. (2000). College binge drinking in the 1990s: A continuing problem. Results of the Harvard School of Public Health 1999 College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(5), 199-210.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Williams, E. (2002). *Differences in Greek leadership styles* (Unpublished research paper). Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI.

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

Larry Long serves as a resident director at Michigan State University. Larry has earned graduate degrees in Student Affairs Administration, Educational Psychology, and Sociology from Ball State University. He also earned bachelor degrees in Physical Sciences and Modern Languages from Kansas State University. Larry serves the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors as a member of the Essentials Editorial Board. He may be contacted at larrydlong@gmail.com.

Alex Snowden serves as the coordinator of student engagement & Greek affairs at Texas State University. Alex earned a Masters of Science in College Student Personnel Administration from Illinois State University. He also earned bachelor degrees in Communication and Political Science from Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi. Alex serves the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors as a member of the First 90 Days Committee. Alex also serves as a volunteer for Beta Theta Pi Fraternity and the Association of Fraternity Leadership and Values and has facilitated the Undergraduate Interfraternity Institute. He may be contacted at as66@txstate.edu.

A SOCIAL IDENTITY APPROACH TO INTERGROUP CONTACT BETWEEN FRATERNITY AND SORORITY MEMBERS AND NON–MEMBERS

KATIE M. WARBER, MELISSA E. TAYLOR, AND DANA C. MAKSTALLER

This study examined group salience (i.e., prominence, relevance) as a moderating variable in intergroup contact between fraternity/sorority members and non-members. Specifically, it examined how salience moderates the relationship between non-member perceptions of intergroup contact and stereotypical behavior of fraternity and sorority members. Results revealed little support for membership salience as a moderator of non-member perceptions of contact quality with members and non-member perceptions of stereotypical member behavior. Main effects were found regarding non-member levels of trust and self-disclosure and perceptions of fraternity/sorority members as deviant.

Undergraduate fraternities and sororities create an environment in which social boundaries are established between members and non-members. Fraternity and sorority members engage in shared attitudes and behaviors, and form group boundaries that tend to be publically known. In addition, stereotypical perceptions of members are known to dictate cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors on non-members. For example, members may be perceived as more sexually and academically deviant, yet at the same time, more socially competent when compared to non-members (Scott-Sheldon, Carey, & Carey, 2007). Further, on college campuses, members sometimes live together in fraternity/sorority houses and can, at times, be identified through fashion and other personal symbols not available to the general student body (e.g. wearing member letters), possibly distinguishing them from the rest of the students on university campuses. As a result, group differentiation and in-group favoritism, or preference for one's own group, could emerge (Allport; 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Tajfel, 1978).

Understanding interaction between fraternity/sorority members and non-members has important practical implications for those who work with fraternity/sorority members on college campuses. Members and non-members frequently interact in the classroom, in athletics, and in social interactions off campus. Raising awareness of the psychological phenomena that are operative during such interactions could give practitioners an advantage when it comes to counseling members on challenges that might arise when interacting with non-members. Further, it is important that educators generally understand intergroup dynamics between members and non-members, as fraternities and sororities are prominent groups on many college campuses and intergroup contact is inevitable.

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which group salience moderates interpersonal contact between members and non-members. More specifically, this research intended to determine if the salience of membership for non-members moderated perceptions of social contact with members and, ultimately, non-member perceptions of member behavior. Both deviance and social self-efficacy are prominently, if not stereotypically, associated with fraternity/sorority membership; therefore, it was expected that salience of group membership for non-members during interpersonal contact with a member should influence the relationship between non-member perceptions of social contact and stereotypical fraternity/sorority behavior.

The primary framework for examining this research problem was social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978), which posits group members differentiate and receive positive perceptions of

their group through intergroup comparisons. Notably, social identity theory specifies the importance of self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) as well as contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998) in understanding how groups distinguish themselves from one another. In this research, aspects of both theories were combined to address non-members' attitudes toward fraternity and sorority members. More specifically, the focus of this article is how salience, or knowledge/awareness of group membership, moderated the relationship between non-member perceptions of intergroup contact and stereotypical behavior of members.

Review of Literature

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) argues that important characteristics of a person's identity are derived from their group membership. Group members achieve a positive identity through favorably evaluating one's own group and negatively evaluating other groups (Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, & Williams, 1986; Tajfel, 1978). Tajfel defines social identity as: "that part of an individual's self concept which derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to the membership" (as quoted in Brown et al., 1986, p. 275). Within social identity theory, self categorization and contact theory are addressed.

Self-categorization theory (Brown & Gaertner, 2003; Turner, et al., 1987) posits that individuals regularly categorize experiences with others. Self-categorization is a process that explains how individuals identify with different groups. Group categories must be salient if members are to minimize differences within and maximize differences between groups. The act of categorization is determined by category-stimulus fit (i.e., how well an object falls into

a certain category) and the perceiver's motives and values (Oakes, 2003).

Based on the literature, self-categorization affects intergroup contact between fraternity/sorority members and non-members (Brown & Gaertner, 2003; Oakes, 2003; Turner, et al., 1987). The extent to which non-members possess high salience (e.g., knowledge of group membership) of fraternity/sorority membership during an interpersonal contact might influence non-members' perceptions of intergroup contact and attitudes toward members, and vice versa.

Contact theory states that unfamiliarity increases a group's propensity to create stereotypes about another group; therefore, increased familiarity between groups should ultimately lower intergroup bias. Connectedly, the contact hypothesis asserts that under certain conditions, intergroup contact could decrease intergroup hostility and discrimination (Allport, 1954; Brown & Gaertner, 2003).

Several conditions foster positive intergroup interaction. Both acquaintance potential (i.e., development of interpersonal relationships) and salience of group membership are moderating variables that strongly influence the relationship between intergroup familiarity and lowered hostility toward the outgroup (Allport, 1954; Brown & Gaertner, 2003). In the case of social contact between members and non-members, one could argue that how non-members view their interpersonal contact with members (i.e., trust, self-disclosure) influences overall perceptions of stereotypical fraternity/sorority behaviors. It is essential that salience of group membership be present for non-members to judge the quality of contact in relation to fraternity/sorority members. In other words, to accurately study non-members perceptions of members, non-members must know the person they are talking to is a member. There are primary assumptions about group salience, trust, self-disclosure, deviance, and social self-efficacy that are made by those involved in the social exchange.

Group Salience

Management and regulation of closeness is necessary for human survival (Smith, Murphy, & Coats, 1999); therefore, wanting to be part of a group is the response to one's desire to feel safe with and accepted by others. A group can create an identity by differentiating itself from other groups (Brown, et al., 1986). Knowledge of group membership must exist for between-group differentiation or social comparison to occur (Oakes, 2003). This knowledge of group memberships is known as *group salience*. From this research, it is possible that when fraternities and sororities are made known to non-members, perceptions of members by non-members become highly differentiated from the rest of the student body due to members' strong attachment to their organization. For example, fraternities and sororities are, on some campuses, noted for similarities in clothing, adhering to group oaths, and developing relationships that are expected to last throughout their lifetimes. This salience could lead non-members to activate certain stereotypes (e.g., social class, membership exclusivity, deviance) of members.

The literature indicated that as fraternity/sorority membership becomes salient to non-members, perceptions of stereotypical fraternity/sorority behaviors were likely to become salient for non-members. Non-member satisfaction with interpersonal contact may influence this salience of group membership.

Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure is the process one uses to present information about himself or herself (including thoughts, feelings, and experiences) to another person (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993). Disclosers must determine what aspects of their self require disclosing. Each group has its valued identities (Goffman, 1963). Group identities become part of the members' self-identity. In fact, "encounters with others are encounters with expectations of what those in front of them should be like" (Weber & Carter, 1998, pp. 17-18). Therefore, when interacting with outgroup members, stereotypes and group identity play a major role in forming expectations and the decision of what kind of "self" should be disclosed.

In interpersonal communication, self-disclosure is important in developing and maintaining interpersonal relationships (e.g., Cozby, 1972; Goodstain & Reinecker, 1974; Jourard, 1971). In intergroup communication on an interpersonal level, self-disclosure can decrease the bias and disliking that usually exist between an ingroup member and an outgroup member (Bettencourt, Brewer, Croak, & Miller, 1992). Ensari and Miller (2002) summarized three interpretations for the beneficial effects of self-disclosure in intergroup communication. The first one is that "by promoting individuation and familiarity, disclosure reduces threatening aspects of interaction with outgroup members" (Ensari & Miller, 2002, p. 314). The second interpretation is that the other party would perceive the disclosure as something scarce, thus, more valued. The reason is that intimate information usually is revealed in friendship situation (Petty & Mirels, 1981). A third interpretation emphasizes that self-disclosure induces trust. Disclosing oneself to the other will make the other feel trusted (Steel, 1991), and therefore, it is more likely that the other party will have a positive attitude toward the discloser (Altman & Haythorn, 1965).

Trust

Trust is defined as the "socially learned and socially confirmed expectations that people have of each other, of the organizations and institutions in which they live, and of the natural and moral social orders that set the fundamental understandings for their lives" (Barber, 1983, p. 164-165). Trust is an important component in interactions. How one views another and the amount of disclosure in which one engages are both affected by perceptions of trust. On campus, fraternity/sorority members and non-

members have many opportunities for contact (e.g., classrooms, clubs, student union). These contacts help to build trust and can influence perceptions of one's outgroup (Allport, 1954).

Stereotypes and competition can hinder effective communication and trust between groups. Fraternity/sorority members and non-members often hold negative stereotypes of one another. Members may be seen as cheaters, promiscuous, or alcoholics by non-members. Non-members are seen, by members, as nerds, lower class, and socially inept. Therefore, existing stereotypes can affect perception of each other's trustworthiness (Storch & Storch, 2002).

Second, trust can be impaired by competition (Sherif, et al., 1961). On college campuses, members and non-members are frequently in competition for organization offices (e.g., student government) and honors. Because of this competition, one might presume non-members perceive members as untrustworthy, and vice-versa.

Lastly, perceptions of fraternity/sorority member trustworthiness are affected by the knowledge of group membership (Ensari & Miller, 2002). When members and non-members interact, it is important to consider whether individuals are aware of the other person's fraternity/sorority membership (e.g., through T-shirts and hats with Greek letters, style of clothing, slang used). If membership is salient, one could expect membership status to influence the perceptions of trust in the interaction.

Deviance

Much extant research recognizes the role that deviant behavior plays in the activities associated with fraternity/sorority membership (McCabe & Bowers, 2009; Scott-Sheldon, et al., 2007; Storch & Storch, 2002). Substance abuse, sexual promiscuity, and sensation-seeking behavior, as well as controversial hazing activities and academic dishonesty, are typically associated with college life in general; yet, fraternities and sororities seem to be scrutinized

most for such behaviors (Kalichman, et al., 2003; Storch & Storch). Past research in these areas mainly focused on substance abuse (e.g., alcoholism) and sexual behavior; however, academic dishonesty has experienced less investigation and deserves further attention (McCabe & Bowers, 2009). Storch and Storch claim that administrators have only recently recognized the high incidences of fraternity/sorority member academic dishonesty. Importantly, the extent of one's involvement within a fraternity or sorority (e.g., salience of group membership) seems to be a moderating variable of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Bowers, 2009).

Storch and Storch's (2002) finding of a positive correlation between the level of one's activity in fraternities/sororities and academic dishonesty relates to the idea that the higher one's salience of group membership (especially high status), the more likely a strong social identity will emerge, which could result in the condoning of deviant behavior. Importantly, non-members are aware of member deviance (e.g., newspapers, word of mouth), which can impact non-member interactions with members.

Social Self-Efficacy

Understanding the role of social self-efficacy in groups is important because it may reveal the extent to which a group perceives the ability to attain and maintain group status. Smith and Betz (2000) looked at the perceived social self-efficacy of college undergraduates and found that social self-efficacy was strongly correlated with social confidence. Additionally, social self-efficacy is significantly correlated with college satisfaction (DeWitz & Walsh, 2002). Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory advances that all attitude and behavior changes are the result of an individual's perception that he or she possesses the ability to succeed at a given task. Bandura extended this concept to include the construct of collective efficacy, which he defines as "the group's shared belief in its conjoint capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to pro-

duce given levels of attainment" (1997, p. 477).

Stereotypically, fraternities/sororities are high-status group. As such, non-members may perceive members as being more efficacious in social situations than non-members. This perception could strengthen the extent to which group membership is salient during the interaction. Furthermore, comparisons of engagement levels reveal members can be equally or more engaged in academic tasks, active learning, interaction with faculty, community service, diversity, satisfaction, personal development, and learning than non-members (DeWitz & Walsh, 2002; Hayek, Carini, O'Day, & Kuh, 2002; Pike, 2003). All of this can enhance the overall college experience, and lead to perceptions of higher social self-efficacy among members. If non-members perceive members are more socially successful, they may interact with members in a way that reflects that stereotype, further perpetuating the label of members as more socially self-efficacious.

METHODOLOGY

Research questions based on this framework were aimed specifically at non-member perceptions of fraternity/sorority members. It was also important to explore potential relationships between non-member perceptions of quality of contact and member stereotypical behavior. The following research questions were generated from these speculations:

1. Is there a relationship between non-member perceptions of contact with a fraternity/sorority member and their stereotypes of member behavior?
2a. If salience of membership is high for non-members during intergroup contact, will quality of contact be positively correlated with non-member perceptions of stereotypical behavior?
2b. If salience of membership is low for non-members during intergroup con-

tact, will quality of contact be negatively correlated with non-member perceptions of stereotypical behavior?

Participants

Participants of this study included 67 non-members (52.3%) and 55 members (sorority = 27.3%; fraternity = 15.6%) from a large southwestern university who were given extra credit for filling out the survey. For the sample, 42.2% of the participants were male, and 53.1% of the participants were female. Participants' ages were normally distributed, M = 21.70; SD = 3.65. The ethnic composition of the sample was 74.2% Caucasian, 4.7% African American, 8.6% Hispanic, 3.1% Asian, and 4.7% of some other ethnic group.

Measures

After receiving Institutional Review Board approval, both fraternity and sorority members and non-members completed a self-paced questionnaire to receive extra credit for their participation. The questionnaire included a series of demographic items pertaining to themselves and family. Next, a question asking the students to briefly describe the last conversation they had with a member was presented. In terms of "conversation with a member" characteristics, 73% of the non-member sample indicated their conversation with a member was voluntary, and 64% indicated they initiated the conversation. The duration of the conversations ranged from one to 11 minutes or more, with 32% of the participants indicating that their conversation was 3-5 minutes, and 25.4% indicating their conversation was more than 11 minutes.

Interestingly, 18 out of 67 non-members (just under a third) indicated their discussion with a member was school- and/or group project-related, suggesting a limited context for many of the conversations. However, these conversations are important to consider in an educational context, as this environment is one that is designed to promote non-segregated interac-

tion. After explaining their conversation, non-members were then asked to rate themselves on the variables discussed below in relation to their discussion with a member.

Independent Variables

Self-disclosure. The Revised Self-Disclosure Scale developed by Wheeless and Grotz (1976) was used to measure self-disclosure. The measurement is in three categories including amount of disclosure, accuracy and honesty of disclosure, as well as the depth of disclosure. There are three items in each category. Participants rated each statement on a five-level Likert scale from (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Statements about the amount of disclosure included statements such as, "During our conversation, I talked about myself for a long period of time." Statements about the accuracy and honesty of disclosures included items like, "During our conversation, I was not confident that my expression of my own feelings, emotions, and experiences were true reflections of myself." Statements about the depth of disclosure included statements such as, "During our conversation, I intimately disclosed who I really am, openly and fully." Alpha reliability for the amount of disclosure scale was $\alpha = .64$. For the honesty/accuracy scale, $\alpha = .71$, and for the depth of disclosure scale, $\alpha = .77$.

Trust. A modified version of Wheeless and Grotz's (1977) Individualized Trust Scale was used to measure trustworthiness. The scale contained 12 items. Each item consisted of two antonyms, or semantic differentials. An example would be "trustworthy" and "untrustworthy." Between each set of words were seven spaces. Participants were instructed to place an "X" in the space which best represented their feelings toward the fraternity/sorority member with whom they last engaged in conversation. The trust scale was reliable, $\alpha = .96$.

Salience. The salience measure, which was expected to moderate the relationship between quality of contact and attitudes toward fraterni-

ty/sorority members, consisted of several questions generated by the research team. Questions included: "To what extent is the individual you talked to like other Greek (fraternity or sorority) members?" and "When talking with this person, how aware were you that they were a Greek member?" The scale was reliable, alpha $\alpha = .81$.

Dependent Variables

Social self-efficacy. A scale was constructed to examine non-members perceptions of the social success of members to measure social self-efficacy. The measure included items such as "I think the Greek system helps people become successful in life," and "Greeks will have better college social experiences compared to non-Greeks," and was measured on a five-level Likert scale from (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). The scale was reliable, $\alpha = .73$. The team also measured self-efficacy in the survey using the Sherer, et al. (1982) Self-Efficacy Scale; however, the measure was not reliable in this study.

Deviance. The deviance scale used was based on Storch and Storch (2002) and consisted of statements such as, "People who are part of the Greek system are more likely to cheat on college tests than non-Greeks," and "Greek members are more likely to lie about an aspect of their life to avoid course assignments compared to non-Greek members." The reliability of this instrument was $\alpha = .83$.

RESULTS

To address the main research question of whether salience of group membership moderated the relationship between non-member perceptions of contact with members and their stereotypical behaviors, a linear regression analysis was performed. Following this, bivariate analyses were conducted to determine relationships within the non-member sample on the variables discussed. Finally, independent *t*-tests were used to determine differences between non-members and members.

Regression. To explore whether group salience moderated the relationship between non-members' perceptions of their contact with and perceptions of members, a linear regression was performed for the non-members ($n = 67$). There was a main effect for the independent variable of trust on the dependent variable of deviance for non-members, $\beta = .36$; $t(61) = 2.79$, $p < .01$, thus indicating that their level of trust was associated with variance in perceptions of member deviance. However, there was no significant main effect for salience, $t(61) = .36$, *ns*, nor was there a significant interaction between salience and trust, $t(61) = 1.851$, *ns*.

There was also a significant main effect for the amount of self-disclosure on deviance, $\beta = -.27$; $t(61) = -2.05$, $p < .05$, thus indicating that the amount of self-disclosure during the conversation was associated with variation in non-member perceptions of member deviance. However, there was no significant main effect for salience, $t(61) = .60$, *ns*, nor was there a significant interaction between salience and amount of self-disclosure $t(61) = -1.51$, *ns*. More regressions were run to determine main effects and interaction effects for the other variables (e.g., honesty/accuracy of self-disclosure, self-efficacy), but none were found to be significant. In sum, two main effects were found to be significant, yet the general research question of whether salience of membership would moderate the relationship between quality of contact and non-member perceptions of fraternity/sorority members went unsupported by the results.

Correlation. A Pearson correlation revealed that in the non-member sample ($n = 67$), there was a significant negative relationship between non-members' amount of self-disclosure and perceptions of member deviance, $r(64) = -.30$, $p < .05$. This suggested that as the amount of self-disclosure increased, perceptions of member deviance decreased, thus lending some support to the research question. There was also a positive, significant relationship found between trust and perceptions of deviance, $r(63) = .38$,

$p < .05$. Importantly, high scores for trust indicated the participants perceived fraternity/sorority members *as less trustworthy* during the conversation. Hence, it seems as non-members had less trust for members, they also perceived them as more deviant.

Further, a significant negative correlation was found between non-members' perception of self-disclosure amount and salience of membership, $r(64) = -.37$, $p < .05$. This suggested that as salience increased, the amount of self-disclosure of non-members decreased. There was a significant, positive correlation between salience of membership and non-member perceptions of trust during the conversation $r(62) = .36$, $p < .05$, indicating that as salience of membership for non-members increased during the conversation, perceptions of trust for members decreased.

Independent t-tests. Independent t-tests were used to determine differences in member ($n = 55$) and non-member ($n = 67$) perceptions of the independent and dependent variables of this study. Results determined significant differences between member and non-member perceptions of deviance (members: $M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.12$; non-members: $M = 1.93$, $SD = .98$), $t(120) = 6.19$, $p < .001$. This indicated that members perceived themselves as more deviant than non-members. There were also significant differences between perceptions of fraternity/sorority member self-efficacy, $t(119) = -3.56$, $p = .001$. This indicated that non-members ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .75$) had significantly higher perceptions of member self-efficacy compared to members ($M = 2.67$, $SD = .66$).

In terms of self-disclosure, there were significant differences between members and non-members in depth of self-disclosure, $t(116) = -3.32$, $p = .001$. This indicated members ($M = 2.47$, $SD = .88$) had lower perceptions of depth of self-disclosure with members relative to non-members ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .98$) during their conversation. There were also significant differences between member and non-members'

perceptions of trust during the conversation, $t(114) = 4.40$, $p < .001$. It seems members ($M = 2.18$, $SD = .85$) had significantly less trust during their conversation with other members than did non-members ($M = 1.53$, $SD = .72$).

DISCUSSION

Though results from this study did not reveal support for the salience of group membership as a moderating variable between non-member perceptions of quality of contact (trust and self-disclosure) with members and non-member perceptions of stereotypical behavior (deviance and social self-efficacy), some support for the first research question was found. The first research question examined the relationship between non-members contact with a fraternity/sorority member and their stereotypical perceptions of member behavior. Of particular relevance are the significant main effects uncovered for trust and self-disclosure on deviance. Non-members perceptions of trust and self-disclosure account for variance in non-members perceptions of member deviance; therefore, these variables are important to consider when examining relationships between groups.

Individuals constantly make group-based assumptions about individuals that may not accurately reflect true experience. Those who work with fraternity/sorority members can combat false perceptions by reminding members that non-members might make assumptions about members that are not necessarily based in reality, but rather based in stereotypical perceptions of fraternity/sorority membership. This is evidenced in the results indicating non-members often perceived members to be more efficacious. Members could be taught, for example, ways to minimize the salience of group differences during interaction (e.g., not wearing membership letters/identifying symbols, meeting for group work at a neutral location) as a means of facilitating harmonious relationships between the two groups.

As non-member self-disclosure increased, their perceptions of member deviance decreased. This significant negative correlation indicated non-members were more willing to reveal personal information to the extent they perceive the member as non-deviant. Examining the extent to which frequency of intergroup contact affects levels of trust between groups may be an area for future research to explore. Further, a significant positive correlation between non-member perceptions of trust and non-member perceptions of member deviance implies that the less trustworthy a non-member perceives the member to be, the more they will perceive members overall as deviant.

Practically speaking, understanding the role of self-disclosure in building trust and intimacy in relationships is invaluable in advancing what is known about intergroup interaction between fraternity/sorority members and non-members. The more individually we come to know and trust members who are not in our group, the less likely we are to stereotype that group as a whole. This is because the more we know people on an individual level, the less likely we are to rely on group-based characteristics to evaluate them. This implies that trust-building activities such as class projects between members and non-members could lead to less negative stereotyping. This is consistent with contact theory (Allport, 1954) which suggests that positive experiences with outgroup members decreases the likelihood of negatively stereotyping the outgroup as a whole.

The relationship between non-member self-disclosure and salience of membership is such that the more salient membership is to the non-member, the less likely non-members are to self-disclose during the interaction. This finding lends some support to the idea that salience of group membership will lead to greater intergroup comparisons and behavior based on stereotypical perceptions of other groups. Finally, a significant relationship between membership salience and non-member levels of trust during

the interaction suggests the more non-members were aware of fraternity/sorority membership, the less trusting they felt of that person during intergroup communication. Lack of trust, in turn, could lead to shallow self-disclosure. These findings could be useful to practitioners in understanding how knowledge of group membership can negatively influence the dynamic of interpersonal interaction.

Tests of independence between groups revealed some interesting findings. First, members seemed to perceive themselves more stereotypically than non-members. For instance, members perceived themselves as more deviant than non-members. Also, members appeared to have less trust in their interactions with other members than non-members had in their interactions with members. Members also reported less depth of self-disclosure in their interactions with other members than did non-members in their interactions with members, suggesting a need for future research.

On the other hand, non-members seemed to perceive members as more socially self-efficacious than members perceive themselves. So, non-members might have been less trusting of members, while simultaneously viewing them as more successful in social situations. Focusing on ways that members could increase trust in non-members would lead to more self-disclosure, thus enhancing the overall quality of intergroup interaction. The more one self-discloses, and to the extent that disclosure is reciprocated, the more likely trust and intimacy are to develop with the other person in the dyad. Self-disclosure is the vehicle through which trust develops in relationships (Altman & Taylor, 1973). Through the process of self-disclosure, members and non-members can discover commonalities, thus leading to more fulfilling relationships.

Understanding how levels of trust might influence depth of self-disclosure in intergroup encounters, particularly when group member-

ship identity is salient, is important for practitioners to understand. If low levels of outgroup trust lead to reduced self-disclosure, then positive differentiation might result from perceiving the outgroup as deviant.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was limited by the fact that the researchers categorized fraternities/sororities as homogeneous and did not account for differences between sororities and fraternities, or for differences between individual chapters on campus. Also, nearly a third of the reported interactions were school-related, suggesting a limited context in which these interactions may have occurred. However, there are important implications for those who work with fraternity and sorority members. Understanding how non-members perceive members is important because, regardless of whether stereotypes are based in reality, they might still dictate perception and drive behavior during intergroup interaction.

Future research should attempt to address the role of trust in intergroup contact, and determine the extent to which frequency and quality of contact with outgroup members affects trust levels. Also, whether certain groups are perceived as more socially efficacious could account for intergroup communication differences and should be examined further. Looking at intergroup communication through a social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) framework allows for further understanding of the role of groups in the formation of one's social identity. Furthermore, self-categorization theory (Turner, et al., 1987) and contact theory (Allport, 1954) provide additional support for intergroup communication processes. Clarifying why people become members of groups, as well as the role of contact between groups in intergroup relations is essential in uncovering social identity formation, as well as other intergroup phenomena.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Altman, I., & Haythorn, W. W. (1965). Interpersonal exchange in isolation. *Sociometry, 28,* 411-426.

Altman, I., & Taylor, D., (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Barber, B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Bettencourt, B. A., Brewer, M. B., Croak, M. R., & Miller, N. (1992). Cooperation and the reduction of intergroup bias: The role of reward structure and social orientation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28*, 301-319.

Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59,* 273-286.

Brown, R. & Gaertner, S. (2003). *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Cozby, P. C. (1972). Self-disclosure, reciprocity, and liking. *Sociometry*, *35*, 151-160.

Derlega, V. J., Metts, S., Petronio, S., & Margulis, S. T. (1993). *Self-disclosure*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

DeWitz, J. S., & Walsh, B. W. (2002). Self-efficacy and college student satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment, 10*, 315-326.

Ensari, N., & Miller, N. (2002). The out-group must not be so bad after all: The effects of disclosure, typicality, and salience on intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 313-329.

Goodstein, L. D., & Reinecker, V. M. (1974). Factors affecting self-disclosure: A review of the literature. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), *Progress in experimental personality research* (pp. 49-77). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hayek, J., Carini, R., O'Day, P., & Kuh, G. (2002). Triumph or tragedy: Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter organizations and other students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*, 643-663.

Jourard, S. M. (1971). *The transparent self* (Rev. ed.). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Kalichman, S. C., Cain, D., Zweben, A., & Swain, G. (2003). Sensation seeking, alcohol use and sexual risk behaviors among men receiving services at a clinic for sexually transmitted infections. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 64,* 564-569.

McCabe, D. L. & Bowers, W. J. (2009). The relationship between student cheating and college fraternity or sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 9*, 573-586.

Oakes, P. (2003). The root of all evil in intergroup relations? Unearthing the categorization process. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup process* (pp. 3-21). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Petty, R. E., & Mirels, H. L. (1981). Intimacy and scarcity of self-disclosure: Effects in interpersonal attraction for males and females. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7,* 493-503.

Pike, G. R. (2003). Membership in a fraternity or sorority, student engagement, and educational outcomes at AAU public research universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 369-382.

Scott-Sheldon, L. A. J., Carey, K. B., & Carey, M. P. (2007). Health behavior and college students: Does Greek affiliation matter? *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 31*(1), 61-70.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S. Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663-671.

Sherif, M., Harvey, L. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup cooperation and competition: The Robbers Cave experiment.* Norman, OK: University Book Exchange.

Smith, E., Murphy, J., & Coats, S. (1999). Attachment to groups: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 94-110.

Smith, H. M., & Betz, N. E. (2000). Development and validations of a scale of perceived social self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment, 8*, 283-301.

Steel, J. L. (1991). Interpersonal correlations of trust and self-disclosure. *Psychological Reports, 68*, 1319-1320.

Storch, E. A., & Storch, J. B. (2002). Fraternities, sororities, and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal, 36,* 247-252.

Tajfel, H. (1978). The psychological structure of intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 27-98). London, UK: Academic Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Weber, L. R., & Carter, A. (1998). On constructing trust: Temporality, self-disclosure, and perspective-taking. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 18*, 7-26.

Wheeless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1976). Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research, 2*, 338-346.

Wheeless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research, 3,* 250-257.

Author Autobiographies

Katie M. Warber is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at Wittenberg University. She received her Ph.D. in Interpersonal Communication from the University of Arizona, Tucson. She teaches courses in courses in interpersonal communication and communication research methods and statistics. Her research focuses on the role of emotion in interpersonal communication.

Melissa E. Taylor, educator for ConnectCare3 Patient Advocacy Service, received her Ph.D. in Interpersonal Communication from the University of Arizona, Tucson. Her research interests include interpersonal conflict, family dynamics, and mental health.

Dana C. Makstaller is a junior communication major at Wittenberg University in Springfield, OH. She worked as an undergraduate research assistant on this project.

EFFECTS OF SORORITY MEMBERS' PORNOGRAPHY USE ON BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN A SEXUAL ASSAULT SITUATION AND RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE

Matthew W. Brosi, John D. Foubert, R. Sean Bannon, and Gabe Yandell

College women's exposure to pornography is growing nationwide. A limited amount of research exists documenting the negative effects of pornography on women's attitudes and behavior related to sexual assault. The present study surveyed sorority members at a Midwestern public university on their pornography use, rape myth acceptance, bystander efficacy, and bystander willingness to help in potential sexual assault situations. Results showed that women who view pornography are significantly less likely to intervene as a bystander and are more likely to believe rape myths. Implications for women's personal safety and for the advisability of consuming pornography are discussed.

Traditionally considered a strictly male phenomenon, the once pronounced gender gap found in pornography consumption has quickly diminished. Increased ownership of personal computers and continually expanding Internet content have provided a greater accessibility to pornographic materials and a greater degree of anonymity, allowing women users to avoid negative labels sometimes associated with female pornography consumers (Fisher & Barak, 2001; Goodson, McCormick, & Evans, 2001; Morahan-Martin, 2000). Forty-nine percent of college women describe pornography viewing as an acceptable expression of sexuality and 31% now use pornography (Carroll et al., 2008; Yoder, Virdin, & Amin, 2005). College-aged women are becoming more likely to view pornography (Boies, 2002), reflecting efforts by the pornography industry to develop materials specifically targeting female audiences (Dines, 2010).

Most of the studies about women's pornography use that have been conducted thus far have studied college women. Specifically, women in social sororities have often been studied in related research about violence and sexual behavior, such as sexual assault particularly due to their high risk of victimization. In a series of nationwide anonymous surveys involving over 20,000 women, sorority women were found to be 50%

more likely to experience rape than other college women (Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss & Weschler, 2004). In addition, women who live in sorority houses are 200 to 300% more likely than other women in college to experience rape (Mohler-Kuo et al.). These two lines of research, rape and pornography viewing among women, have not been well integrated in the scholarly literature. Research relating pornography viewing and rape is particularly sparse with sorority women, who are most likely to experience rape (Mohler-Kuo et al.). The present study explores whether sorority members' pornography use has an impact on whether they will intervene to help prevent the rape of another woman.

For the sake of this study, the definition of pornography was "media used or intended to be used to increase sexual arousal" (Carroll et al., 2008, p. 8). It can include media termed sexually explicit, erotica, and that which is defined as online sexual activity. Research on pornography also includes the effects of stripping, prostitution, and other live performances.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Trends in Pornographic Behaviors

The kind of behavior in today's pornography is commonly described by researchers as far

more shocking and extreme than that of 10 or 20 years ago (Dines, 2010; Eberstadt & Layden, 2010; Jensen, 2007a; Jensen, 2007b; Malerek, 2009). Researchers assessing the most popularly purchased and rented pornography videos today found 88% of the scenes in them included physical aggression toward women such as spanking, open-hand slapping, hair pulling, choking, and bondage. Among the most recent trends, in 41% of the most popular mainstream pornography movies today are scenes in which a man engages a woman in anal sex followed immediately by oral sex for the purpose of her degradation (Bridges, Wosnitzer, Scharrer, Sun, & Liberman, 2010; Malerek, 2009).

With the growth in the pornography industry, the demand for "fresh merchandise" has outstripped the supply, leading pornographers to turn to sex trafficking to have enough women and girls for their online and video materials (MacKinnon, 2007; Malerek, 2009). Furthermore, as the pornography industry grows and seeks to satisfy its increasingly large customer base, it has continuously innovated its products and materials in a direction of more extreme, violent, "edgy," material, often featuring underage actors and scenes depicting a wide variety of dehumanizing behaviors not heretofore seen (Dines, 2010; Eberstadt & Layden, 2010; Jensen, 2007a; Jensen, 2007b; Manning, 2006).

Pornography Use and Women's Psychological Well-Being

The impact of pornography use on women remains largely unknown (Manning, 2006). Most past research, which has suggested a variety of detrimental effects on psychological well-being and socialization variables, is concentrated on the effect of pornography on male consumers or women as partners of consumers (Manning, 2006). Research has shown a positive correlation between women's acceptance of pornography and their psychological well-being (Carroll et al., 2008). Still, more research is needed on women as direct consumers of por-

nography, particularly regarding the effects on women's intra- and interpersonal development.

Rape-Supportive Attitudes, Acceptance of Rape Myths and Victim Blame

One of the most common ways to measure people's attitudes toward sexual violence is to assess their agreement with what are called rape myths. According to Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994), "Rape myths are attitudes and generally false beliefs about rape that are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women" (p. 133). Examples of rape myths include the beliefs that women deserve to be raped or that no woman can be raped against her will. Why individuals accept these myths and what factors affect the socialization of these beliefs is a critical factor in the sexual violence field.

Research has shown that when women are exposed to pornography before the age of 18, they are more likely to have attitudes supporting sexual violence as adults (Corne, Briere, & Esses, 1992). In addition, women who view violent pornography, with its coupling of intercourse and aggression, have been found to have distorted views about rape including increased victim blame and decreased assignment of responsibility to male sexual assault perpetrators (Corne, Briere, & Esses, 1992; Cowan & Campbell, 1995; Davis et al., 2006; Norris et al., 2004). Exposure to pornography has been associated with women's beliefs that they should accept sexual victimization (Norris et al., 2004). Thus, the ties between women viewing pornography and experiencing sexual assault are potentially dangerous.

Notably, research has shown when women in popular mainstream pornographic movies experience physical aggression by a male, 95% of the time they respond with either a response of pleasure or no response at all. Today's mainstream pornography reinforces the notion that violence against women in sexual situations is acceptable and the belief that women enjoy the violence

(Bridges et al., 2010). Further, the content of pornography today seems to be reinforcing the script that women do not resist when hit during a sexual encounter (Bridges et al.). If women internalize these messages that women enjoy violence, it raises a barrier for potential intervention to help a friend or sister in need.

Sexual Assault Bystander Intervention

Bystander behavior has been the topic of much research in the area of sexual assault prevention during the last decade (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Foubert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Brasfield, & Hill, 2010; Katz, 2006). Researchers who study bystander intervention have explored the factors that lead people to intervene to help others who are in distress, rather than stand by and ignore and/or otherwise not act (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan). Several factors have been shown to increase the likelihood people will intervene as bystanders. These include being aware of a situation in which someone is being victimized, making a prior commitment to help, having a sense of partial responsibility for helping, believing that the victim has not caused the situation to occur, having a sense of self-efficacy in possessing the skills to do something, and having seen others modeling such pro-social behavior (Latane & Darley, 1968; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan).

These varied, but interconnected strands of inquiry lead to the formation of a central research question: What impact would exposure to hardcore pornography, sadomasochistic pornography, and rape pornography have on sorority women's rape myth acceptance, bystander willingness to help, and bystander efficacy? Based on prior research showing the connections between women's use of pornography and their attitudes toward rape-related variables (Corne, Briere & Esses, 1992; Davis, et al., 2006; Norris et al., 2004), the researchers formulated the following hypothesis: Women who used each type of pornography would report higher rape myth acceptance, a lower efficacy to intervene as a bystander in a potential rape situation, and a lower willingness to intervene as a bystander in a potential rape situation.

METHODOLOGY

Instrumentation

Perceived ability to intervene as a bystander was measured by the bystander efficacy scale developed by Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan (2005). This instrument asked participants to indicate whether they believe they could do each of 18 bystanding behaviors and if so, to indicate their level of confidence in performing this bystander behavior. Participants rated items on a scale of 1 to 100 percent, indicating their percent confidence they personally believed they knew how to intervene in the given scenario described. Criterion validity of this scale was established through a significant correlation between bystander efficacy and actual bystander behavior ($r = .30$). Construct validity was established with a significant correlation between bystander efficacy and rape myth acceptance ($r = .24$) (Banyard, 2008). This scale yielded an alpha reliability of .91 in the present study.

The Willingness to Help Scale was developed by Banyard et al. (2005) and measures participants' degree of likelihood of engaging in 12 bystanding behaviors on a 7-point scale ranging from (1) not at all willing to intervene to (7) very willing to intervene. Items came from research literature and from discussions with advocates and professionals working in the field of sexual violence. Criterion validity of this scale was established through a significant correlation between bystander willingness to help and actual bystander behavior ($r = .37$). Construct validity was established with a significant correlation between bystander efficacy and rape myth acceptance ($r = .32$; Banyard, 2008). The alpha reliability for these 12-items was .85 in the present study.

Participants' attitudes toward sexual assault were measured using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Participants answer a series of 45 questions on a scale of 1-7 where 1 represents disagreement and 7 represents agreement. Payne et al. (1999) developed this scale through six studies including a factor analysis for construct definition and item pool selection, a complete-link cluster analysis to determine the structure and dimensions of the scale, item pool selection based on fit to a hierarchical model, and a construct validity study correlating the IRMA to seven similar measures ($r = .50–.74$, $p < .001$). They also conducted a study where groups known to differ in rape myth acceptance scored differently as predicted on the IRMA ($p < .001$) and a validity study correlating IRMA scores with a content analysis of open ended scenarios written by participants that were analyzed for rape myth content ($r = .32$, $p < .05$). The alpha reliability in the present sample for this variable was .90.

Several other variables were measured in the present study including participant's race, age, and class year. In addition, participants were asked to report their use of pornography. Specifically, the following questions were asked: "Have you seen media consisting of graphic sex acts (including penetration) being shown or described in videos, movies, magazines, books, or online during the last 12 months: Yes/No (hardcore pornography); Have you seen media consisting of sadomasochistic portrayals of bondage, whipping and spanking but without an explicit lack of consent in video, movies, magazines, books or online during the last 12 months: Yes/ No (sadomasochistic pornography); Have you seen media consisting of sexually explicit rape depictions in which force is used with explicit lack of consent in videos, movies, magazines, books, or online during the last 12 months: Yes/ No (rape pornography)" (Carroll et al., 2008).

Participants and Procedures

Participants in the present study were female members of five sororities at a large public university in the Midwest. Of 902 total members, 307 volunteered to participate, constituting a 34% return rate. Participants were 89% Caucasian, 4% Native American, 3% Hispanic, with the remaining participants being African American, Asian, or mixed race. The mean age of participants was 19.7 ($SD = 1.02$) with 9% at age 18, 39% age 19, 27% age 20, 22% age 21, 3% age 22, and .3% age 23. There were no participants over the age of 23. Participants included 41% first-year students, 28% sophomores, 26% juniors, and 6% seniors.

Research protocols were submitted to and approved by the institutional review board for human subjects. The experimenters also recruited assistance from the Panhellenic Council, the leaders from all of the sororities on campus, to request the volunteer participation from each chapter. Chapters were offered monetary incentives for reaching high levels of survey completion among their members.

Graduate students visited each chapter house up to three times to distribute and collect surveys for this study. Surveys were administered and collected in regularly scheduled group meetings and in additionally scheduled meeting times when members could be present to complete the measures. All individuals participated voluntarily and received no direct compensation for completing the measures in this study. After receiving a briefing about the nature of the study and an informed consent document, surveys were distributed at chapter meetings. Participants completed surveys anonymously and returned their survey in a common return envelope with no identifying information.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Women were asked whether they had viewed three different kinds of pornography during the past 12 months: hardcore pornography, sado-

masochistic pornography, and rape pornography. Among sorority women who completed surveys in this study, 46% had viewed hardcore pornography, 27% had viewed rape pornography, and 21% had viewed sadomasochistic pornography. Survey results were analyzed using SPSS version 17. This section presents results organized by dependent variable alongside with discussion and considerations to enable more direct interpretation.

Rape Myth Acceptance

A 2 by 2 by 2 MANOVA was computed with exposure during the last 12 months to hardcore pornography, rape pornography, and sadomasochistic pornography as dichotomous independent variables and rape myth acceptance as a dependent variable. Consistent with a unidirectional hypothesis, main effects for sadomasochistic pornography emerged $F(1, 265) = 2.67$, $p = .05$ such that women who viewed this type of pornography reported a higher level of rape myth acceptance ($M = 2.29$; $SD = .76$) than women who did not view sadomasochistic pornography ($M = 2.06$; $SD = .75$). The effect size for this difference was between low and medium (Cohen's $d = .30$). Likewise there was a main effect for viewing hardcore pornography. Consistent with a unidirectional hypothesis, if women viewed hardcore pornography within the last year, they reported greater rape myth acceptance ($M = 2.25$; $SD = .65$) than women who did not ($M = 2.05$; $SD = 1.18$), $F(1, 265) = 3.23$, $p < .05$. The effect size for this difference was low (Cohen's $d = .21$).

Bystander Intervention

A 2 by 2 by 2 MANOVA was computed with viewing during the last 12 months to hardcore pornography, rape pornography, and sadomasochistic pornography as independent variables and bystander efficacy and bystander willingness to help as dependent variables. Consistent with our unidirectional hypothesis, there was multivariate significance with women's viewing sado-

masochistic pornography on bystander variables $F(2, 254) = 2.71$, $p < .05$. Univariate effects emerged for bystander efficacy such that women who viewed sadomasochistic pornography ($M = 75.3$, $SD = 18.41$) perceived that they were less able to intervene in a sexual assault situation than women who chose not to use sadomasochistic pornography ($M = 81.0$; $SD = 18.17$), $F(1, 255) = 4.34$, $p < .05$. The effect size for this difference was between low and medium (Cohen's $d = .31$). Women who used sadomasochistic pornography ($M = 4.01$; $SD = .73$) were also less willing to intervene in a potential sexual assault situation $F(1, 255) = 4.29$, $p < .05$, than women who reported they did not use sadomasochistic pornography ($M = 4.23$; $SD = .72$). The effect size for this difference was between low and medium (Cohen's $d = .30$).

Nearly half of the women in this study reported viewing hardcore pornography, attesting to the pervasiveness of its use. Results demonstrated several harmful effects of women's viewing pornography, confirming prior research (Carroll, 2008; Davis et al., 2006; Norris et al., 2004).

Hardcore Pornography

The 46% of women who viewed hardcore pornography during the last 12 months indicated a greater belief in rape myths than women who did not view hardcore pornography. Thus, women who have looked at pornography within the past 12 months were significantly more likely to believe false or stereotyped beliefs about rape, rape victims, or rapists. It appears that when females viewed hardcore pornography, their conceptualization of rape was subject to becoming skewed. Research has shown that what is portrayed in hardcore pornography, particularly that which has been produced during the last 15 years, depicts activity more consistent with nonconsensual than consensual acts (Dines, 2010). In short, "porn plays out 'fantasy' sex that looks more like sexual assault than making love" (Dines, 2010, p. xxvii). Thus, this con-

firms other studies indicating that women who have watched media that blurs the line between consensual and nonconsensual acts would report a less accurate understanding of rape, rape victims, and rapists than those women who abstain from pornography.

Sadomasochistic Pornography

When women reported viewing sadomasochistic pornography during the past 12 months, a consistent pattern of effects resulted. Compared to the 79% of women who had not viewed sadomasochistic pornography, the 21% of women who used it reported significantly greater beliefs in rape myths, less bystander willingness, and lower efficacy to intervene in a rape related situation. Just as in the case of women who viewed hardcore pornography, women who used sadomasochistic pornography had experienced significant effects on rape myth acceptance. Thus, those women who viewed sadomasochistic pornography had significantly more false beliefs about rape than women who did not view this kind of pornography. Although there is overlap between these two groups, with 21% of women viewing sadomasochistic pornography and 46% viewing hardcore pornography, many women looked at hardcore pornography but did not view sadomasochistic pornography. This smaller group, about one in five, who view sadomasochistic pornography constituted a subset of pornography viewers who deserve close scrutiny.

Values on the dependent variable of rape myth acceptance revealed that many females who viewed sadomasochistic porn had distorted perceptions about rape, the nature of rape survivors, and the characteristics of rapists. That these distorted beliefs coincide with viewing sadomasochistic pornography suggests, at a minimum, that such viewing is risky for women who would otherwise want or should have accurate knowledge about rape, survivors, and perpetrators.

In the present study, participants who viewed sadomasochistic pornography also reported a lower level of willingness to intervene as a bystander in a sexual assault situation than non-users. Thus, it seems exposure to sadomasochistic pornography is associated with a lack of women's willingness to intervene to help prevent the rape of another woman. This result is particularly compelling for those interested in reducing the rate of sexual assault on college campuses. Several studies have shown that convincing college students to intervene in potential rape situations is an especially effective prevention practice (Banyard, Plante & Moynihan, 2007; Foubert, Newberry, & Tatum, 2007). Given that viewing sadomasochistic pornography was associated with a lower level of willingness to intervene to help prevent the rape of another woman, it seems advisable to explore effective educational efforts to discourage sadomasochistic pornography use in concert with efforts to promote the bystander model of rape prevention.

Participants who reported viewing sadomasochistic pornography also reported a lower level of bystander efficacy than their peers. With that, it appears there is something about women's viewing sadomasochistic pornography directly related to their belief that they know what to do to intervene in a sexual assault situation more so than their peers who do not use sadomasochistic pornography. Similar to the effect that viewing sadomasochistic pornography may have on one's willingness to intervene, this could be because they have viewed behavior that combines both sex and aggression in a manner the manufacturer intends to be sexually stimulating. Women's confidence in their ability to identify a rape situation as opposed to one that needs no intervention may also be affected. This, unfortunately, then alters their understanding of how to intervene in situations that could turn into rape—perhaps simply because of the blurred boundary resulting from the inclusion of violence in sexual acts.

But what is it about viewing sadomasochistic pornography that is associated with women's perceptions of intimate relationships? Women who view sadomasochistic pornography are exposed to a view of sexual contact where violence, power, and sexual contact are conflated. One explanation may be that when women internalized the messages present in sadomasochistic pornography, they accepted an altered reality of sexual relationships. However, these depictions of men and women in exaggerated power positions (e.g., a dominatrix) may serve to cloud their understanding of mutual, reciprocal relationships.

The challenge to understanding the link between women's viewing sadomasochistic pornography and efficacy in intervening may lie more specifically in determining the degree of consensual sexual contact between sexual partners. An individual's ability to determine whether a sexual assault situation necessitates intervention may be altered by exposure to sadomasochistic pornography. Perhaps women experience difficulty conceptualizing the difference between sexual assault and consent, leading them to question whether a situation is problematic. It appears that sadomasochistic pornography blurs women's understanding of consent, leading to altered beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists; decreased understanding about how to intervene; and lowered willingness to intervene in potential rape situations.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The present study showed that sorority members who used pornography, particularly sadomasochistic pornography, reported higher rape myth acceptance, lower willingness to intervene in a sexual assault situation, and lower efficacy to intervene in a sexual assault situation. In addition to replicating the study with a nonmember comparison group, a potential next step in this research line would be to assess the relationships between use of a wide array of types of pornography and frequency of use along with the bystander variables measured in this study. The present study was limited to assessing sorority women's use of pornography during the last 12 months and did not assess the conditions under which pornography was consumed. It could be that women were viewing pornography voluntarily, vicariously, as an aid for masturbation, against their wishes, with a significant other, or even as part of an event with their sorority where they may or may not have had a choice to take part. Exploring the relationship between the aforementioned variables and the circumstances under which pornography was consumed would add tremendous depth to the understanding of women's pornography use.

It would also be interesting to qualitatively explore sorority women's use patterns, motivations to consume, and attitudes concerning various types of pornography to illuminate and expand upon the present study's findings. For example, individual interviews with women who have consumed pornography could yield information rich data that could shed light on the dynamics of how sadomasochistic pornography impacts women's perceptions of consent and how this phenomenon relates to bystander intervention.

In terms of implications for practice, as sexual assault continues to affect both fraternities and sororities alike, special care should be taken to address the related issue of pornography use. Specifically, this study showed that pornography use is more prevalent among sorority women than may have been thought. Openly addressing the implications of accepting this medium as it pertains to the objectification of women, the concurrent lower likelihood of bystander intervention, and the negative impact on attitudes toward rape is cause for serious concern. As this research has highlighted, the intersection between viewing pornography and adhering to rape myths and intervening in sexual assault situations should be highlighted as an

area that leaders on campuses and in inter/national offices should address as a direct link to sexual violence.

LIMITATIONS

This study is primarily limited by the fact that only sorority women were surveyed on only one campus in the Midwest. The measure of pornography consumption used in this study was limited to the women's exposure to one genre of pornography (violent) during the past 12 months, without assessing the frequency of that use or the circumstances in which the women consumed it. Future research should take into consideration the differences between those who choose to pursue and view pornography on their own from those who are tangentially exposed or tolerate viewing pornography with others (e.g., boyfriends, etc.) in addition to the specific content viewed, the frequency of viewing, and the medium through which it was viewed (online, movie, magazine, etc.). Comparison studies between nonmember college women, women who belong to other groups such as athletic organizations, and men are warranted.

This study is further limited by the response rate. Of the 11 of sororities on campus, five chose to participate with 34% completing and returning the surveys. Thus, the sample may be biased with information collected by individuals specifically interested in this topic. Further, it may be that the sensitivity of the issue being investigated was perceived as casting a negative light on the sorority community as a whole, which could have led some to want to avoid sharing their experiences. This study is further limited by the nature of using self-report measures and the fact that a scale of social desirability was not included. Given the nature of the study, it could have been valuable to measure the degree to which participants were answering truthfully and to selectively remove responses from participants who appeared to be answering in a deceptive or dismissive manner.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, pornography appears to pose a danger to both men and women, particularly as an influence on potential sexual assault behaviors and victimization. Research has shown that men who view pornography are at increased risk for committing sexual assault (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004). However, as indicated in this study, when women view pornography, particularly films with sadomasochistic themes, they are less likely to look out for the safety and security of others and are more likely to stand by and do nothing while a sister is being assaulted.

REFERENCES

Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of pro-social bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims, 23,* 83-97.

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M. & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35,* 463-481.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape prevention through bystander education: Final report to NIJ for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009. Retrieved June 15, 2007, from www.ncjrs.org0pdffiles10nij0grants0208701.pdf

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *32*(1), 61-79.

Boies, S. C. (2002). University students' uses of and reactions to online sexual information and entertainment: Links to online and offline sexual behaviour. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 11*(2), 77-89.

Bridges, A. J., Wosnitzer, R., Scharrer, E., Sun, C., & Liberman, R. (2010). Aggression and sexual behavior in best-selling pornography videos: A content analysis update. *Violence Against Women, 16,* 1065-1085.

Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(5), 279-289.

Carroll, J. S., Padilla-Walker, L. M., Nelson, L. J., Olsen, C. D., McNamara Barry, C., & Madsen, S. D. (2008). Generation XXX: Pornography acceptance and use among emerging adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 23*(1), 6-30.

Corne, S., Briere, J., & Esses, L. M. (1992). Women's attitudes and fantasies about rape as a function to early exposure to pornography. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7(4),* 893-896.

Cowan, G., & Campbell, R. R. (1995). Rape causal attitudes among adolescents. *Journal of Sex Research, 32,* 145-153.

Davis, K.C., Norris, J., George, W. H., Martell, J., & Heiman, J. R. (2006). Rape-myth congruent beliefs in women resulting from exposure to violent pornography: Effects of alcohol and sexual arousal. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(9), 1208-1223.

Dines, G. (2010). *Pornland: How porn has hijacked our sexuality.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Eberstadt, M., & Layden, M. A. (2010). The social costs of pornography: A statement of findings and recommendations. Princeton, NJ: The Witherspoon Institute.

Fisher, W. A., & Barak, A. (2001). Internet pornography: A social psychological perspective on internet sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research, 38(4),* 312-323.

Foubert, J. D. & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Brasfield, H., & Hill, B. (2010). Effects of a rape awareness program on college women: Increasing bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38,* 813-827.

Foubert, J. D., Newberry, J. T., & Tatum, J. L. (2007). Behavior differences seven months later: Effects of a rape prevention program on first-year men who join fraternities. *NASPA Journal, 44*, 728-749.

Goodson, P., McCormick, D., & Evans, A. (2001). Searching for sexually explicit material on the Internet: An exploratory study of college students' behavior and attitudes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 30,* 101-117.

Jensen, R. (2007a). *Getting off: Pornography and the end of masculinity.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Jensen, R. (2007b). The paradox of pornography. In D. E. Guinn (Ed.), *Pornography: Driving the demand in international sex trafficking* (pp. 76-86). Captive Daughters Media: U.S.A.

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994), Rape myths. In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 133–164. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00448.x

Katz, J. (2006). *The macho paradox: Why some men hurt women and how all men can help.* New York, NY: Sourcebooks.

Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*, 215–221.

MacKinnon, C. A. (2007). Pornography as trafficking. In D. E. Guinn (Ed.), *Pornography: Driving the demand in international sex trafficking* (pp. 31-42*)*. U.S.A.: Captive Daughters Media.

Malarek, V. (2009). *The Johns: Sex for sale and the men who buy it.* New York, NY: Arcade Publishing.

Manning, J. C. (2006). The impact of internet pornography on marriage and the family: A review of the research. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity, 13*, 131-165.

Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 65,* 37-45.

Morahan-Martin, J. (2000). Women and the internet: Promise and perils. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 3*, 683-691.

Norris, J., Davis, K. C., George, W. H., Martell, J., & Heiman, J. R. (2004). Victim's response and alcohol-related factors as determinants of women's responses to violent pornography. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 59-69.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois rape myth acceptance scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33,* 27-68.

Yoder, V., Virdin, T., & Amin, K. (2005). Internet pornography and loneliness: An association? *Sexual Addiction and Compulsivity, 12*(1), 19-44.

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

Matthew W. Brosi, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Marriage and Family Therapy and Director, Center for Family Services, Department of Human Development and Family Science, Oklahoma State University, 233 HES, Stillwater, OK 74078-6122; 405-744-3633 (phone), 405-744-2800 (fax); matt.brosi@okstate.edu.

John D. Foubert, Ph.D., Associate Professor of College Student Development and Anderson, Farris, and Halligan Professor of Educational Studies at Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma State University, 314 Willard Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078-6122; john.foubert@okstate.edu.

R. Sean Bannon, M.S., Doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma State University, 314 Willard Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078-6122; rbannon@okstate.edu.

Gabriel Yandell, B.S., Master's student in Marriage and Family Therapy at Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma State University, 233 HES, Stillwater, OK 74078-6122; gabe.yandell@okstate.edu.

DOING A GOOD JOB AT A BAD THING: PREVALENCE AND PERPETUATION OF STEREOTYPES AMONG MEMBERS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK SORORITIES

Natalie T. J. Tindall, Marcia D. Hernandez, and Matthew W. Hughey

This study examined how stereotypes among alumnae members of historically Black sororities affected their experiences as both undergraduate and graduate members. This research contributes to the literature on skin color bias and to the stereotypes of Black women. For the majority of women we surveyed for this research, the myths and stereotypes surrounding skin color bias, intra-racial group relations, beauty, and femininity of different historically Black sororities influenced the initial perceptions of members in each group. The findings include some commonality among stereotypes about the oldest sororities (Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta), yet stereotypes about the other organizations (Zeta Phi Beta and Sigma Gamma Rho) varied due to age, college life experience, and the geographic location of the interviewees. Implications and considerations for future research are included.

Limited academic research exists about representations of historically Black sororities and their members. Each sorority shares similar goals and objectives rooted in sisterhood, service, upright character and morals, and networking (Whaley, 2010). Yet each has its own distinctive characteristics and traits (Fine, 2004) that are cultivated and maintained through the membership's use of formal signs and symbols and unsanctioned use of stereotypes to describe group members. Anderson, Buckley, and Tindall (2010) noted: "Especially in the fraternity/sorority world, signs and symbols are important communicators of codes that display precise meanings regarding identities, behaviors, ways of speaking and being, and social understanding" (p. 7).

This study examined how stereotypes based on colorism—or discrimination based on skin color—and elitism might operate as unofficial symbols and signs for historically Black sororities. To examine this problem, the researchers conducted interviews with collegiate and alumnae members of the four historically Black sororities. The interviews revealed that stereo-types served positive and negative functions for the organizations. These stereotypes were based on the legacy of colorism and classism that served as historical barriers to membership in Black sororities (Giddings, 1994). Today, sorority leaders downplay the issues of colorism and classism as historical anachronistic forms of intra-racial elitism that has little relevance for current members (Russell, Wilson, & Hall, 1992). However our findings indicated stereotypes are a part of the sororities' collective and individual identities, and continue to influence their legacies and current member perspectives.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Background

Although collegiate sororities have existed since 1851, the Black sorority movement started in 1908 at Howard University with the founding of the oldest predominantly Black Greek-letter sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha. In 1913, 22 women who were members of Alpha Kappa Alpha founded Delta Sigma Theta. Zeta Phi Beta, the third Black sorority, was founded in 1920 on

the campus of Howard University. Sigma Gamma Rho is the only sorority to emerge outside of Howard University and at a predominantly White institution. On November 12, 1922, seven women founded Sigma Gamma Rho at Indiana's Butler University. Neumann (2008) recognized that the sororities came into existence because Black women had a need to "carve out a place for themselves" (p. 170). Although founded at different times and places, the mission of these organizations is universally consistent with Du Bois' (later abandoned) idea of "the talented tenth," the notion that the top 10% of Black people would lead the race through the inculcation of fellowship and camaraderie of sisterhood, the promotion of "finer womanhood," the accomplishment of high scholastic and moral standards, and social justice and community activism (Hernandez, 2008).

Race-Based Stereotypes

Historically, race has played a significant role in the lives of Black Americans (Mahoney, 1997). The social construction and concept of race is tied to skin color and phenotype (Omi & Winant, 1994). The color caste system was formulated under slavery when a need existed to deny equal rights and treatments to Blacks and to determine the race of a child born of one White parent (Wright, 1997). Those slaves with lighter skin and features closer to European rather than African tones received better treatment than others without these physical traits (Bennett, 1993; Hurtado, 1999; Quarles, 1965). Graham (1999) wrote: "It was a color thing and a class thing. And for generations of Black people, color and class have been inexorably tied together" (p. 4).

Research has shown that the legacy of differential treatment of Blacks during slavery endures with the existence of a "racial hierarchy" that privileges those with lighter skin today in marketing various social, economic, and political arenas (Hunter, 2005; Keith & Herring, 1991; Hochschild & Weaver, 2007). Moreover,

research on colorism in Black communities and mate-selection suggests that women with lighter skin are privileged in the dating and marriage market by being perceived as more beautiful and feminine (Hill, 2002; Hunter, 2005). This study offers a unique approach to understanding the stereotyping of historically Black sororities as a way to informally provide a "brand" for each organization and to market differences in femininity, beauty, and status between the groups.

Both historically Black and predominantly White sororities emerged during the Victorian era. The prevalent norms of that era influenced the cultural norms surrounding women's behavior and expectations. According to Turk (2004), the Victorian standard of true womanhood declared that men and women occupied two separate, distinct spheres of influence. For women, that sphere was confined to home and centered on marriage, romance, and subservience to manhood (Berkowitz & Padavic, 1999). Finding a husband was the ultimate goal. As mothers and wives, women were responsible for upholding the family using grace, passivity, and morality.

The first generation of sororities did not challenge the sphere of true womanhood; rather, members sought to expand the definition of the feminine ideal to include intellectual capacities. Turk (2004) claimed that the women of the first set of predominantly White sororities "created an identity that combined the seemingly conflicting roles of 'scholar' and 'woman'" (p. 40). For U.S.-born Black women during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, elements of the Victorian gender ideology were viewed as desirable although not always plausible or realistic. Giddings (1984) argued Black women wanted the opportunity to live family-centered and focused lives; however, the marginal status of Black men in post-slavery economies forced many women into jobs in order to provide for the household. Nonetheless, the Black sororities and their precursor, the Black women's club movement, implemented and fomented the Victorian ideals of family, home, hearth, and moral

sanctitude among themselves and in the community as a method to counteract the virulent stereotypes about Black women.

There is a range of topics yet to be explored in depth including stereotypes associated with the groups, development of the membership's racial identity, and practices of colorism by members (Parks, 2008). The existing scholarship tends to focus on two themes: historically Black sororities serving as a comparison group for predominately White sororities, and the service and philanthropy sorority members perform.

Historically Black Sororities as Comparison Groups

The first body of scholarship highlighted differences between the experiences of historically Black sororities and other organizations (Berkowitz & Padavic, 1999) and between the experiences of little sisters for predominantly White and historically Black fraternities (Stombler & Padavic, 1997). A limitation of research comparing historically Black sororities with other organizations is that it fails to consider that the expectations of members in historically Black sororities may differ from predominantly White sororities. For example, historically Black organizations have a relatively higher number of active, dues-paying members involved with graduate chapters (Giddings, 1994; Hernandez, 2008; Whaley, 2010). Scholars also frequently reported that women who joined predominantly White sororities for support and networking in college decreased active participation in these organizations over time (Whipple, Baier, & Grady, 1991). In contrast, women who joined historically Black sororities do so with the understanding that sisterhood is an identity you grow into, rather than out of. For example, over 70 percent of Delta Sigma Theta and Alpha Kappa Alpha's membership are alumnae. Post-college involvement is important to sustaining historically Black sororities (Hernandez, 2008).

Comparative sorority research has grown beyond a "Black vs. White" model, to investigate a wide array of cross-racial memberships within the fraternity and sorority system. For example, Chen's (1998) research examined Asian-American women who joined historically Asian-American, White, and Black sororities. Hughey (2007) provided one of the first sociological and historical accounts of cross-racial membership in Black fraternities and sororities. Hughey also examined the dynamics of non-Blacks joining historically Black fraternities and sororities (Hughey, 2008), the place of White fraternities on historically Black college campuses (Hughey 2006), and ways that shared racialized meanings continued to structure non-White membership in White fraternities and sororities (Hughey, 2010). Together, these comparative studies offered interesting insight into our understanding of how non-Blacks may perceive historically Black fraternities and sororities. In various reports, non-Black members tended to cite the focus on community involvement, academic achievement, and supportive relationships between members as motivations for joining these organizations instead of predominantly White groups (Chen, 1998; Fine, 2004; Hughey, 2007, 2008).

Historically Black Sorority Members and 'Good Deeds' Research

The second body of literature dealt with the "good deeds" conducted by historically Black sororities' members such as philanthropic acts (Gasman, Louison, & Barnes, 2008). Researchers have praised historically Black sororities for encouraging members to "get ahead" by using higher education to improve personal and professional opportunities and to "give back" by contributing to their communities (Berkowitz & Padavic, 1999). Some scholars noted the influence of the Black women's movement in developing feminist thought within the organizations (Giddings, 1994; Neumann, 2008). Even social events such as debutante balls have

in part thought to contribute to the racial uplift and community service ethos of the organizations (Kendall, 2002). In these scenarios historically Black sororities are highlighted as benevolent organizations credited with performing good deeds and developing women of good character.

Comparative studies are often limited to exploring the undergraduate experience as the norm. Yet for historically Black sororities, membership in alumnae chapters is larger than undergraduate chapters and has grown over the years. Researchers have tended to ignore the impact of intra-group relations after graduation, particularly those as salient within Black communities based on colorism and elitism. Research focused on philanthropic work and community service has painted a positive picture of membership, but largely ignored organizational pressures fostering tension between individual members and different historically Black sororities due to stereotyping. An organizational lens model was used to frame the unexplored questions this review raised.

Conceptual Framework: Organizational Culture and Symbols

One method organizations use to imprint the ideas, philosophies, and viewpoints of their culture is the use of symbols and imagery. Hatch (1997) noted that embedded within tangible and intangible representations is the "conscious or unconscious association with some wider concept of meaning" (p. 219). Symbols are important functions for corporations, serving as the organization's public images (Grunig, 1993; Shields, 2004). Symbols are consciously chosen by organizations as they strive to create an authentic relationship between the organization and its audiences, promote their products, and brand themselves. The chosen symbols present and represent the values of the organization and must succinctly communicate those values with internal (members) and external (nonmember) audiences (Shields, 2004).

NPHC sororities each endorse symbols and signs to represent their organizations. For example, Alpha Kappa Alpha's colors are pink and green, and ivy serves as a symbol of the organization. Yet, symbols attributed to a sorority can be interpreted outside of the parameters of meaning and interpretation set by the organization (Hatch, 1997). According to Hatch, "Management can exercise considerable control over the design and display of its artifacts, but the symbolic messages with which artifacts become associated are far less easy to control" (pp. 219-220). Stereotypes of members based on skin color, class, and femininity often serve as unsanctioned symbols of sororities.

Although organizations attempt to control their identity through the use and publicity of certain symbols and images, individuals inside and outside of the organization also shape and define the organizational image (Bromley, 2000; Plowman & Chiu, 2007; Whetten & Mackey, 2002; Williams & Moffit, 1997). The organizational image is how organizations position their identity in communications with audiences (Whetten & Mackey), and this positioning can come in many forms: visual symbols and "the mediums [sic], products, or tactics of communication" (Plowman & Chiu, p. 4). The organizational image can be both the intended and unintended consequences of the constructed organizational identity (Gray & Balmer, 1998). As Cooperrider (1990) explained, "organizations as made and imagined are artifacts of the affirmative mind" (p. 115). Individuals create and form images based on their experiences with the organization and the leadership of the organization. According to Shields (2004), "Image formation is an emotional and psychological process that is based on other experiences that the individual has had with a particular person, company, or object in the past and in the present. … The past and present experiences influence the perceptions of and the possibility for future experiences" (p. 8).

Shields (2004) noted that organizational im-

age can ebb and flow based on the audience's understanding of the organization and attachment/involvement with the organization. Thus, an organization can have a variety of images and use these different images with multiple audiences. As she noted, "The image of the corporation is no longer only determined by the symbols that are chosen." The terms and symbols used and associated with certain sororities can prompt a viewer or listener to connect the visual elements associated with the term. For example, the pyramids, ivy, and doves have explicit meanings to members of Delta Sigma Theta, Alpha Kappa Alpha, and Zeta Phi Beta, respectively. Per Hatch (1997), for sorority members, these symbols have a tangible form and ascribed meaning.

Research Questions

Organizational identity can be socially constructed though stereotyping behaviors. As previously noted, stereotypes surrounding historically Black sorority organizations have been grounded in gender norms, colorism, and elitism (Whaley, 2010). The present study was intended to examine how these stereotypes might affect sorority members' experiences. Specifically, the authors posed the following research questions:

- How do sorority members make meaning of and understand the ideals of femininity in relationship to the stereotypes and perceptions of the four National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) sororities?
- How do members of the four NPHC sororities understand and perceive colorism and elitism in relation to their own organization and with other organizations?

METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Instrument

Based on the theoretical framework and the research questions, the researchers used in-depth interviews to gather "detailed description of situations, events, people, interactions, and observed behaviors" (Patton, 1980, p. 22). This study also attempted to understand the complexity of the social interactions at play in sorority identities and how sorority members attributed these interactions (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Through in-depth interviews, the researchers examined the constructions and projections of organization identity and stereotypes in the four NPHC sororities. Because an in-depth interview is a "conversation with a purpose" (Rubin & Rubin, 1995), the researchers used a semi-structured protocol during the interview. A key list of questions and probes was developed based on the concepts articulated in the literature review. For example, the researchers adopted the colorism questions from Cain (2006). The instrument used for this study is included as Appendix A. Interview participants were also free to introduce new topics, and in those instances the researchers allowed the participants to "tell their story in their own terms" (McCracken, 1988, p. 34) through tangential but meaningful conversations.

Selection of Data and Variables

To obtain representation from each organization, the researchers used quota sampling, a type of purposive sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1999). Quota sampling is a sampling strategy that allows the researcher to find participants based on certain criteria until certain parameters, or quotas, are met. In an effort to gain as much diversity and representation from the scores of women who are members of the NPHC sororities, the researchers attempted to interview a minimum of three members of each organization.

Demographics of the participants

Between November 2009 and January 2010, the researchers interviewed 18 participants. Demographically, two were members of Zeta Phi Beta, three were members of Alpha Kappa

Alpha, and four were members of Sigma Gamma Rho. The majority of the participants, nine, were members of Delta Sigma Theta. Seventeen of the participants were graduate members of the four sororities, and only one was a member of a campus undergraduate chapter. The average age of the participants was 33.5; the median age was 31. The youngest two participants were 22, and the oldest participant was 64 years old. Only one participant became a member of her sorority through a graduate, post-collegiate chapter. The majority of participants who joined at the undergraduate level (*n* = 12) were initiated at predominantly White institutions.

Data Analysis

For data analysis, the researchers used the constant comparative method and coding strategies from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Green & Thorogood, 2004; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Strauss and Corbin presented three coding procedures based on constant comparative methods that provided greater clarity, specificity, and detail on how to proceed with analysis. Open coding, the first level of coding, is the discovery of initial concepts, dimensions, and properties in the data. Doing a microanalysis or a thorough line-by-line reading of the data, the researcher codes for themes, patterns, and occurrences of meaning and to "open or 'fracture' the data … to generate as many potential codes as possible" (Green & Thorogood, 2004, p. 181). Axial coding, the second level of coding, is the establishment of relationships between the categories, properties, and the dimensions. The coding is done around the "axis" or category. Both open coding and axial coding can be done at the same time. The final level of coding is selective coding; the researcher must integrate the codes together to form a cohesive theory. Also, the researcher must choose a central category that has analytic power and sufficiently binds the research together.

The definitions of sorority were constant across all women and all the sororities. Each participant defined her organization as based on core principles of social progress and racial uplift through service and sisterhood. Each also defined sorority within the parameters of sisterhood, scholarship, service, and commitment. For many, the empowering components of sorority were the bonds and friendships that developed within the sisterhood. Joining was noted by many as becoming a part of a group of like-minded people who had a common purpose and similar interests. As one member stated, becoming a member of a sorority meant engaging in a "commitment to similar belief systems." Several women individually discussed the fact that each of the four NPHC sororities is based on the same tenets of sisterhood.

Even though the majority of the participants agreed that all of the sororities were attempting to achieve the same set of principles, stereotypes and perceptions influenced their understandings of the other organizations. The participants also discussed the prevalence of the sorority stereotypes in the fraternity/sorority community, the media influence on these perceptions of Black sororities, and how organizations and members might change these perceptions.

Stereotypes about the Sororities from Other Historically Black Sorority Members

Perceptions and stereotypes of Alpha Kappa Alpha. To describe Alpha Kappa Alpha, the participants used adjectives and phrases such as classy, rich and well-to-do, delicate, pretty, dainty, snobby, "siddity," prissy, and light-skinned with long hair. A Delta who described herself as "a tall, thin, pale straight-haired person" knew that most people thought she would be an Alpha Kappa Alpha member because of her physical appearance and, "some of them might assume that I was an AKA because of the

stereotype that AKAs are lighter. And I probably get from people, Black people, [when] we're talking about sororities, many would probably assume that I'm an AKA."

A member of Delta Sigma Theta had a best friend whose mother was a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha and from an early age, she knew that she would not become a member of the organization because of the mother's attitude and appearance: "She was the stereotypically AKA, you know, light skin, long hair, siddity, that sort of thing. And it was always a turn off to me at an early age because I really didn't identify myself as that, being the, I guess, that stereotypical female."

A member of Zeta Phi Beta who was initiated in the Southeast considered the members to be "very girly; they're very pretentious from what I can see." After looking at the organizations and knowing her friends and family within Alpha Kappa Alpha, she was not convinced that the organization was a fit for her. She noted: "I'm sure that is a stereotype. I have many, many, many friends who are AKAs, but it just as a whole sorority it didn't seem like, it didn't fit my personality."

The mismatch between the stereotypes of a sorority versus the experiences of group members is a common theme from the interviews. One member of Alpha Kappa Alpha was astounded when she first heard of the stereotypes because the common and persistent perceptions of her organization were not a part of her lived experience as a member:

When I was in undergrad, we had a girl sign our website one time and said, "just because y'all driving fancy cars and all y'all are light skinned." And all of us—we just deleted the comment because we were thinking: What? Most of us were brown to dark-skinned. And I think the fanciest car any of us had was a Solara or something like that, you know. Like none of us were ballin', so I was like, what is

she talking about? So I guess it's just something that's been passed down, and people just assume even before they get to know somebody, they must be a part of this stereotype if they're in an organization.

Perceptions and stereotypes of Delta Sigma Theta. Among the interview participants, members of Delta Sigma Theta were classified or labeled at two extremes: as business-oriented, service-focused, involved, hardworking, cool, laidback, and down-to-earth women or as tough, "ghetto," and aggressive women who were prone to fight. Members of the sorority saw the organization as one full of professional women. One member who was initiated in the South remembered her cousin went to her same university and became a member of Delta Sigma Theta. This connection led her to the organization when she saw the members were "about business, being on target, having it together. You have to have goals."

The negative perceptions of the Delta Sigma Theta members were that the members were angry and aggressive. One participant said that the "Deltas are a little bit of the loose cannon girls. Even if they are business-like, they're the ones that if you find out someone got arrested for a fight, she's probably a Delta." The perception of Delta Sigma Theta members as fighters was common as another participant (a member of Zeta Phi Beta) stated, "It's unfortunate that you may have an individual who is just a rabblerouser. Like if she had overalls on, she'd be throwing blows. It just happens that perhaps one time she's throwing blows, she has a Delta jacket on. So people see that individual who is fighting who happens to be a Delta; therefore, all Deltas are fighters."

Fewer participants mentioned stereotypes of Delta Sigma Theta members in term of skin color; however, if it was mentioned, they were always considered to be dark-skinned. As one member of the sorority stated:

My mother told me that the reason she

originally became a Delta was because she was sought by the Deltas and that even if she wanted to be an AKA she was too dark-skinned. So here we are my mother and her sisters have started what's now a family tradition; we have more than, like we almost have 70 Deltas in our family, counting extended family in our family. And you know the younger ones of us don't even know that, oh wow, this might have been just because of their skin color. Now it's something more.

The use of skin color to describe members was more prevalent for women in Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta than for other groups. These organizations are the oldest and largest of the four sororities in the National Pan-Hellenic Council. Historically the two groups have competed for members, awards, and recognition on college campuses (Giddings, 1994; Graham, 1999), which may be a reason for the continued comparison between the organizations.

Perceptions and stereotypes of Sigma Gamma Rho. The majority of participants from the other three organizations had limited knowledge of Sigma Gamma Rho and considered the organization to be less relevant because of its size and its lack of a presence on some campuses and in some communities. Even members of the organization acknowledged that perception. A member from the Midwest said: "With us not being so much in the limelight as you know other sorority organizations I'm not sure what negatives we have." For those who knew about the organization, the widest range in characteristics and attributes associated with the organization was for Sigma Gamma Rho. Only two major stereotypes or perceptions existed for Sigma Gamma Rho. Some participants saw them as the creative artists, and the smart and studious women who did hard work on campus. As one member stated:

We define ourselves as nerdy. We, even with two of us on the yard, we had the highest GPA. I don't know what (her sorority sister) was carrying, but we still had the highest GPA out of all the other organizations on campus, and this was spring '08 semester. We had the highest GPA that semester. I would say we are nerdy. A lot of my sorority sisters carried high 3 point (grade point averages). I guess that would be our biggest stereotype, we're nerdy. We still like to have fun.

Perceptions and stereotypes of Zeta Phi Beta. Along with being seen as compassionate and smart women, the members of Zeta Phi Beta were stereotyped and characterized most often as being portly, unattractive, homely, and dark-skinned women. As one member of Alpha Kappa Alpha stated, Zeta Phi Beta members were "country" and the third choice for women who could not get into her chapter or Delta Sigma Theta. A member of Zeta Phi Beta recalled hearing disparaging comments about the physical attributes of the her organization after she crossed (i.e., was initiated): "It was more in joking, you know, like half jokes so of course they would say, 'You know you don't even look like a Zeta' and 'You didn't even give AKA a chance' and 'Did you look at all of them?' so yeah, I don't know. It was fine. It was more like a half joke." A member of Sigma Gamma Rho from the Northeast noted that the biggest perception of Zetas was that they were ugly and masculine: "fat, manly, ugly—that stereotype does them a disservice because I think they're some of the hardest working women that I've seen, but I think that stereotype does them a disservice."

Regional differences in the stereotypes, specifically for Zeta Phi Beta existed. A Sigma Gamma Rho noted that obviously in different parts of the country, the stereotypes would change and shift: "It depends on where you are. It depends on who has the most people." A Delta Sig-

ma Theta member echoed the same sentiment, "If some of these stereotypes exist, they may exist depending on the type of campus. I'm sure there are distinctions between pledging at a Black campus and pledging a White campus, state school, private school, and it may also be determinant on the people who are selecting the pledges." A member of Zeta Phi Beta who crossed in Maryland saw the differences in her travels:

> I would say it depends on where you are. It depends on the region from what I can see. When I first went over and started touring and visiting, when I was really into it, it would depend. In the South, you would probably see more chapters who had heavyset girls, dark girls. Up north, well not up north, but in New York, no, all those young ladies ran the gambit. I've met sorority sisters who were Asian. I don't know. But just in general you know then when I have gone to meetings, um, it varies so technically it's just a perception. I think the perception is kind of skewed. But the reality is not the case.

Functions of Stereotypes in Sorority Life

In their acknowledgment of stereotypes, participants noted that individual members perpetuate these beliefs both within and beyond the chapter level. As a member of Zeta Phi Beta said, "We as Greeks keep stuff going." As one member of Sigma Gamma Rho said, "It goes from perception to reality when you say it." As evidenced in the interviews, many members of the sorority community were not knowledgeable about the other organizations and their histories. Thus, they relied on the perceptions drawn from their interactions prior to becoming members, and with their sisters after joining a sorority based on information received through informal socialization in the organization. As a member of Sigma Gamma Rho commented:

Whatever the stereotype is you're going to find some people that fit into that category just because that's human nature. There are going to be stuck-up AKAs because there are stuck-up people in the world. There are going to be dark-skinned Deltas because there are dark skinned people in the world. And maybe some of them just happen to be Deltas. I think stereotypes do fit. They kind of fit more because I think that some people get caught up in the nonsense, or kind of engrained in it, kinda like I said, passing down that kind of stuff. You need to act this way. This is how we do. So even if the person is not that way, outside of physical characteristics, if they're not that way, sometimes they try to fit in that way quote unquote because that's what they think their organization's supposed to be—if that makes sense. So I think we as NPHC organizations kinda uphold stereotypes forcing ourselves into these boxes to make us fit the stereotype.

Internally, or inside the historically Black sorority and fraternity community, those stereotypes are projected and reiterated through conversation. Externally, outside the historically Black sorority and fraternity community and to the general public, those stereotypes are reiterated through step shows, chants, calls, yard shows, and other public forums where member behaviors are on display. One participant, who is also a fraternity/sorority advisor, recalled a series of events on her campus that fueled stereotypes and perceptions based on the organizational members' actions at the events:

> This homecoming, the grad NPHC members from this show acted absolutely horrible. My supervisor and me were like who are the kids, and who are the alumni because they just came to the undergrad party when they had their own party and

just (laughs) tore the club up, acting ridiculous. At the step exhibition earlier in the day, you got AKAs who were doing the Deltas' Founders Chant and throwing this fake money on the stage, and just—doing stuff you would think you'd have to get undergrads for. Students in the audience are watching that, that's just going to fuel the Delta vs. AKA issue.

The participant felt frustrated and angered by the behaviors that were perpetuated in the name of the historically Black Greek organizations: "And students came back and said stuff about that. I was like here we go. You know these people act a fool and then they go home. And we're left to try and clean up the mess."

Although some members considered the stereotypes and perceptions as something that members did to joke with one another, they understood the serious repercussions outside of the organizations. One member of Delta Sigma Theta noted:

> I think it's funny that once I became a member I got a little bit exposed more and some of them we do just jokingly. Some of them, you know the AKAs are supposed to be pretty girls and it's funny to even hear. … I was with people my age and we were watching something on YouTube and they were like, "Oh my god, how did they let her in? I thought AKAs were pretty." And literally I stopped breathing for a second. I was like how does a 30-year-old person say something like that? This is a college-educated person who is playing into a stereotype.

A Delta Sigma Theta participant mentioned that all of the sorority members "perpetuate our own stereotypes internally and externally." Through personal actions and the use of disrespectful chants and regular talk, historically Black sorority members perpetuated the

stereotypes about their own organizations and other NPHC organizations. No sorority was immune, although the organization's leadership has not been known to sanction this behavior. This was a learned behavior most often occurring during members' socialization into the organization and resulting in the emission of stereotypes and derogatory statements in public demonstrations and private conversations. A member of Zeta Phi Beta stated: "Sometimes we as Greeks are the worst people because we keep stuff going that doesn't need to keep going." A member of Sigma Gamma Rho reiterated:

> Honestly a lot of the stereotypes come from our own organizations and our own chapters. I think NPHC groups do a very good job at a bad thing, which is passing down nonsense. That's where all the hazing comes from and everything else. I think perceptions and stereotypes are not immune from that. I think that a lot of times people don't check particular attitudes or stereotypes. I think that's where it comes from a lot. I think people just sit around and if someone has a SGR ho joke, it's like aha ha ha ha ha … or they engage in it or ignore it. And neither one is helpful. Nobody necessarily challenges it. And so then you have neos (new members) coming into organizations that think that's okay, or that's cute and funny, or that's what you're supposed to do because such-and-such did it and she's been in such-and-such years. It just kind of spirals down.

Many participants considered Alpha Kappa Alpha as the only organization whose members capitalized on its stereotypic portrayals. One participant mentioned that some members of Alpha Kappa Alpha engaged in "flipping" the stereotype or reversing the stereotype to their benefit. Flipping is the reimagining and reshaping of a stereotype where members deconstruct

the negative and form a positive self-identification for the label. Members will appropriate, upgrade, and embrace elements of the negative stereotype and making it a badge of honor within the organization. A collegiate member of Alpha Kappa Alpha agreed:

> Before I was a member (laughs) I was offended because I knew that it was an organization I wanted to be a part of. And I knew that it would be something that my name was tied to. So I mean like now that I am a member, you hear it so much either you blow it off or you roll with the punches and you kinda use the negative. So I guess we've kind of taken the whole stuck up thing and you'll hear it in chants, yes, we're stuck up, yes, we're conceited…. If I had someone come up and say to me you're stuck up and you're an AKA, I think I'd pretty much be offended because you just judged me based on my organization and not me.

Engaging in the stereotypes does create a *façade* or a false front as noted by one member of Sigma Gamma Rho who worked with an undergraduate chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha: "When they're together, it's kinda like we have to put on a show. They even say it. … It goes from perception to reality when you say it. But then when they're each individually alone it's not. It's like the guard is kinda let down."

Concern for the impact on their individual organizations was apparent for most participants. When members reiterated and acted upon the stereotypes of the organization, everyone and the entire messaging and identity of the organization suffered. The perceptions, stereotypes, and myths surrounding the organization, according to one participant, are "one of the driving forces behind all of the wrong. … A lot of the wrong that goes on have to do with the myths that we tell each other about what's supposed to be; what used to be. … Young sorors

and new sorors coming in believing it's the gospel. It does so much damage." A collegiate member of Alpha Kappa Alpha felt that the acting on the stereotypes of being prissy and pretty damaged the organization:

> A lot of people are kind of losing the meaning or not caring for the meaning of these organizations. And you'll have individuals who are joining not because you know you were founded over 100 years ago and you're still continuing to provide the community with service but because they want to be a pretty girl in 20 pearls. It's like, so I think by doing those things we are perpetuating them. And we're only hurting ourselves.

Getting Past the Stereotypes

Many participants noted that the contentious and competitive campus culture created an "us versus them" personality for members. In the "real world" post-college, people are focused on other demands. After graduation, the women focused on chapter and regional activities, not on other groups. Individual campus experiences can encourage thinking in extremes about other organizations, which lessened for participants after graduation. Yet the stereotypes persisted in some form, readily activated when solicited. An example of this was offered by a Sigma Gamma Rho member:

> I know that they're not true. I have friends in every organization. I've worked with every organization, and I continue to. But why do I continue to cling to some of the myths about each of the organizations? I truly don't know. I don't know. It's something that I'm going to have think about. … And you know more often than not, I concentrate about what we can do together. It's not something I go around thinking about on a daily basis. But as I'm talking to you, I'm going, "You still have

all those things in your head." All of that stuff, it's still there in the back your mind. You probably are still using some of those when you make decisions about who you want to work with on certain projects, or you know what I mean 'cause if I'm going to do something at the City Mission, am I thinking, "Oh I'm not going to ask the Alpha Kappa Alpha chapter 'cause they're not going to want to get dirty?"

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

At the start of this project, a fraternity member approached one of the researchers and said that doing this research perpetuated the ugliness within NPHC organizations. The goal of this research was not to traffic and promote stereotypes, but to shed light on what stereotypes exist and the influence of these stereotypes on organizational members. This is one of the first studies to examine the perceptions, stereotypes, symbols, and myths surrounding historically Black sororities, and this area is suitable for further exploration and investigation.

This research contributes to the literature on bias and the internalization of stereotypes of Black women (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2004; St. Jean & Feagin, 1998). By using an organizational lens to highlight how colorism can enforce stereotypes and consequentially distinguish the membership of sororities, we expand the current scholarship on historically Black sororities (Roberts & Wooten, 2008). Our research also adds to the scholarship on intersectionality by examining how women of color navigate space within a race, gender, and class hierarchy within the interracial environment of historically Black sororities (Collins, 1990; King, 1988). Harrison (2010) noted that historically the derogatory labels used by Blacks to describe others illustrates the power of prejudice and stereotypes (in that the group members being discriminated against buy into the system to such a degree that they begin using

it to discriminate against themselves), but in many ways helps to substantiate and further expand on notions of colorism for the general public.

One of the practical implications of this work is the expressed need that the four NPHC organizations must actively engage in the management of their organizational identities. If change is to occur, challenges to the stereotypes of each group must come from sorority leadership. This will not be without challenges, as even within the small sample of respondents featured in this study, members did not necessarily want change. Thus, one of the practical implications of this project is to reveal the divisiveness created within, between, and outside of the organizations.

This strand of research might be further developed by applying concepts from organizational and communication management to understand the creation of stereotypes and how these perceptions emerge. Scholars applying this framework might also explore how organizational messages implicitly and explicitly reiterate perceptions and stereotypes of sororities, and how to change and align internal and external images and perceptions with the organization's mission and vision. For example, research on the organization's presentation of its culture and identities might be studied via content analyses of step shows, stroll competitions, come out shows, and new initiate or proselyte presentations; public organizational documents such as brochures and media releases; and organizational websites. The perceptions of those who consume these messages might also be studied.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

By only examining the perceptions of those women who are members of the four sororities within the NPHC, the researchers attempted to understand how members understood and perceived other organizations and the impact of stereotyping on intragroup relations. Examin-

ing stereotypes held by group members helped further discussion on the historical influence of skin color and elite status of members and to understand how these stereotypes promote difference within and between the organizations. The stereotypes used to describe sororities are helpful to understand further the organizational identities ascribed to each group.

Interviews revealed that stereotypes played multiple roles in the cultures of historically Black sororities. The stereotypes identified served as distinctive markers for the different organizations and helped members identify boundaries of who fit in a specific group. That said, labeling behaviors can be negative, hurtful, and can cause frustration for those who do not fit. The stereotypes identified in this study were based on historical forms of colorism and classism, forms of intra-racial elitism the sorority leaders tend to downplay as part of the history of their organizations and as having an impact on their legacy and current membership.

Results from this study suggested problems associated with colorism seem to persist within the organizations, as appearance undergirded the discussions of sorority stereotypes. Often participants referred to color in conjunction with organizational stereotypes. Specifically with Alpha Kappa Alpha, the prevalent mentions were related to the perceived typical member of the sorority, light-skinned and long-haired. Although interviewees acknowledged this perception did not match their experiences, they still used those frames and tropes to define the membership of the organization. Additionally, Alpha Kappa Alpha members also used those same frames to position themselves and their organization.

Results also suggested that some members luxuriated in the stereotypes, even if the benefits were simply social or emotional. Belonging to a group with a well-respected organizational identity or brand has benefits, even if it is unofficial and unsanctioned. The interview data revealed Alpha Kappa Alpha members tended to be evaluated most favorably due to hegemonic beauty standards based on skin color politics. Additionally, Delta Sigma Theta members tended to be thought of as well-respected and hardworking. Although the respondents noted that many members did not fit the stereotypes, none of them argued that the public identity of the groups was incorrect.

Traditional femininity and the cult of true womanhood had definite impact on the roles and ideals of White sororities. Those same aspects influenced the feminine ideals that were the basis of the Negro clubwomen movement and its successor, the Black sorority. Stereotypes may fill in the gaps, as little other public information is available for people interested in locating where they most likely fit. The results of this study suggested sorority members engage in the reinforcement and reiteration of positive and negative stereotypes of the four NPHC sororities. Those stereotypes can combine with other forces to create a self-fulfilling prophecy and the continuation of misperceptions about skin color and elitism between the organizations.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Obtaining support and interest from the historically Black sorority community was challenging. Many members were understandably reticent to participate in research that may be critical of their respective organizations. A significant resulting limitation was the scope of the study. Though a cross-section of 18 participants were involved in the study, further research is warranted before broader generalizations may be made. Future research efforts that could strengthen this area of scholarship may include quantitative analyses of stereotypes, examining the perceptions of the sororities from those outside of the organizations (i.e., non-sorority and non-fraternity members), and looking at undergraduate members solely. Finally, this research focused on the perceptions and

stereotypes among the women for whom it matters the most: the members of the organizations. Examining the perceptions of historically Black sorority members among nonmember Black women would further facilitate a broader understanding of the stereotypes.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R., Buckley, P. M., & Tindall, N. (2011). Black Greek-letter fraternities and masculinity. In M. W. Hughey and G. S. Parks (Eds.), *Empirical Studies on Black Greek-Letter Organizations* (pp. 114-135). Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.

Bell, E. L. (2004). Myths, stereotypes, and realities of Black women: A personal reflection. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40, 146-159.

Bennett, L. (1993). *Before the Mayflower: A history of Black America* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Penguin.

Berkowitz, A., & Padavic, I. (1999). Getting a man or getting ahead: A comparison of White and Black sororities. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *27*, 530-557.

Bromley, D. B. (2000). Psychological aspects of corporate identity, image, and reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review, 3*, 240-252.

Cain, C. (2006). Sources, manifestations and solutions: Examining colorism among African-American and Afro-Caribbean women. Unpublished thesis, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Chen, E. W. C. (1998). The continuing significance of race: A case study of Asian-American women in White, Asian American, and African American sororities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist theory: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Cooperrider, D. L. (1990). Positive image, positive action: The affirmative basis of organizing. In S. Srivastva & D. L. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Appreciative management and leaderships: The power of positive thought and action in organizations* (pp. 91-125). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fine, E. C. (2004). *Soulstepping: African American step shows.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Gasman, M., Louison, P., & Barnes, M. (2008). Giving and getting: Philanthropic activity among Black Greek-letter organizations. In G. S. Parks (Ed.), *Black Greek-letter organizations in the 21st century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 187-212). Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Giddings, P. (1994). *In search of sisterhood: Delta Sigma Theta and the challenge of the Black sorority movement.* New York, NY: Harper Paperbacks.

Graham, L. O. (1999). *Our kind of people: Inside America's Black upper class.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Gray, E. R., & Balmer, J. M. T. (1998). Managing corporate image and corporate reputation. *Long Range Planning, 31*(5), 695-702.

Green, J., & Thorogood, N. (2004). *Qualitative methods for health research.* London, England: Sage.

Grunig, L. (1993). Image and symbolic leadership: Using focus groups to bridge the gap. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *5*, 95-125.

Harrison, M. S. (2010). Colorism: The often undiscussed "ism" in America's workforce. *The Jury Expert*, *22*, 67-72.

Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hernandez, M. (2008). Sisterhood beyond the ivory tower: An exploration of Black sorority alumnae membership. In G. S. Parks (Ed.), *Black Greek-letter organizations in the 21ˢᵗ century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 253-272). Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Hughey, M. W. (2006). Black, White, Greek … Like who? Howard University student perceptions of a White fraternity on campus. *Educational Foundations*, *20*(1/2), 9-35.

Hughey, M. W. (2007). Crossing the sands, Crossing the color-line: NonBlack members of historically Black Greek organizations. *Journal of African American Studies, 11*(1), 55-75.

Hughey, M. W. (2008). 'I did it for the brotherhood': NonBlack members of historically Black Greek-lettered organizations.Iin G. S. Parks (ed.). *Black Greek letter organizations in the 21st century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 313-343). Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Hughey, M. W. (2010). A paradox of participation: NonWhites in White sororities and fraternities. *Social Problems, 57*(4), 653-679.

Hunter, M. (2005). *Race, gender, and the politics of skin tone*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hurtado, A. (1999). *Disappearing dynamics of women of color*. (Working Paper No. 4). Boston, MA: Simmons Graduate School of Management Center for Gender in Organizations.

Kendall, D. (2002). *The power of good deeds: Privileged women and the social reproduction of the upper class.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

King, D. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 14*, 42-72.

Jones, C., & Shorter-Gooden, K. (2004). *Shifting: The double lives of Black women in America*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mahoney, M. R. (1997). *Racial construction and women as differentiated actors*. In R. & J. Stefancic (Eds.). *Critical White studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 305-309). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. H. (1999). *Qualitative data analysis* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Neumann, C. E. (2008). Black feminist thought in Black sororities. In G. S. Parks (Ed.), *Black Greek-letter organizations in the 21ˢᵗ century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 169-186). Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Parks, G. S. (2008). Introduction: Toward a critical sociology. In G. S. Parks (Ed.), *Black Greek-letter organizations in the 21ˢᵗ century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 1-18). Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Patton, M. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Plowman, K., & Chiu, S. (2007). Corporate identity and corporate reputation in Silicon Valley: Case studies in public relations and integrated communications. *Public Relations Journal*, *1*, 1-25.

Quarles, B. (1965). *The Negro in the making of America* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Collier Books.

Roberts, L. M., & Wooten, L. P. (2008). Exploring Black Greek-letter organizations through a positive organizing lens. In G. S. Parks (Ed.), *Black Greek-letter organizations in the 21st century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 273-290). Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Russell, K., Wilson, M., & Hall, R. (1992). *The color complex: The politics of skin color among African Americans*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Shields, A. (2004). *Managing relationships and reputations in the National Pan-Hellenic Council*. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Toronto, Canada.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stombler, M., & Padavic, I. (1997). Sister acts: Accommodation and resistance to men's domination in fraternity little sister programs. *Social Problems*, *44*, 257-275.

St. Jean, Y., & Feagin, J. R. (1998). *Double burden: Black women and everyday racism*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Turk, D. B. (2004). *Bound by a mighty vow: Sisterhood and women's fraternities, 1870-1920*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Whaley, D. E. (2010). *Disciplining women: Alpha Kappa Alpha, Black counterpublics, and the cultural politics of Black sororities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Whetten, D. A., & Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of organizational identity and its implications for the study of organizational reputation. *Business & Society, 41*(4), 393-414.

Whipple, E. G., Baier, J. L. & Grady, D. (1991). A comparison of Black and White Greeks at a predominantly White university. *NASAP Journal, 28*(2), 140-148.

Williams, S. L., & Moffitt, M. A. (1997). Corporate image as an impression formation process: Prioritizing personal, organizational, and environmental audience factors. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *9*, 237-258.

Wright, L. (1997). Who's Black, who's White, and who cares. In R. Delgado & J. Stefanic (Eds.), *Critical White studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 164-169). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

Natalie T. J. Tindall (Ph.D., University of Maryland) is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at Georgia State University. Her teaching area is public relations, and the major theme of her research is the intersections of identity and power in organizations. She is a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

Marcia D. Hernandez (Ph.D., University of Albany-SUNY) is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at The University of the Pacific. Her teaching areas are race, gender and theories, and her scholarship covers sociology of education, popular culture and media studies.

Matthew W. Hughey (Ph.D., University of Virginia) is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at Mississippi State University. His teaching and research areas are race and ethnicity, cultural sociology, media studies, and symbolic interaction. He is a member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc.

Personal Information
- What is your full name?
- What is your age?
- Where were you born?
- Where were you raised?
- To what sorority do you belong?
  - When were you initiated?
  - In what chapter?
  - Are you currently financial/active?
  - If yes, in what chapter?
  - If no, why not?

Sorority Life
- How do you define the word "sorority"?
  - Probe: When you hear that word, what do you think about?
  - Probe: Do you believe that word applies to the other organizations? Why or why not?
- What made you join XXXXXX (organization name)?
  - What appealed to you?
- When did you make that decision?
- Before you crossed/became a member, where you told that you fit or match a sorority's stereotype or perception?
  - If yes, which ones?

Perceptions of Other Sororities
- What are your perceptions of the other sororities?
- Where do these perceptions come from?
- Where did you hear or learn about these perceptions?
- How much emphasis do you place on these perceptions?

Racial/Ethnic Identity
- How do you racially identify?
- How do you ethnically identify?
- Have you always used these words to describe your racial identity? If not, what other words have you used?
- At what age did you begin identifying this way?
- How would you describe your skin tone?
  - Why that term?
  - Where did you get that terminology from?
- [ ] Very Light
- [ ] Light Brown
- [ ] Medium
- [ ] Dark
- [ ] Very Dark

Colorism

- Let's first start by defining what colorism means to you.
  - How old were you when you began noticing color issues? Can you describe the circumstances involved?
- How do you define colorism? What prompted you to participate in this discussion?
- How is (has) your life shaped because of your skin colors? (i.e. What does it mean to be an "X" skinned Black woman)?
- What types of names, either positive or negative, have you used or heard when referring to people with light skin? (List as many as you can think of…)
- What types of names, either positive or negative, have you used or heard when referring to people with a medium skin tone? (List as many as you can think of…)
- What types of names, either positive or negative, have you used or heard when referring to people with dark skin? (List as many as you can think of…)
- What stereotypes do you think are associated with light-skinned women? Dark-skinned women? Women with medium-skin tone?
- Does skin color affect any aspect of your life? If so, what aspects? Do you think this is true for other African American/Black women?

Learning about Colorism

- At what age did you become conscious of your skin color and the meaning/value of different skin tones?

Sorority Life and Colorism

- When did you become conscious of skin color and the sorority stereotypes?
- Tell me about your experiences with colorism in your sorority.

Community/Friends and Colorism

- In reflecting on your everyday experiences, how are you made aware of colorism in your day-to-day interactions?
- How significant is the issue of colorism among your peers?
- In what ways foes skin color affect your interactions and relationships with other Black women? Black men?
- What are the skin tones of the Black women in your current friendship groups? In what ways (if any) have your views/beliefs about skin tone impacted who you have developed friendships?
- How do you think your generation views this issue, compared to other generations (i.e., how are you a product of your generation in light of this issue?)

Femininity

- What does the word "femininity" mean to you?
- When someone mentions femininity/masculinity, what comes to mind?
  - Probe: Why do those things come to mind?
- How do you feel about masculinity/femininity and your sorority? How do you think others perceive it in association with your organization?

FRATERNITY AND SORORITY THRIVING:
A RESIDENTIAL PERSPECTIVE

MATTHEW VETTER

When provided with the space and resources common to residential learning communities, fraternity and sorority residences are often viewed as synonymous to the risky behaviors associated with fraternal organizations. The purpose of this study was to compare the levels of thriving of fraternity and sorority members in various living environment to their nonaffiliated peers using the Thriving Quotient. Fraternity and sorority members' type of residence was not found to be associated with student thriving, although living closer to campus was positively associated with Social Connectedness and negatively associated with Engaged Learning. Fraternity and sorority membership overall was positively associated with Academic Determination and Social Connectedness, and negatively associated with Engaged Learning. Implications for intentionally creating living-learning communities and maximizing the residential experience of fraternity and sorority residences are discussed.

Decades of studies have been dedicated to understanding the positive and negative correlates to fraternity and sorority membership. A significant number of researchers have noted negative outcomes, including associations with hazing, alcohol consumption, binge drinking, and a plethora of other negative correlates (Page & O'Hegarty, 2006; Penn, 1974; Tampke, 1990; Wechsler, Kuh, & Davenport, 1996). With such a presence on college campuses, some researchers and student affairs professionals have questioned the continued existence of social fraternities (Kuh, Pascarella, & Wechsler, 1996; Maisel, 1990; Winston & Saunders, 1987). On the other hand, at least some researchers believe fraternal organizations hold some degree of unrealized potential to positively influence student learning and development (Winston & Saunders, 1987).

One of the most iconic parts of fraternities and sororities is the house or place of residence. As such, fraternity and sorority residences are often viewed as synonymous to the risky behaviors associated with fraternal organizations. In an effort to address risk management concerns, some campuses have developed alternative forms of fraternity and sorority housing or opted to remove official fraternity housing altogether (Kellogg, 2001; Shea, 1995). Yet in comparison to the amount of research dedicated to understanding the correlates to fraternity and sorority membership, little research has addressed how fraternity/sorority residences may affect student learning and development.

To meet the needs of students and address risk management concerns, an examination of which facilities support fraternity and sorority members' success is needed. Rather than take a strictly corrective approach, a positive psychology approach (Seligman & Csikzentmihalyi, 2000) would address the characteristics of the living environment so that an optimal residence may be designed. Recent research by Schreiner, McIntosh, Nelson, and Pothoven (2009a) has verified an instrument grounded in positive psychology, the Thriving Quotient, designed to assess the predictors of student success. Such a tool may provide information to assess the comparative ability of student residences to promote student success and thriving.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to compare the levels of thriving of fraternity and sorority members in various living environments to

their nonaffiliated peers. Many variables may affect a student's living environment, including the location on or off campus, the distance from campus, the type of physical residence (e.g., house, apartment), the relationship of living-mates, and the affiliation with the housing unit to a fraternity or sorority. As a measure of student success, the Thriving Quotient (Schreiner, et al., 2009a) was used as part of a larger multi-institutional study.

The primary hypothesis was that official on-campus fraternity and sorority housing provided students with the living environment most likely to promote thriving. Three secondary hypotheses provided additional direction to this study:

Fraternity and sorority members, regardless of their residence, are more likely to experience higher levels of thriving in the domains of Social Connectedness and Positive Perspective and will report higher levels of overall thriving than their non-affiliated peers.

Fraternity and sorority members who live closer to campus than their affiliated peers will report higher levels of thriving.

A shared residential experience among members of a fraternity or sorority, defined by a higher number of fraternity or sorority members in a shared residence, will be associated with higher levels of thriving than students with fewer fraternity or sorority members in their residence.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Campus administrators responsible for fraternity and sorority housing have developed a myriad of options. In some cases, fraternity and sorority members may reside in official housing in the traditional form of fraternity houses or alternatively through townhomes, apartments, designated residence hall floors or hallways, or smaller residence hall suites. In other instances, either due to the college banning the aforementioned housing options or through the lack of available housing for all fraternity and sorority

members, some affiliated students may live in traditional residence halls, off-campus housing, or occasionally in the housing units of other fraternities or sororities.

Few studies have been published assessing the effect of fraternity/sorority housing solutions. Furthermore, even fewer studies have examined the potential benefits and drawbacks to traditional fraternity and sorority housing versus the alternative housing options that some college officials have explored. Identifying residences that best support affiliated students' collegiate success may help administrators implement plans that are intentionally designed to facilitate the growth and development of students.

Fraternities and sororities have an incredible potential to educate young adults outside the classroom. As advisors to these organizations and their constituents, student affairs professionals have a responsibility to ensure affiliated students have the opportunity to make the most out of the fraternity or sorority experience. Yet the lack of research in the area of fraternity and sorority housing has limited the ability of administrators to intentionally facilitate this key component of the fraternity and sorority experience. By addressing these assumptions about the experiences of fraternity and sorority members through research, student affairs professionals may be able to better facilitate positive experiences for these students. Constructing intentional living environments, drafting policies, and programming to affiliated students are just a few ways expanded research in this area may assist student affairs professionals, maximizing the potential of the fraternity and sorority residential experience.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent years, a plethora of research has been conducted on the residential experience and associated student outcomes. However, few of these studies have examined the comparative experience of students in fraternity and sorority

housing, and fewer still have reviewed fraternity and sorority members not living in their fraternity or sorority residence. Many studies presented residence life and fraternity life as dichotomous student experiences (e.g., Blimling, 1999; Hallenbeck, Dickman, & Fuqua, 2003), and therefore do not account for fraternity and sorority members living in residence halls or other residential environments.

In many of the studies that assess broader fraternity and sorority involvement, no cross analysis has been conducted for fraternity and sorority members residing within or outside of residence halls (e.g., Scharmer, 2005). In some research on college student housing, fraternity and sorority members living in official fraternity/sorority residences are intentionally excluded as a means of creating a more homogeneous sample (e.g., Pike, 1999). In this way, the fraternity and sorority experience has been generalized to the experience of those students living in official fraternity and sorority residences.

Research on Fraternity and Sorority Housing

Before researchers began to analyze the learning and development taking place in fraternity and sorority residences, the concept that fraternity houses were places of development had to be adopted. A series of articles published in the late 1960s and early 1970s explored variables associated with living in fraternity and sorority housing, yet largely through the lens of demographic correlates to residence type (Maurais, 1968; Kuder, 1972; Rago, 1973; Rappaport, et al., 1972). Leading up to the publication of *Learning Reconsidered* (NASPA & ACPA, 2004), a fresh perspective on fraternity residences was being developed.

In 1993, Terenzini, Pascarella, and Bliming suggested that the close residential communities that fraternities often develop are similar to the formal residential living-learning communities developed by administrators. Not long afterward in fraternity and sorority-themed

editions of *New Directions for Student Services*, Whipple and Sullivan (1998a; 1998b) compared fraternities to living-learning communities and suggested that colleges and universities do more to create a learning-centered atmosphere in fraternity housing. These authors' concept of fraternal organizations as communities of learners suggests that student affairs professionals should reconsider their assumptions about fraternity and sorority housing and take steps to intentionally develop meaningful learning environments for these students.

Since the turn of the century, several articles have examined the fraternity and sorority residential experience. One part of this dialogue and research has focused on on-campus versus off-campus fraternity and sorority housing. Coley and Henry (2000) identified seven positive outcomes associated with on-campus fraternity and sorority living: (1) stronger sense of community, (2) increased retention, (3) enhanced institutional involvement and guidance, (4) elevated sense of accountability, (5) improved institutional collaboration, (6) symbol of commitment and enhanced recruitment, and (7) a return to values. The authors advocated that on-campus fraternity and sorority housing can facilitate both the educational and social outcomes that fraternal organizations were founded to achieve. Although Coley and Henry based their opinions largely on anecdotal evidence from their experience at Mercer University, the ideals for which they advocate represent the strong potential for on-campus fraternity and sorority housing.

The opinions of Coley and Henry (2000) were echoed by Morettes (2010) in her study of the perceptions of fraternity and sorority members who moved from off-campus to on-campus fraternity/sorority housing. Morettes' qualitative research on fraternity and sorority members' perceptions of academic success, student retention, and residential community in fraternity/sorority housing revealed much about the differences between on- and off-campus living environments. Participants in the study exposed

significant differences in the two environments, ranging from greater financial security and improved maintenance to better laundry services. Perhaps the most significant finding from this research was the relationships between on-campus residences and academic success. Participants in the study reported that the environment at off-campus chapter houses negatively affected academic performance due to the fact that:

1. There was no accountability for attendance at academic study hours and the chapter facilities were not utilized for academic purposes, and

2. The chapter facility negatively affected the academic performance of residents. (p. 54)

In contrast to the off-campus facilities, the on-campus chapter houses offered a clean and safe leaning environment, enforced study and quiet hours, and a popular study room within the facility. These features were reportedly influential in improving the academic focus of residents and the overall academic environment. These findings suggest that on-campus fraternity and sorority housing may offer a better living and learning environment that off-campus equivalent housing arrangements.

Another fraternity and sorority housing research theme has been how the physical space may be constructed to foster community and student growth. Gratto, Gratto, Henry, and Miller (2002) specifically addressed this component through their reflections upon the development and construction of a new fraternity/sorority residential community at the University of South Florida. Grounded in research on student centered physical learning environments, the authors entered into the construction process with the goals of creating on-campus, university-constructed fraternity and sorority residences that would enhance within-group affiliations for individual chapters and the larger fraternity/sorority community; prevent a divide between affiliated and nonaf-

filiated students; create a centralized campus community; and prevent competition among fraternities and sororities based on their physical residence. To promote community within individual chapters, housing units were designed to be large enough to accommodate 20-28 members with an included common area and chapter room. Housing units were constructed in a duplex style and all of the units were internally positioned around a common area to create a communal feel and link each chapter to the fraternity/sorority community. In an attempt to integrate the fraternity and sorority community to the larger university community, the housing complex was placed in close vicinity to the traditional on-campus housing, and all of the units were similarly managed by the department of residence services. Finally, competition between fraternities and sororities was reduced by constructing each unit uniformly with unique landscaping and décor. All of these features allowed for a shared fraternity and sorority experience while remaining integrated into the larger university community.

With fraternity and sorority residences being developed to improve academic success and foster community, it is no surprise that researchers have begun to compare fraternity/sorority housing to living-learning communities. At some campuses such as Miami University (OH), living in a fraternity or sorority house qualifies as fulfilling the sophomore living-learning community residency requirement (Lorenzetti, 2006). To support decisions such as this, Blackburn and Janosik (2009) examined the extent to which fraternity and sorority members experience learning outcomes in their fraternity or sorority residence similar to those experienced by students in typical living-learning communities.

To assess fraternity and sorority members' residential experience, the authors surveyed fraternity and sorority members living in fraternity/sorority residences using the Learning Communities Assessment. This instrument used a 10-point Likert-type scale with distinct do-

mains including active engagement, learning, sense of community, and identity. The results indicated that participants scored highly on active engagement and sense of community, but scored lower on learning. Results on the sense of identity subsection were mixed, with fraternity and sorority members scoring high on some items but low on others.

Several additional trends emerged when examining the contrasting results of fraternities versus sororities. Fraternity members cited improved writing skills and critical thinking skills as a result of their living environments at significantly higher levels than their sorority counterparts. Furthermore, fraternity men rated their experience significantly higher on two items: "everyone knows who belonged to our group" and "we developed our own way of doing things" (Blackburn & Janosik, 2009, p. 66). Both of the later items were in the Sense of Community subscale.

Blackburn and Janosik (2009) made significant progress toward quantitatively assessing fraternity and sorority residences as living-learning communities. However, a number of limitations and shortcomings restrict the extent to which the research succeeded in accomplishing its purpose. In studying fraternity and sorority residences, the authors missed several opportunities to increase the amount of knowledge generated from their study. One of the study's stated objectives was to "examine the degree to which members living in fraternity/sorority housing experienced learning outcomes associated with living in a learning community" (Blackburn & Janosik, 2009, p. 57). No data were published comparing the results of fraternity and sorority residences to other living-learning communities or traditional housing options, the results relied upon individual items from the instrument that were not independently validated, and no control group was used. This lost opportunity would have provided relevant data on the comparative experiences of student housing options. In addition, the

study sampled both on-campus and off-campus fraternity residences but failed to compare or contrast these groups.

At the campus where the research took place, on-campus and off-campus fraternity housing differed based on size and location of the residences. The differences could potentially have significant implications in terms of the student experience. Again, the failure to analyze or report these data was a missed opportunity. Nevertheless, Blackburn and Janosik (2009) demonstrated that fraternity and sorority housing may result in improved developmental and learning outcomes for residents.

Research on Thriving

A plethora of quantitative instruments exist for research on college students and their environment, each with distinct variables and characteristics. Yet when seeking to gain a holistic perspective on a student's success during college, fewer instruments match the criteria. The Thriving Quotient provides a means of assessing the extent that students' academic, intrapersonal, and interpersonal characteristics predict academic success and retention (Schreiner, McIntosh, Nelson, & Pothoven, 2009a). Grounded in the field of positive psychology and related to the concept of flourishing (Keyes & Haidt, 2003), the term thriving has been used to describe college students "who are fully engaged intellectually, socially, and emotionally" (Schreiner, 2010a, p. 4). In this way, thriving includes the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and academic dimensions of student success. Thriving may be further broken down into five factors: Engaged Learning, Diverse Citizenship, Academic Determination, Positive Perspective, and Social Connectedness. These independent factors encompass many of the experiences and attitudes of students during college.

Perhaps the most overlooked dimension of student success in recent research that is examined by the Thriving Quotient is the variable of intrapersonal thriving. Intrapersonal thriving is

measured by the domain of Positive Perspective. Students demonstrating strong intrapersonal development and scoring highly on measures of Positive Perspective demonstrate an optimistic explanatory style, are able to envision future success, and are able to understand and apply their strengths (Schreiner, 2010a). These skills may be learned and developed in college so that students may achieve more during and after their collegiate experience.

Academic thriving encompasses more than achieving good grades during college and is measured by the domains of Academic Determination and Engaged Learning. Schreiner (2010b) outlined Engaged Learning as a compilation of meaningful processing, focused attention, and active participation. Students who are engaged academically make connections from their coursework to extracurricular activities and are psychologically engaged in course material. Furthermore, these students are more likely to be satisfied with the learning process, to interact with faculty outside of class, and to report higher learning gains in college (Schreiner, 2010b, p. 4). Academic Determination is reflected in students' investment of effort, self-regulated learning, environmental mastery, and goal-directed thinking. Students who demonstrate persistence through challenging work, believe their effort will contribute to their academic success, and develop strategies to reach their academic goals demonstrate high levels of Academic Determination. In this way, through both Academic Determination and Engaged Learning, thriving incorporates a multifaceted approach to the academic learning experience.

Interpersonal thriving is reflected in the domains of Social Connectedness and Diverse Citizenship. Social connectedness refers to the sense of community and healthy relationships with peers (Schreiner, 2010c). Beyond developing a support network, strong Social Connectedness may be demonstrated by social integration into campus as a member of a community of learners. Diverse Citizenship encompasses an openness to diversity and a commitment to making the world a better place. Students who demonstrate Diverse Citizenship "not only are open to diverse viewpoints and value differences in others, but they also believe that it is their responsibility to contribute to the community around them and make a positive difference" (Schreiner, 2010c, p. 8). The dual effect of Diverse Citizenship and Social Connectedness is a student who has developed mature interpersonal relations and is thriving in college.

While all five domains of thriving represent distinct individual qualities, the broader concept of thriving has been shown to be a second-order factor based on the cumulative effect of all five domains. Thriving has been shown to account for 12-22% of the variance in student success outcome variables above and beyond other individual and institutional characteristics (Schreiner, Edens, & McIntosh, 2011). In comparison, institutional and student background variables only contribute between 1-7% of the variance for student persistence, satisfaction, and fit (Schreiner, Pothoven, Nelson, & McIntosh, 2009b).

The construct of thriving as defined by the Thriving Quotient has been shown to effectively measure student vitality and success. Furthermore, the instrument accounts for a broad range of student experiences and may account for the many dimensions of fraternity and sorority life. Using a broad construct such as thriving to assess fraternity and sorority housing may provide a more holistic perspective and allow for meaningful comparisons of student experiences.

METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Instrument

Understanding the differences in student success by residence and fraternity or sorority involvement was achieved through the implementation of a correlational design, the distinguishing nominative variable being fraternity or sorority membership. A cross-sectional study

was implemented as an appropriate means of evaluating the effectiveness of mostly unchanging living environments. The independent variables were fraternity or sorority membership, residential location (on or off campus), residence type, and distance from campus. The dependent variable was student self-report scores on the Thriving Quotient and its five domains (Schreiner, McIntosh, Nelson, & Pothoven, 2009a).

The current study was implemented as part of a multi-institutional national survey designed to validate the newly created Thriving Quotient (Schreiner, McIntosh, Nelson, & Pothoven, 2009a). Items on the Thriving Quotient were scaled on a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*) (see Appendix A). Previous studies have established the Thriving Quotient as internally valid in the five factors of Engaged Learning (A = .85), Diverse Citizenship (A = .80), Academic Determination (A = .83), and Positive Perspective (A = .83), and established the validity of the Thriving Quotient as a whole (A = .91; Schreiner, McIntosh, Nelson, & Pothoven, 2009a). In addition to the core instrument, a number of demographic items supplemented the survey and offered a larger perspective on the levels of thriving among different student groups. Finally, specific to the host institution for this study, three additional items were included related to fraternity and sorority residence type, designed to test the core and secondary hypothesis (see Appendix B). Together, the Thriving Quotient, demographic questions, and institution specific items created the online survey administered to students.

Following approval by the Institutional Review Board and the National Panhellenic Council, members of the fraternity and sorority community were notified of the study through an email sent via listservs administered by the institution's Panhellenic Council and Interfraternity Council. The email informed students of the study's purpose, revealed its relationship to the institution's Greek Life Office, and encour-aged them to participate. Although the study was promoted through the Greek Life Office, the researcher was not a part of the office. However, the researcher worked in the adjoining student activities office and therefore was familiar with many of the students in the fraternity/sorority community. For this reason, the promotional email to students included notes about confidentiality and the use of the data.

Based on responses to the listserv request, students were randomly sampled to participate in the study received an invitation via email to their university account on April 29, 2010. Included in the email was the letter of consent and a link to the Thriving Quotient in an online format. A second reminder letter of a similar format was sent one week later. As part of a multi-institutional study, the online survey was administered by representatives of the national project. These researchers were able to insert additional survey items for each institution through the online survey tool Survey Monkey. As a result, the fraternity and sorority housing-specific questions in Appendix B were only administered at a single institution. Following the survey administration, representatives of the national project collected the data, compiled the multi-institutional data, and distributed each participating institution their respective results.

Selection of Data and Variables

The population for this study was college student members of social fraternities and sororities. A stratified random sample was drawn from the general undergraduate population attending a single institution. Of the 1,400 students sampled, half were selected based on fraternity/sorority membership according to institutional research records, and half were randomly selected from the general population as a control group. The sample of fraternity and sorority members represented slightly less than half of the population. Fraternity and sorority members were oversampled to gain sufficient data for correlation analysis. Unlike the previous research

samples using the Thriving Quotient (Schreiner, McIntosh, Nelson, & Pothoven, 2009a), the current study's sample included non-traditional aged students.

Several institutional characteristics helped define how the survey was designed and implemented. At the host institution, fraternity/ sorority involvement is defined as active membership in a local chapter of a National Interfraternity Council (NIC), the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC), or National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) organization. At the time of the survey, 26 national fraternities and sororities were on campus, composing 9.5% of the

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Variable	Number (N)	Valid Percentage
Sex		
Female	55	61.8
Male	34	38.2
Class Level		
Freshman	11	12.2
Sophomore	9	8.6
Junior	25	27.8
Senior	42	46.7
Other	3	3.3
Race/Ethnicity		
Caucasian/White	73	81.1
African-American/Black	5	5.6
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	2.2
Asian-American/Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	2	2.2
Latino	2	2.2
Multiracial	2	2.2
Prefer not to respond	4	4.4

Frequencies of participant responses indicated a heterogeneous sample suitable for comparative analysis. Participation in fraternity and sorority life was balanced among participants, with 36% reporting no involvement (see Table 2). Sixty-eight percent of respondents reported living off campus, which closely matched the institutional characteristic. However, 68% reported living on campus or within one mile of campus. Shared residences with fraternity and sorority members were common among participants with 20% of respondents reporting living with four or more members.

TABLE 2

Involvement Characteristics of Respondents

Involvement Variable	Number (N)	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
How often do you participate in fraternity or sorority life on campus?			
Never	32	36.0	36.0
Once a week or less	4	4.5	40.4
2-3 times a week or so	2	2.2	42.7
About once a day	2	2.2	44.9
2-3 times a day	2	2.2	47.2
4 or more times a day	47	52.8	100.0
Where do you live?			
On campus	28	31.5	
Off campus	61	68.5	
In your current residential setting, how many fraternity or sorority members do you live with?			
One	18	42.9	42.9
Two	13	31.0	73.8
Three	3	7.1	81.8
Four or more	8	19.0	100.0
What is your current residence's distance from campus?			
On campus	23	26.9	26.7
Within 1 mile of campus	31	36.0	62.8
1-5 miles from campus	12	14.0	76.7
6-10 miles from campus	7	8.1	84.9
More than 10 miles from campus	13	15.1	100.0

Given the stratified sampling method used in the study, the confidentiality of participants prevented the researcher from matching responses to the sample groups. Participants were therefore asked to self-report their involvement in fraternity and sorority life during the survey. A strong possibility exists that as a consequence of this sampling method, several respondents from the control group may have reported high involvement in fraternity or sorority life. Responses to other items related to student behavior and involvement were largely on par with institutional norms.

student body. Four NIC fraternities and three NPC sororities had official fraternity and sorority houses on campus with a total capacity for 85 students, although considerably less typically reside in the residences. No official off-campus residences or alternative housing arrangements existed for fraternities and sororities, although it is well known that many fraternity and sorority members live on campus.

Analysis and Results

Frequencies

Although 105 responses were collected, a number of participants did not complete the entire Thriving Quotient. Incomplete responses were not filtered from the data set. Therefore, the response rate for the Thriving Quotient factors ranged from 6.1% for Diverse Citizenship and 6.4% for Social Connectedness. The response rate for the entire Thriving Quotient was 5.9%. The response rate represents a significant weakness of the study and is discussed further under Limitations.

Demographic variables used to understand the students' background included items assessing gender, age, class level, and race/ethnicity. The mean age of participants was 23.08 (sd = 6.97) with a median age of 21, thus reflecting the skewed results toward upperclassmen. Because of a limited number of respondents to some items such as race/ethnicity, no cross analysis were conducted to protect participant confidentiality. In addition, due to incomplete surveys, the percentage for each demographic group displayed in Table 1 reflects the valid percentage based only upon the percentage of respondents to the particular item.

Primary Hypothesis

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the variance in thriving among students in fraternity houses, traditional residence halls, or apartment-style residences. No significant difference in thriving was found between these

groups. Similarly, no significant difference was found between the groups in the domains of Positive Perspective, Social Connectedness, Engaged Learning, Diverse Citizenship, and Academic Determination. To mirror the conditions of the national study, participants 25 years of age and above were filtered out of the data set. A second one-way ANOVA was conducted without the older participants, and no significant difference was found between residence type and thriving, Positive Perspective, Social Connectedness, Engaged Learning, Diverse Citizenship, and Academic Determination.

Secondary Hypotheses

To determine the thriving of fraternity and sorority members regardless of their living environment, a Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to examine the relationship between fraternity and sorority involvement and scores on the Thriving Quotient. A moderate positive correlation was found between the thriving domain of Social Connectedness and fraternity and sorority involvement ($r(87) = .336$, $p < .01$). A negative correlation was found between Engaged Learning and fraternity and sorority involvement ($r(85) = -.291$, $p < .01$). Overall, a weak relationship that was not significant was found between thriving and fraternity and sorority membership (see Table 3).

Additional correlation calculations were conducted using filters to determine the factors that influence thriving in fraternities and sororities. For students who reported their age as under 25 years, a significant relationship was found between Social Connectedness and fraternity and sorority involvement, $r(71) = .272$, $p < .05$. A positive significant relationship was also found between traditionally aged students' fraternity and sorority involvement and Academic Determination, $r(71) = .272$, $p < .05$. When students of all ages were used in the calculations, a significant negative relationship was found between Engaged Learning and fraternity and sorority involvement, whereas when non-

TABLE 3

Thriving and Fraternity and Sorority Involvement Correlations

Thriving Variable	No Filter	Age < 25	≤ 1 Mile	> 1 Mile, Age < 25	≤ 1 Mile, Age < 25
Positive Perspective					
Pearson Correlation	.093	.097	-.058	.237	-.081
Sig. (2-tailed)	.390	.418	.684	.288	.575
N	88	72	52	22	50
Social Connectedness					
Pearson Correlation	.336**	.272*	.314*	.210	.320*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.020	.022	.348	.022
N	89	73	53	22	51
Engaged Learning					
Pearson Correlation	-.291**	-.074	-.358**	.046	-.352*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.538	.009	.839	.012
N	87	72	52	22	50
Diverse Citizenship					
Pearson Correlation	.109	.131	.149	-.103	.138
Sig. (2-tailed)	.317	.281	.298	.656	.344
N	86	70	51	21	49
Academic Determination					
Pearson Correlation	.151	.272*	.083	.637**	-.087
Sig. (2-tailed)	.160	.020	.560	.001	.544
N	88	73	52	22	51
Thriving					
Pearson Correlation	.129	.224	.051	.282	.051
Sig. (2-tailed)	.244	.064	.729	.216	.728
N	83	69	49	21	48

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

traditionally aged students were filtered out, no significant relationship was found (see Table 3).

Measuring students' residence's distance from campus in relation to thriving resulted in several notable relationships. Not surprisingly, students who lived further from campus were found to participate less in fraternity and sorority life than students who lived close to campus, $r(83) = -.583, p < .01$. No significance difference was found between the thriving scores of students who lived on campus ($M = 4.41$, $SD = .51$) versus off campus ($M = 4.50$, $SD =.53$), $t(81) = -.662, p = .510$ (see Table 4). Among students who lived within one mile of campus, fraternity and sorority involvement was found to have a significant positive relationship with Social Connectedness ($r(51) = .314, p < .05$), and a significant negative relationship with Engaged Learning, $r(50) = -.358$, $p < .01$ (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

Thriving and Number of Fraternity and Sorority Member in Residence Correlations

Thriving Variable	No Filter	Age < 25
Positive Perspective		
Pearson's Correlation	-.103	-.089
Sig. (2-tailed)	.515	.586
N	42	40
Social Connectedness		
Pearson's Correlation	-.003	-.001
Sig. (2-tailed)	.985	.994
N	42	40
Engaged Learning		
Pearson's Correlation	-.045	-.025
Sig. (2-tailed)	.780	.882
N	41	39
Diverse Citizenship		
Pearson's Correlation	-.011	-.005
Sig. (2-tailed)	.944	.976
N	40	38
Academic Determination		
Pearson's Correlation	-.171	-.132
Sig. (2-tailed)	.278	.417
N	42	40
Thriving		
Pearson's Correlation	-.031	-.004
Sig. (2-tailed)	.853	.982
N	39	37

In combining the two filters based on age and residence location, additional relationships were found. Among traditional-aged students who lived more than one mile from campus, a strong positive relationship was found between fraternity and sorority involvement and Academic Determination, $r(20) = .637$, $p < .0)$. Among traditional-aged students who lived within one mile of campus, a positive significant relationship was found between Social Connectedness and fraternity and sorority involvement, $r(49) = .320$, $p < .05$, and a significant negative relationship was found between Engaged Learning and fraternity and sorority involvement, $r(48) = -.352$, $p < .05$.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between the number of fraternity and sorority members students lived with and their scores on the Thriving Quotient. No significant relationship was found between the number of fraternity and sorority members in one's residence and thriving, or with any of the thriving domains of Positive Perspective, Social Connectedness, Engaged Learning, Diverse Citizenship, and Academic Determination.

DISCUSSION

Type of On-Campus Residence

Evidence from this study did not support the primary hypothesis that official on-campus fraternity and sorority residences support student thriving. Residents of fraternity and sorority houses reported levels of thriving that were not significantly different than their peers in other on-campus residences. However, it should also be noted that no other type of residence resulted in increased thriving levels. In the same way that the results do not demonstrate increased thriving in fraternity and sorority house residents, the results do not support or justify the abandonment of this traditional form of fraternity housing. In this way, the results are inconclusive.

The lack of a relationship in thriving across fraternity and sorority member residences may be symptomatic of the larger on-campus housing experience. Across the entire sample of affiliated and nonaffiliated students, on-campus housing was not shown to be correlated with increased thriving. A lack of significance in this area challenges an even greater orthodox component of higher education in the United States. Previous researchers have suggested that the lack of conclusive evidence regarding student residences may be attributed to the presence of an indirect correlation, rather than a direct correlation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Living on campus has been previously shown to be associated with higher levels of academic and social engagement (Ballou, Reavill, & Shultz, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Therefore, although on-campus housing may not directly support the development of thriving, an increased likelihood to participate in other positive activities may indirectly support student thriving.

Distance From Campus

While no significant differences were found in levels of thriving based on students' on-campus versus off-campus residence location, participants were also assessed on their residences' distance from campus. In examining the correlations between fraternity and sorority involvement and student thriving among students who live within one mile of campus, results similar to that of the broader population were found— that is, higher levels of Social Connectedness and lower levels of Engaged Learning. It should be noted that the relationships between Engaged Learning and fraternity and sorority involvement was slightly stronger in a negative trajectory among students who lived within one mile of campus. The positive relationship found between Social Connectedness and fraternity and sorority involvement was slightly lower and less significant among students within one mile of campus, although the relationship was nonexistent among students living greater than one mile from campus.

In examining the results of students living more than one mile from campus, a strong significant relationship was found between fraternity and sorority involvement and student Academic Determination. This evidence suggests that living farther from campus may be more conducive to academic thriving. Or when viewed inversely, fraternity and sorority members who are more motivated to do well academically are more likely to choose a living environment away from the social atmosphere closer to campus.

Thriving in Fraternity and Sororities

Fraternity and sorority membership has frequently been associated with social development. In similar fashion, fraternity and sorority involvement was shown to be related to the thriving domain of Social Connectedness. These results support the notion that peer support networks in fraternal organizations encourage interpersonal development. However, in the other measure of interpersonal thriving, Diverse Citizenship, no significant relationship was found. These results indicate that fraternities and sororities may need to expand the breadth of the social relationships and experiences during college to promote more holistic interpersonal development.

Somewhat contradictory results were found relating to fraternity and sorority members' learning and academic thriving. While fraternity and sorority membership was found to be significantly positively related to Academic Determination among traditionally aged students, membership was found to be significantly negatively related to Engaged Learning. The subtle differences in the academic values and attitudes of fraternity and sorority members have also been found in previous studies. Membership in fraternities and sororities has been found to increase the extrinsic value placed upon education but not the intrinsic value (Astin, 1993; McCabe & Bowers, 1996; Wilder, McKeegan, Midkiff, Skelton, & Dunkerly,

1997). Remaining unaffiliated was found to promote intrinsic values of education. The different outcomes for Engaged Learning and Academic Determination may be due in part to how the two domains relate to the intrinsic versus extrinsic value placed upon education.

Age and Thriving in Fraternities and Sororities

While the national study limited its exploration of thriving to traditionally aged students, the current study explored several dimensions of thriving across age limits. When nontraditional-aged students were filtered from the data set, a slightly smaller and less significant relationship was found between Social Connectedness and fraternity and sorority involvement. The negative relationship between fraternity and sorority membership and Engaged Learning that was present in the general sample was no longer present when students 25 and older were filtered out. Furthermore, where no relationship existed in the larger data set, a significant relationship was found between Academic Determination and fraternity and sorority membership. While the sample of nontraditional-aged students in fraternities and sororities was small, the effect of their responses significantly altered the data set. The findings from the age filters suggest that nontraditional-aged students in fraternities and sororities are less likely to be socially connected and have Academic Determination, but more likely to be engaged in their learning than their traditional-aged affiliated peers.

IMPLICATIONS

Building on the research by Blackburn and Janosik (2009) and Morettes (2010), the current study expands the knowledge base relating to fraternity and sorority housing. By intentionally examining and comparing the experiences of affiliated and nonaffiliated students based on their residence location and type using an inde-

pendently validated measure, a more holistic representation of student experiences may be achieved.

While the current case study institution provided one type of official fraternity/sorority housing, the results indicate that fraternity and sorority houses may be developed that do not detract from student thriving. Yet more can be done to fully develop fraternity and sorority houses into the living-learning communities that Whipple and Sullivan (1998a; 1998b) envisioned. Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity has taken a bold step in this direction in the development of Residential Learning Communities for undergraduate chapter members across the country. With evidence supporting higher developmental outcomes associated with housing in living-learning communities (Inkelas, Vogt, Longerbeam, Owen, & Johnson, 2006), implementing similar programs into fraternity/sorority housing has been shown to provide similar results.

Eberly, Wall, and Warren (2007) assessed students from 34 chapters who participated in the Residential Learning Communities using items from the EBI Fraternity Survey and the College and University Residence Environment Scales. The researchers found that chapters with higher faculty involvement were more likely to demonstrate higher academic support among members. Furthermore, higher faculty involvement supported nonacademic outcomes such as fraternal engagement. The results from this study demonstrate that more intentional steps in promoting a positive fraternity residential experience can be successful in promoting strong academic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal development.

The one domain of thriving that was negatively correlated with fraternity and sorority involvement was Engaged Learning. Many living-learning programs specifically promote engaging students in learning outside the classroom, whether through faculty in residence, residential classrooms, or a specific focus on an academic discipline. Promoting these or simi-lar experiences among fraternities and sororities may alleviate the negative relationship between fraternity and sorority involvement and Engaged Learning. As the results indicate that fraternity and sorority members are academically determined in their investment of effort, self-regulated learning, environmental mastery, and goal-directed thinking, the programs developed through living-learning communities may promote the further development of academic thriving through Engaged Learning. Fraternities and sororities should not just strive to achieve the top GPA among other campus chapters, but also to become the most actively academically engaged.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Further research comparing the fraternity living-learning community to other similar residential programs may enhance the understanding of student benefits from such programs. One such study was conducted by Kohl (2009) examining the comparative success outcomes of students in honors living-learning communities, civic/social leadership living-learning communities, or tradition residence halls. Using a similar methodology in examining established fraternity and sorority living-learning communities would provide a benchmark for student development in these programs. If the construct of thriving is used to assess such programs, care should be taken that honors programs are not perceived as the sole academic thriving living-learning community and civic leadership programs as the Diverse Citizenship thriving community, thereby leaving fraternities and sororities to fill the gap of the Social Connectedness thriving living-learning community. In each of the programs, a holistic approach to thriving and student success must be implemented.

Additional research will be necessary to examine the student experiences of fraternity and sorority members residing in different residential environments. The lack of significant dif-

ferences in thriving scores between fraternity and sorority members in these different environments indicates that fraternity and sorority membership in more salient among these individuals than their residential experience. However, the opportunity for student development in the residential setting cannot be ignored. Comparing the experience of fraternity and sorority members in these alternative official or unofficial residential environments — whether they are townhomes, apartments, designated residence hall floors or hallways, or smaller residence hall suites — will allow student affairs professionals to develop intentional programs for student growth in these settings.

The inconclusive results from the present study do not provide step-by-step guidance for institutions exploring the development of fraternity or sorority housing. What can be gained is the need for institution-specific information related to fraternity and sorority residential experiences and a willingness to explore alternative residential environments that best promote student success. Additional multi-institutional research may provide guiding insight into the general residential experiences of fraternity and sorority members. Coley and Henry (2000), however, offer several guiding principles for the process of developing fraternity and sorority housing. They recommend involving students throughout, examining your housing philosophy early, ensuring continuity of the project, incorporating celebrations, and maintaining institutional oversight. As one part of this process, a philosophy of student thriving may guide the development of and intentionally educational residential experience.

LIMITATIONS

Several institutional characteristics and methodological procedures limit the implications that may be drawn from the study. At the host institution, only one type of official on-campus housing was available to students in the form of fraternity and sorority houses. However, even these residences had a relatively small capacity, thereby limiting the number of responses from students. The host campus also did not support any official off-campus fraternity residences. The lack of diversity in fraternity housing created a homogeneous sample that limited the comparisons between fraternity and sorority living environments.

The survey suffered from a relatively low response rate, most likely due to its late distribution. The window for survey responses extended into spring finals and up to graduation. This time frame may have contributed to the higher response rate among seniors, who may have remained on campus until graduation. Furthermore, the high response rate of juniors and seniors may be due to the timing of the survey and the self-identification of students as members of the junior class they would begin in the fall, rather than the sophomore class they had just completed.

Further, results from this study were based on the experiences of students at a single institution; therefore, generalizability is limited. Contradictory or complimentary results may be found in the national sample of student thriving. Broadening the sample of institutions participating in the study on student thriving, and including items relating to fraternity and sorority housing will allow for more generalizable results. Furthermore, while the Thriving Quotient has been statistically shown to be a valid and reliable instrument, it has not been present in the literature long enough for it to be rigorously tested and compared to other instruments which measure similar traits. Doing so would allow for a greater understanding of student experiences.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ballou, R., Reavill, L., & Schultz, B. (1995). Assessing the immediate and residual effects of the residence hall experience: Validating Pace's 1990 analysis of on-campus and off-campus students. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 25*, 16-21.

Blackburn, S. S., & Janosik, S. M. (2009). Learning communities in fraternity/sorority housing. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 56-70.

Blimling, G. S. (1999). A meta-analysis of the influence of college residence halls on academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 551-561.

Coley, C., & Henry, R. (2000). To build or not to build? One campus' perspective. *Perspectives, 3*(4), 08-11.

Eberly, C. G., Wall, A. F., & Warren, B. (2007, May). *Faculty influence on fraternal residential learning communities*. Presentation at the NASPA/ACPA Institute on College Males, Atlanta, GA.

Gratto, F. J., Gratto, K. K., Henry, W. J., & Miller, T. E. (2002). The impact of facilities on community: An application to Greek housing. *College Student Affairs Journal, 22*(1), 23-33.

Hallenbeck, D. A., Dickman, M. M., & Fuqua, D. R. (2003). Dimensions of leadership and motivation in relation to residential setting. *Journal of College and University Housing, 32*(2), 23-31.

Inkelas, K. K., Vogt, K. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Owen, J., & Johnson, D. (2006). Measuring outcomes of living-learning programs: Examining college environments and student learning development. *Journal of General Education, 55*(1), 41-76.

Kellogg, A. P. (2001, November 2). Lawrence U. ends fraternities' right to housing privileges. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 48*(10).

Keyes, C. L. M., & Haidt, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Kohl, J. L. (2009). *The association of critical thinking and participation in living learning programs: Residential honors compared to civic/social leadership programs and non-participation in living and learning programs.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 2009). Abstract retrieved April 8, 2011 from ProQuest database.

Kuder, J. M. (1972). Differences among upperclassmen living in fraternities and residence halls. *Journal of Educational Research, 65*(5), 207-210.

Kuh, G. D., Pascarella, E. T., & Wechsler, H. (1996). The questionable value of fraternities. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 42*(32), A68.

Lorenzetti, J. P. (2006). Two key steps in addressing the sophomore experience. *Student Affairs Leader, 34*(21), 5-6.

Maisel, J. M. (1990). Social fraternities and sororities are not conducive to the educational process. *NASPA Journal, 28*, 8-12.

Maurais, R. L. (1968). A statistical analysis of the effects of housing environment on grade point average. State University of New York, Delhi, Agricultural and Technical College.

Morettes, E. T. (2010). Fraternity member's perceptions of the benefits and limitations of on-campus, university-owned fraternity housing and off-campus, chapter-owned fraternity housing. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL.

McCabe, D., & Bowers, W. (1996). The relationship between student cheating and college fraternity or sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 33,* 443-450.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) & American College Personnel Association (ACPA). (2004, January). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience* [Online]. Available: http://www.myacpa.org/pub/documents/learningreconsidered.pdf

Page, R. M., & O'Hegarty, M. (2006). Type of student residence as a factor in college students' alcohol consumption and social normative perceptions regarding alcohol use. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Substance Abuse, 15*(3), 15-31.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Penn, J. R. (1974). College student life style and frequency of alcohol usage. *Journal of the American College Health Association*, *22*, 220-222.

Pike, G. R. (1999). The effects of residential learning communities and traditional residential living arrangements on educational gains during the first year of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 269-284.

Rago, J. J. (1973). The influence of undergraduate residence upon student personal development. *College Student Journal, 7*(4), 1-11.

Rappaport, J., Bernstein, D. A., Hogan, M., Kane, J., Plunk, M., & Sholder, M. (1972). Fraternal and communal living: Values and behavior on the campus, *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19*(4), 296-300.

Schreiner, L. A. (2010a, May-June). The "Thriving Quotient": A new vision for student success. *About Campus*, *15*(2), 2-10.

Schreiner, L. A. (2010b, July-August). Thriving in the classroom. *About Campus*, *15*(3), 2-10.

Schreiner, L. A. (2010c, September-October). Thriving in community. *About Campus*, *15*(4), 2-11.

Schreiner, L. A., Edens, D., & McIntosh, E. J. (2011, March). *The Thriving Quotient: A new vision for student success*. Presentation at the annual meeting of NASPA, Philadelphia, PA.

Schreiner, L. A., McIntosh, E. J., Nelson, D., & Pothoven, S. (2009a, November). *The Thriving Quotient: Advancing the assessment of student success.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Schreiner L. A., Pothoven, S., Nelson, D., & McIntosh, E. J. (2009b, November). *College student thriving: Predictors of success and retention.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikzentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, *55(1),* 5-14.

Shea, C. (1995). Hamilton College to bar students from living in fraternities. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 41*(27), 32.

Tampke, D. (1990). Alcohol behavior, risk perception, and fraternity and sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 28*, 71-77.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Bliming, G. S. (1993). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 149-162.

Wechsler, H., Kuh, G. D., & Davenport, A. E. (1996). Fraternities, sororities, and binge drinking: Results from a national study of American colleges. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 260-279.

Winston, R. B., Jr., & Saunders, S. A. (1987). The Greek experience: Friend or foe of student development? In R. B. Winston, Jr., W. R. Nettles III, & J. R. Opper, Jr. (Eds.) *Fraternities and sororities on the contemporary college campus* (New Directions for Student Services Series, no. 40, pp. 5-20). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Whipple, E. G., & Sullivan, E. G. (1998a). *Greek letter organizations: Communities of learners?* New Directions for Student Services, no. 81. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Whipple, E. G., & Sullivan, E. G. (1998b). *Greeks as communities of learners*. New Directions for Student Services, no. 81. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wilder, D., McKeegan, H., Midkiff, R., Skelton, R., & Dunkerly, R. (1997). The impact of Greek affiliation on students' educational objectives: Longitudinal change in Clark-Trow educational philosophies. *Research in Higher Education, 38*, 151-171.

AUTHOR AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Matthew Vetter is a residence life coordinator at Bellarmine University in Louisville, KY, where he oversees several residence halls that include sorority housing. He holds a bachelor's degree from Transylvania University and a master's in College Student Personnel from the University of Louisville where he completed the present research under the advisement of Dr. Amy Hirschy. His past professional experiences include work in residence life, student activities, and fraternity/sorority affairs.

Thriving Quotient Variable List

Social Connectedness

Other people seem to have more friends than I do. (reverse scored)

I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns. (reverse scored)

I don't have many people who want to listen when I need to talk. (reverse scored)

Positive Perspective

When things are uncertain for me, I usually expect the best.

I always look on the bright side of things.

I'm optimistic about what will happen to me in the future.

I am satisfied with my life.

The conditions of my life are excellent.

Engaged Learning

I feel as though I am learning things in my classes that are worthwhile to me as a person.

It's hard to pay attention in many of my classes. (reverse scored)

I can usually find ways of applying what I'm learning in class to something else in my life.

In the last week, I've been bored in class most of the time. (reverse scored)

I find myself thinking about what I'm learning in class even when I'm not in class.

I feel energized by the ideas I'm learning in most of my classes.

Diverse Citizenship

Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.

I can best understand someone after I get to know how he/she is both similar and different from me.

I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different cultures.

No matter what kind of person you are, you can always change substantially.

I give time to making a difference for someone else.

I have the power to make a difference in my community.

I value opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community.

I am willing to act for the rights of others.

You can learn new things, but you can't really change how intelligent you are. (reverse scored)

Academic Determination

I am good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.

I am good at managing my time so that I can fit everything in that needs to be done.

Even when course materials are dull and uninteresting, I manage to keep working until I finish.

I study more than most of the students here.

I am motivated to do well in school.

I actively pursue my educational goals.

When I become confused about something I'm reading for class, I go back and try to figure it out.

When course work is difficult, I give up or only study the easy parts. (reverse scored)

APPENDIX B

Additional Items Variable List

If you live on campus, please select your current living setting.
> (1, traditional residence hall; 2, fraternity or sorority house; 3, ULP suite or apartment)

In your current residential setting, how many fraternity or sorority members do you live with?
> (1, 1; 2, 2; 3. 3; 4, 4 or more)

What is your current residence's distance from campus?
> (1, on campus; 2, within 1 mile of campus; 3, 1-5 miles from campus; 4, 6-10 miles from campus; further than 10 miles from campus)